were placed on cars in the Greater Columbia area and were displayed on helicopters, jeeps, and other vehicles of the First Cav in Vietnam.

In November 1966, the 213th Assault Support Helicopter Company was "adopted" by several Columbia civic clubs, and today there are two helicopters in Vietnam named "Spirit of Columbia" and "RSVP" which serve as reminders to the men of the 213th that South Carolinians are supporting them. Recently three hospitals, the 2nd Surgical, 85th Evacuation, and 616th Medical, have been "adopted" by various organizations and incorporated into the RSVP program.

"CAROLINA CORNFIELDS"

Many unique items have been sent to "adopted" units. The late John Wharton spearheaded a drive to find, repair, paint, and send four cement mixers to the First Cavalry Division for use in constructing cement foundations for troop quarters. Today "Carolina Cornfields" are growing in Vietnam, thanks to the nearly 1,000 pounds of tobacco, soybean, corn, tomato, and watermelon seed sent with the help of the Coker Feed Company, U.S. Soil Conservation Department, Richland County Farm Agent Bob Bailey, and many others. The Rotary Clubs of Columbia and Cayce sent an X-Ray machine for the 15th Medical Battalion for use in treatment of South Vietnamese at their dispensary on An Khe. Norm Arnold and the Ben Arnold Company helped get 10,400 plastic utility bags for keeping personal gear dry, which "sponsors" sent to their "adopted" units.

Periodic "Mail-Ins" are held to encourage "sponsors" to send items such as nails, saws, medical supplies, washing machines, doll clothing made by patients at the South Carolina State Hospital and Crafts-Farrow State Hospital, and soap to their "adopted" units.

Reuben Grauer, from Tree of Life Temple, has sent shipments every month for over a year to his "adopted" 227th Aviation Battalion, and South Carolina Tax Commission employees have sent many cases of cigarettes and personal letters to the soldiers in the 85th Evacuation Hospital. Even the Jaycee chapter in the State Correctional Institution and students in several elementary schools in the Columbia area have been active RSVP "sponsors."

STATE HEADQUARTERS

RSVP now has a state headquarters located at 703 Saluda Avenue, Columbia, donated by the South Carolina National Bank. Many citizens bring to the headquarters paper back books, magazines, clothing, and other items to be sent to Vietnam. Both the South Carolina Jaycees and the state's American Legion have "adopted" the RSVP project as statewide programs.

This community-wide project has been endorsed by the General Assembly of South Carolina, the State's legislative delegation to Washington, General William C. Westmoreland, and General John J. Tolson, the Commanding General of the First Cav, as well as by Army Secretary Stanley Resor. Governor Robert McNair sent letters to all State governors regarding RSVP. The State of Montana has already "adopted" Vietnam, patterning their program after South Carolina's.

The Commanding Officer of the 27th Maintenance Battalion expressed the attitude of many servicemen in "adopted" units when he wrote:

"The spirit and generosity you have conveyed is indicative of the finest traditions of a patriotic citizenry toward its fighting men and our country's struggling ally. Although you are not able to see the fruits of your labors, they are many."

All South Carolinians are challenged to join the "RSVP Team" to help organize in communities throughout the State "adoptions" of military units. This is an opportunity to show our fighting men that we are behind them. For further information, please write Dr. J. David Palmer, 4101 Sandwood Drive, Columbia, S.C. 29206.

SENATE—*Monday, June 3, 1968*

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

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

Dear Heavenly Father, we are reminded that You have called us to adventure in living. We are free moral creatures. You have sustained us by Your providence, chastened us by Your discipline, and redeemed us by Your love.

We pray for Your continued presence in our Nation's life as we seek peace in the world and solution to our national problems.

Give to our national and world leaders divine light in dealing with revolution and violence throughout the world. We know that through Your help there is a hope that is redemptive. May the burdens of the day increase our strength, the hindrances turn our steps from evil and all disciplines bring us closer to Your way of life for all mankind. We pray in the Master's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 29, 1968, be dispensed with.

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

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

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

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

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

TRIBUTE TO HELEN KELLER

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, over the weekend, and since the Senate was last in session, a very great American died. I refer to Helen Keller.

It is not necessary that I attempt to praise Helen Keller. She has won her praise and her own reward.

An individual who from childhood, almost from the time of her birth, was both blind and deaf, and at that time mute, came to be one of the great characters, not only of her generation but of all time as well. Her example in overcoming handicaps will be an inspiration, is an inspiration, and has been an inspiration to countless thousands.

She has given to the world an understanding of what it means to live in darkness. The fact that her dedicated teacher could reach her and that she could begin the learning processes is nothing less than a miracle.

So we honor Helen Keller not alone because of the great life she lived in a world of darkness and in a world of silence, unable to hear, finally mastering an ability to talk, but we honor her also because of her sterling character and her unquenchable Christian faith. She will forever be a symbol that will be inspiring and helpful to countless millions down through the ages.

I know that no words of mine can add luster to her name. Truly, she was one of the great citizens of the world, and she has proved that man is more than flesh and bones.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1139.

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

AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURE FROM CONTINGENT FUND OF SENATE

The resolution (S. Res. 291) authorizing expenditure from the contingent fund of the Senate was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 291

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Ninetieth Congress, $35,000, in addition to the amounts, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946, and S. Res. 137, agreed to July 17, 1967.

HEARINGS ON COMPETITIVE PROBLEMS IN THE DRUG INDUSTRY, PART 5

The resolution (S. Res. 292) authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 5 of Senate hearings on competitive problems in the drug industry was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 292

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business one thousand four hundred additional copies of part 5 of hearings before the committee during the Ninetieth Congress,

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

first and second sessions, entitled "Competitive Problems in the Drug Industry."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1158), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

Senate Resolution 292 would authorize the printing for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business of 1,400 additional copies of part 5 of the hearings before the committee during the 90th Congress, first and second sessions, entitled "Competitive Problems in the Drug Industry."

The printing cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

Printing cost estimate

1,400 additional copies at $815.33 per thousand	$1,141.45

HEARINGS ON COMPETITIVE PROBLEMS IN THE DRUG INDUSTRY, PART 6

The resolution (S. Res. 294) authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 6 of Senate hearings on competitive problems in the drug industry was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 294

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business one thousand four hundred additional copies of part 6 of hearings before the committee during the Ninetieth Congress, first and second sessions, entitled "Competitive Problems in the Drug Industry".

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1159), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

Senate Resolution 294 would authorize the printing for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business of 1,400 additional copies of part 6 of the hearings before the committee during the 90th Congress, first and second sessions, entitled "Competitive Problems in the Drug Industry". The estimated printing cost is $1,200.

AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING AND THE SMALL BUSINESSMAN

The resolution (S. Res. 295) authorizing the printing of the study entitled "Automatic Data Processing and the Small Businessman" as a Senate document was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 295

Resolved, That there be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document a study entitled "Automatic Data Processing and the Small Businessman", prepared for the Senate Select Committee on Small Business by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; and that four thousand five hundred additional copies of such document be printed for the use of that committee.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1160), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

Senate Resolution 295 would authorize the printing, with illustrations, as a Senate document of a study entitled "Automatic Data Processing and the Small Businessman," prepared for the Select Committee on Small Business by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; and provide that 4,500 additional copies of such document be printed for the use of that committee.

The printing cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

Printing cost estimate

To print as a document (1,500 copies)	$3,254.44
4,500 additional copies, at $243.94 per 1,000	1,097.73
Total estimated cost, S. Res. 295	4,352.17

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 702) authorizing certain printing for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs was considered, and agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1163), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

House Concurrent Resolution 702 would authorize the printing for the use of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs of 56,100 copies of a publication entitled "Summary of Veterans Legislation Reported, 90th Congress," and an additional 43,900 copies for the use of Members of the House of Representatives (100 per Member).

Printing cost estimate: $6,768.35.

ANTICRIME PROGRAM HEARINGS

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 614) to provide for the printing of 1,000 additional copies of anticrime program hearings was considered, and agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1162), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

House Concurrent Resolution 614 would authorize the printing for the use of the House Committee on the Judiciary of 1,000 additional copies of its hearings entitled "Anti-Crime Program, Hearings Before Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 90th Congress, first session."

Printing cost estimate: $6,873.26.

VETERANS' BENEFITS CALCULATOR

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 44) authorizing the printing of additional copies of a veterans' benefits calculator was considered, and agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1161), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

House Concurrent Resolution 44 would provide that after the conclusion of the second session of the 90th Congress there be printed 50,240 copies of a veterans' benefits calculator prepared by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee of which 2,000 copies would be for the use of that committee, 2,000 copies for the use of the House Committee on Finance, 37,485 copies for the use of the House of Representatives (85 per Member), and 8,755 copies for the use of the Senate (85 per Member).

Printing cost estimate: $5,838.

POLICING OF BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

The bill (S. 3504) 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," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 11 of the Act of August 4, 1950 (64 Stat. 412; 2 U.S.C. 167j) is amended by—

(1) inserting therein, immediately after "SEC. 11.", the subsection designation "(a)"; and

(2) inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) For the purposes of this Act, the term 'Library of Congress buildings and grounds' shall include (1) the whole or any part of any building or structure which is occupied under lease or otherwise by the Library of Congress and is subject to supervision and control by the Librarian of Congress, (2) the land upon which there is situated any building or structure which is occupied wholly by the Library of Congress, and (3) any subway or enclosed passageway connecting two or more buildings or structures occupied in whole or in part by the Library of Congress.".

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1156), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

S. 3504 would extend the present authority of the Library of Congress for policing the Library of Congress buildings to embrace the rental space it utilizes at certain other locations in Washington, D.C. The Library's present authority, expressed in the act of August 4, 1950 (64 Stat. 412; 2 U.S.C. 167–167j), does not extend beyond the streets surrounding its permanent buildings located on Capitol Hill.

The General Services Administration was requested by the Library of Congress to supply guards for the buildings leased by Library purposes at Taylor Street NW. and 214 Massachusetts Avenue NE. locations, but was advised by GSA that it was administratively and physically unable to supply guards for the purpose. Consequently, the Library of Congress has had to recruit its own special policemen to protect the staff and contents of its leased buildings. S. 3504 would grant to such special police the same authority exercised by the police guarding the permanent Library of Congress buildings.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

The resolution (S. Res. 296) to authorize additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 296

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Ninetieth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

GEORGE N. PFEIFFER

The resolution (S. Res. 298) to pay a gratuity to George N. Pfeiffer was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 298

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to George N. Pfeiffer, widower of Helen K. Pfeiffer, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to two months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

MARIE T. MUSSELMAN

The resolution (S. Res. 299) to pay a gratuity to Marie T. Musselman was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 299

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Marie T. Musselman, widow of William Melvin Musselman, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR HAYDEN

The resolution (S. Res. 297) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the tributes on the Senate floor to the Honorable CARL HAYDEN on the occasion of the announcement of his retirement from public office was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES 297

Resolved, That the tributes expressed on the Senate floor by Members of the Senate to the Honorable Carl Hayden, a United States Senator from the State of Arizona and President pro tempore of the Senate, on the occasion of the announcement of his retirement from public office, be printed as a Senate document, in such format and together with such pertinent materials and illustrations as may be determined by the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed and bound for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing that quantity of additional copies of such document permissible under statutory limitations.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 286) to employ additional clerks for the Committee on the District of Columbia which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, in line 2, after the word "from," strike out "May 1, 1968, to" and insert "the date of approval of this resolution through"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia is authorized from the date of approval of this resolution through January 31, 1969, to employ three additional clerical assistants, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 90-57, approved July 28, 1967, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1157), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

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

Senate Resolution 286 as referred would authorize the Committee on the District of Columbia from May 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, to employ three additional clerical assistants, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 90-57, approved July 28, 1967, as amended.

Since the commencement date of May 1, 1968, expressed in the resolution is now past, the Committee on Rules and Administration has amended Senate Resolution 286 to provide that the authorization be effective from the date of approval of the resolution by the Senate. Should that approval date be near June 1, 1968, the three additional employees would be authorized for approximately 8 months, and the total maximum salary expenditures authorized would be approximately $22,000.

CREATION OF COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like to know what the plans are in reference to Calendar No. 1100, Senate Resolution 13, providing for the creation of a Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. This is not a consent bill.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. And it has not been scheduled for floor consideration.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator has no report, then, on when it will be considered?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have no report on when it will be considered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that, under the authority of the order of the Senate of May 29, 1968, the Vice President, on May 29, 1968, signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 3299. An act to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain lands on the Spokane Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14672. An act to amend the act of February 14, 1931, relating to the acceptance of gifts for the benefit of Indians;

H.R. 14922. An act to amend Public Law 90-60 with respect to judgment funds of the Ute Mountain Tribe;

H.R. 15224. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; and

H.R. 15271. An act to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Spokane Tribe of Indians.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

On May 29, 1968:

S. 5. An act to safeguard the consumer in connection with the utilization of credit by requiring full disclosure of the terms and conditions of finance charges in credit transactions or in offers to extend credit; by restricting the garnishment of wages; and by creating the National Commission on Consumer Finance to study and make recommendations on the need for further regulation of the consumer finance industry; and for other purposes.

On May 30, 1968:

S.J. Res. 142. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Crawford H. Greenewalt as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution;

S.J. Res. 143. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Caryl P. Haskins as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; and

S.J. Res. 144. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. William A. M. Burden as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

On May 31, 1968:

S. 68. An act for the relief of Dr. Noel O. Gonzalez;

S. 107. An act for the relief of Cita Rita Leola Ines; and

S. 2248. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Fuentes Roca.

REPORT OF NATIONAL COMMISSION ON ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS TO REHABILITATION OF THE HANDICAPPED—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 324)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying re-

port, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

To most Americans, a stairway poses no problem. A narrow doorway is little more than an inconvenience. But for more than 20 million of our citizens, these simple structures bar the living of a normal life.

One in every 10 Americans suffers from some disability which keeps him from using buildings designed—not cruelly, but thoughtlessly—only for the physically fit. Problems in the design of our buildings pose the greatest single obstacle to employment of the handicapped.

If we are to give the millions of handicapped Americans the opportunity to live life to the fullest, we must not put unnecessary barriers in their path.

We want our schools, libraries, office buildings, theaters, museums, stadiums and transportation systems to be accessible to all.

In 1966, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare appointed a National Commission on Architectural Barriers to Rehabilitation of the Handicapped. I am pleased now to transmit to the Congress the report of that Commission entitled "Design for All Americans."

The report shows increased awareness of the problems by State and local governments, architects, and the general public. In the past year, the General Services Administration has substantially modified its design standards to give more consideration to the handicapped.

But the report also shows that a substantial task lies ahead.

—In many cases, State laws are sadly inadequate. Some cover only State-owned buildings; others do not spell out the needed standards.

—No school of architecture gives special or continuing attention to the problem of accessibility.

In the next thirty years, more buildings will be constructed in this country than have been built in the past two hundred years. And as we go about this tremendous task, we must make sure that the needs of the handicapped are not overlooked.

I commend this Report to your attention.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 3, 1968.*

REPORT ON UNITED STATES-JAPAN COOPERATIVE MEDICAL SCIENCE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 325)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

We in America are fortunate that our lives are almost completely free of the scourges of cholera, leprosy, exotic viruses, and parasitic diseases. Some of our citizens are still struck by tuberculosis and malnutrition, but we are making significant progress against them.

Yet in Asia today, millions are killed or crippled by those six diseases. They also continue to pose a serious threat to our fighting men stationed in Southeast Asia.

The U.S.-Japan Cooperative Medical Science Program was begun in 1965 to find ways, through medical research, to eliminate or control those diseases.

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress today the annual report on that program. In slightly more than a year since the research efforts began

—Fifteen separate conferences dealing with specific diseases have been held in the United States and Asia.

—Contracts and grants were awarded for further intensive study of each disease.

—Additional steps were taken toward the development of a vaccine capable of conferring long-term immunity against cholera.

I believe you will find this report encouraging and enlightening, and I commend it to your attention.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 3, 1968.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 15794. An act to provide for U.S. standards and a national inspection system for grain, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 16127. An act to increase the limitation on the number of officers for the Coast Guard.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 15004) to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities thereunder, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILLS REFFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 15794. An act to provide for United States standards and a national inspection system for grain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.R. 16127. An act to increase the limitation on the number of officers for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Commerce.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 3571. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ediltrodito Quianzon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3572. A bill for the relief of Dr. Renee Diez de Force;

S. 3573. A bill for the relief of Mr. Diego M. Gimenez, Jr.; and

S. 3574. A bill for the relief of Coe A. Boardman and his wife, Martha E. Boardman, and the estate of Frank J. Smith and his widow, Therese E. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 3575. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN (for Mr. TOWER):

S. 3576. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 in order to provide for a fair and effective system of selecting persons for induction into the Armed Forces consistent with national security demands under such act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. HANSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 3577. A bill to amend chapter 13 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that the death of any veteran who, at the time of his death, was entitled to disability compensation for certain service disabilities will be deemed to have resulted from service-connected causes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3578. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release, on behalf of the United States, a condition in a deed conveying certain lands to the South Carolina State Commission of Forestry so as to permit such Commission, subject to a certain condition, to exchange such lands; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1967

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 in order to provide for a fair and effective system of selecting persons for induction into the Armed Forces consistent with national security demands under such act. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by the Senator from Texas, be printed in the RECORD, and that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3576) to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 in order to provide for a fair and effective system of selecting persons for induction into the Armed Forces consistent with national security demands under such act, introduced by Mr. HANSEN (for Mr. TOWER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3576

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 "Fair Selective Service Act of 1968".

SEC. 2. (a) Paragraph (2) of section 5 (a) of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 (50 App. U.S.C. (a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, in meeting any national quota of men to be inducted into the Armed Forces under this act, selection of persons for induction to fill such quota shall be made from persons in the primary selection group, after the selection of delinquents and volunteers. Selection of persons for induction into the Armed Forces from the primary selection group shall be made in an impartial manner, without regard to the age of such persons, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe."

(b) Section 5 (a) of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(3) As used in this section, the term 'primary selection group' means persons who are liable for training and service under this act, who at the time of selection are registered and classified, and who are—

"(A) between the ages of nineteen and twenty and are not deferred, or exempted;

"(B) between the ages of nineteen and thirty-five and, on or after the effective date of the Fair Selective Service Act of 1968, were in a deferred status, but are no longer in such status; or

"(C) between the ages of twenty and twenty-six on the effective date of the Fair Selective Service Act of 1968 and are not deferred or exempted.

Unless selected for induction or unless otherwise deferred from induction, a person shall remain in the primary selection group for one year. Any person who is removed from the primary selection group because of a deferment shall again become a member of the primary selection group, if he otherwise qualifies, whenever such deferment is terminated. Nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit the President from retaining persons in the primary selection group for a period exceeding one year if the President determines such action is necessary for effective national defense."

SEC. 3. The last two sentences of section 6 (h) (1) of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 are hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. The amendments made by sections 2 and 3 of this act shall become effective ninety days after the date of enactment of this act.

The statement of Mr. TOWER is as follows:

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, as a member of the Armed Services Committee I participated in lengthy hearings just a year ago from which evolved the Selective Service Act of 1967.

In those hearings close and careful consideration was given to a number of inequities in the previous Selective Service Law, and the committee ultimately reported a bill—which the Senate approved—in which I felt a serious effort had been made to improve Selective Service.

In our work last spring we were provided the additional suggestions of the Administration and of the President's Draft Advisory Commission. I think it is not incorrect to say, also, that we were led to believe by the comments of Administration spokesmen that if Congress would leave ample flexibility to the Administration certain steps would be taken through *regulations* to accomplish some of the corrections Congress had in mind.

I am a firm believer in the need for flexibility, posed in the commander-in-chief, in the Selective Service System. It is clear that the prime responsibility of that system is not absolute fairness nor the promotion of educational and social programs, but the emergency provision to our armed services of the very best men available when needed for our national security.

Having worked with the intricacies of national security for a number of years, I am intimately aware that only the National Security Council can at all times have immediately available the information needed to make rational judgments about the demands likely to be placed on our armed services in the near future. I, therefore, agreed with the committee and the Congress in last year's bill which left major decisions on draft equitability up to the President and his National Security Council.

One of the things I believed the President and the National Security Council would do—based on clear legislative intent—was to so revise the draft regulations that men at the younger-end of the eligibility scale were taken first.

Perhaps the most distressing trouble with the draft, a trouble which was called repeatedly to my attention last spring, is the years and years of uncertainty it imposes on young men, particularly students, who cannot make career or graduate work plans with any certainty until at least after age 26.

I would like to quote, Mr. President, from the Senate Armed Services Committee report of last year as it bears on this subject:

"The sequence under which eligible persons are inducted for military service today appears elsewhere in this report. This sequence is determined administratively under the President's power to implement the law by regulations. After delinquents and volunteers for induction, persons between the ages of 19 and 26 are reached, with the oldest being selected first."

"This sequence of induction has been criticized almost unanimously by the persons who have reviewed the operation of the draft law and its administration. Among the reasons for criticism of this sequence are:

(1) it prolongs a period of uncertainty about whether a person will be inducted;

(2) it causes hardships for employers when trained employees are drafted;

(3) it increases the number of deferment applications and appeals that must be considered; and

(4) it provides older manpower for the Armed Forces than would another system.

"In his selective service message to the Congress the President has indicated his intention to issue an Executive order that would change the present sequence of induction by having the primary vulnerability to the draft exist for persons between the ages of 19 and 20.

"The committee is not opposed to reversing the current sequence of induction. The transition in reversing the sequence of induction presents some problems, however. If all those persons over the age of 20 at the time the transition is accomplished are not to receive an unfair advantage as a result of the transition, they should be subjected to the same vulnerability as the 19-year-old class. Even if those over 20 are considered along with the 19-year-olds, the number of persons over 20 is likely to be greater than the number between the ages of 19 and 20."

"Thus a preponderance of eligibles who are over 20 would tend to defeat the objective of selecting the 19-year-olds. Moreover, those older than 20 would have the advantage of a reduced vulnerability to the draft, even if they are considered on the same basis as the 19-year-olds. Many of those who would receive this advantage have been deferred as students or for occupational reasons."

That is the way things stood last spring.

The truly unfortunate thing is that we still, today, stand at exactly the same place.

A year later nothing whatsoever has been done by the Administration to correct this problem of too-lengthy draft peril for our young men. And, coupled with an Administration decision to end deferments for graduate students this failure to act on reversal of the age for primary draft vulnerability has threatened our graduate schools with a severe loss of students next fall.

I acted in good faith last spring, Mr. President, when I supported the draft revisions written by the Senate. I waited in good faith for many months for the President and the National Security Council to complete studies, talks and deliberations pending their regulation decisions.

But, after months and months of delay the Administration failed.

It failed to correct this key draft inquiry.

I regret this failure. I know thousands of American young men regret it.

And, because I value the flexibility which should be maintained in national security affairs, it is with respect that I have determined that Congress must now act to restrict that flexibility.

Since we cannot count on the Administration to do what it led us to believe it would do on this issue, I believe further legislation now is crucial.

I have, therefore, prepared—and I introduce here today—a rather tightly-drawn bill designed to override this Administration inaction.

Briefly, this bill would reverse the existing order of draft call so that induction and selection will be made primarily from 19-year-olds, instead of taking the "oldest first" from age 25 down as now practiced.

The bill, entitled the "Fair Selective Service Act of 1968," creates a "primary selection group" of time-limited vulnerability from which most draftees would come in the future. This primary selection groups consists of:

1—men between the ages of 19 and 20 who are not deferred or exempted;

2—men between the ages of 19 and 35 who on the date of enactment of this bill were deferred but become no longer deferred;

3—men between the ages of 20 and 26 who when this bill is enacted are neither deferred or exempted.

Everyone who testified before the Senate committee last year supported this age-reversal solution to many of the draft's uncertainties. Under it each young man normally would undergo *one year* of prime draft vulnerability. If he was not inducted during that year he would be free to plan his future with virtual certainty that short of all-out war he would not be needed in the armed services. Students would be deferred for undergraduate work and would, when those deferments ended, undergo their year of prime vulnerability.

Since both 19-year-olds and new college graduates would combine to make up the primary selection group in any given year there would be no danger, such as we face this year, of having all of the year's demand fall on college graduates thus stripping the graduate schools of scholars at one fell swoop.

Thus, my bill would end lengthy uncertainty and graduate-school stripping. It would provide a better, fairer, more sensible Selective Service System.

May I note that I am aware there are other changes some would like to make in the draft laws. It is clear that my bill does not attempt to be an omnibus measure. Assessing the realities of the current legislative session I cannot, candidly, say that I think there is any chance for an omnibus draft bill to pass. Therefore, I restrict my bill to this item of most vital importance. I think that such a limited draft-improvement bill can be enacted.

I urge my colleagues to give it serious consideration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name be added to the bill (S. 3569) to amend title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 with respect to the use in good faith by State and local authorities of freedom of choice systems for the assignment of students to public elementary and secondary schools.

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3570) relating to the use in good faith by State and local authorities of freedom of choice systems for the assignment of students to public elementary and secondary schools.

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

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 74—RELATING TO THE 28TH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON ALCOHOL AND ALCOHOLISM

Mr. MOSS submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 74); which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 74

Whereas, the 28th International Congress on Alcohol and Alcoholism will take place in Washington, D.C., on September 15–20, 1968; and

Whereas, this International Congress will be the first gathering of this worldwide organization in the United States in 48 years; and

Whereas, this International Congress will be the largest professional gathering in history dedicated to solving the problem of alcoholism, our country's fourth major health problem; and

Whereas, delegates from all parts of the world will be participating in this meeting; and

Whereas, the disease of alcoholism and other alcohol-related problems known no national boundaries: therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States, by concurrent resolution, recognize the importance of this conference to world health and otherwise express the hope that the conference deliberations will help alleviate the serious threat which alcoholism and alcohol-related problems pose to world health; and further, that the President of the United States be requested to issue an appropriate Executive proclamation welcoming the delegates of the International Congress to our Nation's Capital.

EXTENSION OF TAX ON THE TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS BY AIR—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 838

Mr. BENNETT submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 16241) to extend the tax on the transportation of persons by air and to reduce the personal exemption from duty in the case of returning residents, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

THE PARIS PEACE TALKS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, disappointment caused by Hanoi's unwillingness to discuss reasonable terms in the Paris peace talks is understandable. We can hear voices already calling for a breaking off of those talks because of the North Vietnamese Government's intransigence.

William R. Frye, writing in a special report to the Sunday Star, observes that the absence of genuine negotiation at Paris is not a disaster, though it is clear that added military pressures will be needed to change North Vietnam's tune. In the meantime, the Paris confrontation remains. It keeps open the channels of communication and keeps ready the machinery for negotiations. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Frye's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

NO REASONABLE COMPROMISE

(By William Frye)

PARIS.—The fundamental question which has dominated the Paris peace talks from the outset is now susceptible of an answer.

The question is: Will Hanoi let the United States disengage from Viet Nam on the basis of a reasonable compromise?

The answer is no—almost certainly not. At least, not at this stage, and probably not for the foreseeable future.

Boiled down to its essence, Hanoi's "peace" program, as outlined here over the past three weeks, consists of four steps:

1. A total cessation of American bombing and "other acts of war" against the north—with no corresponding reduction of the Communist war effort in the south.

2. A total withdrawal of allied troops from South Vietnam, with no corresponding withdrawal of North Vietnamese forces.

3. A coalition government, including Communist ministers and presumably dominated by them.

4. "Noninterference" from the outside with subsequent Communist efforts to seize complete power.

This is, of course, a program for American capitulation. The only concession it makes to American requirements is the provision for an interim coalition. Otherwise it amounts to a surrender ceremony.

Initial bargaining postures in a major negotiation are always tough. But in most cases, a party which is willing to dicker takes care to telegraph the fact in subtle nuances of wording, in avoidance of absolutes, in private hints. There has been virtually none of this from Hanoi.

The conclusion which Western observers here feel forced to reach, however reluctantly, is that in Hanoi's present state of mind, anything less than a Communist victory is simply unnegotiable.

It does not necessarily follow that W. Averell Harriman and his staff should pack up and go home. Absence of a genuine peace negotiation behind the Paris facade is a disappointment, but not necessarily a disaster.

Many in Washington opposed attempting negotiations in the first place, believing the military balance on the war fronts too unfavorable to permit a satisfactory peace. They appear to have been right.

Except that the bombing north of the 20th parallel cannot readily be resumed in the face of predictable world disapproval, the name-calling here will do little harm, and machinery for negotiations will be ready for use if circumstances ever change.

New military pressure in the south will almost certainly be required to change them. It seems inevitable that the United States will have to turn the escalation screw once again, in order to extract from Hanoi a willingness to compromise.

THE HOUSING BILL, CRIME-CONTROL BILL, AND PARIS PEACE TALKS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a transcript of questions which were asked of me during a TV interview which was filmed on May 29, 1968, and my answers thereto.

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

TEXT OF SENATOR BYRD'S TELEVISION INTERVIEW, MAY 29, 1968

Q: Senator Byrd, you amended the Omnibus Housing bill during Senate debate. What does your amendment do?

A: Well, the bill sets up a program under which low-income families may purchase low and moderately priced housing with the federal government paying a part of the interest on the mortgage.

The bill, as it was brought to the Senate, only allowed private non-profit organizations to coordinate the construction and rehabilitation of dwellings to be offered to low-income families under the subsidy. My amendment extends to local public housing authorities the right to purchase, rehabilitate, and sell housing units to low-income families under the interest rate subsidy.

Now, in West Virginia, as of last December, there were 23 local public housing authorities, and there were over 2,150 in the United States. So here is an obvious source of talent on-going local sponsors which can produce a decided and immediate impact on a comprehensive housing program for low-income families. I think that we ought to be able to take advantage of it.

I want to provide the opportunity to low-income families as soon as possible to own their own homes and my amendment would help to expedite and accomplish this.

Q: To what do you attribute the lop-sided vote of 72–4 by which the Senate passed the Crime Control bill?

A: Well, I think the Senate acted in response to the general mood and temper of the country. I feel that the people of this country are fed up with the situation in which it is unwise and unsafe to walk the streets in many cities. I feel also that a reaction has set in against the excesses of the United States Supreme Court in recent years in dealing with criminals. The Court has, by its efforts, made it possible for many self-confessed criminals to escape punishment for their crimes altogether. The people generally resent this.

In my judgment, the Senate passed not only a good anti-crime measure, but it also delivered a severe and needed and deserved rebuke to the Supreme Court for its disregard of the rights of society which, in my judgment, are certainly superior to the rights of those who would destroy it.

Q: Senator Byrd, how do you evaluate the Paris peace talks at this point?

A: Well, thus far they have not been very fruitful, from our point of view, at least. Hanoi has been using the hiatus in bombing to reinforce her aggressive armies in the South. And she has been using the Paris talks as a forum in which to insist before the world that we are the aggressors in Vietnam.

The North Vietnamese are watching the situation on the ground in South Vietnam and they are holding fast to discussing a

cessation in bombing, and that alone. At the moment they are very intractable.

Q: How long can we refrain from bombing the North in view of the enemy buildup?

A: Well, I think this depends upon the mood and temper of the American people. It depends upon the ability of General Abrams to cope with the increasing enemy buildup in the South. And, I think it also depends upon any progress or lack of progress at the Paris peace talks.

Q: Well, Senator Byrd, how long should we continue our efforts to negotiate?

A: Well, the talks have not yet reached the negotiating stage, because there have been no indications from the other side that this is a two-way street.

We have to be patient, but we have to be firm. And I think we must understand that this is that period which apparently you must always go through in dealing with the Communists.

Now I feel that we must continue to make the effort, but one thing is sure—there can be no real hope for progress until we can get away from the public forum of the public conference table.

In order to have real progress there must be private, substantive, discussions.

INTERVIEWER. Thank you, Senator Byrd.

COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF SOUTH LAFOURCHE HIGH SCHOOL AT GALLIANO, LA.—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ELLENDER

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on Thursday, May 30, I delivered an address at the graduation exercises of the South Lafourche High School in Galliano, La.

First, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the program in its entirety, including the names of the graduating seniors.

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

GRADUATION 1968—SOUTH LAFOURCHE HIGH SCHOOL, MAY 30, 1968, 8 P.M.

CLASS OFFICERS

President, Ann Marie Theriot.
Vice-President, Tyrone Galjour.
Secretary, Becky Waldrup.
Treasurer, Jackie Bellanger.
Reporter, Peter Terrebonne.
Motto: It matters not how long we live . . . but how!
Colors: navy and yellow.
Flower: yellow rose.
Faculty advisors: Mr. and Mrs. Roland J. Thomassie.

PROGRAM

Miss Ann Theriot, Senior Class President, Presiding.

Processional: South Lafourche High School Band, Mr. Raul Prado, Director.

Invocation: Rev. Claude Fontenot, Golden Meadow Baptist Church.

Senior address: Mr. John William Sanders.

Principal's address: Mr. George J. Hebert.

Selection: South Lafourche High School Band, Mr. Raul Prado, Director.

Commencement address: Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER, United States Senator.

Presentation of scholarships and awards: Mr. Easton Pitre, Assistant Principal; Mr. John Rabb, Curriculum Director.

Awarding of diplomas: Mr. I. T. Danos, Visiting Teacher, Lafourche Parish.

Class song: "The Impossible Dream," Mrs. Mary D. Rabb, Accompanist.

Benediction: Rev. R. W. Hanberry, First Baptist Church of Larose.

Recessional: South Lafourche High School Band, Mr. Raul Prado, Director.

GRADUATING CLASS

Arthur Adams
David Adams
Diana Adams
Joanette Adams
Larry Adams
Cathy Alford
Albert Allemand
Cherie Allen
Gerald Angelette
Elton Arceneaux
Charles Aupied
Ryan Autin
Charlie Bankester
Maggie Barrios
John Barton
Randall Beehn
Jackie Bellanger
Linda Bernard
Robert Bernard
Glenda Bielkiewicz
Herbert Billiot
Martha Boudreaux
Winona Boudreaux
Karen Bourg
Mike Bourg
Benny Bourgeois
Glenn Bouzigard
Brad Bouzigard
Amy Bouvier
Maureen Broussard
Melissa Broussard
Rodney Broussard
Al Bruce
Linda Bruce
Bonnie B. Bruce
Bonnie L. Bruce
Cynthia Bruce
Genevieve Bruce
Gloria Bruce
Ray Bruce
Guy Buie
Marie Burkett
Paul Callahan
Gene Callais
June Callais
Mary Callais
Ronald Callais
Susan Carskadon
Judy Champagne
Carol Charpentier
Danny Charpentier
Claudette Cheramie
Keeland Cheramie
Lola Cheramie
Maenell Cheramie
Ned Cheramie
Nell Cheramie
Ovide Cheramie
Pat Cheramie
Phyllis Cheramie
Tony Cheramie
Douglas Chiasson
Terry Chiasson
Barbara Collins
Michael Collins
Susan Collins
Vickie Collins
Jeanette Comeaux
Curtis Compeaux
Fenivick Compeaux
Peggy Creel
Carolyn Crosby
Steve Crouch
Elaine Curole
Willie Curole
Gayle Danos
Rebecca Danos
Russel Danos
Sharon Danos
Dora Dardar
Beverly Degree
Debby Diaz
Eva Diebold
Davis Doucet
Flo Doucet
Beverly Duet
Mona Duet
Marilyn Dufrene
Paul Dufrene
Sandra Dufrene
Debbie Egle
Linda Esponge
Verely Esponge
Ronnie Estay
Wayne Estay
Cheryl Evans
Emilie Eymard
Pat Eymard
Tommy Eymard
Floyd Falgout
Aaron Fanguy
Roland Felarise
Ellen Fontenot
Cathy Foret
Pat France
Paula Galjour
Susan Galjour
Tyrone Galjour
Peter Galliano
Pat Garlington
Rodney Garlington
Bonnie Gautreaux
Curtis Gisclair
Delta Gisclair
Glenn Gisclair
Jerry Gisclair
Mona Gisclair
Joel Greene
Steve Gremillion
Charlene Griffin
Curment Griffin
David Griffin
Gail Ann Griffin
Gail Marie Griffin
Ronald Griffin
Charles Griffith
Carolyn Guidroz
Clark Guidry
Dolores Guidry
Lee Anna Guidry
Norman Guidry
Philip Guidry
Ronald Guidry
Danny Gunn
Gary Hanberry
Mona Hatcher
Kathy Hebert
Mona Hebert
Lynn Howell
Steve Killion
Steve Kohls
Anna Lafont
Dolly Lafont
Larry Lafont
Paulette Lanasse
Chris Lasseigne
Mitchell Lasseigne
Earline Layus
Kathy LeBlanc
Donald Ledet
Evelyn Ledet
Mary Ledet
Susan Ledet
Steve Lazard
Audrey Lee
Donald Lefort
Wanda Lefort
Debbie Lemasters
Kathy Leonard
Debbie Louis
Pat Louviere
Al McCullough
Sharon McNeill
Lanny Malcombe
Curtis Martin
Frances Martin
Glenn Martin
James Martin
Allan Matherne
Pat Matherne
Louis Mayeur
Harriet Moore
Kenneth Naquin
Ronnie Nelson
Edward Orgeron
Gary Orgeron
Joseph Orgeron
Judy Orgeron
Wayne Orgeron
Laura Lee Owen
Vicki Pagliughi
Pauline Perrin
Franklin Picou
Alice Pierce
Clay Pierce
Curtis Pierce
Daniel Pitre
Elaine Pitre
Lenette Pitre
Morris Pitre
Pat Pitre
Paul Pitre
Ronald Pitre
Burgess Plaisance
Carl Plaisance
Elaine Plaisance
Nicky Plaisance
Robert Plaisance
Ronnie Plaisance
Susan Plaisance
Rudy Remont
Charlene Richoux
Wade Richoux
Anne Roberthon
Pat Rodrigue
Elaine Rousse
Mona Rousse
Jordan St. Pierre
Dennis Sanamo
John Sanders
Charlene Savoie
Richard Savoie
Leslie Schouest
Douglas Sevin
Tilman Sevin
Bill Smith
Paula Smith
Lloyd Songe
Lyle Souther
David Summersgill
Charles Taylor
Christine Terrebonne
Donna Terrebonne
Marlene Terrebonne
Peter Terrebonne
Roland Terrebonne
Ann Theriot
Paris Theriot
Sherry Theriot
Larry Toups
Donna Turknett
Calvin Tyler
Eddie Tyler
L. J. Vegas
Nancy Verdin
Renee Vidrine
Danny Vining
Becky Waldrup
Bobby Walker
Cindy Whitman
Cindy Wiley
Donnie Williams
Jenny Williams
Arthur Williford

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address I delivered on that occasion.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, SOUTH LAFOURCHE HIGH SCHOOL, GALLIANO, LA., MAY 30, 1968

Graduating Seniors, Principal Hebert, Members of the faculty, proud parents, ladies and gentlemen: I am delighted to share with you, your parents and your teachers this significant occasion, the great turning point in your lives. I know that you must be bursting with pride on achieving this first important milestone, as you set out to make your way in the world as men and women.

Sixty years ago I sat as you are sitting now, awaiting the award of my diploma. After graduation my problem was to decide which profession I was going to pursue. I boiled down the possibilities to either law or medicine. So help me, I had to flip a coin to determine whether it would be law or medicine. Law won. I became a law student at Tulane University in the fall of 1909.

You are naturally looking ahead to what the coming years will hold for you. This is the way of young people. It is to be expected of them. They are always busy growing and planning and doing things. Rarely do they have time to look to the past.

Those of us who are older and who have some years behind us are given to moments of contemplative reflection on things gone by. But not young people—they are more concerned with tomorrow. They look to the future. It is yours to do with as you will. It is yours to shape for generations to come. When the time comes that you reach the age of reflection, there will be ample time to look back and consider how well you have done.

At the moment, your main consideration is what you are going to do from here, and this is as it should be. It will not be easy, not nearly as easy as it was for generations which have preceded you. Times have changed. Securing gainful employment, rearing a happy family and carrying out the duties of good citizenship are no longer the relatively simple things they once were.

Life is so very complex now that it is difficult to cope with. It is plagued by confusion and conflict which endanger the well-being and happiness of the weak and the unwary and those who are not prepared to meet the demands of today's society.

In a sense, your job will not be as easy as it was when I was a boy. Coming to grips with the world in which we now live is indeed difficult, and I see no hope, no indi-

cations, that it will become less burdensome in the future that is yours.

Never before in our history have young people gone out into the world at a more critical time.

But, by the same token, never have the times been more challenging.

Or more opportune.

Or more promising.

Or more exciting.

Some new discovery or some remarkable advancement is made almost each day. It is difficult to really comprehend the changes that have come about in just the last 60 years, since I received my diploma, as you are today.

At the turn of the century, when the first automobile trip acros the country took 70 days, virtually all of Louisiana's roads were unimproved. Indeed, at that time, there were only 144 miles of paved highways, outside the cities, in the entire United States. Today all of Louisiana is criss-crossed with concrete highways and one can travel to every important city in the United States on hard surfaced roads.

In 1903, the Wright Brothers flew an astounding 852 feet, and eight years thereafter some brave pilot dared to fly the entire distance from St. Louis to Chicago in only one day. This week I flew from New Orleans to Washington in one hour and fifty minutes. I am now able to reach Washington, D.C., from New Orleans more quickly than I was able to travel from Houma to Baton Rouge in 1921, when I was a member of the Convention that drafted our present Constitution. Today we are shooting rockets at the moon, and sending astronauts into outer space to orbit the earth every 90 minutes at a speed of almost eighteen thousand miles per hour or 5 miles per second.

In just a few years longer than your own lifetime, we have gone from radio to television, from propeller to jet and from a bomb that could destroy an entire block to thermonuclear bombs mounted on the noses of inter-continental ballistic missiles that can annihilate all mankind as we know it today.

This is the age of scientific and mechanical advancement, the age of automation in industry and business.

You must avail yourselves of all the education and special training that you can obtain. No longer are a strong back and a willingness to work all that is necessary to find gainful employment. Industry and business demand education and special skills. The pay is better, the hours are shorter and the fringe benefits more numerous. But the jobs are more difficult to secure.

Strive for excellence and scorn mediocrity. Work hard, and avoid what appears to be short-cuts to success. More often, they are dead end streets.

"The need for self-reliance," although an old theme, is applicable during these new and trying times. You must be more careful and learn to use your own minds and reach your own conclusions than at anytime in the past. The barriers between the individual and the mass mind are rapidly being broken down, it seems to me.

Over 100 years ago one of the wisest men in our nation said that, "civilized man has built a coach, but has lost the use of his feet." I can only wonder what that thinker would say about America in 1968, the year of your commencement. Would he say that civilized man has built a modern entertainment system, but has lost his ability to read and think? Would he say that civilized man has created a technical revolution, but has forgotten for what purpose? Or would he say that we have made possible unheard of amounts of leisure time and now do not know what to do with it? Perhaps so.

In any event, I suspect that mental self-reliance is becoming harder to achieve. We have today all manner of influences telling our people how to think, how to act, what to do. There is the pervasive influence of television, which is a thief of time, and a powerful creator of the mass mind. Many of the great newspapers in our nation are biased in their reporting, in an effort to convince their readers to think along certain lines. The various forms of advertising, both open and hidden, try to get us to act and think a certain way so that we will buy a product or support a position. All of these are forms of propaganda and they come at us every day from all directions in order to turn the citizen into something he was not before. All of these boil down to a continuous pressure to "join the crowd" and follow the thinking of others.

If I am correct in this evaluation and if the ability to think for yourselves is becoming more difficult, it is also becoming more important. This is especially true for graduating seniors tonight, and for those who are to follow you. There are many ideologies current in the nation, as well as in other parts of the world, which seek to attract support from the young. Some of these are dangerous. There are many false prophets loose in the land. Demagogues have come forth who are able to base their leadership not on construction, but on destruction. We have seen student "uprisings"—and I use the word advisedly—at many of our great universities. The leaders of these tumultuous events do not seem to know what they want, but they seem able to convince others that current conditions are terrible and without any saving grace whatsoever. Those of you who know European history will recall that the battle cry of the French revolution—liberty, equality, fraternity—served to bring the aristocracy of France to the guillotine in 1789, but it was not sufficient to stabilize and govern a nation. It seems to me that we have some of the same sort of thinking prevalent today.

Why have these events come about? And I refer not only to the universities, but to many other mass movements in our society today. I may be in error, but it seems to me that some of our American citizenry is becoming more and more used to being herded about like cattle. Under the influence of television, the mass news media, propaganda of all varieties, demagogues are able to come to the fore. After the differences and sharp edges have been worn off the will and minds of individuals, it becomes easier to bend the individual mind to the will of others and submerge it into a mass mind. Hitler's Germany was the foremost practitioner of this method of operation, and the Communists have used it to their own great advantage.

There is, of course, another side to the coin. Many of these movements are begun by sincere individuals who see conditions which they believe should be changed. They turn toward agitation of various kinds in order to effect these changes. It is the task of all of us, and especially the young, to be sure that the changes that are espoused will be for the better. In other words, it is necessary to develop an extremely critical attitude toward much of what we see and hear and are told to do today. By that I mean that you should measure the appeals that are placed before you, against the framework of your own personal life and experience.

You should strive to be sure that whatever you do is what you yourself think best. Then do the best that you can. In short, you need to rely upon yourself for mental and moral guidance, and can follow others only when you are yourself convinced that you are going in the right direction.

Once you have become a part of society in your own right, of necessity you will have to take a great many things on faith. Of necessity you will have to be a "part of the crowd" merely to survive. Unless you choose to be a hermit, you will not be able to do exactly what you feel should be done or exactly what you wish to do except on occasion. Modern society requires that we all submit to a multitude of rules and regulations simply to get along with one another in relative peace and harmony. This is particularly true in urban living. On those occasions of testing, however, when your actions will make a difference in your own life and in the lives of others, will you be able to speak with your own voice and you should speak according to your own conscience.

You will find it easier to make the big decisions if you practice on the small ones. You must learn to rely upon yourself in order to develop your own capabilities. Someone once said that "there is a time in every man's education when he arrives at the conviction that imitation is suicide, that he must take himself for better or worse, and that he will never accomplish anything worthwhile unless he works at it himself."

I think that you who are going out into the world tonight, you who are at the threshhold of your beginning, will find that to fulfill your lives you must do something which will provide you with a sense of creativeness. Each of us at some point learns to measure the value of our worth by what we are building and creating. Too much of what is going on today is not creative but is destructive. For that reason, I do not believe that it will continue, but if it does somehow grow in strength, then steps must be taken by our authorities to bring this destructiveness to an end.

As I said, we all need to feel that we are creating something and something worthwhile. It does not really make a difference what it is. A housewife can create a home. A worker can create a product or perform a service that needs to be done. There are as many avenues to creativeness as there are people in this nation.

The point is that for you who are at your beginnings, it will be necessary to discover a purpose or a cause or a manner of living that will provide you with a sense of worth. By relying upon yourself, in the years ahead, you will find endeavors to absorb your attention, utilize your energy and develop your skills and abilities. By relying upon yourself, you will be able to choose those things which will help give meaning to your life and reject those that will not. Up to now your family life, your education here at South Lafourche and other day-to-day influences have served to give you this purpose. From here out, you will have to rely upon yourself and choose among competing influences based upon what you yourself think best.

I would like to close with an old familiar line from Shakespeare's Hamlet. You have doubtless heard it many times before, but in a world that renews itself almost from year to year, the truth of the past perhaps becomes more important. The quotation is: "This above all—to thine own self be true. And it must follow, as the night the day, Thou canst not then be false to any man."

Be true to yourselves and I believe that you will not be able to embarrass yourselves or your family in the years ahead. You will become a credit to your community, to your state and to your nation. You are now going out into a changing world where you will find many opportunities as well as many responsibilities. You yourselves must act to take advantage of the chances that life will place before you, and you yourselves must act to fulfill your responsibilities to yourselves and to others. I envy you graduating seniors. For you this is a beginning of a new phase in your lives and I am proud to have been able to share it with you in some small part. I know that you will bear out the faith and confidence of your parents, your teachers and myself in the years ahead.

May the good Lord protect, preserve and bless you. Choose him as your beacon light and all will be well.

FINANCING A POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, our Nation is becoming increasingly aware of the tragic conditions under which the

poor and underprivileged in our society live. I do not think it is possible to emphasize enough the gravity of these problems. Hunger, unemployment, and other conditions of poverty have for too long deprived millions of citizens from effective participation in American life, and it is vitally important we move with direct and more creative action in eliminating these conditions.

An editorial appearing in a recent issue of Business Week clearly points out the need for new approaches in solving these problems. I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to this statement and therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

FINANCING A POVERTY PROGRAM

Just a few years ago Michael Harrington wrote a book about "The Other America"—that is, about poor Americans, who he said were "invisible" in this rich country. The poor are still with us but they are no longer invisible; indeed, the Poor People's March on Washington (page 34) is only dramatizing what has already become the most conspicuous—and difficult—issue in American politics.

The issue is the most difficult because of the deep resistances to paying the heavy costs of bridging the gap between the many who are affluent and the far too many who live wretchedly in this country. Unless the issue is posed in that way, there is the temptation to talk a lot of pious cant about the problems of the poor.

The simple arithmetic is this: To raise the present incomes of 30-million Americans up to the poverty line of $3,000 per year for a family of four persons would cost a minimum of $11-billion. However, economists who have worked in this area consider that figure far too low for a program with any hope of really moving people out of poverty; they calculate that the annual cost of a barely adequate program would be at least $20-billion above present federal anti-poverty spending.

But such numbers are being proposed at a time when the federal budget is already in heavy deficit. The immediate fight between the White House and Congressional conservatives is over whether to cut federal expenditures by either $4-billion or $6-billion, while increasing taxes by more than $10-billion in order to reduce the fiscal 1969 budget deficit to only $8-billion or so.

Does this mean that the situation is really hopeless, and that politicians and businessmen who are simultaneously decrying poverty and preaching fiscal restraint are talking out of both sides of their mouths? In part, it does. But, more fundamentally, it means that practically no one has faced up to the hard issue of reconciling a redistribution of income toward the poor with fiscal prudence.

Fiscal restraint is required to keep this country from falling into a national and international financial catastrophe. Inflation may not seem to disturb the nation overly much while the boom is on. But when the boom busts, the pains become universally palpable. If the U.S. should elect to persist on an inflationary course, paying for all sorts of government programs by depreciating the currency, it will increasingly be driven to protectionism, governmental controls and manipulation of foreign exchange, and finally economic isolation, which will have grave political as well as economic costs.

But pointing out these financial dangers does not mean that the country should not tackle the crucial problems of domestic poverty. Nor does it mean that much larger resources cannot go to the poor without damaging the national economy.

THE THREE FUNDAMENTALS

How can this trick be worked? There is no magic, but it will involve sticking to three principles:

1. The present composition of government expenditures must be restructured to focus more resources on the people at the bottom of society. There is merit in the complaint of Mrs. Martin Luther King that "our Congress passes laws which subsidized corporation farms, oil companies, airlines, and houses for suburbia, but when it turns its attention to the poor it suddenly becomes concerned about balancing the budget." In this time of inflation, the nation does need to worry—and should worry more—about balancing the budget, but there is no reason in the world (other than pork-barrel politics) that costly programs subsidizing individuals or groups that are quite well fixed should not be cut down or out, and replaced by subsidies for those who really need help.

2. Existing programs for helping the poor need to be improved or replaced. According to government estimates, some $27-billion of federal money is already going to the poor—plus a lot of state and local money. Many of these programs, in the opinion of welfare experts, suffer from deficiencies that lock the poor into poverty—for instance, by making it impossible for a husband to stay with his family or next to impossible for a woman to get day care for her children and go out and work. Welfare's faults have been studied and restudied; we know what to do. The need is to replace study with action.

3. A growing economy can afford, and will benefit from, programs to lift people out of poverty. The so-called "fiscal dividend"—the increasing tax yield of a growing economy—will total $10-billion or more every year. We should devote a larger share of these increasing resources to creating the jobs, providing services such as education and health that will prepare people for employment, and, when necessary, maintaining the income of those who cannot work or cannot support their families with the low-paying jobs for which they can qualify.

None of this will come easily. It will involve hard thought and careful planning of where government spending is going. If we are serious licking the poverty problem in this country, we should put our money—and our private and public planning—where until now only our mouths have been.

THE CURRENT STUDENT SCENE IN AMERICA

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the credentials of Henry Steele Commager to comment upon the current student scene in America are unquestionable. He has a 45-year span of experience in the academic world. In that time, we can be sure, he has dealt with, lectured to, and sought to understand countless thousands of students. In the Sunday Star, he has offered some cogent commentary on today's student revolt. He writes:

At its best, student revolt in America is characterized by idealism, at its worst by bad manners and violence, and almost everywhere by an exasperating combination of logic and irrationality.

But, in truth, he continues, the public reaction is also sometimes quite irrational and maybe more dangerous. The public should listen to these young adults and take some satisfaction in the fact that we do not have an indifferent generation of students. I ask unanimous consent that Henry Steele Commager's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE VIOLENT, IDEALISTIC WORLD OF STUDENT REVOLT

(By Henry S. Commager)

The student revolt at Columbia University has sent a tremor through the academic world as well as the non-academic world. Extreme in its violence and exaggerated in its intransigence, it yet differs in degree rather than in kind from revolts sweeping half the campuses of the country, from Harvard to San Francisco State. And for all its violence it is, by comparison with student uprisings in Paris, Berlin, Rome, and Madrid, a mild affair.

At its best student revolt in America is characterized by idealism, at its worst by bad manners and violence, and almost everywhere by an exasperating combination of logic and irrationality. This is because it is directed not so much against academic as against public grievances, not against ostentatious injustices and oppression as against authority, traditionalism and complacency.

At Columbia University it takes the form, largely symbolic, of resistance to the building of a university gymnasium with facilities for Negro children in a public park—a gesture which the university itself had imagined to be one of friendship and cooperation; at Northwestern it endorses the segregation of blacks in their own dormitories—an arrangement contrary to state laws against segregation. At Wisconsin and elsewhere it is a protest against allowing military and corporation recruiters on campus; at Rochester, and scores of other universities, it is directed against the mindless acquiescence of the university in the importunate demands of the military for the exploitation of university resources and facilities.

FORCE UNJUSTIFIED

None of these issues is so intransigent that it might not yield to reason or to compromise; none certainly seems pernicious enough to justify, scarcely even to explain, the use of force. All of them have a common denominator: resentment against the readiness—indeed the eagerness—of the university to forget its traditional commitment to the great commonwealth of learning, and to enlist in and assimilate to the political and military esablishment.

Irrational as is the outburst of student discontent, the explosion of public disapproval is equally irrational and may be more dangerous. To the public, as to the academy, the student revolt is a traumatic experience, and the public reaction to it is just as emotional as is the student reaction to university malpractices.

What possess the young, their elders ask. Never, after all, was a generation so pampered. We have given them everything, parents assert—an expensive education, a four-year exemption from toil and responsibility, and even from the military, a guarantee of a privileged position in the American society and economy. And to what end?

One segment of adult society sees in the student revolt nothing but ingratitude. Another looks upon it as a rejection of law and order and morality and a surrender to irresponsibility—a wholesale license to indulge in LSD and sex. Still others darkly suspect a Communist or a Black Power conspiracy.

And everywhere there is angry resentment that the young should so shatter our dream of happy and carefree college years, our vicarious enjoyment of a youth we never had. And along with this is a sense of guilt that somehow we have forfeited the confidence of the young, that we have failed to understand what was happening underneath our eyes.

DEFINING REVOLT

Yet the student revolt is neither an expression of original sin nor the product of a conspiracy, but an over-vigorous and overdue assertion of a discontent that has been brewing for years, and that has come to a

head—as many things have come to a head—with the Vietnam war.

First, it is a revolt against the anachronistic notion that the university stands in loco parentis to students who are physically, sexually, politically, and perhaps even intellectually like any other segment of adult society.

There is considerable justice in this complaint and logic in this protest. The university has persisted in the habit of acting in loco parentis long after the real justification for it has disappeared. Yet if little is to be said for the current practice, something is to be said for patience with the liquidation of that practice and the working out of some new formula. Universities do not, after all, act as parents out of sadistic instincts.

The institution of in loco parentis is an ancient one, rooted in two centuries of our own experience with students who were, indeed, children and who required parental care. Thirteen or 14 was the customary age of entrance to college in the 18th century—and after. John Adams was 13 when he entered Harvard, and Samuel Adams 14. John Jay entered King's College at 15, and Joseph Hopkinson was 13 when he enrolled in the new College of Philadelphia, while a really bright lad like John Trumbull could pass the entrance examinations to Yale at the age of seven.

Gradually during the 19th century the age of students crept upward, but colleges were not prepared to abandon the habits of generations and treat them as adults, nor were parents, who confessed a passion for the prolongation of youth unique to our own country.

BOYS AT WAR

That passion lingers on: every politician speaks of "our boys" in Vietnam, and it never seems to occur to us that if they are indeed boys they shouldn't be there, but in school.

Not only are college students kept in a state of pupillage; they are subjected to the indignity of being treated like high school pupils, hedged in for four years by requirements of courses, credits, majors and minors, attendance, examination, all of which are, in a sense, vestigial remains from the high school.

They are fobbed off with professors who do not teach, or who teach not gladly but badly.

They often are denied an effective voice—sometimes any voice—even in the conduct of their own affairs; the organization of student life, discipline, newspapers and journals, the choice of speakers, even the games they play.

STUDENT REJECTIONS

Student reaction to all this is just as irrational as university policy. Students reject the parental role of the university but they reject, with equal vigor, the intrusion of the civil authority onto the campus. They defy university limitations on their drinking habits, sexual freedom, use of drugs, or privacy, but they are outraged at the notion that in all these matters they should be subject to the same disciplines, the same laws, and the same penalties that apply to all other members of society.

Nor do most of them know what to do with student freedom when they have it. We have, in a sense, so corrupted them that they love the chains that bind them. They do not want freedom from the tyranny of courses, but more courses—courses, now, in sociology, now in the ghetto, now in Negro history, now in the Vietnamese war.

They do not want to rid themselves of examinations and credits and attendance and faculty control of their sports; instead they often demand more of all this. They want to be part of the university enterprise, even to have representatives on boards of trustees, but show little interest in the scientific and intellectual functions of the university—the library, for example, or laboratories—and little initiative in the cultivation of music and the arts.

Second, students are revolting against bigness—bigness which reduces the individual student to a computerized number, denies him access to professors or even to his fellow-students, weakens instead of strengthening his sense of individuality, and threatens to fit him into a kind of benevolent academic Brave New World. They are revolting against the university which is quite ready to take their (or their parents') money but which subjects them to inferior instruction from graduate students, which houses them in glorified barracks or, worse yet, houses some of them in fraternity and sorority houses and others in barracks—and wraps all of them in a cocoon of rules and regulations.

Here, again, some of the fault is their own making. Students could insist on good instruction—or stay away from bad. They could, but do not, clamor to be housed in cluster colleges that are somehow manageable. They could certainly do away with the inequities and anachronisms of fraternity and sorority which mirror and even exaggerate the inequities and discriminations of secular life.

Third, students are protesting against what seems to them the irrelevance of much of the education imposed upon them—education justified chiefly by tradition, or by habit, or by the convenience of professors or, still more dubious, by the supposed requirements of the business community or of a government whose standards students do not respect.

So much for the discontents that concern the students themselves, discontents with the internal character and operations of the academy. But these, though they may be most pervasive, are not the most profound.

PUBLIC WRONGS

Be it said to the credit of our students that what disturbs them most deeply are public rather than private wrongs, what chiefly alienates them from the university is not its failure as an educational institution, but as a public institution, not its intellectual miscellaneousness but its moral obtuseness.

A great many students are indeed in the fatuous phrase of their critics, alienated intellectuals, and they have much to be alienated from.

They are alienated by the spectacle of the deep inequalities in the society dedicated to equality, and they are convinced that the academy shares responsibility for creating and perpetuating these inequalities. Now they demand, with a kind of desperate impatience, that the university make up for past sins and lost time: that it admit twice as many blacks as ever before, that it provide special tutoring and social facilities for them and concede them special privileges and power.

They do not seem to realize that all this is a form of racism, nor that in their passion to do justice to the blacks they forget the many other neglected victims of our society and our economy.

They are ashamed that great urban universities have, for the most part, been content to go about their business without giving thought to their neighbors or neighborhoods, and they ask that the university abandon its isolation and its aloofness, and take an active part in slum clearance, neighborhood rehabilitation, improvement of schools, legal aid and similar things.

To the argument that preoccupation with current and immediate problems will distract the university from concentration on future and general problems, they answer that the university already is using a large part of its resources on current problems—but on the wrong ones.

MILITARY ALLIANCE

For they are outraged by the readiness of the university to ally itself with the business, political, and military establishment, to train businessmen and scientists prepared to serve corporations on almost any terms, to lend their intellectual resources and their academic facilities to almost any branch of the government or the military that claims them.

They remember it was John Gardner who said "when a government agency with money to spend approaches a university, it can usually purchase any service it wants," and they quote President Wallis of the University of Rochester, to the effect that "universities have become important wheelers and dealers in affairs large and small. . . . (Their role is in danger of becoming something like that of a hotel keeper for transient scholars and projects."

Nor is it only the university as an institution that they distrust; they distrust, as well, professors who go whoring after lucrative contracts or power or prestige, who are prepared to serve almost any governmental agency in almost any capactiy, prepared even to accept limitations on secrecy in scientific research.

The readiness of the university to lend its facilities to corporations and to government has been dramatized, for students, on every campus in the land by the uncritical eagerness of universities to welcome "recruiters" on campus.

The extent to which the university has been assimilated to the business and governmental community has been dramatized on a hundred campuses by the readiness of universities to act as employment agencies for these interests.

YOUNG REMINDER

Because they are young they do not know, that in World War II every university cooperated with military and with government in every conceivable capacity, and that no one then argued the impropriety of academic participation in the Manhattan Project, in radar, in the Office of War Information, the Office of Strategic Services, or in military government, nor, for that matter, the propriety of government recruiting on campus. They should be reminded of this.

University authorities should not have to be reminded that they are not prisoners of precedent, and that there is a difference between a war which the entire community regards as involving the very survival of civilization and one which a major part of the community—certainly the academic community—regards as hateful and immoral.

Student rebellion, then, takes on a pattern quiet different from that of most rebellions with which we are familiar.

It is primarily a rebellion against conditions outside the campus—against practices which students regard as immoral: the Vietnam war with its accompaniment of napalm and concentration camps; vast expenditures for future wars at a time when the nation is starved for essential social services, the power of military-industrial-labor-university complex which seems unlimited; racial discrimination and urban decay and police brutality, the cruel waste of human and of natural resources.

In other circumstances we would call this an idealistic protest. But the methods with which it is conducted are far from idealistic.

What shall we say of these methods—the bad manners, the stridency, the destructiveness, of the student protest but that it is deplorable, and not only deplorable but absurd. Students deplore violence violently; they use the arguments not of reason but of force to persuade the university to abandon the sponsorship of force and return to the path of reason. In the name of freedom they deny freedom of speech or of conduct to the majority of their fellow students. They call impatiently on government to cultivate patience and yet they champion tolerance with brutal intolerance. They are, in short, tiresomely inconsistent.

CHANNING'S WORDS

But let us keep in mind the wise words of the Rev. William Ellery Channing about the abolitionists: "The great interests of humanity do not lose their claims on us because sometimes injudiciously maintained." Injudicious may seem what Theodore Roosevelt once called a "weasel word," but the principle is the same, and students can retort that most of the words that come from trustees and university presidents are weasel words.

Besides, those who are most vociferous in charging students with lawlessness and violence do not come into court with clean hands. Students can, and do, retort that it is their elders, and betters, who have set the examples that they now follow.

Who are you, they may fairly ask, to counsel reason and moderation? Is it reason and moderation you have displayed in your policies towards Vietnam!

Who are you to deplore violence, you who have poured more bombs on little Vietnam than were rained on either Germany or Japan during the last war?

Who are you to plead the cause of law and order, you who are even now waging a lawless war with lawless weapons, violating the Charter of the United Nations and flouting international agreements on the uses of gas and of weapons of indiscriminate destruction!

Who are you to counsel patience, you who have displayed so little patience with Communist China, and who were so impatient to plunge into Santo Domingo with your marines before there was any evidence of danger there!

Who are you to counsel judiciousness, you who launched the Bay of Pigs attack on a sovereign nation, and who were prepared to condemn the world to a nuclear war at the time of the missile crisis!

Who are you to deplore with such anguish the flouting of civil laws, you who have flouted the provisions of the 14th and 15th Amendments for a century.

Who are you to decry student intransigence about the draft you who stood idly by while one half the states of the Union openly nullified almost every civil rights act on the statute books!

Who are you to bustle about arresting draft resisters with such a show of outraged patriotism, you who failed so conspicuously to arrest Governors Barnett or Wallace when they resisted the decisions of the Supreme Court by force, and who have failed to enforce those decisions against a thousand others who defy them!

DOUBLE STANDARD

One violation of the law does not excuse others, but it is hypocritical of our society to insist on a double standard of morality—one for students, and another and very different one for government itself—and to deplore student violence as a prelude to revolution while standing idly by when local and state officials indulge themselves in open violence.

The answer to student protest and revolt is not hysteria and it is not suppression. Students have something to say—something important for all of us, and we should not deny ourselves the benefit of their protest or their advice because we do not approve of their manners.

Nor should we take refuge in that habit of bewilderment and outrage that is the professional mark of the middle-aged. Let us take reassurance, rather, from the reflection that when older and more respectable elements of society were silent, students spoke up. And let us ask ourselves whether we would rather have a generation of students too indifferent to care about the grave injustices of our society, or too timid to protest against them.

LIGHT MOMENTS IN SERIOUS SITUATIONS

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, in a time when our Nation suffers from external wars and internal stress, it is increasingly difficult to retain one's perspective and judgment. Abraham Lincoln, during the toughest part of the Civil War, observed:

With the fearful strain that is on me night and day, if I did not laugh I should die.

It is vital, I believe, that Americans retain their unique quality to see the humorous and, indeed, even the ridiculous parts of the most serious situations.

Mr. Edwin A. Roberts, Jr., has carried the campus protest movement that presently afflicts some of our institutions of higher learning to its illogical conclusion. He has provided us with a few light moments in a situation taken very seriously by the demonstrators and perhaps even more seriously by the observers. As in most humor, there is a lesson; I leave it to the reader to derive his own benefit from this article published on the pages of the National Observer. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

NEVER TRUST ANYBODY OVER 13—IF THE SPIRIT OF REBELLION RUNS ITS COURSE

In an era of student protests around the globe, it was almost bound to happen. But it still took administrators and faculty by surprise when the pupils at Pine Crest Elementary School went on strike. And because we have two daughters in that educational institution, the seriousness of the youthful ferment was brought home to us in no uncertain terms.

I first learned about the uprising when my wife called the office and said: "Come home right away. The third grade at Pine Crest is picketing the principal's office, and even the kindergarten children refuse to cross the picket line."

"Where are Beth and Leslie?" I asked.

"Beth is carrying a sign that says, 'Down with fractions and demicals.' Leslie and the other first graders are throwing lollipops and bubble gum to the demonstrators."

I decided to head directly for the school, the outside of which was plastered with placards that said: "We Demand Longer Recesses," "Homework Is Oppression," "Compulsory Education Violates Our Civil Rights," "Nuts to Show-and-Tell," "End Testing Now," and "Equal Marks for All."

DRAWING THE LINE

It was impossible to get into the school building because the fifth graders had formed a solid line in front of the entrance.

"Can't this be settled by negotiation?" I asked a fifth-grade militant.

"Don't answer him," a classmate shouted. "Never trust anybody over 13."

"This is a nonviolent demonstration," a second-grader yelled. "But we won't be responsible for what happens if parents and teachers don't bow to our demands. We're going to occupy the library, the all-purpose room, and the school office until our demands are met."

The first graders wore red armbands, the second graders blue, the third graders yellow, the fourth graders brown, the fifth graders green, and the sixth graders purple. The kindergarteners had planned to wear white armbands, but none of them knew how to tie a knot so they abandoned the idea.

One teacher was in tears. "I think it all started at the Valentine's Day party we had for the first graders. We ran out of ice cream and some of the children threatened to take the matter to the streets."

Another teacher wanted firm action. "If you kids don't end this rebellion immediately the whole fifth grade will be made to stay after school."

"Fascist!" shouted a fifth grader.

A GREAT TRADITION

There was some talk among the faculty that the safety patrol should be brought in to break up the demonstration, but the more liberal teachers opposed this idea. "We have a great tradition of academic freedom here at Pine Crest, and we don't want to throw away all we stand for just because we're confronted with pupil activism. After all, these kids care about the way their school is run, and they deserve to participate in the formulation of rules and regulations."

"That's right," said another progressive teacher. "You call in the safety patrol and there will be trouble. We're desirous that the present civil disturbance be quelled without the use of force. We want no barbarism at Pine Crest."

At that moment the teacher was hit behind the ear by a well-aimed rock. "It's only a small minority that's resorting to violence," he said, rubbing the purple lump on his head. "The important thing is to attack the causes of unrest, not the symptoms."

Another rock came flying and this one hit the teacher right between the eyes. "On the other hand," he said, "an educational institution cannot be run as a democracy." Whereupon he lit out after the rock thrower, leaned him against a wall, and administered several educated smacks.

"It's against the law to inflict corporal punishment on children," wailed the lad. "That's teacher brutality."

I asked a boy who appeared to be the leader of the demonstration to explain his demands.

"There are only three goals of the pupil activists" he replied. "We want the complete elimination of homework; we want a permanent ban on testing; and we want everyone to get the same high marks. What we're trying to do is stop teacher oppression of those pupils who hate school and don't do any work. Those kids have their rights too. Also, we might demand TV sets in every classroom and special courses in how to watch television."

"But how are you going to learn anything under those conditions?" I asked.

THE NEW EDUCATION

"The demonstration itself is a learning activity. We pupils are involved. We're fighting for social justice for all kids. We refuse to accept the dreary three-R routine that other generations went along with. We want a voice in the hiring and firing of teachers, and we want to sit on all faculty meetings."

By this time I was anxious to find my own children and try to talk them out of their commitment to the demonstration. I found Beth perched on a window sill. She was telling her classmates that the kids were winning, that the next step was to begin a major protest against parents' power. "I'm sick and tired of going to bed at 8:30," she said, and the other children cheered. "Let's never go to bed again," chimed in another little girl.

Leslie, my first-grade daughter, was listening to an oration by one of her classmates. "The name 'first grade' is a humiliating title for our educational level. It's only a manifestation of the old class system that has no place in a modern society. Let's eliminate all grade numbers in the name of social justice."

Just then I saw a mobile television truck parked nearby and I could hear the TV reporter providing a commentary as his cameraman focused on the troubled scene.

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

"The children, as you can see, are very well behaved," he was saying. "Although the school is now on fire, the boys who put the torch to it did not really seem angry. They were just carried away by the excitement. That car you see being overturned belongs to a fourth-grade teacher who is known for her strictness. It's the children's way of seeking redress of grievances. I think we must all agree that this younger generation has definite ideas and isn't afraid to express them."

Hours later, after negotiations between the pupil leaders and the teachers, it was decided that henceforth any teacher who raised his voice would have to stay after school, that any teacher who passed out a bad mark would be brought to the attention of the local civil-liberties league, and that any teacher who gave a test would automatically have his certificate revoked.

When I finally arrived home, I told my wife all that had happened at Pine Crest Elementary School. She could see I was depressed.

"Never mind," she said, "It's at least nice to know that our children are really getting ready for college."

EDWIN A. ROBERTS, Jr.

THE FULL OPPORTUNITY AND SOCIAL ACCOUNTING ACT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act, introduced in the Senate last year by Senator MONDALE of Minnesota is a highly meritorious proposal. This legislation provides for the creation of a Council of Social Advisors to the President, comparable to the President's Council of Economic Advisers. It would also require the President to submit an annual social report to the Congress. The measure would also create a joint committee in Congress to scrutinize the President's social report.

There is little doubt that the domestic crisis confronting our Nation today requires new imaginative approaches and programs in order to resolve this problem. While the search for the solutions should be nationwide, Senator MONDALE's proposal will give direction to the many efforts initiated by sociologists, historians, criminologists, psychologists, and other scholars and public figures. As my eminent colleague so wisely points out:

At present, our social goals are vague and ill defined. The legislative requirement that the Administration deliver a public social accounting should sharpen the Administration's goals and social planning. This could promote setting long range goals in, for example, education, health care, and the fight against environmental pollution, and encourage definite periodic progress toward their achievement.

Reporting on the "Social State of the Union" is a good idea. I believe that upon reading an excellently written article, published in the June 1968 issue of Trans-action, the Senate will come to the same conclusion. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the article be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

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

REPORTING ON THE SOCIAL STATE OF THE UNION

(By Senator WALTER F. MONDALE)

America's social goals were well stated by the writers of the Constitution: to "establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity." But in 1968 we see little domestic tranquility; we see little justice for a substantial number of citizens; and for millions—poorly educated, ill-housed, or otherwise deprived—the blessings of liberty are a cruel jest.

The search for solutions to this modern dilemma leads those of us in government to turn to social research. There is increasing legislative hunger for social-science counsel. Senator Abraham Ribicoff, in major hearings on the urban crisis, called no fewer than 12 social scientists to testify. In order to improve the federal government's social-science research capability, Senator Fred Harris of Oklahoma has reintroduced legislation to establish a national foundation for the social sciences. He seeks to draw the social sciences from the shadow of the National Science Foundation, thus giving them independent status and increased stature.

In government departments, a new kind of administrator is emerging. For example, Daniel P. Moynihan, former Assistant Secretary of Labor, is "one of a new breed of public servants, the social-scientist-politicos, who combine in their backgrounds both social-science training and full-time involvement in political activity." (See "Black Families and the White House," Lee Rainwater and William L. Yancey, *Trans-action* July/August 1966.) Another new political animal in federal departments and agencies is the systems-approach expert, who—by means of cost-effectiveness analysis and other tools—seeks to help decision-makers understand all relevant alternatives and key interactions among them by calculating costs, risks, and potential results associated with each course of action. An example of this new breed is William Gorham, formerly of the Pentagon and the RAND Corporation, and Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who has been appointed head of the Urban Institute, a government-supported independent research center.

The development of these new types of scientist-politicians suggests a governmental institution—an arm of the executive—that can combine a knowledge of sociology, science, history, social psychology, criminology, and social economics. These new specialists can place their knowledge in a governmental context, and bring a systems approach to bear on broad social programs.

Early last year I introduced in the Senate the Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act, which was cosponsored by Senators Clark, Hart, Harris, Inouye, Kennedy of Massachusetts, McCarthy, McGee, Muskie, Nelson, and Proxmire, who is chairman of the Joint Economic Committee. This legislation would draw the social scientists into the inner councils of the Administration; it would foster the use of the systems approach for an overview of the broad range of domestic social programs; and it would establish a system of social accounting to keep a constant check on our domestic social status. Furthermore, it would require a public report of this social audit.

In its statement of policy, the Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act reaffirms that "it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the federal government, consistent with the primary responsibilities of the state and local government and the private sector, to promote and encourage such conditions as will give every American the opportunity to live in decency and dignity, and to provide a clear and precise picture of whether such conditions are promoted and encouraged in such areas as health, education and training, rehabilitation, housing, vocational opportunities, the arts and humanities, and special assistance for the deprived, the abandoned, and the criminal."

To accomplish this, the legislation would:

Declare social accounting a national goal;

Establish the President's Council of Social Advisers, comparable in the social sphere to the Council of Economic Advisers in the economic area;

Require the President to submit an annual Social Report to Congress, the social counterpart to his Economic Report; and

Create a joint committee of Congress to examine the substance of the Social Report.

In his Social Report, the President is to detail "the overall progress and effectiveness of federal efforts" toward implementing the policy of the act; review state, local, and private efforts to this end; and present "current and foreseeable needs, programs, and policies and recommendations for legislation."

The three-member Council of Social Advisers, supported by a staff of experts in the social sciences and in those natural sciences concerned with man and his environment, would be empowered to "gather timely and authoritative information and statistical data" and analyze and interpret them. The Council would also appraise the various programs and activities of the federal government and develop priorities for the programs, recommending to the President the most efficient and effective way to allocate federal resources.

The model for this act is the Employment Act of 1946, which has had an indisputably favorable effect on the nation's economy. This economic progress—owing in large part to highly refined economic analysis and indicators—is a powerful argument for using social analysis and measurement.

The Council of Economic Advisers recommends measures to maintain a stable, prosperous, and expanding economy. It operates on four assumptions:

That welfare (the ultimate objective) is dependent upon the level and health of national economic activity;

That economic factors can be quantified;

That action by government can cause specific changes in the national economic conditions; and

That from analysis of economic data it is feasible to recommend specific action to achieve national economic health.

To do its job, the C.E.A. had to develop a system of economic criteria to measure the present and prospective conditions of the economy. It had to increase the expertise and the rigor of the economics discipline in order to reduce the margin of error in economic measurement. It had to develop tools of economic analysis, calling upon the entire community of economists for contributions. It had to proceed with caution so as to command the respect and acceptance of decision-makers. Finally, its recommendations and findings had to be action-oriented.

The same process is now appropriate and necessary in the social endeavors of the federal government. But we should mislead no one: This new job will be far more difficult. There should be no false hopes for instant success. For the most part, economic indicators are hard, cash-register data, and in most indices the dollar is available as a uniform measuring unit. Understandably, it is far easier to count the cash in workingman's pocket than to measure the quality of his health or education.

A true attempt to apply non-economic measures to the quality of life in America could have a revolutionary impact on government. It might be the first time that government looked at the individual to see what government programs do *to* and *for* him—in other words, to discover the effect, rather than merely to measure the effort, of government programs. For example, we know how many people take advantage of Medicare, but there are no public reports on the quality of this care. The same is true of education, criminal rehabilitation, and much of the poverty effort (although the publication of studies on the effect of Head Start has been a laudable beginning).

At present, our social goals are vague and

ill defined. The legislative requirement that the Administration deliver a public social accounting should sharpen the Administration's goals and social planning. This could promote setting long-range goals in, for example, education, health care, and the fight against environmental pollution, and encourage definite periodic progress toward their achievement.

Some argue that this system of progress reports will curb innovation and experimentation. But I think we have little to fear if we use fresh, imaginative ideas. And in fact, the lack of adequate indicators can actually conceal the success of government innovations. Critics of the Job Corps, for example, attack the cost per corpsman, while the Corps' effect on the corpsman's life and potential is ignored.

Some see a danger of the indicators' being manipulated for political ends, or the goals deliberately being set so low that accomplishment will appear spectacular. Of course, our political system is, at every level, vulnerable on this score. But there are checks built into the legislation. It provides for a Joint Congressional Committee empowered to probe deeply into the substance of the Social Report—to examine and criticize the declared goals, to question the philosophy behind the various programs, and to test the adequacy of the indicators. For a demonstration of how effective this legislative tool can be, we need only refer to the transcript of the 1967 hearings of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report chaired by Senator William Proxmire.

There are also other legislative checks on the Administration. The General Accounting Office has won a strong reputation for its auditing of Administration expenditures. Senator Abraham Ribicoff has proposed that this operation be expanded by adding an Office of Legislative Evaluation charged with "evaluating the results of the social and economic programs [Congress] has enacted." The Full Opportunity Act proposes to give the Administration new evaluative and analytical equipment. Certainly Congress should be given comparable legislative tools.

The Administration, with the program-planning-budgeting system directed by the Bureau of the Budget, is already taking limited steps toward improving program evaluation and determining program priorities. And William Gorham, in his work in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has been coordinating a panel working on a "social state of the nation report." No one can guarantee, however, that it will be a permanent institution of government.

SEARCH FOR A CONSTITUENCY

As a matter of practical politics, the passage of legislation requires a constituency. Since most laws grow out of a need that has immediacy and relevance for a sizable part of the population, most proposed legislation has a constituency highly motivated to promote its passage. But where is the constituency of legislation that looks to the future—legislation that will have profound impact, yet is currently difficult to understand and in constant danger of being misinterpreted?

To build such a constituency, we must look to the social scientists themselves. And there are other allies as well. At all leves of government social-welfare organizations and officials are concerned about the effectiveness of programs ranging from welfare to education, from city planning to health care.

The initial job in building a constituency is to bring the legislation to the attention of those for whom it has inherent interest. I have sent letters to 500 social scientists inviting their comment. Furthermore, editorials in media ranging from the *Minneapolis Star* and *Milwaukee Journal* to specialized newsletters have brought encouraging response.

The second step is persuasion, which in this case means education. Few people in policy-making positions are aware of the concept of social accounting—largely because literature on the subject is confined mostly to the academic journals.

The congressional committee is a useful educational device, particularly as an efficient information conduit to the policymakers. The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act has been referred to the Government Operations Committee, which has sent it to Senator Harris's Subcommittee on Governmental Research. In the summer of 1967 that subcommittee held a unique one-day seminar to explore the ramifications of the proposal. Both that session, and the hearings the subcommittee held later, elicited highly illuminating views from social scientists, present and former government officials, businessmen, and journalists. Above all, the discussions buttressed the need for an institutionalized and on-going review of the state of our nation's social health, at the highest level of government as well as on the community and state levels. In great part the hearings produced more questions than answers, and exposed our ignorance rather than a wealth of information about social processes. But our country is now demanding the answers, and it is essential that we begin asking the right questions.

While the Full Opportunity Act will have a vigorous impact upon government, I believe it will have no less impact on the social sciences. There is every reason to believe that the social sciences—like economics since 1946—will be greatly stimulated by enactment of the legislation. Such legislation may prod many social scientists into devoting increased attention to social problems that have specific relevancy to government. Instead of concentrating solely on research and comment, they will become active participants in policymaking.

Are social scientists up to the task? While most who have written me believe that they are, some are less confident. One social scientist of long experience warned, "The behavioral sciences, in my judgment, are in no real position at this point to give any hard data on social problems or conditions." He added, "There are many promises and pretentions; however, when it comes to delivery, what is usually forthcoming are more requests for further research. . . . "

If social scientists have not developed the necessary sophistication to fully participate in policy determination, then they *must*—and very soon. For government at all levels is going to ask them for advice and value judgments. This responsibility is going to be thrust upon them, and I don't think they are going to refuse it.

I am encouraged by the reports sent to me by social scientists who are involved in both the planning and the evaluation phrases of future-looking projects. The work of organizations such as Resources for the Future and the Russell Sage Foundation is well known. And, of course, virtually every major university has a center or institute doing extremely ambitious research on social problems. Others, such as the Center for Research on the Utilization of Scientific Knowledge at the University of Michigan, are devoting their activity to ways of using scentific skills in the social as well as in the natural sciences. The book *Social Indicators* (*M.I.T.* Press, 1966), edited by Raymond Bauer, shows how researchers can frame the important questions and meet the basic requirements for social accounting.

All this suggests that some social scientists want to become activists—to convert their role from that of observer to that of participant.

THE COMMUNICATION GAP

Today, because much valuable information disappears into the academic journals, many policy-makers remain unaware of its existence. A Council of Social Advisers could probably correct this problem by providing a funnel through which the findings of social-science research would be directed to government.

Of course, government policy-makers shouldn't expect a full range of sophisticated social indicators to be developed overnight, nor should they expect evaluation and analysis that bear the stamp of certainty rather than theory. Scientific progress doesn't work this way. If I read the history of the Council of Economic Advisers correctly, it took that group many years, and experimentation by several Council chairmen, to evolve a satisfactory role in economic analysis and policy recommendation. This will be even more necessary when we are dealing with elusive social values.

Now, a word of warning: There is a history of mistrust on the part of some members of Congress toward the social sciences. This attitude is based partly on unfamiliarity, partly on poor communications between scientists and policy-makers, and partly on the fact that many Congressmen regard themselves as successful practitioners of applied social science—because they have won elections. Institutionalized channels of communication will help break down this mistrust.

Also important is the fact that policymakers are wary of the political backlash contained in the findings of the social scientists. One dramatic example was the response of policy-makers to the Moynihan Report on the Negro family.

Finally, there are still a substantial number of people who see behavioral-science study as a trend toward the society of Orwell's 1984. They are wary of invasion of privacy in social research, and fear that data banks will make the individual increasingly vulnerable. These are legitimate concerns, often deeply felt by the social scientists themselves. These concerns demand vigilance. There must be guarantees against misuse of some of the most valuable equipment in social-science research.

But despite these difficulties, it is time to establish an alliance between policymakers and social scientists. The alliance promises better lives and more individual opportunity through a more orderly approach to the future.

Of this need, former Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary John W. Gardner has said: "We have a great and honored tradition of stumbling into the future. In management of the present, our nation is—as nations go—fairly rational, systematic, and orderly. But when it comes to movement into the future, we are heedless and impulsive. We leap before we look. We act first and think later. We back into next year's problems by studying the solutions to last year's problems."

Bertrand de Jouvenel has written that the 20th century now has the opportunity to devise "a long-term strategy for well-being." As I read the Preamble to the Constitution, it seems to that that this was precisely the goal of the 18th century Constitutional Convention. Today, a vigorous program—backed by the collective political wisdom of the Congress and the technical expertise of the social scientists—finally offers us hope of achieving that goal.

"NEW DIRECTIONS FOR URBAN AMERICA" BY REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, much of the social and political attention in America is directed toward the urban crisis. We are faced with a multitude of unsolved human problems, crime and civil disorder, a declining urban environment, and inadequately equipped urban governments.

The Republican coordinating committee has released today another of its splendid reports. Prepared by the Task Force on the Functions of Federal, State, and Local Governments, and entitled "New Directions for Urban America," this paper directs attention to 55 far-sighted and innovative programs suggested by the Republican Party to deal with the urban crisis.

In the past 4 years, we have come face to face with the harsh reality of widespread violence and destruction. We have discovered social failure of a depth previously unrecognized. But as the report correctly points out:

> The urban crisis is more than civil disorders and unmet social needs; it is a crisis of confidence, of leadership and of human relationships that contributes to a depression of the national spirit.

The present administration has demonstrated its basic belief that the individual, and especially the individual in less fortunate circumstances, should be dependent on the Government. It has constantly sought to expand governmental control over individual lives and to impose Government solutions for human needs. This has made it easy to issue the promises of instant prosperity and to offer to solve the problems of a millennium in a decade.

The Republican Party on the other hand recognizes that—

> In a pluralistic society, no government, no administration, and no political party can effect the entire range of necessary social adjustments.

Our pledge is "that the Republican Party, in 1968 and the years ahead, will seek to provide a leadership of ideas, inspiration, and innovation to set new directions for urban America."

Citizens, voluntary and self-help organizations, and revitalized communities all utilizing the dynamism of private enterprise can build a better America. People who see progress of their own making will work to defend rather than to destroy.

A good example of misdirection is the attitude of the present administration toward low-income housing. The entire thrust of Government housing assistance programs for low-income families has been in the direction of rental housing rather than homeownership. Communities have been destroyed by urban renewal, and the low-income family has been forced to become transient. Under public housing systems, the worker who improves his job and his income is penalized by having to move.

It has taken Republican leadership to produce the constructive and commonsense alternatives. The Percy-Widnall homeownership plan, considered in part by the Senate this year, offers imaginative and constructive approaches to improving the quality of our housing and the lives of lower income families.

Mr. President, the Task Force on the Functions of Federal, State, and Local Governments has issued 55 specific recommendations designed to attack the urban crisis. The areas covered by the recommendations are: job opportunities and training, education, poverty and welfare, housing, human rights, crime and law enforcement, pollution control, transportation, government structures and procedures, and intergovernment finance.

These are positive, imaginative ideas. They provide new directions for urban America.

I ask unanimous consent that the Republican coordinating committee report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR URBAN AMERICA

(Adopted by the Republican Coordinating Committee; May 6, 1968. Presented by the Task Force on the Functions of Federal, State, and Local Governments)

REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Presiding Officer: Ray C. Bliss, Chairman, Republican National Committee.

Former President: Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Former Presidential Nominees: Barry Goldwater (1964); Richard M. Nixon (1960); Thomas E. Dewey (1944 and 1948); Alf M. Landon (1936).

Senate Leadership: Everett M. Dirksen, Minority Leader; Thomas H. Kuchel, Minority Whip; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Chairman, Republican Policy Committee; Margaret Chase Smith, Chairman, Republican Conference; George Murphy, Chairman, National Republican Senatorial Committee; Milton R. Young, Secretary, Republican Conference; Hugh Scott, Vice Chairman, National Republican Senatorial Committee.

House Leadership: Gerald R. Ford, Minority Leader; Leslie C. Arends, Minority Whip; Melvin R. Laird, Chairman, Republican Conference; John J. Rhodes, Chairman, Republican Policy Committee; H. Allen Smith, Ranking Member of Rules Committee; Bob Wilson, Chairman, National Republican Congressional Committee; Charles E. Goodell, Chairman, Planning and Research Committee; Richard H. Poff, Secretary, Republican Conference; William C. Cramer, Vice Chairman, Republican Conference.

Representatives of the Republican Governors Association: John A. Love, Governor of Colorado; John A. Volpe, Governor of Massachusetts; George Romney, Governor of Michigan; Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of New York; Raymond P. Shafer, Governor of Pennsylvania; John H. Chafee, Governor of Rhode Island; Nils A. Boe, Governor of South Dakota; Daniel J. Evans, Governor of Washington.

Republican National Committee: Ray C. Bliss, Chairman; Mrs. C. Wayland Brooks, Assistant Chairman; Mrs. Collis P. Moore, Vice Chairman; Donald R. Ross, Vice Chairman; Mrs. J. Willard Marriott, Vice Chairman; J. Drake Edens, Jr., Vice Chairman.

President of the Republican State Legislators Association: F. F. (Monte) Montgomery.

Robert L. L. McCormick, Staff Coordinator.

MEMBERS OF THE REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE'S TASK FORCE ON THE FUNCTIONS OF THE FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Robert Taft, Jr., Chairman, Member of Congress from Ohio.

Karl Mundt, Vice Chairman, United States Senator from South Dakota.

Mrs. Consuelo Northrop Bailey, Secretary of the Republican National Committee.

George C. S. Benson, President, Claremont Men's College.

Neal Blaisdell, Mayor of the City of Honolulu.

Joseph L. Budd, Republican National Committeeman for Wyoming.

Howard H. Callaway, Member of Congress from Georgia, 1965–1967.

Frank Carlson, United States Senator from Kansas.

Roger Cloud, Auditor of the State of Ohio.

William Cowger, Member of Congress from Kentucky.

Walter DeVries, Former Executive Assistant to the Governor of the State of Michigan.

Willis D. Gradison, Jr., Member of City Council, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Robert J. Huckshorn, Professor of Political Science, Florida Atlantic University.

Denison Kitchel, Attorney, Phoenix, Arizona.

Warren P. Knowles, Governor of the State of Wisconsin.

Edwin G. Michaelian, County Executive, Westchester County, New York.

Karl M. Ruppenthal, Professor, Graduate School of Business, Stanford University.

Robert F. Sittig, Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Nebraska.

Craig Truax, Executive Assistant to the House Majority Leader, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Fred VanNatta, Former Aide to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, State of Oregon.

Charles E. Wittenmeyer, Republican National Committeeman for Iowa.

Lawrence L. Thompson, Secretary to the Task Force.

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR URBAN AMERICA

The United States is engulfed in an urban crisis. Events in the cities over the past four years have thrust upon our nation the harsh reality of widespread violence and destruction of an intensity unexpected, and have exposed conditions of disadvantage and social failure of a depth previously unrecognized. Tragically and paradoxically, we encounter this crisis at a time when many of the normal indicators of social progress—national output, personal income, employment levels, educational attainments, technological advancement, and life expectancy—have risen to record heights.

Consequently, the urban crisis is more than civil disorders and unmet social needs; it is a crisis of confidence, of leadership and of human relationships that contributes to a depression of the national spirit. The situation demands a recognition that just as the customary indicators of progress are no longer completely valid, so also the customary responses, whether they be the establishment of one more Federal program, the appointment of another blue-ribbon study commission, or an after-the-riot plea for law and order, are woefully inadequate.

The urban crisis has occurred under the stewardship of the Democratic Administration. During the past four years, as the crisis has developed and deepened, the Administration has displayed its inability to devise effective policies and programs to deal with the situation.

The President's major action in 1967, as the full dimensions of the crisis became apparent was to appoint an Advisory Commission on Civil disorders whose report he has largely ignored. In our view, the Commission's report neglected to set any priorities among its numerous recommendations, failed to come to grips with the crucial questions of cost and financing, and could be construed as unfairly accusing all whites of practicing racism. It failed to recognize adequately the need for self-help and private and voluntary citizen action. Nevertheless, we believe the report contains much valuable information and analysis, and its recommendations are worthy of detailed attention and consideration by the President and the Congress.

In its approach to urban problems the Administration's gravest failure has been an absence of responsible, candid, and inspiring leadership for our troubled nation. We indict the Democratic leadership on three counts: (1) the reckless use of inflated promises and a resort to political sloganeering which raised many expectations that were not realized; (2) a lack of decisive action and influence in dealing with the immediate problems of lawlessness and disorder; and

(3) an unwillingness to establish a well-ordered set of priorities to meet pressing social needs and to chart the nation's future course. The record shows clearly that the Democratic Administration—its leadership and its policies—must stand accused of failure in attempting to resolve the urban crisis.

To lift the urban crisis from our land will require profound adjustments throughout out social system, involving new personal attitudes and commitments, more relevant public and private institutions, a reassignment of priorities and resources, and, above all, new national leadership to replace the "politics-as-usual" of the past four years.

In a pluralistic society, no government, no administration, and no political party can effect the entire range of necessary social adjustments. But this we pledge: that the Republican Party, in 1968 and the years ahead, will seek to provide a leadership of ideas, inspiration, and innovation to set new directions for urban America.

This paper outlines the main aspects of current urban problems, sets forth a comparison of the approaches of the Republican and Democratic Parties to these problems, and presents 55 of the principal recommendations on urban affairs made by the Republican Coordinating Committee in various position papers issued since its inception in 1965. A full listing of 123 recommendations made by the Coordinating Committee on urban problems is compiled in an appendix to this paper.

A CATALOGUE OF URBAN ILLS

The crisis of the cities encompases numerous aspects of urban living conditions, and its full extent is revealed by an array of pertinent facts and figures. The following catalogue of urban ills presents a disturbing portrait of the troubled situation confronting the nation.

1. Unsolved human problems

In the cities today, a host of fundamental human problems remain such as chronic unemployment, unequal education opportunities, racial discrimination, substandard housing, inadequate transportation services and the breakdown of family and community structures. These persistent problems yield a compound of disadvantage and discontent, contribute to lawlessness and disorder, and bear witness to the failures and inadequacies of the present Administration's policies and programs.

Despite a reduction in overall unemployment rates, substantial "hardcore" unemployment continues. Among Negroes the jobless rate is twice the national average; among young people it is more than three times as great.

Unemployment is an especially serious problem in the central cities. Among young Negro men in the cities the unemployment rate is nearly 25 percent, seven times the national rate.

Rising prices, largely the result of unsound Democratic economic policies, have reduced any gain in the urban resident's income and have diminished the value of his savings. A price increase of over six percent in just two years has worked a particular hardship on the social security recipient and others with fixed incomes, the unemployed, and the unorganized wage earner.

Great disparities in educational opportunities and achievement exist in urban areas. According to achievement tests the average minority group child in metropolitan areas is behind other children when he begins school and the gap tends to widen; he is roughly two grades behind the others at grade six; three grades behind at grade nine; and four grades behind at grade twelve.

In poverty neighborhoods of the fifteen largest cities roughly 60 percent of the tenth-grade students drop out before finishing high school; unemployment and delinquency rates among dropouts are many times greater than the national average.

Despite generally high rates of private housing construction, the goal of "a decent home and suitable living environment for every American" proclaimed in the 1949 Housing Act remains unfulfilled for millions of families. Roughly 4 million substandard housing units continue to exist in urban areas; nearly two-thirds of all minority group families today live in neighborhoods marked with unsuitable housing and urban blight.

Despite the passage of numerous civil rights laws at all levels of government, widespread discrimination or segregation continues in employment, education and housing due to uneven enforcement of existing laws and gaps in coverage. Moreover, the recent passage of Federal fair housing legislation, achieved only with wide Republican support in Congress, establishes a desirable goal but will not alone eliminate segregated housing conditions. As recognized in the legislation, leadership at local and State levels is a necessary and positive factor for achieving progress in the elimination of such discrimination. The persistence of discriminatory practices, unjustified in all forms, contributes greatly to the sense of frustration and resentment among minority groups in the cities.

The proportion of families living with no father in the home is growing, both among Negro and whites, and these families are heavily concentrated at the low end of the income scale. This breakdown of family structure leads to numerous unfortunate consequences for the children, including a sense of alienation, a lack of direction and, too often, outright delinquency.

2. Crime and civil disorder

Rising crime rates and a series of major riots and civil disorders have left a trail of victims, both Negro and white, creating an atmosphere of fear, alarm, mistrust, and apprehension all across the country.

The number of crimes committed per year has increased by 88 percent since 1960, nine times faster than the growth of population. The crime rate in large cities typically is double the national rate.

High crime rates and the need for better police protection are acute problems in the low-income districts of the central cities. One low-income neighborhood experienced a serious crime rate 35 times greater than in the high income sections of the city.

Since 1963 riots and disorders have occurred with greatly increased frequency. In 1963, five serious disorders occurred; in 1964–65, 15 serious disorders or incidents were recorded; in 1966 the number of riots and disorders increased to 43; and during 1967, 164 riots and disturbances took place in an eruption of violence that shook the nation.

This year riots and disorders occurred in over 80 cities during the period following the tragic assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

A study of 75 riots and disorders by a Senate Subcommittee revealed a toll of 83 deaths and 1,897 injuries as a result of these disturbances. Property damage estimates range from many tens of millions to hundreds of millions of dollars.

3. The declining quality of the urban environment

Beyond the unmet human needs and social disorders described above, the cities of America are characterized today by deteriorating environmental conditions which impair for all the quality of urban living.

Automobiles, factories, power plants, and heating facilities pour into the atmosphere 140 million tons of air pollutants each year, an average of 1400 pounds for each American. Scientists have correlated high levels of air pollution found in large cities with increased respiratory diseases and even death.

Once pure lakes and streams are polluted and rendered unfit for swimming and fishing because of wastes discharged from municipal sewer systems, industry, and other pollution sources. It is estimated that 64 million people—nearly one-half the entire urban population—are served, if at all, by inadequate waste treatment plants.

The failure of the Federal government to eliminate air and water pollution from its own installations and facilities sets a bad example across the country to industries and communities that are being called to join the battle against pollution.

Traffic congestion and inadequate mass transportation service cause costly, time-consuming delays and create hardships for millions of urban residents. Daily commuter round trips of two hours are not uncommon, depriving workers of leisure and family time. Inadequate bus and transit service add to the employment and mobility problems of low-income residents, only one-half of whom own automobiles.

Newer forms of pollution, often the by-product of technological advances, contribute to the declining quality of the urban environment. For example, noises from high-powered, high-speed jet aircraft, flying with increasing frequency, produce a serious annoyance for many city dwellers and at times result in property damage.

4. The inadequacies of urban government

Many big city governments are ill-equipped to respond effectively to the endless list of serious problems which they confront. The shortcomings are largely a result of weaknesses in the structure, organization, and financial capacity of the typical city government.

A fundamental problem of urban government is the inadequacy of available revenue sources. The departure of industry and middle-income families to the suburbs, and the influx of low-income residents in need of extensive governmental services, have left the large cities with an array of costly social problems; yet they lack the tax resources to pay for them. Attempting to meet the costs and to compensate for the loss in tax base, cities are forced to raise tax rates, but this simply hastens the outward flight of industry and middle-income families.

Caught in this fiscal squeeze, the cities increasingly have turned to the Federal government for financial support. But under the specialized grant-in-aid system, this assistance has been accompanied by Federal controls and administrative tangles that tend to erode home rule and impair the effectiveness of aided programs.

In recent years a number of States under Republican leadership have demonstrated a new awareness of city problems and have devoted increased resources and attention to their resolution. We believe the States can and must play an increased role in planning and in achieving coordinated solutions for urban and metropolitan problems. Often, however, neither State nor Federal aid distribution formulas adequately recognize the disparity between the financial capacity of cities and their great needs.

Another basic problem is that urban government is not one government, but many governments. The proliferation of special purpose governmental units and authorities for planning, renewal, public utilities, transportation, etc., often with independent revenue sources, fragments local government authority and disperses responsibility and accountability. This condition, further complicated by the involvement of State and Federal agencies, fosters lack of coordination and impedes comprehensive planning, particularly for metropolitan area-wide problems. By most recent count each metropolitan area contains an average of 87 units of local government or special districts. The Chicago area alone encompasses 1,060 governments and the New York area, 1,112.

A final problem is the declining level of citizen interest and participation in city government. Over the past generation the move-

ment toward professionalization of city civil service systems has brought numerous benefits. However, a distinct disadvantage has been the centralization of city government in a largely impersonal and frequently inaccessible bureaucracy. City departments too often are staffed by those who do not identify with the problems of the lower income families. As a result many residents feel alienated from city hall, and have a low degree of confidence in its ability or willingness to deal with their problems. This is demonstrated perhaps by the low voter turnout for many city elections, estimated to average less than 30 percent.

This, then, is the condition of urban America in 1968—beset by social problems and unmet human needs, wracked by crime and rioting, exposed to an environment increasingly polluted and congested, and governed by units of authority often with neither the structure nor the financial capacity to respond effectively to the long catalog of problems.

A REPUBLICAN APPROACH TO URBAN PROBLEMS

The Republican Party believes that the urban crisis must be analyzed and approached in terms of the proper utilization of those human and institutional resources which are basic to the operation of a stable and progressive society: (1) the individual; (2) voluntary and self-help organizations; (3) the community; (4) private enterprise; (5) government; and (6) leadership. Success in dealing with the situation will depend on a careful understanding and appreciation of these six elements, and will require policies that assign to each a proper role and emphasis. The following discussion contrasts the basic approach of the Republican Party to that of the Democratic Party and presents examples of the failures of the frequently misguided Democratic approach.

1. The individual

The policies of the Democratic Party demonstrate its basic belief that the individual, especially the individual in less fortunate circumstances, *should be dependent upon the government*. From the New Deal to the Great Society this approach to the individual has been consistently propounded by the Democrats, extended to cover more and more human needs, and expanded to apply to more and more individuals.

Today this approach is enshrined in the nation's welfare system. Largely instituted in the Thirties to provide temporary relief to those in financial distress, the welfare system has grown in these times of relative affluence to cover over 9 million people at a current annual cost of more than $6 billion. Instead of a temporary relief measure, welfare has become a way of life with second and even third generations trapped in the system. By means of restrictions and investigations that invade the individual's privacy and deny him dignity, these programs emphasize the individual's dependency on government, and offer him few incentives or little hope for a better future. For millions of individuals and families in the cities today Democratic welfare policies are perpetuating rather than alleviating poverty, broken homes, and bleak idleness. In short, today's welfare system just does not work.

The Republican Party, by contrast, believes in the intrinsic dignity, of each individual. We hold that dignity is bestowed not by treating individuals as wards of the state, but by providing a climate of opportunity that builds self-reliance and independence. We believe the individual achieves fulfillment when engaged in productive employment, utilizing his abilities, expanding his talents, and adding to the economic well-being of society.

We, therefore, strongly favor and have consistently supported government action to improve educational opportunties, to expand job training and provide job incentives, and to remove employment barriers as the keys to providing more individuals with enlarged opportunities for self-improvement and fulfillment. The individual in turn has the responsibility for seeking and using opportunities to improve himself and his community. This approach, in combination with welfare measures to protect the individual from temporary hardship, offers a constructive and lasting solution to the problems of poverty and disadvantage in the cities.

2. Voluntary and self-help organizations

From America's earliest history individuals have joined together voluntarily to solve problems and meet needs too big for the individual. They have created associations and informal groups for the purpose of self-help rather than turning to government for handouts and controls.

Such self-help activity is particularly meaningful in our cities today, because it enables participants not only to meet their tangible needs but also to increase their self-esteem and self-reliance.

The spirit of self-help is rising in the cities of America. In numerous instances independent representative citizen organizations have been established to stimulate private self-help efforts in education, job training and orientation, family counseling, housing, small business assistance and other areas. Many observers have judged these efforts to be highly successful—frequently more successful than government controlled programs.

The Democratic Party has not fully appreciated the importance of voluntary and self-help activity and has not sufficiently encouraged the formation and strengthening of organizations dedicated to self-help principles. Too frequently, in fact, local self-help groups have been undermined by Federally directed and subsidized organizations.

The Republican Party, at the Federal, State and local level and through its individual members, pledges to stimulate and encourage voluntary and self-help organizations in the cities. We recognize that people who are producing progress of their own making are people who will work to defend and to build, rather than to destroy.

3. The community

The policies of the Democratic Party have tended to ignore the importance of intangible factors such as community stability, identity, and cohesiveness in enhancing the quality of urban living. Indeed, the concepts of neighborhood, community pride, and mutual assistance seem to have disappeared from many American cities today. This is revealed by high turnover rates in housing, by unkept property, streets, and alleys, and by the shocking indifference of bystanders to acts of violence. Three major examples show how recent Democratic policies have contributed to the waning sense of community in the cities: (1) the obsession with rental housing assistance programs for the disadvantaged; (2) the heavy-handed destruction of neighborhoods and districts through urban renewal and other government construction programs; and (3) the failure to stem the wave of crime and riots.

The entire thrust of government housing assistance programs for low income families has been in the direction of rental housing rather than homeownership. This emphasis has produced a number of undesirable effects, by fostering a large population of tenants with weak community ties and high mobility rates. Also, many of these programs penalize diligence and ambition by requiring tenants to move should they improve their economic standing. In short, the Democratic obsession with rental housing programs has contributed to the high turnover rates and the loss of community identity which characterize our cities today.

Urban renewal and other government-sponsored construction programs have had unfortunate effects on the cohesiveness of many communities. Too often these programs have destroyed entire neighborhoods, uprooting thousands of families, depriving numerous small businessmen of their livelihood, and aggravating already overcrowded conditions in other low-income neighborhoods. The number of housing units destroyed by urban renewal is roughly four times the number created; moreover, provision for relocation of those displaced has been woefully inadequate.

The effect of such policies on the structure of the community and on the outlook of the residents is far-reaching. According to studies conducted after the Newark riot, neighborhood disruption caused by government construction programs was high on the grievance list of riot area residents.

Nothing is more damaging to the health and vitality of a community than unchecked crime and rioting. The immediate effect on the victims is just one dimension; the other is the poisoned community atmosphere that lingers to breed suspicion, anxiety, and fear and to cause community residents to turn inward. The Democratic Administration has shown far too little sensitivity to this by-product of urban violence.

The Republican Party pledges to adopt urban policies which will foster and reinforce the vital but intangible values of community pride and trust. These neglected values can be restored by shifting the emphasis for low income rental housing to homeownership programs, by respecting the cohesiveness of established neighborhoods in urban renewal and other construction programs, and by establishing more effective law enforcement programs. The goal must be to restore a sense of place, a familiarity with sights and sounds, a feeling of belonging and contributing, and an absence of hostility and tension that every human being longs for. These are the features which can make a city a truly desirable and attractive place to live.

4. The role of private enterprise

Over the past generation the Democratic Party has too often expressed and demonstrated a basic distrust and misunderstanding of the role and capabilities of private enterprise. The dominant Democratic theme equates private enterprise with selfishness and narrowness of purpose, but equates public enterprise or government with the virtues of altruism and social purpose.

The distortion inherent in this attitude can be demonstrated by listing some of the vital public purposes accomplished by private enterprise—job creation, capital investment and economic growth, higher productivity and wages, along with more leisure time. It is also revealed by some of the less noble tendencies of government, notably the persistent inability of government to reverse course or terminate unproductive activities and the endless drive for power among rival government officials. These factors invariably result in attempts at program expansion, and cause debilitating interagency conflicts at public expense without regard to social purpose.

The short-sighted Democratic attitude toward private enterprise has prevented this Administration from fully recognizing and utilizing a development of great potential significance—the harnessing of the strengths of private enterprise to the solution of public and social problems, particularly in the cities.

Largely as a result of consistent Republican urging, private enterprises and foundations in recent years have shown an awareness of the problems of the cities, and have moved to devise new and effective approaches to their solution. Across the full spectrum of urban problems private enterprise has produced or sponsored numerous innovations in job training and placement, programs of learning for disadvantaged children, low-cost housing technology, pollution abatement methods, and college student loans, to name just a few.

Thoughtful Americans are realizing that

private enterprise and independent organizations possess numerous skills and resources which are vitally important assets in the struggle against the growing urban problems. Among these are: (1) a capacity for innovation and fresh thinking; (2) an ability to mobilize community leadership and spirit; (3) an on-the-spot method of operation that cuts delays and deemphasizes publicity; (4) a capacity for hard evaluation, reassessment, and changes of objectives and policies when needed; and (5) an informal network of communications and associations which can draw together a combination of resources tailored to each problem's unique needs.

The Republican Party pledges to promote and foster the increased commitment and utilization of private enterprise in coping with the urban crisis. A basic element of this approach must be the establishment of a general climate of government that encourages widespread private participation. In this regard, the Republican Party's consistent understanding and awareness of the strengths of private enterprise, in contrast to the suspicions historically exhibited by the Democrats, is a decisive advantage.

Beyond creating a proper climate, government can promote a greater role for private enterprise in many ways. These include offering tax benefits and other incentives to channel private resources to purposes of high social priority; using and applying government regulatory powers wisely; involving private enterprise in the implementation of government programs; and consulting continually with representatives of private enterprise in planning and administering government programs. We favor a complete review of government policies and operations with these guidelines in mind.

An example of programs designed to expand participation of private enterprise is the Republican-sponsored Domestic Development Bank. Under this proposal financing would be provided on favorable terms to whites and non-whites alike for private business and commercial projects, in order to expand job opportunities in poverty areas and to stimulate local entrepreneurship.

5. The approach to government

The most conspicuous and unwise aspect of the Democratic approach to government is the drive for greater centralization of local public services in the hands of the Federal government. The accelerating trend toward centralization under Democratic Administrations has restricted the home-rule powers of city governments, and has reduced their ability and capacity to respond effectively and creatively to the problems they confront.

Centralization results first from the Federal government's virtual monopoly of the lucrative income tax, thereby forcing the States and local communities to rely on the less responsive and less equitable sales and property taxes; and results secondly from the unparalleled growth and proliferation of specialized Federal grant-in-aid programs, currently numbering over 400 and accounting for an annual Federal expenditure of $18 billion.

Despite the added revenues provided, the Federal grant-in-aid system ultimately weakens city governments. The system permits the Federal government to establish local priorities and to exercise detailed control over a vast array of essentially local public services. It also creates a maze of bureaucratic red tape that saps the energy of local officials, adds to delays, and reduces program effectiveness.

There are also more subtle effects. Individual grant programs are generally handled between a specialized element of the bureaucracy in Washington and a counterpart agency at the local level, completely bypassing the mayor and other elected officials. This procedure strengthens the hand of obscure city hall employees at the expense of the mayor and the residents to whom he is responsible. Also, since final authority over these programs is often lodged in the Federal Government, and with higher Federal pay scales acting as an inducement, city employees and potential new employees may be lured away to Washington.[1]

Another conspicuous deficiency of the Democratic Administration's approach to government has been its failure to recognize that sound, balanced, and healthy growth in the economy is the keystone to social progress and human betterment. The distorted performance of the economy during the past four years of Democratic mismanagement has had a number of adverse effects in urban areas. Rampant inflation, with rising prices and higher interest rates, has taken a heavy toll on the economic well-being of urban residents. These economic conditions have compounded the problems of city governments by raising the cost of public services and increasing the cost of borrowing for capital improvements. Continuation of unsound Democratic economic policies could lead to run-away inflation or a plunge into recession with dire consequences on employment levels, purchasing power, and the future hopes of city residents.

The Republican Party believes that the capability of city governments to be masters of their own houses and to solve their own problems must be restored. To this end we have consistently and repeatedly proposed a system of revenue sharing and block grants to the States with provision for the allocation of funds to local and city governments. These measures, together with a system of Federal income tax credits for State and local taxes, would greatly strengthen these governments and would lift the tired hand of the Federal government from control of local public services. We also pledge to restore soundness to the Federal government's economic policies as a means to improve the financial position of city governments.

We favor these measures in the firm belief that city governments, if structurally and financially strong, can effectively provide the leadership, sense of purpose, creativity, and responsiveness needed for the solution of their present problems.

6. Leadership

As we stated at the outset, the gravest failure of the present Administration's approach to urban problems has been an absence of responsible, candid, and inspiring leadership. The failure of national leadership consists, principally, of: (1) the use of inflated promises and political slogans; (2) a lack of action to deal with the immediate problems of lawlessness and disorder; and (3) an unwillingness to establish a well-ordered set of priorities.

Little doubt exists that the repetition of irresponsible promises and political slogans by the Administration in 1964 and 1965 contributed to the violence and disorder of the succeeding two summers. The rhetoric of the War on Poverty and the Great Society created the impression among the disadvantaged of the cities that their living conditions would be dramatically and rapidly improved. The deep-rooted ills of inadequate education and job training, racial discrimination, poor housing, blighted neighborhoods, and lack of transportation facilities would—according to this script—be cured overnight.

It is clear that these promises extended far beyond the reach of any performance humanly possible. As a result, expectations were raised, but not realized, and for many, a sense of betrayal occurred. This led to hostility, and for some, violent outbursts. We charge the present Administration with irresponsibility in making these inflated and politically motivated promises to the poor.

A nation in crisis demands of its President the ability to summon all the vast resources of the Office for the purpose of restoring calm and inspiring confidence in the minds of the people. As the urban crisis has developed and expanded, the President's actions have not met these standards, but have been halting, unclear, and unsteady.

An example of uncertain leadership and an apparent admission of failure is the President's public statement that the nation can expect more rioting and disorder in the cities this summer. Such statements do not resolve crises and reduce tensions; they contribute to them.

The Administration has failed to present a blueprint for the future, based on a national strategy to reconcile hostilities and to alleviate the cities' unmet social needs. The basic ingredients for such a strategy are: (1) a clarion call for an end to group hostility and discrimination, together with a strong assertion of the need for understanding and fairness; (2) the setting of hard and meaningful priorities to provide needed funds for urban problems while reducing or deferring outlays for less essential programs at home and abroad; and (3) a summoning of vision and energy from all of our leaders in order to gain popular acceptance for these measures, to establish a sense of purpose, and to lead the future course of urban America. We commend the group of Republican Members of the House of Representatives for recently pointing the way by proposing a "Human Renewal Fund" based on a specific reallocation of resources in favor of the cities.

The Republican Party pledges to provide the American people the quality of leadership needed to resolve the urban crisis and to build a better future in our cities. The three most vital elements of national leadership—and the three that the Democratic Administration has most visibly lacked—are responsibility, candor, and inspiration. We promise to restore these values to the American political scene.

A SUMMARY OF REPUBLICAN RECOMMENDATIONS

Over the past three years the Republican Coordinating Committee has issued 27 major position papers dealing with domestic affairs. Many of these statements, in part or in their entirety, have addressed the problems of urban America. In total, over 100 specific recommendations have been presented to combat the full range of urban ills.

These recommendations are presented in two sections. The first section, which follows below, contains a summary of 55 recommendations to which we wish to direct particular attention because of their relevance to the present urban crisis. The second section, presented as an appendix to the full paper, incorporates the entire list of 123 recommendations made by the Republican Coordinating Committee in previous papers, including the 55 contained in the first section.[2]

We earnestly believe that our recommendations, based upon the Republican approach to urban problems outlined in the previous section, constitute the foundation for a broadly conceived plan of action to set new directions for urban America. We commend these policies and programs to the attention of the American people.

JOB OPPORTUNITIES AND TRAINING

We recommend that Congress enact the Republican-authored Human Investment Act to grant to employers a credit against Federal income taxes toward the costs incurred in training employees or potential employees in skills in short supply. Republicans agree that the most effective technique for achieving widespread business involve-

[1] City governments are also experiencing difficulty competing for employees with private organizations, such as community action agencies, which are permitted to pay higher salaries under the terms of lucrative Federal grant programs.

[2] The selection of recommendations for inclusion in the first section is not in derogation of the others.

ment is through incentive tax credits, both for hiring the unemployed and upgrading the under-employed, and for investment in urban and rural poverty areas.

We recommend a National Job Opportunity Survey to include nationwide collection of data on job market conditions, unfilled jobs, developing job needs, labor supply, regional and local patterns and the skills needed to meet the demands, together with a nationwide communications system making this data available to vocational educators, counselors, placement personnel, the Armed Services, labor unions, and business enterprises.

We urge vocational educators to expand further their programs among the hard-core unemployed in urban ghettoes, and to reorient and modernize these programs to match the demands of today's job market.

We recommend that the resources of industry, labor, education and all levels of government should be mobilized to institute a program of Technological Education for the Future (TEFF). This program would offer young people up to two years of functional training in needed new skills in schools and through on-the-job training. The employer would receive a credit against his Federal income tax for part of the wages paid the enrollee.

To meet the expanded demand for skilled technicians and semi-professional personnel, and to offer the high school graduate a choice other than ending his formal education or pursuing a four-year college program, we urge the expansion and strengthening of two-year technical institutes and community college programs located near the students' homes.

EDUCATION

Early childhood education programs should, as a matter of priority and urgency, be expanded to include all 5 and 4-year olds, and perhaps 3-year olds, from impoverished neighborhoods who could benefit from this experience.

We urge that Project Head Start be administered in the Office of Education through the States, not by the Office of Economic Opportunity. We believe the program should be taken out from under the Economic Opportunity Act and funded to the full extent of its need through the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

We support a massive campaign against illiteracy in the United States.

As a basic principle, we believe that teachers must be accorded the professional status, pay, and prerequisites commensurate with the challenge of the assignment and with the benefits which society realizes when this assignment is successfully discharged.

We feel that recent proposals for school decentralization in a number of the larger cities are worthy of serious attention and consideration by others as possible guides for action.

We recommend that steps be taken to embark on a constructive program to provide new and expanded school facilities in the cities, equivalent to the modern and spacious plant frequently found in suburban school districts. In view of ever-rising construction costs, these efforts should proceed without delay.

We feel that Federal aid programs for elementary and secondary education should be combined into a smaller, more manageable number of grant categories, in order to provide larger amounts of aid to problems of the highest priority.

The educational goals of excellence and equality of opportunity in urban schools, to which we subscribe, apply uniformly to all American children regardless of whether they attend public or non-public schools. For this reason, Federal government aid to education should be distributed on the basis of fair and equitable treatment of all school children.

If financial aid goes only to public institutions, the existing balance could be shifted strongly toward public education. This could effectively be remedied in part by the granting of Federal income tax credits for tuition and certain other expenses in education. Financial aid programs such as this must be carefully designed, along with other needed education programs, to include significant assistance to young people from families with the greatest financial need.

We believe that no qualified student should be deprived of a college education because of economic hardship. We recommend that families be allowed tax credits for the costs of college tuition and fees.

POVERTY AND WELFARE

We recommend removal of disincentives for work. People on welfare who are working part-time should be able to retain a portion of their earnings, thus increasing their incentive to move to full-time employment.

We recommend providing work incentives for dependent youth by giving teenage children of welfare recipients a desire to become productive through minimum wage exemptions.

We urge the expansion of child care facilities to be available in each State for working mothers.

We recommend fuller involvement of the poor in the solution of their own problems, by giving them representation on the community action boards in each area.

We recommend that the Office of Economic Opportunity be responsible for Community Action Programs alone and that the other programs under the Economic Opportunity Act be returned to the individual government departments and agencies in which they logically belong.

We recommend setting realistic ceilings on the salaries of poverty employees. Salaries of poverty workers should not exceed the salaries paid persons holding comparable positions in the area.

HOUSING

We believe that opportunities for acquiring ownership of units must be enhanced. In this regard, the Percy-Widnall home ownership plan and sweat equity proposals offer imaginative and constructive approaches to improving the quality of our housing and the lives of lower-income families.

Where public housing has been accepted by local decision, local public housing officials should be encouraged to make use of the Republican-sponsored program of short term leasing of existing housing, voluntarily offered by private landlords at public housing levels.

Federal or local tax policy can be used to encourage, rather than penalize, the owner for improving his property. Such encouragement could be based on a tax credit or tax abatement approach, using as a guide the cost of the improvement or the local property tax increase. Certainly, all levels of government should study their tax laws to eliminate factors which encourage the maintenance and spread of profitable slums.

A coordinated approach to housing and urban renewal should realize that there is social benefit in retaining the neighborhood—which may be the only social institution with meaning and value for the low income urban family.

We recommend better techniques to solve the relocation problem in urban renewal. Needed are more adequate payments for moving expenses, and more equitable compensation awards and procedures where property is taken under eminent domain.

A detailed and careful study of the operations of the Federal urban renewal and slum clearance programs by Congress is urgently needed. Such a study should include in-depth hearings involving the people directly affected by the program.

HUMAN RIGHTS

We call for faithful execution of the fair housing provisions of the civil rights bill recently passed by Congress with majority Republican support. This measure, aimed at providing all persons regardless of race, color, religion or national origin with nondiscriminatory access to most sale and rental housing, should help to reduce tensions in the central cities by creating opportunities for greater economic and social mobility among minority groups.

We pledge to reduce discrimination in employment. The Administration has failed to give prompt and effective implementation to Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which bans discrimination by employers and labor unions with more than one hundred members. Once again, we Republicans call upon the Democratic Administration to enforce this section of the law.

We firmly believe in the positive value of inter-cultural and interracial educational experiences for all children. Integrated schools expand the knowledge and understanding of the child, increase his awareness of others, and provide lessons of tolerance and fairness that are important assets to the individual and to society.

CRIME AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

We recommend substantial Federal financial assistance in the form of block grants be given directly to the States for crime control, and the creation of State departments of criminal justice to direct and coordinate all phases and segments of State and local crime prevention and control.

We urge enactment of the Republican proposal to create a permanent Joint Congressional Committee on Organized Crime.

We recommend that the Congress and the States enact appropriate codes of police procedures.

We urge the Federal government—through the National Institutes of Health—to increase substantially its research into causes of and cures for narcotic and drug addiction.

We call upon the Federal government to establish a model juvenile crime control system for the District of Columbia.

We recommend that Congress enact legislation to more effectively control the indiscriminate availability of firearms and to assist the States in enforcing their own firearms control laws by preventing circumvention in ways which are beyond the power of the States to control.

We urge the Federal government to establish an accelerated research program into the causes of crime and elimination of the causes of crime.

POLLUTION CONTROL

We propose a system of Federal tax benefits to industry for investments in air and water pollution control devices, so that the costs of controlling pollution will be widely shared, as well as the benefits. Congress should hold hearings and act favorably on legislation of this type.

We call for effective action rather than words to halt air and water pollution emanating from Federal installations, so that the Federal government in its own activities will be above reproach and can provide more effective leadership.

In order to promote efficiency and increased effectiveness in the operation of Federal water and sewer grant programs, we recommend transfer to the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration of all such programs now administered by four other Federal agencies.

We believe that Federal water pollution control grants should be allocated to local projects only after approval by the State as meeting an area-wide or regional pollution control plan.

We urge greater use of regional and metropolitan area agreements among States and

local governments in the control of air pollution, so that solutions may be matched to the geographical pattern and wide variations of the problem, and to minimize Federal controls consistent with the approach contained in the Air Quality Act of 1967. The Federal government should offer increased financial incentives to State and local governments so encourage them more strongly to enter into regional and metropolitan area agreements.

TRANSPORTATION

We propose a system of Federal tax incentives to private transit companies for investments in new equipment and systems, as a supplement to the Federal urban mass transportation grant program. These incentives might take the form of an increased investment credit or an accelerated depreciation allowance for such outlays.

In order to establish a more balanced set of priorities within total Federal research and development outlays, we recommend an accelerated and improved research and development program for urban mass transportation with an increased funding commitment for these activities.

We propose that the present limited program of aid for urban and suburban Federal routes be expanded into a new category of Federal-aid highways to be known as the Metropolitan System. To be eligible for funds, communities in metropolitan areas would have to show that new construction was in conformity with metropolitan area-wide transportation planning.

Before a particular freeway is built, careful consideration should be given to its liabilities and to its costs. Careful attention should be given to the impact on families, neighborhoods, business enterprises and whole communities. Appropriate care should be taken to preserve places of historical and cultural interest and areas of scenic beauty.

GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE AND PROCEDURES

The resolution of urban and metropolitan problems requires at the very least considerably increased coordination than generally now exists. And where it is necessary, units too small to handle effectively their share of metropolitan problems should relinquish enough of their powers to area governments to meet essential needs. In some instances a total merger of governmental units into a new or existing area-wide government may be the required answer.

Each of the States should make an active study of its constitution and laws with the aim of making whatever changes are required to facilitate metropolitan cooperation and organization.

The States should be encouraged to establish offices or departments of local government. Such agencies should help local governments in each State be more effective in meeting their responsibilities, and cooperating with nearby units.

For certain problems, governmental subdivisions within large cities or other mechanisms of citizen participation should be studied and tried.

INTER-GOVERNMENT FINANCE

We call for a reversal of the trend in the proliferation of specialized grant-in-aid programs—now estimated at well over 400—by a gradual consolidation of grants eventually into a small number of block grants.

We favor measures to allow Federal income tax credits for State and local taxes to enable State and local governments to finance their activities increasingly under their own powers. Stricter Federal expenditure control and a gradual reduction in Federal tax rates should go hand in hand with this program.

We recommend that Congress authorize and appropriate a Federal revenue sharing fund to be allocated to States and local governments with minimum restrictions and in an amount consistent with sound fiscal policy.

Under block grants and revenue sharing, the initial distribution of funds should be to the States. However, with growing urbanization in our society the pressing needs of city and other local governments must be recognized. Any final plan, therefore, must contain appropriate and enforceable provisions to ensure that State governments pass on a fair share to units of local government.

The formulas governing distribution of Federal and State aid to local governments should include equalization factors that take into account the great needs and the limited financial capacity of the cities.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a news article entitled "Republicans Want Decentralization of Urban Programs—Hit Promises," published in the Washington Post of Monday, June 3, be printed in the RECORD following the coordinating committee report.

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

REPUBLICANS WANT DECENTRALIZATION OF URBAN PROGRAMS—HIT PROMISES

The Republican leadership called yesterday for a new approach to America's urban crisis, based on local rather than Washington control and emphasizing education and training to help end all forms of discrimination.

The aim, as set forth in a report from the Republican Coordinating Committee, would be two-fold: "to give individuals self-reliance and personal dignity" and to restore the community as a center of life.

The Committee, which brings together all top elements of the Party for consideration of policies and programs, offered its prescription as an antidote for ills which it accused the Democratic Administration of generating through lack of "responsibility, candor and inspiration."

"We indict the Democratic leadership," the report said, on three counts:

"1—The reckless use of inflated promises and resort to political sloganeering which raised many expectations that were not realized.

"2—A lack of decisive action and influence in dealing with the immediate problems of lawlessness and disorder.

"3—An unwillingness to establish a well-ordered set of priorities to meet pressing social needs and to chart the Nation's future course."

The Committee said unfulfilled promises undoubtedly contributed to violence and racial disorders that have wracked the Nation's cities.

President Johnson was rebuked for largely ignoring the findings of his Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. The Commission itself came under fire because it "neglected to set any priorities among its numerous recommendations, failed to come to grips with the crucial questions of cost and financing, and could be construed as unfairly accusing all whites of practicing racism."

Charging the Democrats with failing to come through on their promises to the poor, the Committee said:

"The rhetoric of the War on Poverty and the Great Society created the impression among the disadvantaged of the cities that their living conditions would be dramatically and rapidly improved.

"It is clear that these promises extended far beyond the reach of any performance humanly possible. As a result, expectations were raised, but not realized, and for many, a sense of betrayal occurred."

The recommendations included a variety of tax incentives to private groups and businesses which "too frequently . . . have been undermined by federally directed and subsidized organizations."

Also called for were ambitious job training programs, a national job opportunity survey and a nationwide communications system to facilitate job placement, improvement and expansion of vocational education programs, a program of technological education, expansion of two-year technical institutes and community colleges, early childhood education and new and expanded ghetto school facilities.

The GOP group also called for "block grants" directly to states which would eliminate Federal participation—and control—clear down to the lowest local level.

SOVIETS HAVE PROPAGANDA FIELD DAY WITH U.S. FAILURE TO RATIFY HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, those of us who have been pushing hard for Senate ratification of the United Nations conventions on genocide, forced labor, and the political rights of women are all too aware of the propaganda advantage the Soviet Union takes of this body's failure to ratify the conventions. It is ironic indeed that a totalitarian form of government takes every opportunity to excoriate a nation founded on "liberty and justice for all" because of our failure to extend this liberty and justice, symbolically, to the world at large by ratifying the U.N. conventions.

Here's what Izvestia had to say recently regarding the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights:

> In the conditions of capitalism the declaration's basic tenets remain unfulfilled to this day. The bourgeois democracies, which serve the interests of imperialist monopolies, have turned the rights and freedoms assured by their constitutions into a farce. Thanks to the unstinted efforts of the Soviet Union . . . the U.N. has taken a series of measures aimed at restoring the independence of colonial people, the ending of all forms of racial discrimination, and (has) signed conventions condemning racism and genocide.

Every single person on the floor and in the gallery knows that this is a ludicrously false statement, but our failure to ratify human rights conventions will be continually thrown in our face by Iron Curtain propagandists until we act. How can we as representatives of a nation that almost 200 years ago was the cradle of liberty, refuse to ratify these conventions by hiding behind empty legalisms when we know that nations whose governments cannot match ours in terms of individual rights and liberties have no qualms whatsoever in becoming signatories? We have no reason to duck this issue. We have every reason to face up to it. I hope that we will act and act soon.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AUTHORITY TO REAPPOINT CHAIRMAN OF JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-

pore. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The BILL CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1224) 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.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MILLER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of Wednesday, May 29, 1968, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for a period not to exceed 30 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

TURMOIL ON THE CAMPUS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles written by Carl Rowan, published in the Washington Evening Star on May 15 and on May 31.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 15, 1968]

IT'S TIME TO CRACK DOWN ON CAMPUS ACTIVISTS

(By Carl T. Rowan)

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—There was a time when young people went to college, wise only to the point of knowing that they had a lot to learn.

Today's campuses are being convulsed by a motley assortment of student "activists" who express an arrogant certainty that they need to educate their presidents, deans, faculties, and most of the rest of mankind. And to a disturbing degree, they have made the process of educating a hapless hostage to their absurdity.

After boisterous upheaval, Stanford University is to be partly run by students who, in their wisdom, have made a topless go-go girl the prime candidate for president of the student body.

The president of Oberlin College has knuckled under to pressures and barred all military recruiters from the campus. Now—on the premise that the United States is guilty of "war crimes"—Oberlin students are demanding that the college sell all its U.S. Savings Bonds and that it pull Oberlin funds out of companies that contribute directly to the military effort in Vietnam.

At Columbia, students seek to force the university to end its ties with the Institute for Defense Analysis, a consortium that does military research for the government.

And here, ceremonies to install a new president of the University of Minnesota were disrupted by a group angered mostly because police took action against a colleague who had ignored a batch of tickets for traffic violations.

This group cloaked its anger in "nobler" cause, of course, as it barred regents and scholars from entering the front door of Northrop Auditorium.

"We've been going through back doors for decades," insisted a Negro protester. "Now you all go through the back door."

People politely complied.

On campus after campus, turmoil rages over such diverse demands as a separate course in Negro history, the right of male students to entertain girls in their dormitory rooms at all hours, or the addition of a bit of color (racial, that is) to the college coaching staffs.

The preferred tactics of the activists, whether their demands are obviously just or patently ridiculous, is to virtually kidnap college administrators, seize offices or entire buildings, and otherwise bring the processes of teaching and learning to a chaotic halt.

It is clearly time for college administrators to meet and adopt some joint strategy to deal with this absurd business—and for these reasons:

1. The anarchists and nihilists, who are more interested in destroying universities and "the system" than they are in improving things, are picking off the schools one by one. Administrators, and faculties are knuckling under for fear of becoming the first institutions totally wrecked by student strikes and resignations of faculty sympathizers.

2. In this election year, the politicians are eager to get into the act, as the House has shown. Whatever institutions irresponsible and irrational students fail to wreck will be intellectually dismembered by overly righteous congressmen and their meat-ax attempts at repression.

College administrators must agree on areas where they have been wrong and unresponsive to legitimate complaints.

Administrators making bold, honest efforts to right these wrongs will carry along the great majority of students and thus isolate those bent on destruction.

When this latter group resorts to illegal, mob tactics, it ought to be agreed by every president that they are to be expelled—pronto!

Perhaps a few mushheads will say that this is treating students like juveniles. But it is merely treating immature adolescents like immature adolescents, ruffians like ruffians, and serious students and scholars like students and scholars.

It is high time somebody began to make the distinction.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 31, 1968]

(By Carl T. Rowan)

CAMPUS TURMOIL AIMED AT PROMOTING ANARCHY?

A couple of weeks ago, 23-year-old Cathy Wilkerson stood on the campus of American University here, fanning the fires of student rebellion.

Miss Wilkerson was only one of several SDS non-students who were encouraging or abetting campus revolts in May. At least partly because of the zeal of these young revolutionaries, two great spasms of violence had rocked Columbia University, resulting in 897 arrests and injuries to 216 persons.

What does it all add up to? Is it just a new "campus fad," or is it a development that merits the attention of those concerned with national security?

Some key people in the Justice Department are convinced that Columbia is only an early target in a national plan by student revolutionaries to either seize control of dozens of universities or wreck them.

FBI and other reports indicate that even as violence raged at Columbia some of the ringleaders were fanning out around the country trying to intensify conflicts on other campuses.

These reports also show that many of those doing the most haranguing on campuses are not students at all but well-organized outsiders exploiting campus grievances to further their goal of "changing American society."

One Justice Department report says that "trained agitators and subversive elements represent a hard core whose basic objective is to promote outright anarchy. There is growing evidence that this hard core is composed of many non-students. There is growing evidence, too, that there is a broad interaction involving travel from one campus to another either to instigate a student eruption or to exploit an existing student demonstration."

These reports note, for example, that one Thomas Hayden helped found the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and that he works out of Chicago for the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam. Hayden turned up as a key figure in the uprising at Columbia.

Government files show that Mark Rudd, most persistent of the agitators at Columbia, contacted colleges as far away as Oklahoma and California in early May informing them that a "speakers' bureau" had been set up at Columbia to send people anywhere to set in motion "rallies, actions, strikes in support of Columbia's demands, on local racism, or repression issues."

SDS had a non-student in the Roosevelt University disturbance in Chicago on May 15, another non-student agitator at the University of Delaware on May 16, and on the same day had a Columbia activist, Jeff Girth, at the University of Texas in Austin.

Miss Wilkerson admits that SDS's goals and activities are national, but she denies any master plan for college upheaval. "You can't transplant revolt from one campus to another," she told me. "The impetus has to come from the local situation. People have to feel oppressed before they will revolt."

She insists that "the FBI is trying to make SDS look subversive" but that the group only wants to "change the system and give power to the 90 percent of the people who have no economic or political control whatsoever now."

Miss Wilkerson is certainly correct in her assumption that the FBI and other elements of government distrust SDS and its motives. A current report, being carefully studied in top levels of government here, asserts that the campus riots are much more menacing than any mere reflection of "the generation gap."

"It is only the beginning of a still greater planned effort which may shake the campuses of the colleges and universities to their very foundations in the forthcoming school year if school administrators and others do not recognize the need to face up to this challenge," the report states.

Cathy Wilkerson agrees that more campus revolts are in store, not because of malevolent instigation, she says, but because college administrators "are becoming more and more repressive and oppressive."

Whatever the facts about student motivation, college administrators clearly face a grim challenge.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the May 15 article is entitled "It's Time To Crack Down on Campus Activists." Among other things, Mr. Rowan in this article states:

There was a time when young people went to college, wise only to the point of knowing that they had a lot to learn.

Today's campuses are being convulsed by a motley assortment of student "activists" who express an arrogant certainty that they need to educate their presidents, deans, faculties, and most of the rest of mankind. And to a disturbing degree, they have made the process of educating a hapless hostage to their absurdity.

Mr. President, in the second article entitled "Campus Turmoil Aimed at Promoting Anarchy?" among other thoughts expressed by Mr. Rowan, he says:

A couple of weeks ago, 23-year-old Cathy Wilkerson stood on the campus of American University here, fanning the fires of student rebellion.

Miss Wilkerson was only one of several SDS non-students who were encouraging or abetting campus revolts in May. At least partly because of the zeal of these young revolutionaries, two great spasms of violence had rocked Columbia University, resulting in 897 arrests and injuries to 216 persons.

What does it all add up to? Is it just a new "campus fad," or is it a development that merits the attention of those concerned with national security?

Some key people in the Justice Department are convinced that Columbia is only an early target in a national plan by student revolutionaries to either seize control of dozens of universities or wreck them.

Mr. President, I concur completely with the views expressed by Mr. Rowan. I think we have been asleep. We have been lulled into a state of security not justified by what is happening in this country. These are not dissents. They are not demands for reforms. They are the initiation of anarchy, the real purpose of the nonofficial and the revolutionary being to take over and control our revered institutions.

I repeat, it is time that law enforcement officials wake up. It is time that the heads of our educational institutions exercise their authority and prerogatives and demonstrate that the property of the public and the property of private institutions shall be held inviolate against those trying to precipiate anarchy.

Moreover, the time has come when the officials in charge of our educational institutions must exert themselves to eliminate this danger, as well as every law enforcement official in the Department of Justice and every prosecuting attorney in the Nation.

I thank the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] very much for yielding to me at this time.

THE RECORD ON INFLATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, it is said that the farther one is from Washington, the closer one is to reality.

I wish to discuss today the hard reality of inflation.

For too long, those in control of our Federal Government in Washington have covered up the reality of inflation. And when its existence was finally acknowledged, it has been played down with the excuse that inflation is a necessary evil to be expected at a time when we have never had it so good.

But the social tragedies spawned by the evil of inflation have not been deterred by sanguine speeches and press releases. Inflation has been exacting a terrible price from the people.

Inflation has added over $100 billion to the cost of living of our people in the past 7 years.

Inflation has shrunk the value of checking accounts of our people by $10 billion in the past 7 years.

Inflation has robbed our people of $32 billion from their savings in the past 7 years.

Inflation has reduced the value of pension fund reserves by over $17 billion in the past 7 years.

Inflation has eroded away $15 billion from the value of U.S. Government and other bonds in the past 7 years.

Inflation has eaten $13 billion from life insurance reserves in the past 7 years.

Mr. President, these costs of inflation total over $188 billion in the past 7 years—nearly $1,000 for every man, woman, and child.

And it is getting worse. Already, in the first 3 months of 1968, the American people have been hit by more than $19 billion of inflation—$10 billion in cost-of-living inflation and $9 billion loss of value of their cash-convertible assets. At this rate, inflation in 1968 will take away more purchasing power from our people than the Federal income tax.

This record constitutes a glaring indictment of the stewardship of those in control of the administration and the Congress.

It is the inevitable result of their refusal to follow a stable dollar economic policy; to follow, instead, the irresponsible paths of uncontrolled spending, no priorities in spending, guns and butter, and deliberate multi-billion-dollar budget deficits.

The record is full of statements by those in control of our Federal Government that inflation is "the most unjust and capricious form of taxation." But that is all the record shows—noble words unmatched by deeds.

One of the basic causes of the feelings of helplessness and hopelessness among large segments of our people is the ever-increasing cost of living resulting from inflation. When their dollars continue to buy less, the squeeze on family budgets becomes unbearable.

Our people see prices continuing to rise as the buying power of their money continues to shrink.

The inflationary policies of this administration and its controlled Congress have undercut most the very segment of our society which the poverty programs are supposed to be helping—the poor and underprivileged. But also deeply hurt by these policies are our younger people who are trying to finance ever-increasing costs of an education, purchase a home, maintain a young and growing family, and raise the money needed to go into business or farming; and, of course, the older Americans whose earning power is ended or greatly diminished and who rely on fixed pensions, insurance, annuities, and savings for a livelihood.

If the Federal Government is going to take away purchasing power from the people, it should be done by taxation rather than by inflation. Either way the people end up with less purchasing power, but the tax way, at least, is out in the open and usually is related to ability to pay. The inflation way is easier to cover up and its impact has no relationship to ability to stand the impact.

The evidence of the bankrupt economic policies of the present administration is abundant:

The cost-of-living index increased from 214.6 in 1960 to 247.6 in April of this year. Living costs in April were climbing at the fastest rate in 17 years.

The continued decrease in the purchasing power of our dollar from 47 cents—based on a 1939 dollar valued at 100 cents—in 1960 to 40 cents today.

The inflation-spawned increase in interest rates to the highest level since the Civil War.

The continued increase in the national debt, which has jumped from $290 billion at the end of 1960 to $350 billion as of last April 30.

The continued increase in the annual interest on this national debt, which has risen from the $9.2 billion 7 years ago to $14.4 billion.

The 7-year Federal budget deficits of more than $54 billion.

This is a tragic record. The evidence fully supports the indictment of mismanagement.

There is much talk about increases in our gross national product. These should be evaluated in light of the portion of these increases representing inflation—as distinguished from "real dollar" increases in GNP. A few years ago, 20 percent of the Nation's increased GNP consisted of inflation. By 1966, 47 percent of the increased GNP consisted of inflation. Last year, 60 percent of the increased GNP consisted of inflation.

Inflation has had a disastrous impact on the agricultural sector of our economy. In the last 7 years, farmers' costs of production have gone up over $8 billion. Net income has increased $2.9 billion, but when the inflation is shrunk out of 1967 dollars to reduce them to 1960 dollar equivalents, net agricultural income is back to where it was in 1960. Last March, the U.S. Department of Agriculture reported that inflation will take more than $1 billion from farmers' income during 1968 alone.

Inflation hurts wage earners—whether union members or not—by reducing the real income of their wages and the value of their retirement pensions. Real income of wage earners today is lower than a year ago, which means that cost-of-living inflation has more than offset wage increases. One cannot blame the wage earner for seeking more dollars in his pay envelope when all of his dollars are worth less; but this is tending to push up prices in the face of tightening competition from imports and tougher competition in our overseas markets. Our favorable balance of trade has fallen from $6.7 billion in 1964 to $3.8 billion in 1967, and this has contributed to the worsening balance-of-payments deficit, which was $3.6 billion last year. There is no indication that the favorable balance-of-trade picture is going to get better while inflation continues, and it could grow worse.

During the last 7 years, the cost of a college education has gone up over $100 a year in public colleges; still more in private colleges.

A home costing $12,000 in 1960 cost $16,500 in 1967, and higher mortgage interest rates will add considerably more.

During the last 7 years, the cost of maintaining a family of husband, wife, and two children has jumped over $900 on an average.

Our older citizens have been deeply hurt by inflation. In 1965, Congress

passed a 7-percent social security pension increase—the first since 1958. In the interim, inflation reduced the value of social security pensions by $1.5 billion, and even with the 7-percent increase, pensions were not worth as much as they were in 1958. Since the 7-percent increase went into effect, inflation has taken another $2.3 billion away from the value of these pensions. The new 13-percent increase, which went into effect last February, will be rapidly destroyed if the present rate of inflation continues.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table which shows how the face amount of social security pensions has been increased at various times by the Congress while, as a result of inflation, the value of these pensions has practically stood still.

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

TABLE I.—SHOWING INCREASES IN SOCIAL SECURITY PENSIONS LEGISLATED BY CONGRESS IN ORDER TO ENABLE PENSIONERS TO MAINTAIN THEIR PURCHASING POWER IN VIEW OF DECLINE IN VALUE OF THE DOLLAR

[The example is a worker having a $3,000 annual income base, single at retirement and "fully covered." The 1940 year figure is for a worker retired under the 1935 act. Other figures are for a worker retired under successive acts for years indicated.]

Year	Annual pension	Purchasing power of dollar compared to 1939 dollar worth 100 cents (in cents)	Real value of pension
1940	$499.20	99.2	$495.20
1950	870.00	57.8	502.86
1952	930.00	52.3	486.39
1954	1,062.00	51.7	549.05
1958	1,140.00	48.1	548.34
1965	1,220.00	44.0	537.00
1966	1,220.00	42.7	510.94
1967	1,220.00	41.6	507.52
April 1968	1,367.00	40.4	552.27

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, as I have been pointing out for several years, the most meaningful way to make the average person aware of what cost-of-living inflation has been doing to him is to reduce it to a sales tax equivalent. A sales tax and cost-of-living inflation have a similar impact. For example, inflation of 3 percent would cut the purchasing power of a dollar by 3 percent; and a sales tax of 3 percent would take 3 percent out of each dollar spent, with the same result—just that much less purchasing power remaining. Both are regressive in that each bears most heavily on the low-income, large-family, and fixed-income groups.

Since the Democratic administration took over the reins in 1961, along with control over both Houses of Congress, there has been an average annual cost-of-living inflation of nearly $15 billion. This has had an impact on the citizens of the various States equivalent to a sales tax ranging from 2 to 10 percent, depending on the relative personal income of each particular State. During 1967, cost-of-living inflation amounted to over $25 billion. This had an impact on the citizens of the various States equivalent to a sales tax ranging up to 18 percent, depending on the relative personal income of each particular State.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks two tables: one showing the average yearly loss of purchasing power due to cost-of-living inflation from 1961 through 1967, allocated among the various States, with the allocated amount shown in sales tax equivalents; the other showing the same information with respect to cost-of-living inflation for 1967. Appropriate explanatory notes are also set forth in these tables.

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

TABLE II.—COST OF LIVING INFLATION IN THE 50 STATES, 1961-67, UNDER ADMINISTRATION AND CONGRESS CONTROLLED BY DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Based on information provided by the President's Council of Economic Advisers, the U.S. Treasury, and the Department of Commerce, the following figures show the average extent of inflation for each of the 50 States for 1961-67, together with the amount of additional sales tax which would be required in each of these States to recoup such an amount.

State	Average yearly cost of living inflation, 1961-67	Sales tax equivalent (percent)	Type of tax
Alabama	$177,840,000	4.1	General sales.
Alaska	22,896,000	8.0	Retail sales.[1]
Arizona	101,520,000	2.9	General sales.
Arkansas	95,328,000	3.2	Do.
California	1,626,480,000	4.5	Do.
Colorado	141,408,000	4.2	Do.
Connecticut	262,224,000	6.3	Do.
Delaware	44,784,000	6.2	Retail sales.
Florida	388,944,000	3.8	General sales.
Georgia	262,800,000	3.2	Do.
Hawaii	55,872,000	2.1	Do.
Idaho	42,192,000	3.8	Do.
Illinois	941,472,000	4.6	Do.
Indiana	375,984,000	2.4	Do.
Iowa	197,568,000	3.4	Do.
Kansas	158,832,000	4.0	Do.
Kentucky	176,544,000	3.9	Do.
Louisiana	207,648,000	2.8	Do.
Maine	59,040,000	4.3	Do.
Maryland	293,328,000	6.4	Do.
Massachusetts	438,768,000	10.2	Do.
Michigan	675,792,000	3.9	Do.
Minnesota	258,480,000	5.6	Retail sales.[1]
Mississippi	103,104,000	2.8	General sales.
Missouri	319,536,000	3.7	Do.
Montana	44,784,000	4.6	Retail sales.[1]
Nebraska	97,776,000	4.6	Do.
Nevada	37,296,000	3.1	General sales.
New Hampshire	47,952,000	5.4	Retail sales.[1]
New Jersey	588,816,000	8.4	General sales.
New Mexico	57,168,000	2.5	Do.
New York	1,585,152,000	5.2	Do.
North Carolina	279,504,000	4.1	Do.
North Dakota	36,720,000	4.7	Do.
Ohio	779,328,000	6.3	Do.
Oklahoma	151,776,000	4.0	Do.
Oregon	141,552,000	5.2	Retail sales.[1]
Pennsylvania	849,744,000	6.6	General sales.
Rhode Island	67,536,000	6.8	Do.
South Carolina	130,608,000	3.4	Do.
South Dakota	39,888,000	3.8	Do.
Tennessee	213,984,000	3.4	Do.
Texas	681,840,000	5.2	Do.
Utah	62,064,000	3.3	Do.
Vermont	26,784,000	5.0	Retail sales.[1]
Virginia	292,176,000	6.7	General sales.
Washington	249,264,000	2.4	Do.
West Virginia	97,632,000	2.3	Do.
Wisconsin	306,432,000	9.4	Do.
Wyoming	21,888,000	2.7	Do.

[1] Percentages for these 8 States are based on assumption of a simple retail sales tax on lumber, building materials, hardware and farm equipment dealers; general merchandise group stores; foodstores; automotive dealers; gasoline service stations; apparel and accessory stores; furniture, home furnishings, and equipment stores; eating and drinking places; drugstores; proprietary stores; other retail stores; and nonstore retailers.

SOURCES

(1) *1961–1967 cost of living inflation.*—This was obtained from the January 1968 *Economic Indicators,* Joint Economic Committee, p. 2. "Total gross national product in 1958 prices" for 1966 was subtracted from "Total gross national product in 1958 prices" for 1967. This remainder was subtracted from the difference between "Total gross national product" for 1966 and "Total gross national product" for 1967. The remainder, $25.2 billion, represents cost of living inflation for the United States for 1967, expressed in dollars. One should bear in mind that gross national product is something of a misnomer in that it includes the sum total of *purchases* during a period by the various levels of government, personal consumption *expenditures,* and private *investment.*

Similar remainders on non-inflated GNP growth statistics, that is GNP figures all measured in 1958 prices, were subtracted from GNP growth figures in current, inflated, dollars for the years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966. The yearly dollar value of cost of living inflation thus calculated was:

	Billion
1961	$6.8
1962	7.5
1963	8.9
1964	11.9
1965	15.6
1966	25.0
1967	25.2
Total	100.9

Thus the total amount of cost of living inflation expressed in dollars for the period 1961 to 1967 was $100.9 billion, an average of approximately $14.4 billion per year. To assign each of the fifty States its appropriate share of this inflation, the *Survey of Current Business,* April 1968, was used. Page 13, table 3, contains "Total Personal Income, by States and Regions." Personal income for the United States was divided into each State total which gave each State a percentage, in most cases three significant figures, which represents State share of Total National Personal Income. The average cost of living inflation ($14.4 billion) was then multiplied by this percentage. The result appears under the title *Average Yearly Cost of Living Inflation, 1961–1967.*

The State percentages of National Personal Income are: Rhode Island .469%, Connecticut 1.821%, New York 11.008%, New Jersey 4.089%, Pennsylvania 5.901%, Delaware .311%, Maryland 2.037%, District of Columbia .556%, Michigan 4.693%, Ohio 5.412%, Indiana 2.611%, Illinois 6.538%, Wisconsin 2.128%, Minnesota 1.795%, Iowa 1.372%, Missouri 2.219%, North Dakota .255%, South Dakota .277%, Nebraska .679%, Kansas 1.103%, Virginia 2.029%, West Virginia .678%, Kentucky 1.226%, Tennessee 1.486%, North Carolina 1.941%, South Carolina .907%, Georgia, 1.825%, Florida 2.701%, Alabama 1.235%, Mississippi .716%, Louisiana 1.442%, Arkansas .602%, Oklahoma 1.054%, Texas 4.735%, New Mexico .397%, Arizona .705%, Montana .311%, Idaho .293%, Wyoming .152%, Colorado .982%, Utah .431%, Washington 1.731%, Oregon .983%, Nevada .259%, California 11.295%, Alaska .159%, Hawaii .388%, Maine .410%, New Hampshire .333%, Vermont .186%, Massachusetts 3.047%.

(2) *New taxes needed to recoup average 1961–1967 loss from cost of living inflation.*—This was obtained in cases where State sales and use taxes are in existence from "State Tax Collections in 1967," U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Government Finances, GF No. 16. Additional State taxes needed to recoup money lost through cost of living inflation in the average year 1961–1967 were determined as follows: "Average Yearly Cost of Living Inflation 1961–1967" multiplied by "State General Sales Tax Rate" was divided by "State General Sales Tax Collections for 1967" for each of the States. In each case, this gave the additional tax necessary to recoup money lost through this inflation.

For the eight States which had no Sales, Selective Sales, Gross Receipts or Use Taxes as of June 30, 1967, a generalization was made based on information from the *Statistical Abstract* of the United States for 1967. Page 790 of the *Abstract* lists sales for "Retail Trade Establishments by State" for the eleven groups of retail trades utilized. Dividing "Average Yearly Cost of Living Inflation 1961–1967" for each State by "Retail Sales" gave the percentage tax rate which would be necessary, if imposed on retail sales, to raise the average dollar amount of cost of living inflation incurred by that State in 1961–1967.

(3) *Accuracy.*—A degree of error is possible in the figures shown due to the law of significant figures. Retail trade statistics vary from a high of six significant figures to a low of four significant figures, while personal income statistics vary from five significant figures to three significant figures. Since average cost of living inflation for the United States for 1961–1967 is in excess of $10 billion—eleven significant figures—these statistics are useful principally as a general illustration of the awesome scope of cost of living inflation, State by State, across the nation. They do not include another $87.4 billion cost of inflation, 1961–1967, representing reduction in value of savings, demand deposits, currency, life insurance and pension fund reserves, Government and corporate bonds, due to erosion of the purchasing power of the dollar.

TABLE III.—COST OF LIVING INFLATION IN THE 50 STATES FOR 1967 UNDER ADMINISTRATION AND CONGRESS CONTROLLED BY DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Based on information provided by the President's Council of Economic Advisers, the U.S. Treasury, and the Department of Commerce, the following figures show the extent of cost of living inflation for each of the 50 States during 1967, together with the amount of additional sales tax which would be required in each of these States to recoup such an amount]

State	1967 cost of living inflation	Sales tax equivalent (percent)	Type of tax
Alabama	$311,220,000	7.2	General sales.
Alaska	40,068,000	14.1	Retail sales.[1]
Arizona	177,660,000	5.1	General sales.
Arkansas	166,824,000	5.6	Do.
California	2,846,340,000	8.0	Do.
Colorado	247,464,000	7.5	Do.
Connecticut	458,892,000	11.0	Do.
Delaware	78,372,000	10.9	Retail sales.[1]
Florida	680,652,000	6.7	General sales.
Georgia	459,900,000	5.7	Do.
Hawaii	97,776,000	3.7	Do.
Idaho	73,836,000	6.7	Do.
Illinois	1,647,576,000	8.0	Do.
Indiana	657,972,000	4.3	Do.
Iowa	345,744,000	6.0	Do.
Kansas	277,956,000	7.0	Do.
Kentucky	308,952,000	6.8	Do.
Louisiana	363,384,000	4.9	Do.
Maine	103,320,000	7.5	Do.
Maryland	513,324,000	11.3	Do.
Massachusetts	767,844,000	17.9	Do.
Michigan	1,182,636,000	6.9	Do.
Minnesota	452,340,000	9.9	Retail sales.[1]
Mississippi	180,432,000	4.9	General sales.
Missouri	559,188,000	6.5	Do.
Montana	78,372,000	8.1	Retail sales.[1]
Nebraska	171,108,000	8.1	Do.
Nevada	65,268,000	5.5	General sales.
New Hampshire	83,916,000	9.5	Retail sales.[1]
New Jersey	1,030,428,000	14.8	General sales.
New Mexico	100,044,000	4.4	Do.
New York	2,774,016,000	9.1	Do.
North Carolina	489,132,000	7.2	Do.
North Dakota	64,260,000	8.2	Do.
Ohio	1,363,824,000	11.1	Do.
Oklahoma	265,608,000	7.0	Do.
Oregon	247,716,000	9.2	Retail sales.[1]
Pennsylvania	1,487,052,000	11.6	General sales.
Rhode Island	118,188,000	12.0	Do.
South Carolina	228,564,000	6.0	Do.
South Dakota	69,804,000	6.7	Do.
Tennessee	374,472,000	5.9	Do.
Texas	1,193,220,000	9.1	Do.
Utah	108,612,000	5.8	Do.
Vermont	46,872,000	8.7	Retail sales.[1]
Virginia	511,308,000	11.7	General sales.
Washington	436,212,000	4.3	Do.
West Virginia	170,856,000	4.0	Do.
Wisconsin	536,256,000	16.4	Do.
Wyoming	38,304,000	4.7	Do.

[1] Percentages for these 8 States are based on assumption of a simple retail sales tax on lumber, building materials, hardware and farm equipment dealers; general merchandise group stores; food stores; automotive dealers; gasoline service stations, apparel and accessory stores; furniture, home furnishings and equipment stores; eating and drinking places; drugstores; proprietary stores; other retail stores; and nonstore retailers.

SOURCES

(1) *1967 cost of living inflation.*—This was obtained from the January 1968 *Economic Indicators,* Joint Economic Committee. p. 2. "Total gross national product in 1958 prices" for 1966 was subtracted from "Total gross national product in 1958 prices" for 1967. This remainder was subtracted from the difference between "Total gross national product" for 1966 and "Total gross national product" for 1967. The remainder, $25.2 billion, represents cost of living inflation for the United States for 1967, expressed in dollars. One should bear in mind that gross national product is something of a misnomer in that it includes the sum total of *purchases* during a period by the various levels of government, personal consumption *expenditures,* and private *investment.*

To assign each of the fifty States its appropriate share of this inflation, the *Survey of Current Business,* April 1968, was used. Page 13, table 3, contains "Total Personal Income, by States and Regions." Personal income for the United States was divided into each State total which gave each State a percentage, in most cases three significant figures, which represents State share of Total National Personal Income. This percentage was then multiplied by $25.2 billion. The total appears under the title, *1967 Cost of Living Inflation.*

The State percentages of National Personal Income are: Rhode Island .469%, Connecticut 1.821%, New York 11.008%, New Jersey 4.089%, Pennsylvania 5.901%, Delaware .311%, Maryland 2.037%, District of Columbia, .556%, Michigan 4.693%, Ohio 5.412%, Indiana 2.611%, Illinois 6.538%, Wisconsin 2.128%, Minnesota 1.795%, Iowa 1.372%, Missouri 2.219%, North Dakota .255%, South Dakota .277%, Nebraska .679%, Kansas 1.103%, Virginia 2.029%, West Virginia .678%, Kentucky 1.226%, Tennessee 1.486%, North Carolina, 1.941%, South Carolina .907%, Georgia 1.825%, Florida 2.701%, Alabama 1.235%, Mississippi .716%, Lousiana 1.442%, Arkansas .662%, Oklahoma 1.054%, Texas 4.735%, New Mexico .397%, Arizona .705%, Montana .311%, Idaho .293%, Wyoming .152%, Colorado .982%, Utah .431%, Washington 1.731%, Oregon .983%, Nevada .259%, California 11.259%, Alaska .159%, Hawaii .388%, Maine .410%, New Hampshire .333%, Vermont .186%, Massachusetts 3.047%.

(2) *New taxes to recoup 1967 loss from cost of living inflation.*—This was obtained, in cases where State sales and use taxes are in existence, from "State Tax Collections in 1967," U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Government Finances, GF No. 16. Additional State taxes needed to recoup money lost through cost of living inflation in 1967 were determined as follows: "State General Sales Tax Rate" multiplied by "Cost of Living Inflation in 1967" was divided by "State General Sales Tax Collections for 1967" for each of the States. In each case, this gave the additional tax necessary to recoup money lost through cost of living inflation.

For the eight States which had no Sales, Selective Sales, Gross Receipts or Use Taxes as of June 30, 1967, a generalization was made based on information from the *Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1967.* Page 790 of the *Abstract* lists sales for "Retail Establishments by State" for the eleven groups of retail trades utilized. Dividing "1967 Cost of Living Inflation" for each State by Retail Sales gave the percentage tax rate which would be necessary, if imposed on retail sales, to raise the dollar amount of cost of living inflation incurred by that State in 1967.

(3) *Accuracy.*—A degree of error is possible in the figures shown due to the law of significant figures. When added up, State percentages of Total U.S. Personal Income equal 99.973 percent. The error, in other words, is .00027, well within tolerable standards. It should be noted that these figures are based on the $25.2 billion cost of living inflation for calendar year 1967 and do not include an additional $23 billion cost of inflation representing reduction in value of savings, demand deposits, currency, life insurance and pension fund reserves, government and corporate bonds due to erosion of the purchasing power of the dollar.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, these tables, based on statistics from Federal Government sources, dramatically underscore the impact of cost-of-living inflation on the people of the United States.

Only when the administration stops spending more money than it can persuade the Congress to collect from the taxpayers will this be stopped.

Only when the Congress asserts its independence from the executive branch of the Federal Government and matches its appropriations with our revenue collections will this be stopped.

With a view to showing the reach of inflation, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD a further table which sets forth the principal areas of inflationary impact due to the declining purchasing power of our dollar.

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

TABLE IV.—INFLATION RECORD [1]

[In billions]

	Total	Cost of living (1)	Demand deposits and currency (2)	Savings accounts, banks (3)	Savings accounts, other (4)	Pension fund reserves (5)	U.S. Government securities (6)	State and local government securities (7)	Corporate bonds (8)	Life insurance reserves (9)
All areas:										
1961	$9.8	$6.8	$0.4	$0.4	$0.6	$0.5	$0.4	$0.2	$0.04	$0.5
1962	14.2	7.5	.8	.8	1.4	1.3	.8	.4	.08	1.1
1963	18.7	8.9	1.2	1.3	2.1	1.8	1.2	.6	.10	1.5
1964	19.0	11.9	.8	1.0	1.6	1.3	.8	.4	.05	1.1
1965	29.2	15.6	1.6	1.9	3.1	2.7	1.5	.7	.09	2.0
1966	49.0	25.0	2.8	3.5	5.5	4.9	2.5	1.2	.15	3.4
1967	48.5	25.2	2.6	3.5	5.3	4.7	2.5	1.2	.17	3.3
Total	188.4	100.9	10.2	12.4	19.6	17.2	9.7	4.7	.68	12.9
3 months 1968	19.3	9.9	1.0	1.5	2.1	2.0	.9	.5	.07	1.3
Total	207.7	110.8	11.2	13.9	21.7	19.2	10.6	5.2	.75	14.2

[1] Sources: Item (1), Economic Indicators, President's Council of Economic Advisers; items (2) through (9), Economic Division Library of Congress, based on Bureau of Labor Statistics and Federal Reserve Bulletin (February 1968).

THE POOR PEOPLE AND THE FACTS OF LIFE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in its lead editorial yesterday, the Washington Sunday Star commented:

No one needs to be told that the impoverishment of millions of Americans is the result of years of neglect, or that there is still a very long way to go before poverty is eliminated. But the impression so pervasive in many of the Poor People's campaign lead-

ers' statements to the effect that the poor are starting from a zero point—that little or nothing of real consequence is now being done—is entirely fallacious.

There is much truth in that comment. To leave with the general public—indeed, the entire world, for we are being judged by other nations on the basis of the unrest now settling on this country—the impression that nothing is being done or has been done to alleviate conditions of poverty in this Nation is a disservice to those who have been concerned with the problem for so many years.

Yet, if one were to take recent statements at face value, the Federal Government, including the Congress, has been most unfeeling and unconcerned. This impression afforded great credence in the past year or so, is unfortunately gaining even greater momentum in recent weeks.

But if one were to examine the flow of Federal funds to those in need, one would find that the Federal Government has been quite concerned and has been far from indifferent. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare recently pointed out that 20 percent of our gross national product is being spent for health, education, and welfare—much directed at the poor.

Last year, a total of $21 billion was spent on programs and aids designed solely to benefit the poor. This $21 billion included $2 billion for education; $1 billion for work and training programs; $3.2 billion for health programs; $12.8 billion in cash benefit payments; and $2 billion in other social welfare and economic services.

This year, the total will go up to $24.6 billion and, in 1969, to $27.7 billion.

On a monthly average basis, Federal public assistance grants to States and localities will help provide aid for more than 8.8 million of our poorest citizens, including 4.6 million children.

Community action agencies in our Nation's urban and rural communities will not only involve the disadvantaged in self-help activities, but will provide needed services to about 9 million people.

Intensive preschool education will be provided 652,000 underprivileged children under project Headstart, a Federal program. Follow Through federal program assistance will be extended to another 89,000 children.

Some 50 or more neighborhood health centers will be in operation next year to provide comprehensive health care to the poor.

This demonstrates that the Federal Government has not been cold and indifferent to those in need. It is not to say we are doing enough, only that the Government cannot and should not be labeled as heartless and unconcerned. It is not to say that our welfare and poverty programs should not be restructured so that the great sums of money involved are spent more efficiently and effectively; this should and must be done if the lot of the poor is to be bettered and a fair and full return is to be obtained from the taxpayers' dollar.

Mr. President, the Sunday Star editorial to which I referred earlier also said:

It is hard to tell a man who is hungry or homeless—or militant—to be patient. It it difficult to explain to such a man that it is not sufficient for the government merely to act, but that it also is necessary to act wisely. It is not easy for him to accept the fact that drastic legislative change requires time.

Then the editorial writer put his finger on the heart of the matter, the area which so few take into consideration, when he wrote:

Yet these are the hard facts of the situation. They are the ways in which meaningful advances are achieved in our society, and they are the only ways.

The patterns of progress and change now in motion justify a great deal of optimism, not discouragement, among the poor. There is assuredly a place for continued pressure on their part to expedite the process. But there also are recognizable limits to rational protest and pressure, which can be passed only at the cost of enormous waste, with tragic consequences for us all.

With deep, multibillion-dollar budget deficits of the Federal Government and the inflation and record high interest rates they spawn with particularly tragic impact on the poor and underprivileged, we are at that "recognizable limit" now. Threats or actions of more militancy, of disruptive deeds to the orderly process of government, of "burning the cities" if immediate action is not forthcoming—these will only hamper progress and produce conditions of anarchy. Such conditions must not be permitted to develop.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "The Poor People and the Facts of Life," published in the Washington Sunday Star of June 2, 1968, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Sunday Star, June 2, 1968]

THE POOR PEOPLE AND THE FACTS OF LIFE

At the White House the other day, President Johnson hailed the Senate's approval of a $2.5-billion housing bill as a step which has moved the promise of adequate housing "a little closer to reality for millions of poor people."

At approximately the same time, in the ankle-deep mud of the poor people's encampment on the Mall, the Rev. Ralph Abernathy was telling reporters almost precisely the same thing.

These parallel incidents would be worth noting if only because there have been so few expressions of this kind of accord since the Poor People's Campaign began here three weeks ago. Actually, however, the progress of the housing bill has a good deal more significance than that, for it suggests several points which the participants of the poor people's march should understand fully in terms of the goals they seek to achieve.

No one needs to be told that the impoverishment of millions of Americans is the result of years of neglect, or that there is still a very long way to go before poverty is eliminated. But the impression so pervasive in many of the campaign leaders' statements to the effect that the poor are starting from a zero point—that little or nothing of real consequence is now being done—is entirely fallacious.

The fact is, first, that proposals of substantial magnitude to alleviate the problems of the poor already are in the legislative mill. Perhaps the housing bill, which stands a good chance of passage this year, is the best case in point.

The eventual goal of this measure, oriented largely to the needs of the poor, is to replace, over the next decade, 6 million substandard dwellings—or roughly six times the volume of low-cost housing the nation has produced during the last 30 years. The bill proposes, for the first time a new federal subsidy program to help low and moderate-income families purchase their own homes. It vastly expands rental subsidies. It seeks effective financial incentives for the development of new towns, where it is hoped that many residents of urban ghettos may find not only decent housing but jobs. It attempts to swing the emphasis of federal housing programs dramatically from public effort to a greater involvement of private enterprise.

These are meaningful innovations, and they are reflected as well in pending legislative proposals in the fields of employment, health and education. Beyond the specifics of these proposals, however, something else new and different has emerged: There are signs today of a growing political will to advance these measures, and a greater determination in and out of government to find more effective substitutes for the old, inadequate ways of doing business.

On Capitol Hill, no less than 60 Republican members of the House are urging the creation of a "Human Renewal Fund." Its purpose: To curtail low-priority expenditures and to divert, this year, some $2.5 billion of the savings directly to the relief of urgent "human" problems.

Just a few weeks ago, the White House created a federally supported Urban Institute, a sort of urban "think tank" which will put to work the best talent that can be found to evaluate existing programs and to evolve new approaches to the problems of cities.

In the private sector, such groups as the Urban Coalition, headed by former HEW Secretary John Gardner, are in the process of developing their own campaigns of research and pressure in behalf of answers to social problems.

These developments, considered alone, are hardly earth-shattering in their importance. But they reflect, as a whole, an atmosphere of urgency in regard to the problems of the poor which is brand new, and immensely encouraging.

The essential strategy of the Poor People's Campaign is of course to try to step up the attack—to exploit this sense of national urgency in the hope of obtaining dramatic, immediate new gains. If there is merit in this approach, however, there also are problems. The constant, dominant danger is that the present pattern of progress may be undermined by acts of violence or irresponsibility. Senseless incidents like the encounter at the Supreme Court building last Wednesday have not helped the just cause of the poor. A continuation of such acts would inevitably have disastrous effects.

It is also high time, it seems to us, for the march leaders to begin conditioning their followers to the plain truth that the positive, discernible gains which can realistically be anticipated in the days and the weeks ahead are extremely limited.

To be sure, the marchers have won an agreement from Secretary Freeman, their primary target thus far, to increase the distribution of food surpluses to counties throughout the nation. The Agriculture Department, moreover, is a legitimate and vulnerable target of protest, for the hunger which exists in this nation in the midst of food surpluses is an intolerable anachronism which must be corrected.

The point is, however, that the real accomplishments in this area, as in others, will not be administrative concessions. They require money, in greater volume than is now available. They also require time, for the truly significant legislative advances in social reform invariably pass through evolutionary stages of legislative and public acceptance.

A recognition of this time requirement is most pertinent of all, perhaps, in terms of the proposal nearest the heart of the Poor

People's Campaign—a program of guaranteed annual income for the poor to replace and expand the traditional forms of public welfare.

This concept, advanced in a seemingly endless variety of forms, is attracting support from liberals and conservatives alike, most recently from 1,000 economists affiliated with some 125 of the nation's universities. The subject is fast becoming the dominant social issue of our time, and we wholeheartedly welcome the coming debate. The finding of more effective alternatives for the inadequacies of traditional relief programs is long overdue.

But it would be a hoax to lead anyone to believe that legislative action along these lines is imminent. The Heineman Commission, created by the President to evaluate the complexities of the various income-maintenance proposals, will not even report its findings until a year from now. No affirmative action is conceivable this year, and the prospects during 1969 also are dubious.

It is hard to tell a man who is hungry or homeless—or militant—to be patient. It is difficult to explain to such a man that it is not sufficient for the government merely to act, but that it also is necessary to act wisely. It is not easy for him to accept the fact that drastic legislative change requires time.

Yet these are the hard facts of the situation. They are the ways in which meaningful advances are achieved in our society, and they are the only ways.

The patterns of progress and change now in motion justify a great deal of optimism, not discouragement, among the poor. There is assuredly a place for continued pressure on their part to expedite the process. But there also are recognizable limits to rational protest and pressure, which can be passed only at the cost of enormous waste, with tragic consequences for us all.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield the floor

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

GOVERNMENT REPORTS SHOULD NOT BE PUBLISHED BEFORE RELEASE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, early this year the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders—a Commission appointed by the President—issued its report on riots.

In releasing this report this Commission followed a rather unusual practice by withholding the publication of the official report 30 days and in the meantime furnished the New York Times and Bantam Books, Inc., an advance copy, whereby they were able to place on the newsstands a complete copy of the report 30 days in advance of the official report. This, in effect, gave the publisher exclusive rights to a Government publication.

Questioning the propriety of such a procedure, I submitted an inquiry to the Comptroller General, and on May 21, 1968, I received his reply wherein he criticized the procedure.

I quote an excerpt from the Comptroller General's letter:

> We do believe it inappropriate that a single private publisher should be given the economic advantage of making public the contents of a Federally financed document of wide public interest. . . .
>
> The report was released through Bantam ostensibly because the Commission felt that the significance of the report and the widespread interest in it made it unreasonable to delay release until the Government Printing Office edition could be completed. We are not aware of the basis for the Commission's determination nor do we have any basis for questioning the necessity for or reasonableness of GPO's delay. But given that circumstance including the conclusion that it was in the public interest to disseminate the report content on an immediate basis it seems, despite the absence of applicable statute, that fundamental standards of fairness and propriety require that no single publisher should have been granted a pecuniary advantage without fully offering the same opportunity to others.
>
> We believe that there should have been a public announcement of the Commission's reasons and desire for a publication of its report and full opportunity afforded to all publishers interested in meeting the Commission's requirements. If for any reason it would not have been practical to proceed in such manner, the proper alternative would have been to seek whatever solutions were possible through the Government Printing Office rather than to favor a single publisher.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my letter of March 20, as addressed to the Honorable Elmer B. Staats, Comptroller General of the United States, and his reply thereto of May 21, be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1968.

Hon. ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States,
General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STAATS: The Commission appointed by the President recently issued its report on riots. The day after the report was released Bantam Books brought out the complete report for the New York Times under their copyright. Thus no newspaper or other media could reprint it until such time as the United States Government Printing Office put out its edition, when it would become public domain and could be reprinted. Until that time the New York Times and Bantam could sell it exclusively. In the meantime, however, it was on every news stand in the nation and was a best seller.

In view of the fact that Congress was in recess almost a week during this immediate period it would seem that the Government Printing Office could have produced its reprint and thereby made it available to the public with the result that any sales price would automatically revert to the United States Treasury instead of to the New York Times and the Bantam Books, which had an exclusive monopoly.

I would appreciate a report first, as to the propriety of a Commission which was appointed by the President and financed with Government funds to make available to any private publication an advance copy of its report whereby it could be printed and ready for distribution on the exact hour that its official report was released to Congress and the public. Second, would it not have been possible for the Government Printing Office to have had its report ready for prompt distribution rather than holding back several weeks in what appears to have been an effort to protect the sales of a private enterprise?

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., May 21, 1968.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: By letter of March 20, 1968, you raised several issues concerning publication by New York Times and Bantam Books, Inc., under a New York Times copyright of the recent report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

You point out that the day after the report was released, Bantam brought out the complete version and that since the official United States Government Printing Office edition did not appear until some time later, Bantam was thus able to take exclusive advantage of the market in the interim.

In view of the fact that Congress was in recess almost a week during this immediate period, you suggest that the Government Printing Office could have produced its reprint and thereby made it available to the public with the result that any sales price would automatically revert to the United States Treasury instead of to New York Times-Bantam, which had exclusive monopoly.

You request a report as to the propriety of a Commission, appointed by the President and financed with Government funds, to make available to any private publication an advance copy of its report whereby it could be printed and be ready for distribution "on the exact hour" that the official report was released to the Congress and the public. And you ask whether it would not have been possible for the Government Printing Office to have had its report ready for prompt distribution rather than holding back several weeks in what appears to have been an effort to protect sales of a private enterprise.

Government Printing Office records show that representatives of the Commission and of the General Services Administration, the requisitioning agency, first met with GPO officials on November 14, 1967, and discussed the style, format, and final delivery date of the report. During the latter part of February 1968 GSA requisitioned the printing of 2,000 advance copies of the report for distribution to the President, members of the Cabinet, the Congress and the press. A letter, dated March 1, 1968, in GPO files, addressed to the Congress from the Commission, indicates the Commission did make such distribution on March 1, 1968. The letter advised that, "The release date of the report is 6:30 p.m. (E.S.T.), Saturday, March 2, 1968." The letter further stated: "Copies of the official printed version should be available in about thirty days. An inexpensive commercial edition (New York Times-Bantam) will be published next week; we have arranged to have copies sent to you." GPO officials told us that the commercial version was printed from the advance report.

Thus, GPO could and did print the advance version prior to the printing of the report by Bantam Books, Inc. However, according to GPO officials, GPO was instructed by GSA that the advance report was for official use only. In this respect, GPO officials advised it is their policy not to distribute matter for public use that has been designated by the requisitioner for official use only. Therefore, distribution was not made to the general public.

Government Printing Office records show that printing of the final or official version of the report was approved on March 29, 1968, and delivery thereof started on April 3, 1968. Based on the information we obtained during our inquiry into this matter, it appears doubtful if GPO could have accelerated the publication of the final report. For example, GPO records show that the manuscript of the final version of the report was submitted to GPO by the Commission over about a 1-month period (February 23 to March 22, 1968) and the related page proofs required numerous revisions. In this respect, the last page proofs were not returned to GPO until March 29, 1968, or about 1 month after distribution of the advance edition of the report.

You state in yout letter that because Bantam Books brought out the report under copyright, other media could not reprint it

until such time as the Government Printing Office edition was released thereby placing the report content in the public domain. This is not entirely accurate. The report itself was in the public domain from the first and could have been safely reprinted by any publisher at any time notwithstanding appearance of the Bantam edition.

The Bantam edition does include pictures and an introduction by Tom Wicker, Washington Correspondent of the New York Times, which were not in the public domain. We do not believe it reasonable to conclude that those in the publishing business are not sufficiently sophisticated to have appreciated their right to publish the report itself as opposed to the pictures and introduction. As a practical matter, however, publication by another firm after Bantam's edition appeared was probably not feasible.

We do believe it inappropriate that a single private publisher should be given the economic advantage of making public the contents of a Federally financed document of wide public interest. In this connection, it has been reported that if publishers other than Bantam had been interested they would have received the same treatment as Bantam. "Washington Daily News" of March 7, 1968.

The report was released through Bantam ostensibly because the Commission felt that the significance of the report and the widespread interest in it made it unreasonable to delay release until the Government Printing Office edition could be completed. We are not aware of the basis for the Commission's determination nor do we have any basis for questioning the necessity for or reasonableness of GPO's delay. But given that circumstance including the conclusion that it was in the public interest to disseminate the report content on an immediate basis it seems, despite the absence of applicable statute, that fundamental standards of fairness and propriety require that no single publisher should have been granted a pecuniary advantage without fully offering the same opportunity to others.

We believe that there should have been a public announcement of the Commission's reasons and desire for a publication of its report and full opportunity afforded to all publishers interested in meeting the Commission's requirements. If for any reason it would not have been practical to proceed in such manner, the proper alternative would have been to seek whatever solutions were possible through the Government Printing Office rather than to favor a single publisher.

Concerning your comment as to loss of income to the United States Treasury because of lowered sales by the Government Printing Office, we would note that it is not a part of GPO's function to profit from sales of documents; and, therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that any loss of sales revenues would be largely offset by corresponding production costs which were not incurred.

In light of the nature of the questions raised, and of the public statements by Commission spokesmen which have been reported, we did not believe it would serve any useful purpose to contact members of the Commission, which is now expired, for purposes of our response.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK H. WEITZEL,
Assistant Comptroller General of the United States.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding rule VIII, that I be permitted to speak out of order.

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

The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

IS THIS THE "RIGHT OF PETITION" OR IS IT MOB INTIMIDATION?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Washington Post on Sunday, June 2, published an article entitled, "Visit by Poor Misses BYRD."

The article stated that "a delegation of about 200 poor people" gathered outside my home on Saturday and said that they "wanted to see the Senator." My wife informed the group that I was working at my office. She was quoted in the newspaper as saying, "You will have to take these things up with him."

The Post article further stated that Robert Fulcher, a "46-year-old man from Bluefield in BYRD's home State, served as spokesman for the delegation." Fulcher, according to the Post article, "described himself as a disabled coal miner living on a State disability pension of $46 a month."

According to the Washington Sunday Star of June 2, Fulcher, who knocked on the door of my home, was told by my wife, "My husband is at work in his office. He will be glad to see you, I am sure. He works all the time for you people. Why don't you go to see him there?"

At this point, according to the Star article, one of the marchers shouted, "I always thought fat cats took Saturdays and Sundays off."

Mr. President, my office was open all day on Friday. I conducted hearings on the District of Columbia budget during the morning and during the afternoon. I was informed in late afternoon that radio broadcasts had announced that a delegation of Appalachian whites connected with the Poor People's Campaign, would picket my home on Saturday.

On Saturday morning I came to my office to work, as I usually do when I am not out of the city. I stayed there until 5 o'clock in the afternoon. I did not leave the office for lunch.

The group from Appalachia was in the city on Friday but made no attempt that day to see me at my office. My office has reported to me that no call was received requesting an appointment for the group. My office normally does not answer the telephone after 12 o'clock noon on Saturdays. I have only a skeleton force in the office on Saturdays. But, on this particular Saturday, a skeleton force continued to answer the telephone until about 3:30 in the afternoon, after which time I personally answered the phone until 5 o'clock.

The phone was answered until 5 o'clock, just to be sure that if the group contacted the office, the visitors would find me there, waiting and willing to receive the delegation.

The demonstrators reached my home shortly before 11:30 in the morning on Saturday, I am told, and left about 20 minutes to 1 p.m. At first, they sang songs and chanted and marched. The Arlington police directed traffic and kept the demonstrators from interfering therewith as much as possible.

When Mr. Fulcher knocked at the door of my home, my wife responded; and, as I have already indicated, she informed Mr. Fulcher that I was not at home but that I was at the office. She went outside the door and told the demonstrators that I would be glad to see them at the office, whereupon they indicated that they wanted me to come to see them at my home.

Mr. Fulcher stated that the group had tried to get my address from my office but that my office would not give out the information. He had reference to my home address, of course. There is no record at my office of anyone's having called to identify himself as a Mr. Fulcher or as a member of the group to ask for my home address.

In any event, I consider one's home to be a place of privacy, and I do not consider it a fitting place to meet with delegations wishing to transact business. Certainly, no reasonable individual would think it a place to attempt to carry on a discussion with a group of 150 to 200 persons. My office is the proper place for appointments; and, in the case of delegations of this size, a committee room can usually be made available for use as a meetingplace.

Many West Virginians call upon me in delegations and as individuals to discuss pertinent matters, and they are always considerate and understanding. They are never in doubt regarding the fact that Capitol Hill is the locus of my office and the proper place to contact me.

I believe I have a reputation of being one of the hardest working Senators on the Hill, and most people know that when the Senate is in session, I am in, or in the vicinity of, the Senate Chamber, attending to my duties there, and that when the Senate is not in session, I am attending to my senatorial duties at my office or in the vicinity thereof.

Of course, I take work home at night, after I finish my work in the office, and I work often in my home until midnight or 1 o'clock in the morning, 2 o'clock in the morning, or 3 o'clock in the morning. I always work on Sundays, at the office and at home. Of course, I do not answer the telephone or see delegations on Sunday at the office, but I do work there and at home on Sundays. I cannot recall having had a Sunday that I could call my own in the past several years. I never have a Sunday that I can call my own and in which I can forget my work and get away for some rest and relaxation with my family.

I have had no parties at my home since I came to Washington 16 years ago. I give 7 days a week, working for my constituents, working for the people. I say this to indicate the diligence with which

I try to approach my duties in behalf of the people of West Virginia, some of whom are poor.

Apparently, this group did not want to see me at my office—which is the place for such meetings—but preferred, rather, to conduct a demonstration and to get the publicity therefrom, in the peace and quiet of the neighborhood area where I live. They had ample opportunity to see me on Friday and Saturday at the office, but, according to their own statements, they made no effort to seek an appointment with me at the office.

Mr. President, the accounts of the demonstration as related in the newspapers do not give the full story. If one reads the newspapers, one might properly get the impression therefrom that the demonstrators came to my home that this was a short, orderly, quiet meeting, and that the group merely sang and marched and presented a petition and went away.

But there was more to it than this.

According to neighbors and other eyewitnesses, the participants in the demonstration at my home did not in the main appear to be poor or to be elderly people. I am told that there were a few—perhaps six or eight—about 10 to 12 years old, that about a half dozen of the demonstrators appeared to be 60 years old, or in their sixties, that about 20 were in the 30- to 40-year bracket, and that the rest appeared to be between the ages of 20 and 25. Several of the participants, I am informed, were not from West Virginia. Some of them were not from Appalachia. About 40 were Negroes, the majority were whites.

I will quote neighbors and other eyewitnesses as they have since related the events to me:

Some were from Oklahoma and Texas.
Some looked prosperous.
Some were children, and some were teenagers.
There were quite a few young people.
There were very few who were old.
A man said that he was a one-man delegation from California.
It was the darnedest looking bunch of people.
Most of them looked well fed.
Several looked to be very well dressed.
The Mexican-Americans looked poor.
Several of them had good looking cameras, better than I own.
Many were hippie-looking, the long-hair type.

Mr. President, I do not mean to imply that the majority of the demonstrators were not from West Virginia, nor do I mean to imply that some of the demonstrators were not poor. The majority, apparently, were from West Virginia.

The demonstrators came in three chartered buses. There was one "blue" Chevrolet pickup truck carrying a Maryland license. There was a black Ford pickup truck with West Virginia license. I am informed that there was a "white Buick sedan" with West Virginia plates; a Cadillac convertible with District of Columbia plates; a foreign-made car with Richmond, Va., tags; another car, which did not appear to be a marcher's, according to my neighbors, carrying Virginia tags; a foreign-made car carrying District of Columbia license plates; a "blue" car with District of Columbia plates; and two cars with Maryland plates.

There is a possibility, of course, that one or more of these cars were those of onlookers rather than demonstrators.

Another aspect of the demonstration which does not penetrate clearly through the newspaper accounts was the aspect of rudeness on the part of the most of the demonstrators. The following are some of the comments of neighbors and other eyewitnesses:

The big-mouthed fellow (Fulcher) and the colored man worked them into a frenzy.
I am sure that your constituents down in West Virginia would be ashamed of that kind of riff-raff.
The crowd included a lot of weird looking characters.
They did their shouting and chanting and created quite a circus.
They were loud.
They were chanting and hollering.
They sure were noisy.
They made so much noise.
The leader (Fulcher) was vicious.
They were the kind of people you couldn't talk to.

Mr. President, where similar comments occur, they were made by different observers.

My wife told me it was difficult for her to communicate with the crowd. She said she told them I was at the office, that there was the proper place for delegations to meet with me, and that I would be glad to see the group and talk with them if they would go there.

At one point, when the group indicated they did not want to go to the office but wanted me to come to my home, my wife said she would call me on the telephone and relay the message. She did this, whereupon I responded by telling her to again inform the group that I was at the office and that I would be glad to see them if they wished to come to my office. She so informed the group. My wife told me that everyone seemed to be talking at once and that she had difficulty getting them to listen to her. She said they were loud and boisterous.

In this regard, one neighbor said:

Mrs. Byrd tried to talk loud but everyone seemed to be talking, yelling, and shouting.

Another eyewitness said:

They were all throwing questions or talking loudly.

Another observer said:

They were loud, they all wanted to ask questions, and they didn't listen to answers.

Another person said:

They didn't care what she (Mrs. Byrd) had to say.

One neighbor said:

Mrs. Byrd was subjected to bullying conduct and offensive remarks.
One could not but admire Mrs. Byrd for her coolness and courage and dignified bearing. It was in strong contrast to the crude, rude, and boorish conduct of the leaders of the so-called Poor People.

Another neighbor said:

Three or four were very insulting. She (Mrs. Byrd) said, "I will be glad to listen but I can't understand what you're saying. You're all talking at once. You all just don't want to listen."

Again, with respect to Mr. Fulcher, one neighbor referred to him as follows:

He was a loud mouth. He was typical of the group. He was the kind of example I connect with this sort of thing. He certainly did not look hungry.

Other remarks reported to me by neighbors and eyewitnesses were as follows:

Knock the door down.
We want a house like Byrd's got.
We want Byrd food.
We want to eat like Byrd.
He doesn't know what it means to be poor.
Senator Byrd won't cooperate. She (Mrs. Byrd) won't either.
If he (Byrd) doesn't come, we will camp on the lawn.

My son-in-law, Mohammad Fatemi, and his wife, my older daughter, were at the house when the event occurred. My son-in-law was born in Teheran, Iran, which was ancient Persia. One of the demonstrators looked at him and said:

How come Byrd let you in his house? You are so dark. What nationality are you?

My son-in-law responded by saying:

Being insolent and insulting won't get you anywhere.

Mr. President (Mr. Moss in the chair), I have taken the time to round out the story concerning the demonstration at my home. I want people to know the character of these demonstrations. I want people to know the kind of treatment to which my wife was subjected as she attempted to talk and communicate with the demonstrators. I want people to know about the behavior of those people who make up these mobs which demonstrate in front of public officials' homes in an attempt apparently to harass and intimidate the occupants of those homes.

I do not say this just because it was my home. I have attempted to relate facts in order that Senators and other interested readers of the RECORD may get a true picture of what is going on in the name of the so-called Poor People's Campaign. The newspapers do not always present the entire picture. I do not say this in criticism of the news media.

I can understand that there is always a problem of newspaper space, and so forth, but the facts should be fully related. In the first place, I do not believe that private homes should be subjected to this kind of thing. In the second place, I think a permit should be required before mobs can carry on such demonstrations. Otherwise they can come at any hour of the day or night. I believe that there is justification for requiring that a permit be requested and granted before such marches and demonstrations are allowed to take place. Certainly, this would properly alert the appropriate authorities and enable them to more effectively prepare for such occurrences. This kind of thing could become a threat to the public peace.

In any event, had the group merely marched and sang and presented a petition, as people who were not present may have been led to believe, this would have been one thing; but, based on the reports which have been given to me, the conduct and mood of the group were not

in keeping with common courtesy and decorum.

It is one thing for a group to present its petition in a courteous and orderly manner, with one person talking at a time, and then to listen to the response made by the person to whom the petition is submitted. But it is quite a different thing when a crowd displays the attitude and arrogance of a mob, with everyone talking at the same time and showing no inclination whatsoever to listen to what the other person has to say, even when that person happens, as was the case here, not to be the individual to whom the petition is being directed, or about whom complaints are being made or concerning whom criticism is being voiced.

In my judgment, based upon what I have heard, the people who came to my home were not truly representative of the poor people of West Virginia. I have lived among the poor people of West Virginia. I grew up among the poor people of West Virginia. I was poor before some of the demonstrators were born. I was working for the poor people before some of the demonstrators were even born.

The poor people of West Virginia, generally speaking, are respectable. They do not act the way in which that crowd acted. In my judgment, the people of West Virginia would have been ashamed to be represented by that kind of riff-raff. This is not to say that all the people in the delegation were riff-raff. There are always exceptions.

I understand that some of the people in the delegation did not want to march. They went back to the buses. But what happened? They were urged to get out of the buses and to march. They did not want to march; they wanted to sit in the buses. But they were made, by some of the others, to get out and participate.

As one onlooker, who knows my State, said to me:

I have never seen anyone like this in West Virginia. This was not like West Virginia.

Mr. President, a petition was presented to my wife, carrying the names of various persons. One news wire report stated that the "poverty protesters unrolled a 25-foot long petition signed by 1,500 West Virginians." I counted the names. According to my count, there were 491 names and addresses of individuals from West Virginia.

I may have erred by one, two, three, or half a dozen, but in any event, approximately 500 names were on the petition with addresses in West Virginia, as well as 49 names of individuals with addresses from other States, and 35 names without addresses which would make a total, if I am correct, of something like 600 names on the petition.

Other petitions without names were given to my wife, and I shall take the time to read the petition "demands" into the RECORD. For the record, I shall state my response to each "demand."

First:

We demand that Senator Byrd renounce racism and prejudice.

My response: I stand for equal opportunity, equal justice, equal responsibility and equal accountability under the law, regardless of race. That is not racism.

Second:

We demand that Senator Byrd renounce his stand on the use of violence against protesters and demonstrators.

My response: I have never advocated the "use of violence" against "protesters and demonstrators." I have advocated the use of force in dealing with adult looters and arsonists, when necessary, in riots.

Third:

We demand Senator Byrd support the Poor People's Campaign.

My response: I am sympathetic toward poor people. I grew up in poverty. I was working to help the poor long before some of those who participated in the demonstrations were born. But, I do not support the so-called Poor People's Campaign. It is a fraud.

Fourth:

We demand Senator Byrd stop his fight to oppress welfare recipients.

My response: I have never sought to oppress deserving and qualified welfare recipients. To the contrary, I have supported increased welfare payments while pressing for the removal of welfare cheaters from the rolls. Welfare cheaters siphon away money which could go to deserving welfare recipients or which could be spent on other programs helpful to the poor.

Fifth:

We demand Senator Byrd reverse his view that government is more important than people and that property rights are more important than human rights.

My response: I have never held government to be more important than people." I hold that our Government was instituted by and for the people; but I also hold that government has a right to survive. Its first duty is to maintain law and order, else there can be no justice. I hold that people have a duty to support and defend the government which protects them.

As to property rights, they are not separate from or independent of human rights. Property rights constitute a basic human right.

Sixth:

We demand that Senator Byrd withdraw his proposal that Federal employees associated with civil rights activities lose their jobs.

My response: I have never proposed that Federal employees "associated with civil rights activities" lose their jobs. I have advocated, and I still advocate, barring Government employment to persons convicted of the commission of a felony in connection with a riot or other civil disorder.

Seventh:

We demand that Senator Byrd stop his opposition to open housing.

My response: So-called open housing is all right for those who want it, if it is voluntary on their part. I am opposed to forced housing by Government compulsion. I maintain that every man has a right to buy or rent wherever he wishes, but I also submit that the owner's rights in the property he possesses are superior to the nonexistent rights of a would-be purchaser in that property, and that the owner, therefore, has a right to refuse to sell or rent based on his own good judgment. I shall continue to be opposed to "forced housing" legislation.

Eighth:

We demand Senator Byrd support a guaranteed annual income.

My response: I neither support nor oppose a guaranteed annual income at this point. I have made no decision yet as to such a proposal. I will not be influenced by pressure tactics and efforts toward intimidation.

Ninth:

We demand that the money Senator Byrd would use to kill in Vietnam be used to save America.

My response: Senator BYRD is not "using" any money to kill anybody anywhere. I did not send American boys to fight in Vietnam, but I will not vote to withhold money from the support of our fighting men who are there.

Tenth:

We demand Senator Byrd renounce his membership in the Ku Klux Klan.

My response: The demonstrators are beating a dead horse, dead before many of them were born. I have no membership in the Ku Klux Klan to renounce.

Eleventh:

We demand Senator Byrd support OEO programs and support their being in the hands of the poor.

My response: I do support some OEO programs. I am opposed to others and will continue to be as long as they are wasteful and poorly administered.

Twelfth:

We, the people of West Virgnia, demand Senator Byrd's resignation.

My response: The people of West Virginia have elected and reelected me many times. I shall continue to fulfill my obligations to the people whom I represent and to whom I owe, in the words of Edmund Burke, not my industry only but also my judgment.

Thirteenth:

We demand home rule for the District of Columbia.

My response: I am opposed to home rule for the District of Columbia and for good reasons. Moreover, I doubt that the poor people of West Virginia are especially concerned about home rule in the District of Columbia.

Fourteenth:

Senator Byrd must represent his constituents.

My response: I do represent my constituents and have served them dutifully, conscientiously, and faithfully for 22 years.

Fifteenth:

We demand that Byrd help Mingo County in their dealings with the Justice Department.

My response: I have no jurisdiction in this matter. It is a responsibility of the Justice Department to enforce the law and to determine whether a Federal law has been violated. The Justice Department has been looking at the charges and the evidence.

Sixteenth:

Byrd caused West Virginia to be humiliated by his remarks made after the death of Martin Luther King.

My response: West Virginia has not been humiliated. My remarks are clear for all to see, and I make no apologies for them to anyone.

Seventeenth:

Byrd should initiate laws which could prevent West Virginia and Appalachia's wealth from leaving our States.

My response: Such a law would be infeasible, impracticable, unworkable, unwise, and unconstitutional. If the authors of this proposal have in mind a severance tax on coal, et cetera, they should address themselves to the State legislature, which, incidentally, has considered the matter heretofore. There is where the jurisdiction rests, not with Congress.

Eighteenth:

We pledge to clean up Mingo County, W. Va., and the whole of the State so Byrd never carries the State again.

My response: There have been those, from time to time, who have said—and hoped—that BYRD would not "carry" his county, or his district, or the State. This may happen some day, but I shall do my best to prevent its occurrence.

Nineteenth:

If Byrd does not begin to represent the interests of West Virginia (instead of furthering his own ambitions) we will go into every county of the State and tell people what kind of a man he really is.

My response: I salute the man who has "ambitions." If more people had ambitions, fewer people would be on the dole in this country. My ambition is to be a good Senator, a servant worthy of his hire. Can I be blamed for this?

Twentieth:

Byrd should support the Metcalf bill.

My response: Senator METCALF is the author of many bills.

And, finally, I read as follows:

One Appalachian delegation demands the resignation of you, Mr. Byrd, and feels that Mr. Byrd is an unqualified racist leader. He has voted against every progressive bill presented in Congress which would have helped the people who have elected him. He should support a 100 percent of needs welfare bill. We feel Mr. Byrd does not spend enough time to even listen to the people of Appalachia or West Virginia.

Mr. President, the record refutes this. I have voted for legislation to help all of the people—old and young, white and nonwhite, Republicans and Democrats, those who elected me and those who worked and voted against me. I have supported veterans' legislation, increased social security payments, medicare, elementary and secondary education programs, food stamp legislation, minimum wage legislation, housing legislation, and lower retirement age, and so on ad infinitum.

As to my spending time to listen to the people of West Virginia, I try to visit every county in the State every year. I was not able to do it last year, when congressional adjournment did not occur until December 15. I am always willing and glad to listen, and it is my duty to listen, to those who speak with reason and who are willing to have a courteous exchange of views.

Mr. President, I have no doubt that the demonstrators will be back. I shall be glad to see them at my office, and I would expect them to call for an appointment, so that arrangements can be made for a meetingplace. I shall be glad to hear their demands. I shall listen courteously to their demands, and I shall expect that courtesy should beget courtesy, and that I might have the opportunity, if and when the time comes, to state my viewpoint, certainly to which I have a right. And I would also hope, if any group visits me, that the people will select a spokesman, and will not all attempt to speak at once, and that it will be a meeting that will be orderly and constructive. I shall make every attempt on my part to respond to their comments and their questions forthrightly, frankly, candidly, honestly, and sincerely; and I trust that they will have the courtesy to listen—a courtesy which was not accorded to my wife on Saturday when they congregated at my home in Arlington.

Mr. President, I want the record to be as clear as I can make it that I do not feel I am under any obligation to see people from other States. I do not say that I will not see them, but I hope that any delegation which visits my office will be made up of West Virginians. They are the people who elect me, and the people to whom I have to answer. I hope this will be kept in mind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD at this point the following items:

A story from the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, June 1, entitled "Poor Pay Visit to Byrd Home."

The story which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of June 2, and to which I have already referred, titled "Poor Polled on Stepup in Militancy."

The story to which I referred earlier, and which appeared in the Washington Sunday Post of June 2, titled "Visit by Poor Misses BYRD."

A story which appeared in the Beckley, W. Va., Post-Herald and Register of yesterday, June 2, titled "Poor People Demonstrate at Byrd Home."

A story which appeared in yesterday's Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail titled "One Hundred Representing Appalachian Poor Pay Visit to BYRD, but He Isn't Home."

A memorandum that was submitted to my wife by the demonstrators, titled "Appalachian People Oppose Senator ROBERT BYRD."

The two lists of petitions which I have just read, and to which I have responded.

An item which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of June 2, titled "Marchers to Stay on, Abernathy Tells Baptists."

A story which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, June 2, titled, "Marchers Level Sights on Congress."

A story which appeared in the Washington Star of Sunday, June 2, entitled, "Alabama Lawyer to Attempt to Incorporate Tent City."

A story which appears in today's Washington Post, by Paul W. Valentine, titled, "Poor People to Step up Militancy."

A story which appears in today's Washington Star titled, "Press Building Here is Target of Indian Poor."

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 1, 1968]

POOR TAKE DEMANDS TO BYRD HOME

About 100 Poor People's campaigners demonstrated at the Arlington, Va., home of Sen. Robert C. Byrd, D.-W. Va., today to present their welfare demands to the chairman of the Senate District appropriations subcommittee.

After ringing the two-story brick home on North 4th Street and chanting, "We want Byrd," the marchers knocked on the Senator's door to be told by Mrs. Byrd that he was not at home, but at work in his office.

The marchers at first seemed unconvinced, and one shouted "I always thought Fat Cats took Saturdays and Sundays off!" the group decided to head for Byrd's office, where the West Virginia Democrat was working.

The marchers were mostly whites from Appalachia.

Before starting back to the city, however, the demonstrators read a list of demands including more welfare provision, revisions in the welfare laws affecting the Appalachian region, a demand for Byrd to "stop buying votes," and to stop making what were termed public statements intended to divide people according to race.

The demonstrators then changed their minds and decided to return to the private Hawthorne School in Southwest where they have been staying.

During this week, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference has concentrated on getting the demonstrators settled into their West Potomac Park encampment and grappling with its numerous physical problems yesterday, the leadership said it was ready to shift into high gear with protest activities.

Nearly 500 demonstrators marched to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare yesterday to hear from Secretary Wilbur Cohen the steps he is taking to meet campaign demands.

After a progressively noisy wait of nearly two hours, the marchers—who did not have an appointment—heard Cohen outline a number of steps being taken by his department, including ordering some 300 school districts in the South to take further specific action to desegregate.

Cohen said the school districts were being told the "freedom of choice" system of desegregation "has not produced enough progress." The Supreme Court ruled Monday that "freedom of choice" was an inadequate method of ending the dual school system.

Hosea Williams, the SCLC leader who has been traveling with the campaign's symbolic mule train from the South, arrived in Washington this week to head the mobilization for direct action.

It was disclosed yesterday that supporting "action cadres" are being organized in other cities, which can move in to replace demonstrators here in case the government attempts forcible eviction of the Resurrection City campers.

The Rev. Andrew Young said that efforts to emphasize the national aspects of the drive in "black Washington, Baltimore, Richmond, Philadelphia, Wilmington and New York" were designed "to have protection in case the crazy folks of Congress decide to run us out."

The supporting "action cadres" will be formed because it "is easy to put 3,000 in jail," he explained. If arrests begin in Washington, those arrested will be replaced by demonstrators who will move in from other cities.

PROBLEMS IN "THE CITY"

As to the problems of Resurrection City, turned into a chilly and muddy morass by rainy weather most of the last two weeks, Young admitted there was some flu and there are sewage problems.

But, he added, "If the D.C. health authorities order evacuation and we did not see signs of an epidemic, I think they would have to move us out bodily."

Young said that at this time, no demonstrations are planned for mass arrests.

Thirteen persons, mostly Spanish-speaking Americans from the Southwest encamped at the tent city, were taken to the 13th Precinct yesterday but later released without charge after an incident at the French Embassy.

Police found the 13 picketing in front of the embassy, carrying signs written in French and supporting the French workers and students. The picketers complied when police told them to move 500 feet from the building, but police found red paint on the building, including some red stars.

At the precinct station, they talked with Capt. Tilmon O'Bryant and Gerald Caplan, executive assistant to the public safety director, before being released.

Eighty Indian-American demonstrators met yesterday in two sessions, one at the Office of Education Building with representatives of various federal agencies having responsibilities for Indian affairs, and the other at the Indian Claims Commission, to discuss problems on the welfare of Indians.

Bayard Rustin, the civil rights leader, met for an hour yesterday with Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark and other federal officials to seek aid in the Poor People's mass demonstration planned for June 19 in Washington.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, June 2, 1968]

POOR POLLED ON STEP-UP OF MILITANCY

(By Charles Conconi)

Leaders of the Poor People's Campaign yesterday planned to canvass the residents of Resurrection City to determine who is willing to go to jail, as plans were formulated for more militant demonstrations on Capitol Hill and at federal agencies this week.

At a press briefing yesterday, Hosea Williams, who heads the Southeastern Christian Leadership Conference action programs, said he is trying to learn who is "prepared to go to jail for six months . . . and who is prepared to get beat up."

Williams explained that demonstrations will become "a little more militant and more often," with Congress remaining the main target. He made reference to the law that forbids demonstrations on Capitol Hill and said, "Their law will not keep us from going up there."

CAMP DRYING OUT

The burly, bearded former truck driver and research chemist threatened that if the residents of Resurrection City are jailed for demonstrating at the Capitol, SCLC will bring in thousands from other cities to replace those in jail.

Most of the residents of the camp took advantage of the sunshine yesterday to continue constructing huts as the mud began to thicken and dry.

In the early afternoon, about 100 marchers—mostly Appalachian whites—demonstrated outside the Arlington home of Sen. Robert C. Byrd, D-W. Va., one of the most outspoken critics of the campaign.

A small group of Arlington police and Virginia state troopers stood by as the marchers sang on the sidewalk and then surrounded the Senator's home on North 4th Street.

A group of five demonstrators, led by Robert E. Fulcher of Bluefield, W.Va., walked to the door of the two-story house and rang the bell.

The Senator's wife answered and told the demonstrators that Senator Byrd was not at home. "My husband is at work in his office. He'll be glad to see you, I'm sure. He works all the time for you people. Why don't you go to see him there," she said.

The marchers at first seemed unconvinced, and one shouted, "I always thought fat cats took Saturdays and Sundays off!"

The demonstrators then threatened to go to Byrd's office, but returned to Hawthorne School, where they have been staying.

Informed of the incident at his home, Byrd said: "I'll be here all day. If they're West Virginians, and they want to see me, I'll be here."

Cleveland Mayor Carl Stokes came down to the city for a visit yesterday afternoon with Mayor Walter E. Washington. Stokes was in town to address the Capital Press Club, along with Gary, Ind., Mayor Richard Hatcher, also a Negro. Hatcher did not come with Stokes.

Stokes, who was recognized immediately by most of the people in the camp was asked to visit "City Hall," but said, "I've got to see my people first."

He greeted Cleveland residents and posed in front of a hut with a sign on the side reading: "Cleveland Now Says: Our Soul Brother, Carl B. Stokes." A small-framed picture of Stokes is tacked to the side of the hut.

A group of District residents from the Northwest I Redevelopment Area, near North Capitol Street, who had come down to visit Resurrection City, saw Washington and crowded around him. The residents complained that they are being moved from their homes before adequate new housing has been found for them.

Washington listened to them for a few minutes, then walked away saying: "I didn't come down here for this, you all didn't program this for me. I'll be glad to see you, but not now."

Earlier, when Williams was asked at his briefing what he meant by more militant demonstrations, he explained that as a possibility demonstrators might return to the Agriculture Department cafeteria, eat, and not pay for their meals.

Last week the group twice ate at the cafeteria there and paid one bill of nearly $300 and part of another bill.

Williams said another activity might be to go to the office of a congressman and "decide it is more comfortable up there than at this hole (the camp) and make our home in his office."

Williams, who just returned from Mississippi, where he was organizing and directing the mule-drawn wagon train that is slowing coming to Washington, made it clear that he is going to make an effort to get the generally chaotic campaign organized and working.

"Things went a little haywire due to our inexperience," Williams admitted in reference to SCLC's often stumbling attempt to handle the physical problems of running the camp.

He said there has been "too much segregation in the camp," and expressed hope that everyone connected with the campaign would be moving in by tomorrow evening.

"The women are demanding that everyone who participates in this campaign move in," Williams said as a group of residents standing nearby cheered.

During the morning, before Williams arrived, an angry group of women descended on "City Hall" to complain about the nightly absence of the campaign leaders, most of whom sleep in a midtown motel.

"I didn't came here to lie in the mud while they lie in a hotel," declared a woman from Cleveland. "We ought to go down there and get them out."

Williams said that the Rev. Ralph David Abernathy, SCLC president, "will move in tomorrow if we have to evict someone else."

TOWN MEETING SLATED

Last week, Abernathy held a 2 a.m. press conference in a hut he identified as his residence at the campsite and said he had spent nearly every evening in Resurrection City.

Williams said he will be conducting a closed town meeting with the residents of the camp to listen to their complaints and promised to settle food complaints and get shower facilities in working order "if we gotta buy them from Spain."

At a meeting at the Interior Department on Friday, campaign officials and their attorney, Frank Reeves, reported they had hired a contractor to begin hooking up the shower and washing facilities with existing District sewer lines. Work was to have begun yesterday.

The campaign leaders also said they had set up a new campsite organization and were dividing Resurrection City into "wards," each with its own leaders to take care of problems like open burning.

Interior had called the meeting to try to prod the officials into improving facilities, such as garbage disposal, that might be detrimental to the health of the campers. Not apologizing discussing these problems yesterday, Williams said:

"I am not apologizing for anything that has happened. It would have happened anyway." He apparently referred to rumors of a split in the SCLC leadership now that Williams had apparently taken direction of the city from the Rev. Jesse Jackson, the camp manager, who conducted previous demonstrations.

Without mentioning Jackson by name, Williams said, "No one is being disposed of or replaced."

Abernathy, who had been out of town on speaking engagements, is expected to return today to give the baccalureate address at D.C. Teachers College.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 2, 1968]

VISIT BY POOR MISSES BYRD

A delegation of about 200 poor people gathered outside the Arlington home of Sen. Robert C. Byrd (D-W. Va.) yesterday and said they wanted to see the Senator.

They arrived at about 11:30 a.m. in three buses, a pickup truck and a few automobiles outside Byrd's two-story brick home at 3741 N. 4th st. in a quiet, shaded neighborhood of North Arlington.

The Senator's wife, Erma, came to the door and said her husband was working at his office. She said that he "works 17 hours a day for you people."

One of the demonstrators called out that the Senator knew they were coming to his home. Another demanded that the Senator come to them, saying, "We're not going begging to him."

"You will have to take these things up with him," said Mrs. Byrd, going back inside.

Robert Fulcher, a heavy-set 46-year-old man from Bluefield in Byrd's home state, served as spokesman for the delegation, which he said included many persons from the Appalachian region.

"Let me tell you people in Washington," Fulcher told a curbside rally, "we apologize to you for sending Byrd down here."

Fulcher noted that Byrd, who is chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the District and has criticized the Poor People's Campaign, has been quoted as saying people from Appalachia were not joining the campaign.

"White people is poor and we're all walking in the same shoes together and we're all brothers and sisters together," said Fulcher, who described himself as a disabled coal miner living on a state disability pension of $46 a month.

The Poor People's delegation left at about 12:30 p.m. after the majority voted to go. Fulcher said most of the group would return to Appalachia but they and more followers would come back on June 18. A few would stay here in an "Appalachia hollow" at Resurrection City, he said.

[From the Beckley (W. Va.) Post-Herald and Register, June 2, 1968]

MARCHERS GO TO SENATOR: POOR PEOPLE DEMONSTRATE AT BYRD HOME

(By Richard Lerner)

WASHINGTON.—About 100 Appalachia whites from the Poor People's Campaign demonstrated Saturday outside the red brick suburban home of Sen. Robert C. Byrd, D-W. Va., one of the most outspoken congressional critics of their campaign.

For 30 minutes they sang on the sidewalk in front of Byrd's home in a sedate, middle-class neighborhood in Arlington, Va., in the march's first demonstration in the suburbs where many Washington officials and civil servants live.

Then disabled coal miner Robert E. Fulcher of Bluefield, W. Va. led five demonstrators to the door of Byrd's home, rang the bell and spoke to the senator's wife.

BYRD AT WORK

"My husband is at work in his office," she told Fulcher. "He'll be glad to see you, I'm sure. He works all the time for you people. Why don't you go to see him there?"

The poverty protesters unrolled a 25-foot long petition signed by 1,500 West Virginians on the front lawn.

"We, the poor people, demand our rights in our land," it started. It was printed in bold letters.

A pair of broken silver chains were laid at each end to symbolize what Fulcher termed the breakout from economic slavery that the poor sought.

A small group of Byrd's neighbors left their simple brick homes to watch. A group of Arlington police and Virginia state troopers stood by but did not intervene.

Byrd has also been critical about the march's cost to the federal government.

Meanwhile, Rep. Glenn R. Davis, R-Wis., a member of the House Appropriations Committee asked chairman George Mahon, D-Tex., to order federal agencies to report any expenditures because of the poor people. "Public funds are being used to maintain and encourage the presence of the marchers," Davis said.

Rounding out the third week of demonstrations since the poor established their poverty settlement in Resurrection City the demonstration was the first conducted by the Appalachian whites who, so far, have been living in the basement of a private Washington school. Along with a group of Mexican-Americans, the poor whites have been reluctant to move into the encampment.

Byrd began peppering the demonstration with sharp criticism in Senate speeches even before it started.

He called on the Interior Department to refuse to grant a permit for use of government property by the marchers as an encampment site. He urged President Johnson to keep federal troops in the city for the duration of the march rather than send them home after the Washington riot in early April.

Most of the marchers stayed in their hut village, still coping with the problems created by a flood of mud. A day of brilliant sunshine helped.

FEW NEGROES

The Appalachian whites drove their buses to the encampment to ask Negro demonstrators to join them, but they said the police would not let them drive into the campsite. Only a few Negroes left Resurrection City to join the whites.

Fulcher said he has been living on state compensation since hurting his back in a coal mine accident. He said the demonstration was staged to dispute Byrd's contention that his constituents were satisfied with conditions in their state and did not need help.

He angrily rejected Mrs. Byrd's suggestion that the demonstrators return to their buses and visit Byrd at his office.

"As usual, no cooperation from Sen. Byrd," he said. "No cooperation from Mrs. Byrd."

When the senator's wife repeated her suggestion, he said: "This is the way poor people have always tried to see their representatives—by crawling on their knees."

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Sunday Gazette-Mail, June 2, 1968]

SENATOR'S OUT: 100 REPRESENTING APPALACHIAN POOR PAY VISIT TO BYRD, BUT HE ISN'T HOME

(By John W. Yago)

ARLINGTON, VA.—A group of West Virginians visiting Washington tried to pay a visit to their senator Saturday, but he wasn't home.

More than 100 members of the Appalachian contingent of the Poor People's Campaign went to the home of Sen. Robert C. Byrd in suburban Arlington to present him with a petition.

When they learned the Senator was at his office, they demonstrated in front of the house for a while and then returned to Washington.

"This is ridiculous," Robert Fulcher of Bluefield told the crowd. "A man represents people, and we can't even find him."

Fulcher said the petition was drawn up at last week's Appalachian Conference in Charleston and signed by about 1,000 people. It was a demand by the poor for their rights as citizens, he said.

The demonstration, which lasted less than an hour, was orderly. Arlington police were on hand but didn't interfere except to keep the street open to traffic and the demonstrators off the senator's grass.

When the demonstrators arrived shortly before noon, Mrs. Byrd told them her husband has gone to his office on Capitol Hill. Mrs. Byrd also indicated that she felt the senator was being unjustly criticized.

Fulcher addressed the crowd while Mrs. Byrd went inside to telephone her husband.

"We're only good to him when we vote," Fulcher said. "People begging to get in the seats of power and they get too high. They're going to have to be cut down."

Byrd has been a frequent critic of the Poor People's Campaign and last month proposed court action to prevent the poor from setting up camp in Washington.

Fulcher accused the senator of representing the campaign as a strictly Negro enterprise. "One thing they have kept away from the eyes of America is that white people are poor, too, that we are all walking in the same shoes together," he said.

The Appalachian group is about 70 per cent white. It was augmented for the demonstration by representatives of other poor groups, including Mexican-Americans and California migratory farm workers.

Speaking to the crowd in the style of an Appalachian evangelist, Fulcher said Byrd represents only the rich and is more concerned about crime in the streets than about the plight of the poor.

While this was going on, two neighborhood women hurriedly set up a table to supply ice water to the demonstrators, and a man across the street cranked up his mower and began cutting his lawn.

Mrs. Byrd returned to the front door to report that she had talked with the senator. "He takes care of delegations at the office and would be glad to see you there," she said.

This was unacceptable to the demonstrators. Some wanted to remain in the street until Byrd came home. Fulcher said he would be guided by the majority but reminded the crowd that they had planned to return to their homes today and would be back in greater force on June 18.

The majority agreed with him.

APPALACHIAN PEOPLE OPPOSE SENATOR ROBERT BYRD

(Statement prepared by and for the Appalachian People's Meeting goes to Washington group)

Are you looking for the one man in the U.S. Senate who opposes everything the poor people of America want? You don't have to go any further than Senator Robert E. Byrd of West Virginia. That's just what's going to happen on Saturday, June 1st. The people from Appalachia who came to Resurrection City this week are going to march to Senator Byrd's home in Washington.

Representatives of the other groups at Resurrection City will be marching with us. Come with us! Help us tell Senator Byrd that the poor people of America have had enough of his miserable racist record in Congress.

Senator Byrd is the man who stood up in Congress the day after Martin Luther King, Jr., was murdered and said Reverend King brought it on himself. Senator Byrd is the man who won election to Congress from the most corrupt state in Appalachia and who carried Mingo County, the most corrupt county in the United States north of Mississippi. Senator Byrd is the man who wants a bill passed to deny jobs to anyone arrested in a civil disturbance. Senator Byrd wants welfare payments reduced. Senator Byrd opposes Open Housing and the guaranteed annual income. He opposes the community action program. He wants a "get tough" policy in the cities, including shoot-to-kill during rebellions. He wants the U.S. to go all out for military victory in Viet Nam as well as in our own streets.

WHY IS SENATOR BYRD A THREAT TO EVERY POOR PERSON IN AMERICA?

Because right now he is on his way to becoming chairman of the Senate Appropriation Committee, which passes on every bill for education, housing, welfare, taxes, war—and everything else. Because he is making plans to be the next majority leader in the Senate.

Because racists are talking him up to be the candidate for Vice President.

Because he thinks poor people are communists.

Because he's a bigot.

Most of all, because he has enough power in Congress, along with other reactionaries, to block every kind of progressive legislation that would help the poor people of America.

Help us fight Senator Byrd! Come with us when we march to his house. We need your help!

Meet with us at the Appalachian Holler in Resurrection City on Saturday, June 1st, at 10 A.M.

1. We demand that Senator Byrd renounce his racism and prejudice.

2. We demand that Senator Byrd renounce his stand on use of violence against protestors and demonstrators.

3. We demand that Senator Byrd support the Poor Peoples Campaign.

4. We demand that Senator Byrd stop his fight to oppress welfare recipients.

5. We demand that Senator Byrd reverse his view that government is more important than people, and property rights more important than human rights.

6. We demand that he withdraw his proposal that federal employees associated with civil rights activities lose their jobs.

7. We demand that Sen. Byrd stop his opposition to open housing.

8. We demand that Sen. Byrd support a guaranteed annual income.

9. We demand that the money Sen. Byrd would use to kill in Vietnam be used to save in America.

10. We demand that Sen. Byrd renounce his membership in the KKK.

11. We demand that Sen. Byrd support OEO programs, and support their being in the hands of the poor.

12. We, people of W. Va., demand Senator Byrd's resignation!

13. We demand Home Rule for D. C.

14. Byrd must represent his constituents.

15. Help Mingo County in their dealings with the Justice Department.

16. Byrd caused West Virginia to be humiliated by his remarks made after the death of Martin Luther King.

17. Byrd should initiate laws which could prevent West Virginia and Appalachia's wealth from leaving our states.

18. We pledge to clean up Mingo County, West Virginia, and the whole of the state so Byrd never carries the state again.

19. If he doesn't begin to represent the interests of West Virginia (instead of furthering his own ambitions) we will go into every county of the state and tell people what kind of a man he really is.

20. Byrd should support the Metcalf Bill.

One Appalachian delegation demands the resignation of you, Mr. Byrd, and feels that Mr. Byrd is an unqualified racist leader. He has voted against every progressive bill presented in Congress which would have helped the people who have elected him. He should support a 100% of needs welfare bill. We feel Mr. Byrd does not spend enough time to even listen to the people of Appalachia or West Virginia.

The group also condemn's Byrd for his bigoted statement on the death of our deceased leader, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, June 2, 1968]

MARCHERS TO STAY ON, ABERNATHY TELLS BAPTISTS

(By Caspar Nannes)

BOSTON.—The leader of the Poor People's Campaign declared here yesterday that residents of Resurrection City will stay there until the words of their freedom anthem have been changed from "we shall overcome" to "we have overcome."

The Rev. Ralph D. Abernathy, president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, told the American Baptists Convention in War Memorial Auditorium, "America has slammed shut the door of opportunity and justice on the poor and in so doing has denied them the right to life."

"In Resurrection City, U.S.A., we will knock nonviolently against the doors until they are opened to us," he said.

"This is not a struggle for black or poor people alone but it must be the concern of all American citizens. It is a struggle for the right of a black baby to be born and to have the right to live as long as a white baby," Abernathy said.

DENIAL OF OPPORTUNITIES

Charging that our government was pursuing a genocidal course in denying the poor opportunities given to others, Abernathy said discriminatory practices were being followed in agriculture, public education, housing, health and medical services, economic possibilities and military service.

Claiming that the U.S. is producing enough food to feed "half the starving world," Abernathy asserted farmers are being paid "not to farm, and surpluses of food are dumped into rivers while people . . . are allowed to go hungry and die of malnutrition."

He urged his audience to join with his movement in "pricking the conscience of this nation so that something creative will be done about this problem."

DR. RUTENBER ELECTED

Dr. Culbert G. Rutenber, professor of philosophy at Andover Newton Theological School, yesterday was elected president of the 1.5 million-member American Baptist Convention. He succeeds the Rev. L. Doward McBain of Phoenix, Ariz.

In what was generally interpreted as a gesture toward healing divisions that may have resulted from demands presented earlier this week by a group of Negro clergymen to the convention, the Rev. Samuel McKinney of Seattle, Wash., president of the Black Churchmen, seconded the nomination of Rutenber. One of the demands had been election of a Negro as president of the denomination, though later that demand was interpreted as being "in principle."

"Dr. Rutenber has shown his compassion and integrity for all mankind and therefore the members of the Black Churchmen seconded his nomination for president," McKinney said.

Time ran out on the convention's business session yesterday and after a brief but heated debate all remaining resolutions, save one on Selective Service and Christian Conscience, referred to the 1969 resolutions committee. Among statements deferred were those on Vietnam, the role of the United States in world affairs and the arms race.

The Selective Service statement asked that American-Baptist Churches be "sympathetic and supportive to the conscientious objector whether or not, they agree with him." But it also called upon these congregations to "aid, counsel and pray for those who in equally good conscience accept combatant military service."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 2, 1968]

MARCHERS LEVEL SIGHTS ON CONGRESS

(By Willard Clopton, Jr.)

A top leader of the Poor People's Campaign said yesterday that future protest efforts would be focused on Congress, and raised the prospect of mass arrests on Capitol Hill.

"The U.S. Congress is our main target," said Hosea Williams, the Campaign's director of mobilization.

Citing the arrest of 18 demonstrators last week outside the Longworth House Office Building under a city law barring public assemblages on the Capitol grounds, Williams said:

"That law is not going to keep us from going there. We don't mind spending six months in jail. If they arrest 3000 of us, we'll bring in 6000 and if they are arrested, we'll bring in 12,000."

For only the second time since their arrival, the residents of Resurrection City spent the whole day in camp, while a hot sun began stiffening the mud surrounding their dwellings.

Although no demonstrations were conducted by those at the camp site, about 100 Campaign participants from Appalachia, who have been staying elsewhere in Washington, staged a half-hour protest outside the Arlington home of Sen. Robert C. Byrd (D-W. Va.). Byrd, who has frequently criticized the Campaign, was not at home.

A tour of Resurrection City was made yesterday by Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, Archbishop of the Catholic Archdiocese of Washington.

The Most Rev. John S. Spence, Auxiliary Bishop of Washington, who accompanied the Cardinal, said the visit was made "to show our concern and so we could see the conditions for ourselves . . . and gain new insights into the human needs to which we are trying to render assistance."

The Cardinal met briefly with Williams, who told him:

"Running a city is not our business and we have been making mistakes we are trying to correct. Too many of our resources have gone into maintaining the city rather than exposing the conditions of poverty."

"I must say," the Cardinal replied, "that the people are showing great fortitude, stamina and courage in the face of all this rain."

Williams replied "we firmly believe the Lord will take care of us."

At one point, while the Cardinal was speaking with newsmen, a one-legged camp resident, unaware of the cleric's presence stood a few feet away, shouting a string of obscenities at another resident until a Campaign peace martial arrived to quiet him.

Ignoring the outburst the Cardinal said he hoped the protesters "will continue as they have and remain in the language of Dr. King, nonviolent. I think they will accomplish so much more."

Late yesterday afternoon Mayor Walter E. Washington took Cleveland Mayor Carl Stokes on a tour of Resurrection City.

Stokes, here to address the Capital Press Club last night immediately sought out the Cleveland contingent. He met privately with a group of Cleveland residents for a short time in their plywood shelter, which was decorated on the outside with a picture of Stokes.

Washington, meanwhile, was beleaguered by residents of the District's Northwest. One urban renewal area who had come to Resurrection City to enlist the poor peoples' aid in their fight against relocation.

They demanded that the Mayor listen to their complaint that the Redevelopment Land Agency is moving residents out of the neighborhood faster than replacement housing is built.

Washington agreed to meet with representatives of the group, but declined to set a date.

Williams told the press that future demonstrations will be "a little more militant and a little more often." He indicated the protests could include an attempted sit-in at the Capitol and a camp-in at the White House.

He said a canvass of the campers is under way, to find out "who is ready to demonstrate, who is ready to go to jail and who is ready to get beaten."

Williams added that the Rev. Ralph David Abernathy, the Campaign's leader who was on a speaking visit to Boston yesterday, will move into the camp today.

A Resurrection City resident was arrested last night by Park Police while standing with a group of people outside the shantytown at French Drive and Independence Avenue sw.

James E. Jones, 24, was charged by police with carrying a knife with a blade more than three inches long. He forfeited $25 collateral.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, June 2, 1968]

ALABAMA LAWYER TO ATTEMPT TO INCORPORATE TENT CITY

(By Paul Hathaway)

A Birmingham attorney showed up yesterday at Resurrection City in blue denims and black alligator shoes and announced he would seek to incorporate the poor people's community.

Orzell Billingsley Jr., who has launched a movement in Alabama to incorporate hundreds of predominantly Negro municipalities, said he hopes to file the papers with the District of Columbia Recorder of Deeds "within the next few weeks."

"We're going to go to his office and if he tells me I can't file, I'm going to tell him I can and then I'm going to hand him the papers and leave 'cause I know I can," Billingsley said.

Billingsley was silent on what legal justification he has for incorporating a community within the District of Columbia.

"I'll explain it when the time is ready," he said with a wink.

Billingsley has already incorporated one all-Negro town of 4,000 in Alabama named Roosevelt. He has filed incorporation papers for three others.

A petition will be passed among Resurrection City residents this week, for filing with the incorporation papers, Billingsley said.

He said that after the filing a referendum will be held to determine if the residents want to be incorporated. This would be

followed 30 days later by the election of a mayor and a city council.

Billingsley gives the impression of a man who is going to have a difficult time waiting for the filing date. He pictured the looks on the faces of people in the office of the Recorder of Deeds as he files his papers.

"They may be laughing when I start," he said. "But they won't by the time I'm finished. This is serious business."

He has already hired a local civil engineer, Carl D. Jones, to draw up a map to file with the papers.

Asked the benefits that accrue from incorporating a city, he replied, "Just think of the federal aid we could get. And no one, no one could come in here and tell us we're in violation of some law. Hell, when we're a city we'll make our own laws."

He said he has the backing of the Rev. Ralph David Abernathy, head of the Poor People's Campaign, and other leaders of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Hosea Williams, newly appointed city manager, lauded the plan.

"I think it's a dramatic idea," he said. "It's an act of good faith that is going to give people here an even greater sense of togetherness."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post]

POOR PEOPLE TO STEP UP MILITANCY

(By Paul W. Valentine)

Poor People's Campaign demonstrators marched on the Agriculture Department again yesterday led by field operations chief Hosea Williams, who indicated that campaigners would utilize civil disobedience today.

"If the police want to use those clubs," he told a cheering crowd of about 500 marchers, "we're going to give them a chance to use them tomorrow. The picnic is over."

Raising his fists toward the Metropolitan Police surrounding the assemblage in front of Agriculture's headquarters building, the bearded Williams shouted:

"Yeah, they gonna make you beat us. I know that's your job. But as soul brothers and soul sisters, we got a job, too."

The officers, about 40 strong, stared blankly at the cheering crowd.

Although the ostensible purpose of the demonstration was to memorialize the death of a campaigner, Arthur Easton, 25, who collapsed while waiting in a cafeteria line at the Agriculture Department last Wednesday, Williams repeatedly stressed the policy of increased Campaign militancy, starting today.

"I'm telling you," he said, "that Monday we're gonna start demonstrations that folks on Capitol Hill won't be able to stand."

At another point, he said, "We are ready to bleed as long as there is a drop of blood in us."

Earlier, at the Campaign's Resurrection City, Williams told a press conference that leaders are trying to "structure" the demonstrations by dividing protesters into tightly organized "divisions" which in turn are subdivided into "caravans" and "buses."

WITHHOLDS DETAILS

He declined to give details of today's plans.

Residents of Resurrection City, still wallowing in mud from heavy rains, continued digging out yesterday. Despite the efforts of garbage collection teams, bread, fruit, opened food tins and empty milk cartons were scattered throughout the 15-acre encampment.

At least 30 fires burned in open oil drums. Smoke, black ash and the odor of rotting food hung in the air. Groups of workers sprayed disinfectant in the mud puddles scattered throughout the campsite.

As a muggy heat settled, a D.C. water truck arrived in mid-morning. Residents brushed their teeth and managed to do rudimentary bathing from the spigots on each side of the tank. There is still no running water in the camp.

A QUIET MORNING

The encampment was quiet in the morning. Several small groups of residents went in cars to area churches.

The only religious activity in the campsite occurred when a tall gaunt Indian, who declined to give his name, began preaching to a loose assembly of persons and predicted a devastating seven-year famine in America from 1974 to 1981.

He was quickly challenged by residents, most of them Negroes. The meeting developed into a shouting match in which the Indian was generally ignored and the opposing sides began arguing over the relevance of Christianity to Negroes.

"I've been waiting 346 years for Jesus," said one youth sarcastically, "and I ain't gonna wait no more."

An older man wearing a clerical collar argued that the Church was an agent of white imperialism.

CHARGES BIGOTRY

"To me, all people, black, brown, white and yellow, are the same," he said. "But the Church don't want that because that'll break up their hustle."

Challenged about his views on violence, he shouted, "I believe in nonviolence. That's why I say, brother, get you a machinegun so your neighbor will be nonviolent, too."

In the afternoon, the Agriculture Department demonstrators walked eastward on the Mall past the Washington Monument to Department headquarters at 14th Street and Independence Avenue sw.

Six "pallbearers" carrying an empty coffin symbolizing the death of Arthur Easton led the marchers. They deposited the coffin at the steps of the Department, cheered Williams' exhortations, sang freedom songs and then returned to Resurrection City in a heavy rain.

The Agriculture Department has been a target of Campaign demonstrations because of what leaders feel is mismanagement of the Nation's food surplus program.

"They throw millions of dollars worth of food in the Atlantic every year," Williams said, "while thousands of poor people go hungry. . . This Nation must be sick to take food from babies and throw it in the sea."

He said Easton was the "second casualty" of the Poor People's Campaign. The first, he said, was the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

Easton collapsed last Wednesday and was dead on arrival at D.C. General Hospital. Dr. Richard Whelton, D.C. coroner, said yesterday that Easton, 25, of Philadelphia, died of diabetes and possible complications from a lung infection. He stressed there was "no positive evidence" of a contagious disease.

EDUCATION PROCESS

In an appearance yesterday on the WRC-TV program, "Dimension Washington," the Rev. James Bevel said the Poor Peoples' Campaign is a process of education for the general public about poverty in this country.

"Initially, it (the campaign) will stir up resentment," he said, "but once a relationship of confidence is built up, things will change. People will say the city didn't blow up with poor people in town. Writers will start writing about poverty and people will start examining things and say 'I didn't know there was poverty.' "

Mr. Bevel, who is in charge of nonviolent education for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, said the campaign also shows that "political psychiatry will be the new revolutionary technique of the future."

When asked whether Resurrection City would be maintained in its present location beyond the June 16 deadline, Mr. Bevel said he did not know. But, he added, the Campaign would continue until the poor are helped.

"If there are laws imposed that say 'go home hungry,' we are not going to obey those laws," he said. "If there are laws that are imposed that say you cannot discuss hunger, we will not obey them."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 3, 1968]

PRESS BUILDING HERE IS TARGET OF INDIAN POOR—RUSH-HOUR PROTEST BY MARCHERS AIMS AT NATIONAL MEDIA

A contingent of Indians launched the fourth week of protest by the Poor People's Campaign today by staging a demonstration in the middle of downtown Washington, aimed at the national news media.

"Last week at the Supreme Court we sought justice," said Hank Adams, one of the leaders of the Indian group, "and today we seek truth."

Adams said the morning rush-hour protest at the National Press Club, 14th and F Streets NW, was to be nonviolent but "perhaps somewhat provocative and disruptive."

LIMITED TO 40

About 40 Indians participated, and Adams said they had asked other campaigners from Resurrection City "not be present in force."

"We're trying to offer the press a chance to prove, perhaps for the first time, that they are really interested in more than comic strips and isolated human interest stories."

The campaign yesterday took on a stronger note of militancy. Hosea Williams, a top Southern Christian Leadership Conference official and head of the "direct action" phase of the campaign, told a group of campaigners, "The picnic is over."

During a demonstration at the Department of Agriculture, Williams said:

"We are coming out of these shacks. We are ready to bleed as long as there is a drop of blood in our bodies."

Earlier yesterday, he said "Police will have a chance to use their billy clubs. We are going to plague this nation. . . . Monday we're going to start demonstrations that folks on Capitol Hill won't stand for."

The Rev. Ralph David Abernathy and SCLC officials conferred into the early morning hours today with leaders of the other ethnic delegations on this week's activities.

INTERVENTION SOUGHT

The Mexican-American contingent of about 200 persons scheduled a march on the Justice Department today to protest the arrest of 13 Spanish-speaking demonstrators in Los Angeles last week.

The 13 were arrested on felony conspiracy charges in connection with a March boycott of four predominantly Mexican-American high schools in Los Angeles, United Press International reported.

Rudolpho Corky Gonzalez, a leader of the Mexican-American group, said it would demand that the Justice Department intervene in the case on grounds that the arrests violated constitutional rights of protest.

The Spanish-speaking campaigners still have not moved into the campsite on the Mall after a week of rumblings of discontent between the SCLC and the contingent. However, Abernathy was to march with them to the Justice Department, spokesman for the Mexican-Americans said.

Adams, the Indians' spokesman, alluded today to a demonstration last week at the Supreme Court when five windows were shattered as he discussed the demonstration against the news media.

"We find broken windows almost insignificant, but we are distressed that the American press sees only this and disregards the broken minds and broken treaties," Adams said.

"The Press Building looks very convenient for setting up something obstructive that

probably would disrupt the activities of the press for a while," he added.

Rain, which has been almost synonymous with the campaign, continued to batter the campsite at the foot of the Lincoln Memorial yesterday.

Over half an inch of new rain once again turned the camp into a quagmire after a warm, dry Saturday had begun to harden the terrain.

An SCLC spokesman said about 1,300 meals were served last night, and apparently some 1,000 campaigners continued to stay in area churches.

About 400 to 500 campaigners marched on the Department of Agriculture yesterday, continuing what has become almost a daily activity.

The march was announced as a memorial to Arthur Easton, a 25-year-old campaigner from Philadelphia who collapsed and died there during a midweek demonstration.

MOCK COFFIN CARRIED

A mock coffin was carried by demonstrators who marched from the campsite in a chilly rain.

Police lined the two flights of low stone steps as Williams led his marchers to wooden barricades at the bottom. Behind ornamental grillwork gates, police and building guards could be seen.

"Those police out there are the products of a sick society," Williams said. "They are trained like a canine, trained to prevent us from saying . . . that we are not going to be hungry no more. . . .

"We should not have to go demonstrate at the Department of Agriculture," Williams said at a press conference before the march, "but there is hunger, disease and poverty in the United States. We are forced to because the department can do many things it is not doing."

Abernathy, SCLC successor to the slain Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., delivered a baccalaureate address to graduates of D.C. Teachers College last night, urging them to become "prophets of protest as well as lawyers and teachers."

U.S. UNREST CITED

Speaking in Departmental Auditorium, he warned, "There is a restlessness in this land, a determination of all people to secure what they are entitled to. If they can't get it through legitimate channels—I tremble to think of it—they will get it through illegitimate channels."

Abernathy, afterwards, would not comment on Williams' indication of demonstrations designed to provoke arrests but did concede that the pace of the campaign would be stepped up. Abernathy also would not comment on comments by Williams earlier in the day that the campaign had been infiltrated by hired troublemakers.

Williams told a group of camp residents, "I know darn well there are people paid to come down and start trouble." But he declined to say who he thought might be responsible, citing only the "economic conspiracy," his term for the nation's power structure.

Sen. John L. McClellan, D-Ark., yesterday reiterated his charge that Communists have tried to infiltrate the Poor People's Campaign.

NEW DATA CITED

Speaking on Metromedia's "Opinion Washington," he said he had "some additional information since I made that statement but I am not at liberty to identify it."

He added that "it came from a reliable source. Now, I do think our efforts in trying to bring this to attention and focus attention on it may have induced some greater precautions being taken than were being taken prior to that time" (of his original comment two weeks ago).

"There has been some screening out and we're glad to see that. We hope nothing happens. But at the same time, as long as it (the campaign) continues, you have the danger of potential trouble," McClellan said.

Meanwhile, on Capitol Hill today, action could come on a measure approved by the House Public Works Committee that would prohibit the campaigners use of any parkland or government-owned land in the capital after the June 16 expiration of the federal permit for Resurrection City.

A spokesman for the Public Works Committee said a rule from the Rules Committee may be sought so the bill could be brought to the House floor later in the week. There has been no indication, however, that the Senate would follow the House lead on such a prohibition. A massive protest has been set for June 19 by the SCLC.

In New York yesterday, Bayard Rustin, organizer of the 1963 March on Washington, who is coordinating the June 19 protest, issued "A Call to Americans of Goodwill."

"We march to redeem the American promise," he said.

"To abolish poverty requires a massive, nationwide and integrated effort. By themselves, the poor are neither numerous nor powerful enough to win these advances.

UNITED EFFORT URGED

"Therefore, we march together—black and white, red and brown, country people and slum dwellers, the poor and those who are not poor—because only through such a united effort can we truly overcome."

Rustin's statement called for, among other things—employment at a decent wage; a guaranteed income for those who cannot work "as a matter of right;" restoration of budget cuts for bilingual education and other poverty programs; and the institution of food distribution programs wherever severe hunger exists.

"We call upon all who share these basic commitments to join with us in this massive effort."

The symbolic mule train of the Poor People's Campaign will be brought by truck to Richmond, when it reaches Atlanta—probably by Friday, Williams said yesterday. It will resume its plodding journey to Washington from the Virginia capital with its some 100 campaigners, he said.

OTHER CAMPS PLANNED

In Chicago yesterday, the Rev. Jesse Jackson—who was "city manager of Resurrection City until late last week—said 50 "satellite" campsites would be set up around the country. He is heading this effort.

In commenting on the change of leadership in Resurrection City, Jackson said, "Dr. Abernathy asked me to come down at first and pull the city together. Now that's done and Hosea Williams, head of our direct action section, can take over.

"In the next few weeks, I will be bringing Resurrection City the support of Washington Negroes and the support of sympathetic people all along the Eastern Seaboard," Jackson said.

AUTHORITY TO REAPPOINT CHAIRMAN OF JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1224) to authorize the reappointment of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

REAPPOINTMENT OF GENERAL WHEELER AS CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF SHOULD NOT BE CONFIRMED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, President Johnson's request for authority to nominate Gen. Earle Wheeler for an additional term of 1 year as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be denied. The reason given for the request is that Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford, being comparatively new to his job desires the continuing advice of General Wheeler, who has served as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff during the entire period of our major military operations in Vietnam.

While Secretary of Defense Clifford has to date performed commendably in his high office, it is a fact that he requires the advice of a knowledgeable and able man as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I do not dispute that; no one disputes it. It is for that very reason that I am opposed to this proposed legislation, which would enable General Wheeler to continue in that capacity for another year.

The policy of escalating and expanding the civil war in South Vietnam into an American air and ground war, which he has advocated and urged over the past 4 years, has been disastrous to the United States. While the President and the Secretary of Defense should have a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in whom they have confidence, I for one cannot accept the idea that Gen. Earle Wheeler is the only general officer in our Armed Forces in whom such confidence can be placed. If his views and advice are so important to the President and the Secretary of Defense, let them provide a plush office in the Pentagon, next door and handy to that of the Secretary of Defense, or an office in the White House, where the general can be readily available to advise the President and the Secretary of Defense after his term as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff expires next July 2.

It is doubtful that there will be an end to the bloodletting in Vietnam in the immediate future. However, the negotiations presently in progress in Paris do offer some hope that we can end our involvement in the ugly civil war in South Vietnam by the end of this year. In any event, that is an objective for which we all hope and pray. Obviously, once we are freed from the Vietnam quagmire, there will be a total reexamination of our foreign policy. There is need for new thoughts and new ideas for going forward, turning away from our outmoded policies of the past. Of course, the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff will be of vital importance to the new Chief Executive who will take office next January 20th. It would be tragic for a new President to be saddled with a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff whose advice over the past 4 years has been so discredited, and whose thinking, as revealed by his actions and public statements, is so closely tied to that military-industrial complex against which President Eisenhower warned in his farewell statement to the American people.

The present law, Mr. President, provides that a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff may not be reappointed after two terms except in time of war declared by Congress. The fact is that the United States is not engaged in a war declared by Congress. Instead, we are involved by executive action in a civil war in a small agrarian country, South Vietnam, 10,000 miles distant from our shores and of no strategic or economic importance whatever to the defense of our Nation—it never was and never will be.

It is also a fact, Mr. President, that we are now on the defensive in that war, despite an expenditure of more than $115 billion, despite the death of more than 26,000 Americans killed in combat, the wounding of more than 100,000 others in combat and the affliction of thousands of GI's with malaria, hepatitis, and other jungle diseases. Yet we are nowhere nearer victory than we were 4 years ago. This, notwithstanding the continued optimistic statements issued by General Wheeler and the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff during the past 4 years. In fact, in South Vietnam we are on the defensive at the present time. The Vietcong have been able to invade Saigon, the capital of South Vietnam, and to hold sections of that city for days on end and to successfully invade at the capitals and cities throughout South Vietnam almost at will.

The fact is that the Vietcong now control more than twice as much of the land area of South Vietnam than do the United States forces and the forces of the so-called army of our puppet military regime in Saigon headed by Thieu and Ky.

Throughout all of this period, Gen. Earle Wheeler has been our highest ranking military officer as these melancholy events have unfolded.

I do not assert that General Wheeler himself is entirely responsible for this turn of events or that he alone was the architect of these disastrous policies. However, I do assert that to permit him to serve for another year as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would be a virtual confirmation by Congress of those policies and would be an abdication of congressional power.

We know from reading the horrible headlines and news articles from Saigon in today's Washington Post that the Vietcong have again invaded Saigon, and that they now hold several areas in that city. Furthermore, during the Vietcong's Tet offensive of January 31, the forces of the National Liberation Front, or the Vietcong, seized and held for many hours—and in some instances for many days—38 Provincial capitals of the 44 Provinces of South Vietnam. Finally the Vietcong, after a month of street fighting by our marines in Hue, the old capital of Vietnam, were finally driven out. However, there was damage done to our huge new Embassy in Saigon, which has the appearance of a fortress and is guarded as a fortress. The embassy cost American taxpayers $3 million.

In the Tet offensive our Embassy was breached, entered, and held by the Vietcong for some 7 hours. Fortunately, Ambassador Bunker escaped capture by hurriedly leaving his residence within the Embassy walls and hiding outside for 7 hours.

After this Vietcong Tet offensive Gen. Maxwell Taylor sounded off on "Meet the Press" as if it were a victory for the Americans and for the South Vietnamese.

This is an example of our Generals' advice that is being followed by President Johnson. Here is a report that recently appeared in Parade magazine, published throughout the country:

> Question: On Meet the Press, General Maxwell Taylor described the Tet offensive of the Viet Cong in which they successfully invaded 40 South Vietnamese cities as a net victory for us since we compelled the enemy to change his strategy. What sort of delusion is this? Was the Tet offensive really a genuine victory for us?

The answer published in Parade magazine stated:

> In many natural quarters the Tet offensive has been considered a political and psychological victory for the Vietcong. Having originally advised, along with Walter Rostow, that President Kennedy send U.S. troops to Vietnam, General Taylor may have been exercising on Meet the Press what psychologists call "Ego Reinforcement."

In other words, he had given the President bad advice and he was trying to reinforce his ego. That attitude is typical of the generals of our Joint Chiefs of Staff.

At this time, I assert that I am not uttering any criticism whatever of General Wheeler as a general officer of our Armed Forces. I hold him in high admiration as a military leader.

It is very understandable to me that in 1964 President Johnson nominated him to be Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I was a Member of the Senate at that time. I regarded his appointment as an excellent appointment by our President. Along with other Senators, I voted to confirm his appointment.

Of all the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at that time, and also, I say frankly, of all the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at this time, I consider General Wheeler to be the most personable, probably the most knowledgeable, and the most likable. Certainly he was deserving of the promotion that the Senate gave to him when it confirmed his nomination as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

General Wheeler officially became the Chairman on July 6, 1964. Bear in mind, however, that our law is precise and crystal clear regarding the service of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It reads:

> The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from the officers of the regular components of the Armed Forces. He serves at the pleasure of the President for a term of two years, and may be reappointed in the same manner for one additional term. However, in time of war declared by Congress there is no limit to the number of reappointments.

That is the law of the land. It should be obeyed and followed. I reject as untenable and, in fact, as absurd the claim advanced that Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford is so new in his position as Secretary of Defense that he needs Congress to change the present law and also to violate all precedents by extending for another year the term of General Wheeler beyond his usual tenure of two terms.

Assuming that the proposed authorization is rejected by the Senate, Gen. Earle Wheeler will continue to be a general in the Armed Forces. He is a comparatively young man. He is in fine physical and mental condition. He will be available to give advice to Secretary of Defense Clifford at all times upon the request of that Cabinet officer, regardless of whether we accede to the wishes of the small group of generals and of Admiral Moorer who are the present members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas for a question.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, I noted that in his prepared remarks the Senator from Ohio referred to the existing law, which he accurately quoted, as providing a limitation of a 2-year term or two consecutive terms for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The law also provides, I believe the Senator would agree, that such limitation would not pertain in time of war.

Would not the Senator agree that that limitation was placed in the law because it was necessary to give the Commander in Chief and his associates in the Cabinet—including the Secretary of Defense—the personnel which they might need to prosecute the war? I know that the war referred to in the law is a war declared, under the Constitution, by act of Congress.

My question is this: Although there has not been a legal declaration of war, does not the Senator think that those conditions exist today, and would he not think that the spirit of the law would permit the President to send up this name and have General Wheeler reappointed for 1 more year, within the spirit of that provision of the law which waives that requirement during time of war?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. In answer to the question of the distinguished Senator from Kansas, the law states that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff serves at the pleasure of the President for a term of 2 years, and he may be reappointed in the same manner for one additional term. The law does not merely say, "However, in time of war there is no limitation to the number of reappointments." It specifically states:

> However, in time of war declared by Congress there is no limit on the number of reappointments.

It seems to me that that language is clear and restrictive, and that, since there has not been any declaration of war by Congress—in fact, there has not been any request that Congress declare war—it is a strong argument and indication of congressional intent when the statute was enacted.

Now, Congress has a right to waive that. That is what Congress is being asked to do. But it seems to me, that in the law itself there is a strong argument that we should not extend it for another year, because there is no war declared by Congress.

In that connection, may I say that in the Joint Chiefs of Staff and in our Armed Forces—our Air Force, our Navy, our Army, and in our Marine Corps—we have some very superb generals, any one of whom the junior Senator from Ohio feels would make an excellent Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Though I served for 37 months in World War II—most of the time in the infantry—I was never really more than a

civilian in uniform; so I cannot consider myself an expert on war matters.

But it seems to me that the important position of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—and I shall advert to this in more detail later on in my remarks—having been held for 4 years by General Wheeler, could well be given to another outstanding general in our Marine Corps, Army, or Air Force or to an admiral of our Navy.

Mr. President, I know and admire Defense Secretary Clark Clifford. Over the years he has had a plethora of experience as an official and as an adviser to Presidents of the United States. He is a distinguished citizen of the United States. It seems to me fantastic and absolutely unfounded and untenable to claim that Clark Clifford could better serve as Secretary of Defense were the present law to be disregarded and General Wheeler retained in his present position beyond 4 years, for another year.

In fact, if Defense Secretary Clifford desired to do so, he could readily give General Wheeler an office next to his or a desk next to his, or an office or desk in the White House, or he could give him a private telephone line to his bedroom. So, if General Wheeler's term as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were not extended, if he were simply one of the top generals in our Armed Forces, Defense Secretary Clifford could have the outstanding services of General Wheeler, irrespective of whether the general is granted another year as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Furthermore, let us face the facts. Secretary of Defense Clifford may not serve as Secretary of Defense beyond next January 20. Regardless of whether the Democratic candidate is elected President or the Republican candidate is elected President, there is no certainty that Clark Clifford will hold the office of Secretary of Defense at any time following January 20, 1969. Therefore, to be realistic, if anyone claims it is important that the period of service of General Wheeler as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff be extended, why not extend it for 6 months instead of for a year. Of course, I am opposed to any extension whatever.

An important reason for defeating the pending measure can be readily understood when one considers the fact that President Johnson has followed the advice of the generals of our Joint Chiefs of Staff of our Armed Forces from January 1965 up to the present time, just as if that advice were sacrosanct.

The framers of our Constitution provided that civilian authority in this country should always be supreme over military authority. Had the President followed his own judgment over the past years instead of implicitly following the advice of the generals of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, certainly the United States would not be any worse off than it is at the present time in South Vietnam.

Due to their advice, President Johnson has committed 600,000 Americans to fight in a civil war in South Vietnam. More than 26,000 Americans have been killed in combat, and more than 100,000 Americans have been wounded. In addition, many lives have been lost due to bubonic plague, hepatitis, and jungle diseases. We have spent approximately $115 billion of taxpayers' money to uphold and support the militarist regime in Saigon in a civil war in South Vietnam.

Mr. President (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair), it is sickening to think how just a third of that money could have been spent in the United States to help end poverty in this country and to provide jobs and higher education for our youngsters instead of sending our youngsters over to fight in a little agrarian country of no importance to the defense of our Nation.

The Saigon regime we support is only in office due to our military might. Our prestige throughout the world, particularly in Asiatic capitals is at its lowest ebb in our history.

The undeclared war President Johnson has involved us in, by meddling in a civil war in South Vietnam, has grown into the most unpopular war the United States has ever waged. It is more unpopular than the Mexican War of 1846. As I stated recently in this Chamber, at that time a Congressman from Illinois by the name of Abraham Lincoln spoke out and voted against that war, and he was defeated for reelection to Congress as a result of it.

We in the Congress have not been afforded an opportunity to vote for or against a declaration of war, and yet we have more than half a million men involved in this civil war in South Vietnam. The end of that conflict is not in sight.

General Westmoreland earlier this year asked for 206,000 more troops. Fortunately, the President denied this number to him. Whether or not General Wheeler sanctioned that request or upheld General Westmoreland is not known to me. However, to my knowledge, no Senator has heard any statement to the contrary coming from any of the generals of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, nor from the Chairman, General Wheeler.

In our Armed Forces we have dozens and dozens, and perhaps hundreds, of outstanding generals. It would seem to me to be fitting and proper, for example—and I have mentioned this before—that a general in command of the Marine Corps should be designated as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Last January I spent nearly 3 weeks in Southeast Asia. I was in every area in South Vietnam. I was north of Danang and in the area close to Khesanh. In Khesanh and Danang I was horrified to observe that our marines were bottled up and were on the defensive. There have been approximately 88,000 marines fighting in South Vietnam. The Marine Corps of the United States is the finest trained, best equipped, and the most intelligent group of fighting men in the world. They are trained for offensive fighting, to be in the vanguard, and to lead in amphibious operations.

When I observed them north of Danang and in the area of Khesanh they were on the defensive. There were several thousand in the Khesanh area and 6,000 or 8,000 in the Danang area, and to my knowledge none of them were used in any amphibious operations in the Mekong Delta.

As a civilian, but one who has worn the uniform of his country, it would seem to me that South Vietnam would be an ideal place for our fighting marines to be on the offensive and to be used in connection with amphibious operations. However, under the command of General Westmoreland, they were on the defensive at Danang and Khesanh, and they still are. That leads me to believe it would not be a bad idea for a Marine Corps general to be the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

While I was in the area north of Danang, and in the vicinity of Khesanh, about 3 or 4 days before the Tet Lunar Holiday, General Westmoreland told me that the Communists has encircled Khesanh, and that we were encircling the encirclers. He and other generals were well pleased with themselves because they had brought some 40,000 of our Armed Forces up from the central highlands for that purpose, thus depleting that section of South Vietnam of our Armed Forces. They were brought up to encircle the encirclers, who were making so much noise at night and making known their presence in the area. What happened? It is now evident that the Vietcong never intended to try to overrun Khesanh. They showed good judgment in that respect. Instead, at the height of the lush rice harvesting season they assailed Saigon, the provincial capitals, and everywhere else in South Vietnam.

The truth is that the Vietcong generals out-generaled General Westmoreland. Perhaps our President finally concluded that was a fact because he denied the request for 206,000 more soldiers and replaced General Westmoreland with General Abrams who is held in high regard as a result of his service in Vietnam and as a combat commander in World War II.

Mr. President, our Air Force is the most powerful in the world. We have every reason to be extremely proud of our Air Force. Why should not a general of the Air Force, such as Gen. John McConnell, or some other general, be promoted to be Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of our Armed Forces instead of retaining General Wheeler, and thereby going along apparently with the same policy that we have been following with disastrous results during the past 4 years?

Mr. President, General Wheeler, on too many occasions, has spoken out publicly on the foreign policy of this Nation, which is an area definitely not in his jurisdiction nor in that of any officer of the Armed Forces of our country. General Wheeler and other generals and admirals would be well advised to give attention to their duties as leaders of the Armed Forces instead of sounding off, as some of the generals and admirals have been doing, on political and foreign policy matters.

Let me say that not long ago I was somewhat distressed to hear a general of our Armed Forces testify before the Armed Services Committee that we must have more missile power because the Soviet Union is seeking to bury us by force and violence. I heard it stated by this general that we must proceed with additional armaments and spend more

billions of dollars of taxpayers' money, despite the fact that we have a superiority over the Soviet Union, all as the result of Khrushchev's warlike threat that "We will bury you."

The truth is that of all the many wisecracks of former Russian Premier Nikita Khrushchev, the one which most Americans remember best is the statement, "We will bury you." Taken in the full context of Khrushchev's meaning at that time, he made it crystal clear that he did not mean war, but that he meant the wisecrack in reference to economic competition.

He said, "You say your system is best. We say our Communist system is best. Let us compete and see which is best, and we will bury you."

Frankly, following the time I heard this general state that, I could not believe he was a graduate of West Point, that I must be mistaken. So, I looked it up and found that he is a graduate of West Point, so perhaps there is something wrong with West Point. I hope not.

Now, Mr. President, I am about to conclude my remarks in support of my views that it would be better for our country and it would be better for the Armed Forces if some other outstanding general or admiral be considered for Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. President, a serious erosion is taking place in the constitutional balance that supposedly places the military under civilian control and direction.

One of the most important principles written into the Constitution by our Founding Fathers, the architects of that great document, was that civilian authority should and must always be superior over military authority in this Nation. We have witnessed a serious erosion of this great doctrine in recent years. President Eisenhower warned the American people against the danger of the industrial-military complex and their power. Unfortunately, President Johnson seems to have disregarded that advice. The Department of Defense, last year, spent more than $70 billion and it will probably spend more than $80 billion this year, well over half the expenditures of the Federal Government. This is a phenomenon which did not exist in this country prior to World War II. It happens that last year we had a Defense Department appropriation bill of $70,100,000,000, which was the largest single Defense Department appropriation bill in the history of the Republic, greater by far than any single Defense Department appropriation bill in World War II. It was passed by an overwhelming margin in both Houses of the Congress. This year, the Department of Defense appropriation bill will even exceed $70,100,000,000. I mention that because it shows that the lives of millions of Americans and the existence of thousands of business concerns are dependent upon the decisions made daily by officials of the Department of Defense. It is of the utmost importance to all Americans that these decisions be made wisely and that the ultimate responsibility concerning them be under the control of civilian authority.

Finally, may I say that the decisions of the past 4 years in connection with the intervention in a civil war in South Vietnam have been proven wrong. It is definitely time for a change, and foremost among the changes that should be made, it seems to me, should be the appointment of a new Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I strongly urge the defeat of the pending joint resolution.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, does the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Yes; I yield the floor.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, in response to the very good statement made by my friend, the Senator from Ohio, I should like to say that occasionally I find myself slipping into the faulty habit of confusing personalities or single events with institutions. By that I mean that occasionally a decision of a Supreme Court Justice will run contrary to what I think is right and just and proper, and there is a tendency to blame the whole Supreme Court; or an officer of the State Department will do something that I deem to be foolish, and all of a sudden I condemn the whole State Department or the diplomatic policies of the country.

In like manner, a vote in Congress would indicate to some of us, on occasion, that Congress has lost escape to any avenue of good judgment.

I know that the Senator from Ohio is a strong and able and conscientious opponent of the dreadful war and agony in Vietnam. There is no question of his sincerity. I think that here, however, he has done the very same thing that the Senator from Kansas has done on other occasions.

His argument against the measure now before the Senate centers on four points: First, that the present Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has been wrong in his advice. Second, that it is against the legal requirement of the law. Third, that other men in the Armed Forces are capable of fulfilling this very responsible office. And last, that the Secretary of Defense does not need the counsel and advice of General Wheeler as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the extent that he needs to be reappointed to this post.

In response to the first criticism, I respectfully say that if the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has been wrong in his advice, all of us who have been wrong about this war, if we should suffer the penalty, would be denied further service by virtue of that mistake. I think it would apply to the same extent to the vast majority of those who serve in this body, to the vast majority of those who serve in the executive branch, and, indeed, to the vast majority of our military leaders. As I recall, Assistant Secretary of State Walt Rostow made the same agrument with reference to the Tet offensive, when he said it was of great advantage to us. So one may go up or down the ladder and find criticism about wrong advice. It seems to me that to single out this particular officer is to isolate what really lies in the House and Senate—the Congress of the United States.

The Senator from Ohio said that the law provides that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff may be appointed for two terms, each of 2 years in duration, and he also, as the report of the committee says, states that in time of war this appointment may be extended for successive terms. There has been no declaration of war, so the legal requirement as set forth in the statute does not obtain; but I do submit, with a war which has lasted longer than any other conflict in our history, save two with casualties now exceeding 22,000 killed and 90,000 wounded, as the Senator has cited; and with the cost of the war continuing; that the spirit of the exception written into the particular statute should apply to the bill before us.

I do not deny that there are many other capable men to fulfill the office. I was a member of the Navy in World War II. I have, I suppose, a feeling of great affection for and pride in the Navy. Perhaps I would feel that the Chief of Naval Operations should serve in the position of Chairman more often. But in this instance, a man of the Army has the particular advice and experience which would be most capable of being utilized.

I do not deny that the Senator is correct in saying that if the Secretary of Defense wants the advice and counsel of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he can give them an office beside him. But the advice and experience needed are not only for the Secretary of Defense. They pertain to all the people in the military and to all the people in the civilian part of the government. I think that advice is good and accurate only when it carries the weight of the authority of the office that General Wheeler holds today.

So the arguments that, first, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has been wrong; second, that this proposal is against the legal requirement; third, that there are other capable people; and last, that the Secretary of Defense can obtain advice and counsel without this reappointment—all of these are weak arguments when one considers the national interest and what is best for the United States, the military, and all of us, especially at this stage of the war, when a new Secretary of Defense has taken office and needs the best advice he can get in these trying times.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the able Senator from Ohio knows of my respect and affection for him. Often we agree on matters. In this case, we do not.

I have already expressed the opinion it is unfortunate that since the Defense Department was set up in 1947, there has been only one Chairman of the Joint Chiefs fron. the Navy, and only one Chairman from the Air Force. All the rest, ever since the act went into force, have been Army.

On the other hand, a new Secretary of Defense has been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. As we know, his job is difficult at best, and General Wheeler is his choice for this position. It seems, therefore, the least we could do would be to give this new Secretary the officer he believes would be of the most assistance to him in handling this important work. This year, counting the supplemental, defense will cost the American people over $80 billion.

Is it fair game to continue to attack the military for decisions incident to the Vietnam war? The military cannot defend themselves, because they are in the chain of command; and it is common knowledge, and so testified to before our committee, that the recommendations by the chiefs as to how the war should be conducted have been consistently disregarded by their civilian superiors. I have made a point of asking all other services whether or not Joint-Chiefs-of-Staff recommendations with respect to the handling of the war were supported by the Chairman, General Wheeler. Without reservation, they replied that was true, that the position General Wheeler recommended was the position of the Joint Chiefs until Secretary McNamara and his civilian staff overruled it.

I must say, Mr. President, inasmuch as the new and inexperienced civilian heads of the Department of Defense in recent years have consistently conducted the war against the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs, it would seem unfortunate their Chairman is now criticized for what has been going on for 3½ years.

Who made what decisions at action in Vietnam has been brought out in hearings before the Military Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, where, under oath, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, members of the Joint Chiefs, other heads of departments and officers who had retired in protest, gave us the truth. Senators present in the Chamber today, including my fellow members on the Committee on Armed Services, know the degree to which the recommendations of the military as to how this war should be conducted have been disregarded. Furthermore, Mr. President, it was not their decision to get into this war.

So I hope the name of a great American, a personal friend, an officer who has done his best to serve his country to the best of his ability, and whose major recommendations with respect to the war have been so consistently disregarded in the past, who is wanted by the new Pentagon management to help with a war in which we have already lost over 23,000 dead and over 100,000 wounded, will not run the risk of being sulled by attacking him for events for which had no responsibility. Actually the reverse is true because whatever authority he had was disregarded by those who bear the responsibility for the failure of this war.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will give the President the authority to reappoint Gen. Earle Wheeler as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President. I rise to join in the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas and the able senior Senator from Missouri. As other Senators have stated, I too have the highest regard for my good friend from the great State of Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. I know that he is a very conscientious Senator, and I fully appreciate the reasons that he has given for the position he has taken on the pending resolution.

Mr. President, under our system of government, the President of the United States is Commander in Chief. Lyndon B. Johnson will be President until January 20, 1969. During that period of time, he needs to have, as his first military adviser, a man in whom he has full and complete confidence.

In addition, Mr. President, the President's chief civilian adviser, the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Clark Clifford, has made it very clear that he feels that General Wheeler's term should be extended for 1 year.

I think we have a duty and a responsibility to support the request of the Commander in Chief, in dealing with a special situation, which this certainly is, that the term of office be extended for 1 year.

On a personal note, I wish to say that I know General Wheeler to be indeed a man of great integrity. He is an outstanding soldier. He is a man who has demonstrated time and again that he regards seriously his responsibility to keep Congress currently informed; and we have always found him to be forthright and honest.

Mr. President, as the Senator from Missouri has so ably pointed out, I think it would be a real attack on the integrity of General Wheeler for the pending joint resolution to be rejected, thus denying him an additional 1 year in office. I believe Congress has a responsibility to support the President in his awesome duties in connection, not only with the problem in Vietnam, which is the overriding one at the moment, but with his worldwide responsibilities involved in protecting and providing adequately for the security interests of the United States of America.

I hope that the resolution will be agreed to by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I realize how conscientious and dedicated the distinguished Senator from Ohio is in his views in regard to House Joint Resolution 1224.

As a general proposition, I fully support the 4-year limitation that has been placed on the appointment of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

But I do believe that House Joint Resolution 1224 points to an exception which should be made by Congress; so I concur in the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Missouri, the Senator from Washington, and the Senator from Kansas that it would be in the best interests of our Nation for Congress to act affirmatively on the pending resolution.

General Wheeler has served 4 years in this position. He impresses me as being an officer of unusual ability.

That in itself would not be grounds for changing the law and extending his service by an additional year; but in recent months we have had a new Secretary of Defense. He has been in office only a short time, and he has earnestly requested, as has the President of the United States, that General Wheeler be continued for 1 additional year in his capacity as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

It seems to me it is a reasonable request when one considers that we are engaged in a major war in Vietnam, we have 525,000 troops there at the present time, and we are facing explosive possibilities elsewhere in the world.

The Senate would be very wise, I feel, to follow the President's recommendation and the recommendation of the new Secretary of Defense and pass House Joint Resolution 1224 to permit the reappointment of Gen. Earle Wheeler to continue for 1 year as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The position of Secretary of Defense is a most difficult one under the best of conditions. It is especially difficult in the early months, and if Secretary of Defense Clifford feels he needs the continued assistance of General Wheeler for 1 year, I feel the Senate should consent to this request.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in very briefly concluding my argument in support of my position on the pending joint resolution, I express my heartfelt and very sincere thanks and gratitude for the generous statements that have been made pertaining to me by four of my colleagues on the Senate Armed Services Committee.

It is very evident that mine is a minority view in that committee. But it also is very evident that there is mutual respect and affection between those of us who are serving on the Armed Services Committee and doing our utmost for our country as we see our duty.

I previously quoted the law, and should like to do so again. It reads:

> The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from the officers of the regular components of the armed forces. He serves at the pleasure of the President for a term of two years, and may be reappointed in the same manner for one additional term. However, in time of war declared by Congress there is no limit on the number of reappointments.

The present law is crystal clear. And, of course, there has been no declaration of war by Congress. Nevertheless, as was stated by the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], although there has been no declaration of war by Congress, this is one of the most terrible wars in which our Nation has ever been involved, and, with the exception of our War for Independence, it is probably about the longest war in which our country has ever been engaged. So, I concede that there is some validity to the argument made by the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

So that there will be no misunderstanding, may I say that I personally regard General Wheeler as an outstanding general officer of our Army. I know him. I like him. He is an honest, forthright person. In addition, I know General Wheeler to be a fine gentleman in every respect. Also, I am certain that he would be an excellent fighting, combat general. He is one of the great leaders in our Armed Forces. There is no question about that.

What I do question today, though, is not the personality or the person or the uniform, but rather the attitude, the policies, the philosophy, and the determination of the man who would occupy a high office. And I feel that the position of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is one of the most important. That position has been occupied by General Wheeler for 4 years.

The last 4 years has been an agonizing period in the history of our country. We are on the defensive in Vietnam now with respect to land operations.

I feel that we should not retain General Wheeler as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, since he has been the highest uniformed military officer throughout the unfolding of the melancholy events that have brought us to today's unhappy plight, and he bears a certain degree of responsibility for the policies pursued in Vietnam during the past 4 years. To permit him an additional year as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would, in my opinion, be a virtual confirmation by the Congress of those policies.

There should certainly be no scapegoat. I want it definitely understood that I have a personal feeling of friendship and admiration and respect for General Wheeler. He is one of the great men in our Army.

Opposition to the pending joint resolution was also expressed in the House of Representatives. However, it was a fruitless effort there. It may also be fruitless here.

Mr. President, the assistant majority leader, who is presently on the floor of the Senate, has just talked with me. Before he talked with me, we had an understanding that I would request that the vote on the pending measure go over until tomorrow.

The assistant majority leader now has reasons that appear valid to me as to why he would like to dispose of the pending matter today.

Mr. President, I do not choose to ask for a rollcall vote on this Monday afternoon. However, as far as the junior Senator from Ohio is concerned, he is ready for a vote at the present time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of House Joint Resolution 1224.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I suggest that the attaches inform Senators that a rollcall vote is about to take place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is on its passage. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senators from California [Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWERS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senators from California [Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 2, as follows:

[No. 172 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Allott	Fannin	Mondale
Bayh	Fong	Moss
Bennett	Hansen	Mundt
Bible	Harris	Nelson
Boggs	Hart	Pearson
Brooke	Hickenlooper	Percy
Burdick	Holland	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Hollings	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Smathers
Cannon	Jackson	Smith
Carlson	Javits	Spong
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Stennis
Church	Mansfield	Symington
Cooper	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Curtis	McGee	Williams, Del.
Dominick	McGovern	Young, N. Dak.
Eastland	McIntyre	
Ellender	Miller	

NAYS—2

Metcalf	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—46

Aiken	Hayden	Murphy
Anderson	Hill	Muskie
Baker	Inouye	Pastore
Bartlett	Jordan, N.C.	Pell
Brewster	Kennedy, Mass.	Prouty
Clark	Kennedy, N.Y.	Randolph
Cotton	Kuchel	Ribicoff
Dirksen	Lausche	Scott
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Ervin	Long, La.	Talmadge
Fulbright	Magnuson	Thurmond
Gore	McCarthy	Tower
Griffin	Monroney	Tydings
Gruening	Montoya	Yarborough
Hartke	Morse	
Hatfield	Morton	

So the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1224) was passed.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the resolution was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I am authorized to make the following statement by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]:

The bill just passed by the Senate (H.J. Res. 1224) represents a formal procedure by the Congress to authorize certain action which the President could take, without authorization, "in time of war declared by Congress".

We have followed this procedure only because there has been no formal declaration of war by the Congress. However, this formality should in no way be interpreted as suggesting that there has not been an informal declaration of a state of war by the

Congress through its votes on the Tonkin Gulf Resolution and subsequent appropriations activity directed at supporting the war in Vietnam—and informal declaration which precedent clearly indicates is sufficient for purposes of the Constitution.

AMENDMENT OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT AND THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT LAW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in order that we may lay before the Senate the pending business for tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1001, S. 1316.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1316) to amend the Bankruptcy Act and the Civil Service Retirement Law with respect to the tenure and retirement benefits of referees in bankruptcy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 2, line 2, after the word "and" strike out the comma and "from and after the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the effective date of this amendment, 7½ per centum" and insert "7½ percent"; in the second column after line 7 strike out "From and after the effective date of this amendment," and insert "After June 30, 1968."; after line 10 strike out:

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of a referee in bankruptcy this section applies upon his becoming seventy-five years of age and completing five years of service, except that, as regards a referee serving on the date of the enactment of this amendment, this section applies upon his becoming seventy-five years of age and completing the term of office under which he is serving upon the effective date of this amendment.

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

(f) A referee in bankruptcy who becomes 75 years of age and completes 5 years of service shall be automatically separated from the service. The separation is effective on the last day of the month in which the referee becomes 75 years of age or completes 5 years if then over that age, and pay ends from that day. Subsections (a), (c), (d), and (e) of this section do not apply to a referee in bankruptcy.

On page 3, line 11, after "2½" strike out "per centum" and insert "percent"; and after line 15, strike out:

SEC. 6. This amendatory Act shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins more than sixty days after the date of its approval.

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

SEC. 6. (a) The amendments made by section 2 of this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1968.

(b) In the case of a referee in bankruptcy who is serving on the date of enactment of this Act, the amendment made by section 2 of this Act shall not apply until such referee has completed the term of office under which he is serving on the date of enactment of this Act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the third sentence of section 34a of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 62(a)), is amended to read as follows: "Except as otherwise provided in section 37 of this Act, each appointment and reappointment of a full-time referee shall be for a term of twelve years and each appointment and reappointment of a part-time referee shall be for a term of six years."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 8334(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the word "Member," in the first sentence thereof the following: "and 7½ percent of the basic pay of each referee in bankruptcy,"

(b) Section 8334(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of the chart the following:

"Referee in bankruptcy for referee service--- 7½	After June 30, 1968."

SEC. 3. Section 8335 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(f) A referee in bankruptcy who becomes 75 years of age and completes 5 years of service shall be automatically separated from the service. The separation is effective on the last day of the month in which the referee becomes 75 years of age or completes 5 years if then over that age, and pay ends from that day. Subsections (a), (c), (d), and (e) of this section do not apply to a referee in bankruptcy."

SEC. 4. Section 8339(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(c)", renumbering items "(1)" and "(2)" to "(A)" and "(B)", respectively, and adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"(2) The annuity of a referee in bankruptcy retiring under this subchapter is computed under subsection (a) of this section, except that his annuity is computed, with respect to his service as a referee, by multiplying 2½ percent of his average pay by the years of that service."

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, retirement benefits resulting from enactment of this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

SEC. 6 (a) The amendments made by section 2 of this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1968.

(b) In the case of a referee in bankruptcy who is serving on the date of enactment of this Act, the amendment made by section 2 of this Act shall not apply until such referee has completed the term of office under which he is serving on date of enactment of this Act.

EXTENSION OF ABSENTEE REGISTRATION AND VOTING PROCEDURES TO ALL CITIZENS RESIDING ABROAD

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 2884.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2884) to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 so as to recommend to the several States that its absentee registration and voting procedures be extended to all citizens temporarily residing abroad, which was, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 101 of the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 (50 U.S.C. 1451) is hereby amended by striking out paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting in lieu thereof a new paragraph (3) as follows:

"(3) Citizens of the United States temporarily residing outside the territorial limits of the United States and the District of Columbia and their spouses and dependents when residing with or accompanying them."

SEC. 2. Section 204(b) of the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 (50 U.S.C. 1464) is hereby amended by striking out subparagraphs (3) c., d., e., and f. and inserting in lieu thereof new subparagraphs (3) c., d., and e. as follows:

"c. A citizen of the United States temporarily residing outside of the territorial limits of the United States and the District of Columbia □

"d. A spouse or dependent of a person listed in (a) or (b) above □

"e. A spouse or dependent residing with or accompanying a person described in (c) above". □

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, S. 2884 was passed by the Senate on April 8, 1968.

The bill amends the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 by recommending to the several States that absentee registration and voting procedures be extended to all citizens temporarily residing abroad.

On May 20, 1968, the House of Representatives agreed to S. 2884 with an amendment necessitated by the enactment into positive law as part of title 50, United States Code, of the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955.

Without changing any of the text of the bill, the House amendment merely brings S. 2884 into conformity with the changes in the code.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL VOTING ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 1581.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1581) to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 584), which were, on page 2, line 14, strike out "Clauses (1) and" and insert "Clause".

On page 2, line 14, strike out "are" and insert "is".

And, on page 2, strike out lines 16 through 20, inclusive.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, S. 1581 was passed in the Senate on July 17, 1967, and in the House on May 20, 1968.

The bill amends the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 for the purpose of improving and expediting the procedures for registering and voting by members of the Armed Forces.

The House of Representatives adopted the Senate bill with one amendment which struck from the bill the requirement that the Secretary of Defense designate one day during the latter part

of September in a general election year as "Armed Forces Voters Day."

The House amendment does not materially affect the bill and the Secretary of Defense may still designate a day as Armed Forces Voters Day.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

DENNIS W. RADTKE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 2178.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2178) for the relief of Dennis W. Radtke, which was, on page 2, line 2, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives. The total amount involves only $10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The motion was agreed to.

SENATOR GEORGE AIKEN—THE OUTSPOKEN SAGE OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Parade magazine of June 2, 1968, there appeared an article, "Senator GEORGE AIKEN: The Outspoken Sage of the Senate," by Jack Anderson.

Mr. President, there are Senators and Senators' Senators. Once in a great while a Senator achieves wide recognition because of the record which he has built in his State and in this body and because he is a man whom all Members can look up to, regardless of their own political views. Such a man is the dean of the Republicans in this body, GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont. He has proved himself, down through the years, to be one of the inspirations of this body, and, I daresay, one of the inspirations for the younger generation of this country. To me he typifies what a Senator should be—rock hard in an outlook, cased in understanding and tolerance, a man who knows how to make up his own mind and, once made, to stick to it; a man who has an awareness of the situations which confront the Nation in a period of change; a man who is willing to listen; a man who is willing to stand up and be counted.

Mr. President, I look upon GEORGE AIKEN as one of the great Senators of our generation, if not one of the great Senators in the history of the Republic.

Out of my admiration and respect for him, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred may be incorporated at this point in the RECORD. I express the hope that GEORGE AIKEN will be with us for many years to come, that we may continue to be the beneficiaries of his advice, his counsel, and his wisdom.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would like to join the majority leader in paying my respects to one of the finest Members of this body. It has been my privilege to know GEORGE AIKEN for over a quarter century. He is a man of great character and energy, one who is always logical and constructive. I hope that we here may continue to have his advice, and the country his able and devoted service, for many years to come.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in paying my respect to Senator AIKEN, not only as a Senator from the State of Vermont, but as a Senator of the United States. He has been of great service to the Senate, the people of his State, and above all, to the people of this Nation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Delaware. All I can say is that they do not come any better than GEORGE AIKEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I am sure there will be no objection if the article to which the Senator from Montana has referred is printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR GEORGE AIKEN: THE OUTSPOKEN SAGE OF THE SENATE

(By Jack Anderson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—To repair its reputation, the Senate recently drafted a code of ethics. In the showdown voting, however, the Senate's historic reluctance to reform itself prevailed, and the new code was vented with more loopholes than a medieval fortress. Yet the senators, one by one, paid solemn lip service to the pretended reforms. At last, gnarled, gnomish Sen. George Aiken rose, the customary twinkle gone from his eyes. "I will not be a party to the perpetrating of a fraud upon the American people," he declared, "by making them think that we are trying to purify ourselves when we are really making ourselves look worse."

He stood alone when the Senate finished recording the votes, 67 to 1. But his few clipped words had an impact that belies the final count. For under his mossy exterior, there is solid granite. "Any position Aiken takes," said Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield of the Senate's senior Republican, "automatically becomes respectable, just because it's held by George Aiken."

FORTY YEARS IN POLITICS

His character has withstood the ravages of 40 years of politics. In all this time, he has served Vermont as a state legislator, lieutenant governor, governor and senator. It is a testament to his integrity that the road in front of his farm at Putney, Vt., is still unpaved.

Many of his peers would like to ignore Aiken, but they have learned they cannot. His incisive views have served as an irritant to both parties over the years, and he has seldom failed to support a Democrat when he thought the opposition was right or lambast a Republican when he believed his own party was wrong.

Like few other members of Congress, he lives on his salary. His blue suits shine. His lank red tie is a trademark. He lives in a small $150-a-month apartment near his Senate office so he can walk to work. Until she died in 1966, Beatrice Aiken, his wife for 52 years, stayed home in Putney to help keep the expenses down, waiting for Aiken's frequent visits. Lonely without her, Aiken remarried in mid-1967. His bride is Lola Pierotti, who had been his administrative assistant for many years.

Like the sugar maples near his Vermont home, Aiken imparts his wisdom in slow drops. He sits back and listens intently to the exchange of ideas in the Senate. Then he cuts through the froth of words with his sharp Yankee philosophy.

Nor has his understanding been blurred by age. Although 75, Aiken has a clear, crisp insight into the problems of today. His views are usually blunt: Here are a few of them:

On *Today's Youth*—"We have always had hippies in one form or another. I don't think kids are much worse now than they used to be. They have better educations now, but there are many without opportunities. This is where the trouble starts. They wind up blaming the system, then they try to change the system."

On *Vietnam*—"I have maintained for many months that we made a huge military commitment in that part of the world simply because we did not have the wit, the imagination or the courage to devise a political strategy to suit a political problem."

On *Civil Rights*—"If I were to wake up some morning and find, before 10 o'clock, that everyone was the same race, creed and color, people would find some other causes for prejudice by noon." He added that the militants of both races "aren't looking for solutions: they just want action."

On *The Presidency*—"As I see it, it is far more important to elect a person of integrity and ability to the presidency—one who will conscientiously perform the duties of the office as described in the Constitution—than it is to elect one on the promise that he may agree with our particular viewpoint."

Aiken has been in the Senate since 1941, but he waited until this year to issue a statement on the state of the Union. "This is a privilege I have forgone in the past," he explained, "because usually I have felt that the Union's state was not as bad as its detractors would have it, nor so good as those in office wanted to make it out to be. But this year, the state of the Union is so clearly bad that for the first time in my 27 years as a Senator I feel compelled to stand on my privilege."

Then in terse, punchy sentences, he looked at America's place in the world and rendered his verdict. "We are entering an intensely political year," he said, "and I believe the deteriorated state of politics is very much at the root of the malaise of our times. In politics, as in television, media has triumphed over matter. A man's image has become so much more important than the substance of his thoughts and ideas that we have elevated a cult of personality far above any real debate of the issues. And in this respect, we are not far apart from our ideological enemies as we would like to think we are or as we should be."

ADVICE IGNORED

He proceeded to outline concisely what he thought was wrong with President Johnson's policies. Afterward, Aiken remarked, eyes twinkling but only in half-jest, to a friend: "If Mr. Johnson did what I told him, he'd be the best President in history."

Aiken never went to college and has never pretended that he holds the world's knowledge. Still, when he believes it is time to speak, he doesn't hesitate. "Some say you shouldn't prune except at the right time of the year," he philosophizes. "I generally do it when the saw is sharp."

The Senator's rural background is always with him as he goes after the world's great issues. "Problems," he says, "are like the large rock in a farmer's field. He may hire a derrick to have it removed only to find two larger ones underneath. But, after all, problems are what make life worth living."

OPPOSITION TO INCREASED RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last week H.R. 16903 was approved by the House committee along with an amendment which will increase the retirement benefits of Members of Congress by 33⅓ percent above the existing law.

It is preposterous that such a proposal would even be considered at this time. Congressional approval of this proposed 33⅓-percent increase in its own retirement benefits under the circumstances existing today would be an expression of contempt for the American taxpayers.

It would be the height of fiscal irresponsibility for Congress to approve a multimillion-dollar bonus for itself at a time:

First. When we are considering the necessity of voting for a tax increase;

Second. When Congress is considering the reduction of expenditures in all areas—which reduction will automatically force the curtailment or cancellation of many otherwise meritorious projects;

Third. When our Government is confronted with a deficit of $20 billion in fiscal 1968 and a potential deficit of $28 billion in 1969—less the amount of any tax increase or expenditure reduction as approved in H.R. 15414; and

Fourth. When both our national debt and interest rates are at the highest level in the history of our country, and the stability of the American dollar is being challenged and inflation on the homefront represents a serious threat.

Not only does this bill propose to increase the retirement benefits by 33⅓ percent, but in addition it has the potential mathematical effect of increasing the retirement benefits of Members of Congress even higher in subsequent years.

Under existing law civil service retirement benefits are computed on the basis of the highest 5-year average salary. Under H.R. 16903 future benefits for Congress would be computed on the basis of the highest salary in effect at the end of retirement, which could be the salary of only 1 year or conceivably 1 month or even less.

It is true that under this bill the contributions by the Members would be raised from 7½ to 10 percent, but this increase does not offset the increased benefits.

The actuaries of the retirement division estimate that the minimum projected cost of this bill would be $14 million. The civil service retirement fund as of June 30, 1968, will have an unfunded liability of over $52 billion, and it should not be further jeopardized.

It has been rumored that rather than pass H.R. 16903, this provision may be attached as an amendment to some previously approved Senate bill, whereby it could conceivably go direct to conference without an opportunity for additional Senate committee consideration.

Foreseeing the possibility of this development I am today writing the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee urging that should such a procedure develop, our conferees reject this amendment.

If and when this proposal does reach the Senate floor it will meet a determined opposition. I am today advising the Senate leadership of my opposition to this proposal and filing a request that I be notified in advance of its consideration, whether it be in the form of a separate bill or as a part of the conference report.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 4, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 3, 1968:

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

George C. Trevorrow, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for a term expiring July 15, 1973 (reappointment).

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grades as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Bruce Palmer, Jr., O20117, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. John Edward Kelly, O20156, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Richard Giles Stilwell, O21065, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Walter Thomas Kerwin, Jr., O21963, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Donald Vivian Bennett, O23001, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Robert Howard York, O21341, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3692.

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grades as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Berton Everett Spivy, Jr., O19479, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. William Pelham Yarborough, O20362, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. John Jarvis Tolson, III, O20826, U.S. Army.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, June 3, 1968*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

My Father worketh hitherto and I work.—John 5: 17.

Our Heavenly Father, returning from the memorial recess we come again to face the unending struggle to preserve and to promote the freedom which is the fruit of the faith of our fathers and which, we pray, will always be our faith.

As we share our lives in the creative endeavor to keep our country great in peace, great in war, and great in the hearts of our countrymen, may we labor diligently using all our hearts, all our heads, and all our hands. To this end strengthen Thou our hands, make serene our hearts, and put wise thoughts in our heads that our work may be well done and we may continue to be workers with Thee for good in Thy world.

O Thou who dost the vision send
And givest each his task,
And with the task sufficient strength;
Show us Thy will, we ask;
Give us a conscience bold and good;
Give us a purpose true,
That it may be our highest joy,
Our Father's work to do.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 29, 1968, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 16913. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 16913) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr.

STENNIS, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. MUNDT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill, joint and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 444. An act to establish the Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area in the States of Utah and Wyoming, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution regarding the status of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

S.J. Res. 175. Joint resolution to suspend for the 1968 campaign the equal-time requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for nominees for the offices of President and Vice President; and

S. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution creating a Joint Committee on Arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice President-elect on January 20, 1969.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to take action to insure the United States will derive maximum benefits from an expanded and intensified effort to increase the accuracy and extend the time range of weather predictions.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11308) entitled "An act to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965."

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

HOOD RIVER COUNTY, OREG.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3165) for the relief of Hood River County, Oreg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3165

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Hood River County, Oregon, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $84,-841.36 representing an amount owed by such county to the United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, for alleged timber trespass arising out of timber sales from the land described in section 2 of this Act during the period 1946 through 1961. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey, by quitclaim deed, and without monetary consideration, and within ninety days after the date on which this Act is approved, to Hood River County, Oregon, all right, title, and interest which the United States may have in and to one hundred and sixty acres of land, more or less, located in Hood River County which land is more fully described as the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter and the north half of the northwest quarter and the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 9, township 1 south, range 8 east, of the Willamette Meridian.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hood River County, Oregon, a sum of money, which shall be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture as provided in subsection (b) of this section, in full settlement of all its claims against the United States for the sale of timber by the United States Forest Service from the land described in section 2 of this Act.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture shall determine and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury a sum of money which equals the revenue received by the United States from any sale of timber made by the United States Forest Service after January 1, 1964, from the land described in section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 4. No part of the amount appropriated in section 3 of this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That Hood River County, Oreg., is relieved of all liability to the United States for any amounts owed by such county to the United States for amounts claimed by the U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, for alleged timber trespass arising out of timber sales during the period 1946 through 1961, inclusive, from the land described as follows:

"One hundred and sixty acres of land, more or less, located in Hood River County which land is more fully described as the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter and the north half of the northwest quarter and the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 9, township 1 south, range 8 east, of the Willamette Meridian."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN E. FOGARTY FEDERAL BUILDING

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 16629) to name the U.S. customhouse, Providence, Rhode Island, the "John E. Fogarty Building."

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 16629

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States customhouse, Providence, Rhode Island, shall, from and after the date of enactment of this Act, be known and designated as the "John E. Fogarty Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such United States customhouse shall be held to be a reference to the "John E. Fogarty Building".

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, insert "Federal" after "Fogarty".

On page 1, line 9, insert "Federal" after "Fogarty".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to name the United States customhouse, Providence, Rhode Island, the 'John E. Fogarty Federal Building'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 16629, sponsored by our distinguished friend and colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. TIERNAN] provides that the U.S. customhouse building in Providnce, R.I., be named the "John E. Fogarty Federal Building" in honor of our distinguished and beloved colleague, the late John E. Fogarty.

This was the building in which John Fogarty had his office for so many years as a Representative in Congress. He was elected to the 77th and 78th Congresses and served from January 31, 1941, until his resignation on December 7, 1944, to enlist in the U.S. Navy. He was reelected to the 79th and to the 11 succeeding Congresses, serving from January 3, 1945, until his death on January 10, 1967, when he suffered a severe heart attack and died in his congressional office while waiting to go on the floor to be sworn in for a new term in the House of Representatives.

John, a great American and public servant, established one of the great records in the history of the Congress, first as a member and then as a subcommittee chairman on the Committee on Appropriations. It is impossible to evaluate the impact of John Fogarty on the cause closest to him—the support of medical research. The National Institutes of Health is today the world's most powerful and influential force for the support and conduct of medical research due in large measure to the hard work and perseverance of John E. Fogarty, who fought so well and so long for the programs it carries on. Thus, his work in the Congress is a contribution not only to the lives of all Americans but all who are beneficiaries of medical advances throughout the world. His dedication, efforts, and foresight for the betterment of the health of people throughout the world for today and future generations stand as a memorial to our beloved John E. Fogarty, who leaves a better world for his having been in it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 3363) to designate the U.S. Customs House Building in Providence, R.I., as the "John E. Fogarty Federal Building," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3363

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States Customs House Building in Providence, Rhode Island, is hereby designated as the "John E. Fogarty Federal Building" in memory of the late John E. Fogarty, a distinguished Member of the United States House of Representatives from the State of Rhode Island from 1945 through 1967. Any reference to such building in any law, regulation, document, record, map, or other paper of the United States shall be deemed a reference to such building as the "John E. Fogarty Federal Building".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAY

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAY: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 3363 and insert the provision of H.R. 16629, as passed, as follows:

"That the United States customhouse, Providence, Rhode Island, shall, from and after the date of enactment of this Act, be known and designated as the 'John E. Fogarty Federal Building'. Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such United States customhouse shall be held to be a reference to the 'John E. Fogarty Federal Building'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 16629) was laid on the table.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. TIERNAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on behalf of my bill H.R. 16629 which provides that the U.S. customhouse in Providence, R.I., be designated as the "John E. Fogarty Federal Building."

John Fogarty served in this Chamber for 26 years, half his lifespan. He was an uncomplicated man who from the beginning of his public life held an unshakable faith in the democratic belief that ordinary and unadorned men could govern themselves far better than a monarch or a ruling elite. It seems to me that he had the people most on his mind when he turned down a golden opportunity to be elected to the Senate in 1960. His humanitarian record attests to his success in helping to enrich and improve the life of all people, particularly in the field of health and medical resources.

John had his Rhode Island office in the U.S. customhouse building for over 22 years. The building became a part of him and in some way gained from its most famous occupant an added look of strength and character.

The renaming of this building in honor of John E. Fogarty will continue to remind all of us in Rhode Island of the great legacy he left for all Americans. On behalf of the family of Congressman Fogarty and the Rhode Island congressional delegation, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], and the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], and all the members of the committee for their prompt consideration and support of this legislation.

SALARY STEP ADJUSTMENTS FOR EMPLOYEES MOVING TO AND FROM DIFFERENT PAY SYSTEMS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15395) to provide salary step advancements and adjustments for employees moving to and from different pay systems, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 15395

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 5334 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsection (d), (e), and (f) respectively; and

(2) by inserting immediately following subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) An employee who, without break in service of one workday or more—

"(1) moves from a position to which this subchapter does not apply to a position to which this subchapter applies in a grade the minimum rate of which exceeds the minimum rate of the pay range from which he moves by at least the sum of two step-increases in that pay range; or

"(2) together with his position is brought under this subchapter and chapter 51 of this title, with the position being placed in a grade the minimum rate of which exceeds the minimum rate of the pay range from which he moves by at least the sum of two step-increases in that pay range;

is entitled to basic pay at the lowest rate of the grade to which he moves under subparagraph (1) or (2) of this subsection which exceeds his rate of pay immediately before his move under either of such subparagraphs by at least the sum of two step-increases in the pay range from which he moves. If there is no rate in the grade to which he moves under either of such subparagraphs which is at least the sum of two such step-increases above his rate of pay immediately before his move under either of such subparagraphs, he is entitled to—

"(A) the maximum rate of the grade to which he moves, or

"(B) a rate of basic pay equal to his rate of pay immediately before his move, if the latter rate is the higher.".

(b) Subsection (e) of such section 5334 (which, prior to the redesignations made by subsection (a) of this section, was subsection (d) of such section 5334) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the first sentence thereof the following: "and is not entitled to a higher rate of basic pay under subsection (c) of this section".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 3551(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Postmaster General may appoint any person who has been employed in a civilian capacity in any branch of the United States Government or the government of the District of Columbia to any position in the postal field service and may place him in any step of the appropriate salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule which is less than one full step above the highest basic salary which he received from the United States or the District of Columbia, unless the provisions of subsection (d) of this section are applicable.".

(b) Section 3551 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in this section or section 3559 of this title, the Postmaster General may—

"(1) effect the move, without break in service of one workday or more, of an officer or employee from a position in the departmental service, or an officer or employee from a position in another department or agency in any branch of the United States Government or the government of the District of Columbia, to a position in a salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule the minimum rate of which exceeds the minimum rate of the pay range from which the officer or employee is moved by at least the sum of two step-increases in that pay range; and

"(2) effect the move, without break in service of one workday or more, of an officer or employee in the departmental service, or an officer or employee of another department or agency in any branch of the United States Government or the government of the District of Columbia, together with his position, to the postal field service, and place such position in a salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule the minimum rate of which exceeds the minimum rate of the pay range from which the officer or employee is moved by at least the sum of two step-increases in that pay range. An officer or employee who becomes subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule pursuant to subparagraph (1) or (2) of this subsection is entitled to basic compensation at the lowest rate of the salary level in which he is placed pursuant to such subparagraph which exceeds his rate of pay immediately before his move under such subparagraph by at least the sum of two step-increases in the pay range from which he is moved. If there is no rate in the salary level in which he is placed pursuant to such subparagraph which is at least the sum of two such step-increases above his rate of pay immediately before his move under such subparagraph, he is entitled to—

"(A) the maximum rate of the salary level in which he is placed, or

"(B) a rate of basic compensation equal to his rate of pay immediately before his move, if the latter rate is the higher.".

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, strike out line 10 and all that follows down through the second period in line 16 on page 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 3551(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The Postmaster General may appoint any person who has been employed in a civilian capacity in any branch of the United States Government or the government of the District of Columbia to any position in the postal field service and may place him in any step of the appropriate salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule which is less than one full step above the highest basic salary which he received from the United States or the District of Columbia.'

"(b) Section 3551 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(d) The Postmaster General may, in lieu of exercising his authority under any other provision of this section in any particular case—

"'(1) effect the move, without break in service of one workday or more, of an officer or employee from a position in the departmental service, or an officer or employee from a position in another department or agency in any branch of the U.S. Government or the government of the District of Columbia, to a position in a salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule the minimum rate of which exceeds the minimum rate of the pay range from which the officer or employee is moved by at least the sum of two step-increases in that pay range; and

"'(2) effect the move, without break in service of one workday or more, of an officer or employee in the departmental service, or an officer or employee of another department or agency in any branch of the U.S. Government or the government of the District of Columbia, together with his position, to the postal field service, and place such position in a salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule the minimum rate of which exceeds the minimum rate of the pay range from which the officer or employee is moved by at least the sum of two step-increases in that pay range.

An officer or employee who becomes subject to the postal field service schedule pursuant to subparagraph (1) or (2) of this subsection is entitled to basic compensation at the lowest rate of the salary level in which he is placed pursuant to such subparagraph which exceeds his rate of pay immediately before his move under such subparagraph by at least the sum of two step increases in the pay range from which he is moved. If there is no rate in the salary level in which he is placed pursuant to such subparagraph which is at least the sum of two such step increases above his rate of pay immediately before his move under such subparagraph, he is entitled to—

"'(A) the maximum rate of the salary level in which he is placed, or

"'(B) a rate of basic compensation equal to his rate of pay immediately before his move, if the latter rate is the higher.

"'(e) In the administration and operation of subsection (d) of this section—

"'(1) subparagraph (1) of such subsection does not authorize the move of any officer or employee to—

"'(A) any position subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule, the duties, responsibilities, and work requirements of which substantially involve the actual performance of—

"'(i) the collection, separation, distribution, processing, dispatch, transporting, or delivery of mail,

"'(ii) postal services at a public window of a post office, or

"'(iii) first-level supervision of employees performing duties, responsibilities, and work requirements covered by clause (i) or (ii) above, and

"'(B) any other position in a post office, unless the Postmaster General determines that no qualified employee in the postal field service serving under a career appointment at that post office is available for, and willing to accept, appointment to the position concerned; and

"'(2) subparagraph (2) of such subsection does not authorize the move of an officer or employee, together with his position, to a post office, unless the Postmaster General determines that no qualified employee in the postal field service serving under a career appointment at that post office is available for, and willing to accept, appointment to the needed position having the duties, responsibilities, and work requirements concerned.'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

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

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

There was no objection.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN VESSELS FROM COAST GUARD REQUIREMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13366) to exempt certain vessels engaged in the fishing industry from the requirements of certain laws.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13366

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4426 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (46 U.S.C. 404) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "As used herein, the phrase 'engaged in fishing as a regular business' includes cannery tender or fishing tender vessels of not more than five hundred gross tons which are engaged exclusively in (1) the carriage of cargo to or from vessels in the fishery or a facility used or to be used in the processing or assembling of fishery products, or (2) the transportation of cannery or fishing personnel to or from operating locations."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of August 27, 1935 (46 U.S.C. 88), is amended by designating the existing section as subsection (a) and by adding a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) All cannery tender or fishing tender vessels of not more than five hundred gross tons except those constructed after the effective date of this subsection or those converted to either of such services after five years from the effective date of this subsection are exempt from the requirements of this Act."

SEC. 3. The first proviso of section 1 of the Act of June 20, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 367), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "As used herein, the phrase 'any vessel engaged in the fishing, oystering, clamming, crabbing, or any other branch of the fishery or kelp or sponge industries' includes cannery tender or fishing tender vessels of not more than five hundred gross tons which are engaged exclusively in (1) the carriage of cargo to or from vessels in the fishery or a facility used or to be used in the processing or assembling of fishery products, or (2) the transportation of cannery or fishery personnel to or from operating locations."

SEC. 4. The first subparagraph of section 4417a of the Revised Statutes of the United States (46 U.S.C. 391a(1)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "Notwithstanding the first sentence hereof, cannery tenders, fishing tenders or fishing vessels of not more than five hundred gross tons when engaged exclusively in the fishing industry shall be allowed to have on board inflammable or combustible cargo in bulk to the extent and upon conditions as may be required by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating."

SEC. 5. This Act is effective upon enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu there of the following:

"That section 4426 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (46 U.S.C. 404) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentences: 'As used herein, the phrase "engaged in fishing as a regular business" includes cannery tender or fishing tender vessels of not more than five hundred gross tons used in the salmon or crab fisheries of the States of Oregon, Washington, and Alaska which are engaged exclusively in (1) the carriage of cargo to or from vessels in the fishery or a facility used or to be used in the processing or assembling of fishery products, or (2) the transportation of cannery of fishing personnel to or from operating locations. The exemption of the foregoing sentence for cannery tender or fishing tender vessels shall continue in force for five years from the effective date of this amendment.'

"SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of August 27, 1935 (46 U.S.C. 88), is amended by designating the existing section as subsection (a) and by adding a new subsection (b) as follows:

"'(b) All cannery tender or fishing tender vessels of not more than five hundred gross tons used in the salmon or crab fisheries of the States of Oregon, Washington, and Alaska except those constructed after the effective date of this subsection or those converted to either of such services after five years from the effective date of this subsection are exempt from the requirements of this Act.'

"SEC. 3. The first proviso of section 1 of the Act of June 20, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 367), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentences: 'As used herein, the phrase "any vessel engaged in the fishing, oystering, clamming, crabbing, or any other branch of the fishery or kelp or sponge industries" including cannery tender or fishing tender vessels of not more than five hundred gross tons used in the salmon or crab fisheries of the States of Oregon, Washington, and Alaska which are engaged exclusively in (1) the carriage of cargo to or from vessels in the fishery or a facility used or to be used in the processing or assembling of fishery products, and (2) the transportation of cannery or fishing personnel to or from operating locations. The exemption of the foregoing sentence for cannery tender or fishing tender vessels shall continue in force for five years from the effective date of this amendment.'

"SEC. 4. The first subparagraph of section 4417a of the Revised Statutes of the United States (46 U.S.C. 391a(1)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: 'Notwithstanding the first sentence hereof, cannery tenders, fishing tenders or fishing vessels of not more than five hundred gross tons used in the salmon or crab fisheries of the States of Oregon, Washington, and Alaska when engaged exclusively in the fishing industry shall be allowed to have on board inflammable or combustible cargo in bulk to the extent and upon conditions as may be required by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be discharged from further consideration

of the bill S. 2047 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2047

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4426 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (46 U.S.C. 404) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "As used herein, the phrase 'engaged in fishing as a regular business' includes cannery tender or fishing tender vessels of not more than five hundred gross tons which are engaged exclusively in (1) the carriage of cargo to or from vessels in the fishery or a facility used or to be used in the processing or assembling of fishery products, or (2) the transportation of cannery or fishing personnel to or from operating locations."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of August 27, 1935 (46 U.S.C. 88), is amended by designating the existing section as subsection (a) and by adding a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) All cannery tender or fishing tender vessels of not more than five hundred gross tons except those constructed after the effective date of this subsection or those converted to either of such services after five years from the effective date of this subsection are exempt from the requirements of this Act."

SEC. 3. The first proviso of section 1 of the Act of June 20, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 367), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "As used herein, the phrase 'any vessel engaged in the fishing, oystering, clamming, crabbing, or any other branch of the fishery or kelp or sponge industries' includes cannery tender or fishing tender vessels of not more than five hundred gross tons which are engaged exclusively in (1) the carriage of cargo to or from vessels in the fishery or a facility used or to be used in the processing or assembling of fishery products, or (2) the transportation of cannery or fishing personnel to or from operating locations."

SEC. 4. The first subparagraph of section 4417a of the Revised Statutes of the United States (46 U.S.C. 391a(1)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "Notwithstanding the first sentence hereof, cannery tenders, fishing tenders or fishing vessels of not more than five hundred gross tons when engaged exclusively in the fishing industry shall be allowed to have on board inflammable or combustible cargo in bulk to the extent and upon conditions as may be required by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating."

SEC. 5. This Act is effective upon enactment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARMATZ

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARMATZ: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2047 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 13366, as passed, as follows:

"That section 4426 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (46 U.S.C. 404) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentences 'As used herein, the phrase "engaged in fishing as a regular business" includes cannery tender or fishing tender vessel of not more than five hundred gross tons used in the salmon or crab fisheries of the States of Oregon, Washington, and Alaska which are engaged exclusively in (1) the carriage of cargo to or from vessels in the fishery or a facility used or to be used in the processing or assembling of fishery products, or (2) the transportation of cannery or fishing personnel to or from operating locations. The exemption of the foregoing sentence for cannery tender or fishing tender vessels shall continue in force for five years from the effective date of this amendment.'

"SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of August 27, 1935 (46 U.S.C. 88), is amended by designating the existing section as subsection (a) and by adding a new subsection (b) as follows:

"'(b) All cannery tender or fishing tender vessels of not more than five hundred gross tons used in the salmon or crab fisheries of the States of Oregon, Washington, and Alaska except those constructed after the effective date of this subsection or those converted to either of such services after five years from the effective date of this subsection are exempt from the requirements of this Act.'

"SEC. 3. The first proviso of section 1 of the Act of June 20, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 367), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentences: 'As used herein, the phrase "any vessel engaged in the fishing, oystering, clamming, crabbing, or any other branch of the fishery or kelp or sponge industries" includes cannery tender or fishing tender vessels of not more than five hundred gross tons used in the salmon or crab fisheries of the States of Oregon, Washington, and Alaska which are engaged exclusively in (1) the carriage of cargo to or from vessels in the fishery or a facility used or to be used in the processing or assembling of fishery products, or (2) the transportation of cannery or fishing personnel to or from operating locations. The exemption of the foregoing sentence for cannery tender or fishing tender vessels shall continue in force for five years from the effective date of this amendment.'

"SEC. 4. The first subparagraph of section 4417a of the Revised Statutes of the United States (46 U.S.C. 391a(1)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: 'Notwithstanding the first sentence hereof, cannery tenders, fishing tenders, or fishing vessels of not more than five hundred gross tons used in the salmon or crab fisheries of the States of Oregon, Washington, and Alaska when engaged exclusively in the fishing industry shall be allowed to have on board inflammable or combustible cargo in bulk to the extent and upon conditions as may be required by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating.' "

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 13366) was laid on the table.

TO REPEAL SECTION 1727 OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO POSTAGE ACCOUNTING

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 17024) to repeal section 1727 of title 18, United States Code, so as to permit prosecution of postal employees for failure to remit postage due collections, under the postal embezzlement statute, section 1711 of title 18, United States Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 17024

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1727 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby repealed; and

(b) The table of contents for chapter 83 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking therefrom

"1727. Postage accounting."

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect in any way any prosecution for any offense occurring prior to the date of enactment of such Act.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 17024. The purpose of this bill is to repeal section 1727 of title 18, United States Code, so as to permit prosecution under section 1711 of title 18 where postal employees have failed to remit their postage-due collections.

At present, when a postal employee fails to remit his postage-due collections, both section 1727 and section 1711 apply. Section 1711 says that a person found guilty of this crime "shall be fined in a sum equal to the amount or value of the money or property embezzled," or shall be "imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both; but if the amount or value thereof does not exceed $100, he shall be fined no more than $1,000 or imprisoned no more than 1 year, or both."

On the other hand, section 1727 says that the person found guilty of the same crime "shall be fined no more than $50."

Thus, the question arises as to which penalty the court might impose. This is a serious question in view of the fact that in some cases as much as $10,000 has been embezzled. Where one statute says that the court may not punish the defendant in excess of a $50 fine, and another statute says that for the same crime the court may not punish the defendant in excess of a 10-year prison sentence and/or a more severe fine, it follows that the only way that the court can obey both statutes is by imposing the lesser penalty. This principle applies in other areas of the law. For example, when a plaintiff seeks to bring a lawsuit, and finds that there are two statutes of limitation that apply, he, of course, must obey them both, the shorter as well as the longer.

Since the courts have followed this principle in postal embezzlement cases, this legislation becomes necessary. By eliminating the lower limitation, the court becomes free to impose the appropriate penalty.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTEREST RATES ON LOANS AND MORTGAGES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14796) to change the provision with respect to the maximum rate of interest permitted on loans and mortgages insured under title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 3017, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Maryland if this limitation or ceiling for interest rates is for all time to come? And if the answer is in the affirmative, will the legislation or committee then reduce the ceiling at a subsequent time should our economy stabilize and interest rates in general decline?

Mr. GARMATZ. I would say the answer is "yes."

Mr. HALL. The answer is "yes" to both questions?

Would it require additional legislation to lower the interest rate subsequently?

Mr. GARMATZ. No. The administration of the Merchant Marine Administration has the right to lower the rates if necessary.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3017

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of American in Congress assembled, That section 1104(a)(5) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(5) shall secure bonds, notes, or other obligations bearing interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance, and service charges, if any) at rates not to exceed such per centum per annum on the principal obligation outstanding as the Secretary of Commerce determines to be reasonable, taking into account the range of interest rates prevailing in the private market for similar loans and the risks assumed by the Department of Commerce;".

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 14796) was laid on the table.

CRAB ORCHARD NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2452) to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge in Illinois.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2452

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the obtaining or retaining of exclusive jurisdiction or any other measure of legislative jurisdiction by the United States over lands or interests therein which have been or shall hereafter be acquired as part of the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge in Illinois shall not be required. The Secretary of the Interior may relinquish to the State of Illinois such measure of legislative jurisdiction as he may deem desirable over any lands or interests in the said refuge that are under his immediate jurisdiction, custody, or control. Such relinquishment of jurisdiction on the part of the United States shall be indicated by filing a notice thereof in such manner as may be prescribed for this purpose by the laws of the State of Illinois, and unless and until a notice is filed in accordance with such State laws, or with the Governor if the laws of such State do not prescribe another manner, it shall be conclusively presumed that no transfer of jurisdiction pursuant to this Act has taken place, nor shall any transfer of legislative jurisdiction pursuant to this Act take place unless and until the State of Illinois has accepted jurisdiction in such manner as its laws may provide. Upon a relinquishment by the United States of all of its legislative jurisdiction over said refuge to the State of Illinois, the State thereafter shall, with respect to such area, exercise the same jurisdiction which it would have had if legislative jurisdiction over such area had never been in the United States.

SEC. 2. Any civil or criminal process, lawfully issued by competent authority of the State of Illinois or political subdivision thereof may be served and executed within any area of the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge under the exclusive, partial, or concurrent jurisdiction of the United States to the same extent and with the same effect as though such area were not subject to the legislative jurisdiction of the United States: *Provided,* That this section shall not be construed to affect the rights of authorized officers of the Federal Government or of any department or agency thereof to issue rules and regulations at any time for the purpose of preventing interference with the carrying out of Federal functions.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. In the interest of good law enforcement and in behalf of convenience for the visitor who enjoys the fine facilities at the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge, this legislation is needed.

Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge—located in the State of Illinois—comprises approximately 43,000 acres of land over which uniform Federal and State jurisdiction does not exist. The northeastern portion of the refuge, consisting of approximately 21,000 acres of land, was formerly administered by the War Department as the Illinois ordnance plant. Exclusive legislative jurisdiction of these lands was accepted by the United States from the State in 1942. Such jurisdiction continues to be vested in the United States and cannot be relinquished except by an act of Congress.

Except for a small area of about 20 acres acquired by the Department of the Army, the remainder of the refuge area, of approximately 21,500 acres in the western half of the refuge, was acquired from 1933 to 1935 by the Resettlement Administration of the Department of Agriculture. The United States has something less than exclusive legislative jurisdiction over this area.

The act of August 5, 1947 (61 Stat. 770) transferred to the Secretary of the Interior—for administration, development, and disposition—the 43,000 acres of land, now known as the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge.

As to land in the exclusive legislative jurisdiction area, only Federal laws are applicable, and criminal laws may be enforced only by Federal authorities and in Federal courts. In the rest of the refuge—as in other refuges and most other federally owned areas—State laws not inconsistent with Federal purposes are applicable and are enforced by State authorities, supplemented by Federal laws and regulations which are enforced by Federal authorities.

Various law-enforcement problems involving both capital offenses and minor crimes have arisen out of the existence of the mixed jurisdiction of this refuge.

Some examples of the problem are: Hunting, fishing, and trapping are permitted on various parts of the refuge by Federal regulations, which in all instances require that the hunter, fisherman, or trapper comply with State laws and regulations, and State licensing requirements. However, State officials lack authority to prosecute violations occurring on the portion of the refuge subject to exclusive jurisdiction.

In 1961, an employee of one of the industries in the area was involved in an automobile accident on the portion of the refuge subject to exclusive legislative jurisdiction. Illinois State police endeavored to prosecute the employee for not having in his possession a motor vehicle operator's license. They were unsuccessful because of lack of jurisdiction.

A motor grader owned by a contractor—who was building a public highway through the portion of the refuge subject to exclusive legislative jurisdiction—was sabotaged in 1958. The State police refused to investigate because the crime occurred on an area subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States. Thus, it was necessary to call in the FBI. Such action could have been avoided had the State possessed legislative jurisdiction over the area.

There would be no additional cost to the Federal Government in the event this legislation is enacted.

In fact, it is estimated by the Department of the Interior that its enactment should result in a savings of time and manpower on the part of refuge personnel and, at times, that of other Federal law-enforcement officers.

I urge passage. Thank you.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZE COOPERATION WITH CENTRAL AMERICAN COUNTRIES TO CONTROL CERTAIN LIVESTOCK DISEASES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 16451) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the several governments of Central America in the prevention, control, and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 16451

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with the several governments of Central America in carrying out operations or measures to prevent or retard, suppress, or control, or to eradicate foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest in Central America where he deems such action necessary to protect the livestock and related industries of the United States. In performing the operations or measures herein authorized, the several governments of Central America shall be responsible for the authority necessary to carry out such operations or measures on all

lands and properties in each nation and for such other facilities and means as in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture are necessary. The measure and character of cooperation carried out under this Act on the part of the United States and on the part of the several governments of Central America, including the expenditure or use of funds appropriated pursuant to this Act, shall be such as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Arrangements for the cooperation authorized by this Act shall be made through and in consultation with the Secretary of State. The authority contained in this Act is in addition to and not in substitution for the authority of existing law.

SEC. 2. For purposes of this Act, funds appropriated pursuant thereto may also be used for the purchase or hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft, for printing and binding without regard to section 87 of the Act of January 12, 1895, or section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U.S.C. 111), and for the employment of civilian nationals of the several nations of Central America.

SEC. 3. The governments of Central America, for the purposes of this Act, mean the governments for those countries located between the Republic of Columbia and the Republic of Mexico.

SEC. 4. In carrying out this Act the Secretary of Agriculture is further authorized to cooperate with other public and private organizations and individuals.

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEASE AND TRANSFER OF CERTAIN TOBACCO ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 17002) to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 17002

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 318 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1318(b)), be amended by changing the second condition to read as follows: "(2) no transfer other than by lease of an allotment or quota from a farm subject to a mortgage or other lien shall be permitted unless the transfer is agreed to by the lienholders;".

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, following "other than by" insert "annual".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR PREPARATION OF A ROLL OF PERSONS OF CALIFORNIA INDIAN DESCENT AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF CERTAIN JUDGMENT FUNDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10911) to provide for preparation of a roll of persons of California Indian descent who are eligible to share in the distribution of certain judgment funds and for a referendum on the compromise settlement in consolidated dockets Nos. 31, 37, 80, 80-D, ond 347, Indian Claims Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to interrogate one of the sponsors of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JOHNSON] reserves the right to object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to have one of the sponsors tell the House how much money will be available for distribution to the Indians of California.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. There will be available as of this time—and of course the interest is accumulating every day—$30.2 million.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. That would be the total amount available for distribution?

Mr. ASPINALL. As of this time, but the interest is accumulating on that amount daily.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. The next question is that if a roll is taken as to the number of Indians entitled to share in this distribution, approximately how many Indians would be involved? What would be the total number that the gentleman would expect to be enrolled?

Mr. ASPINALL. If my colleague will yield once again, the exact number, of course, is not known, but it is some place around 40,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. 40,000? This would mean that each Indian then would get around $700 on this distribution?

Mr. ASPINALL. It would be $700 plus.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Will there be any strings attached to the distribution of this money, or will it be paid out without any strings attached at all?

Mr. ASPINALL. Without any strings attached at all, as far as the per capita payment is concerned.

Of course, there may be some Indians who will not apply for some reason or other, and that amount of money, small though it might be, would remain in the Treasury.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I have another question. Quite a number of Indians have come here to Resurrection City and I have heard them on television and the radio bemoaning the fact of the relatively raw deal that they have received, and so forth.

I have been on this committee for 3 years and it seems that large sums of money, millions of dollars, have been paid out to various Indian tribes.

Will this $29 million or $30 million satisfy the Indians of California, would you say?

Mr. ASPINALL. I would say it would not satisfy all of them. Indians are human just like all other people and it may be some of them will not be satisfied, but so far as this judgment is concerned, or so far as obtaining any judgment under the Indian Claims Commission procedure, this will have to satisfy them. They will have to have somebody, if they are not satisfied, bring another bill to the Congress and that bill will have to stand on its own and it will not be handled through the present Indian Claims Commission procedure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Would it not be better rather than just paying money out promiscuously to them, if you established a family plan distribution like you have in some of the other bills that come before the Congress?

Mr. ASPINALL. On this particular matter the answer, of course is "No." These Indians are scattered. Some do not belong to any bands and others belong to small bands and there is no way at all to supervise such a proposition. We would have done that if it were possible.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. My questions are ones of principle and involve questions of precedents rather than the wisdom of the Indian Claims Commission or the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Will this, perhaps, establish a precedent in distributing land in lieu of now worthless paper money to Indians who have a just claim?

Mr. ASPINALL. I would answer my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, and say it could not establish any precedent. These Indians, as I have suggested, are scattered—40,000 of them—all of them except perhaps 300 or 400 are favorable to this distribution. There is no other way these Indians could receive any kind of like treatment from the Federal Government except through this judgment.

Mr. HALL. But, is there not a provision in this bill, or the amendments thereunto, or in the report, that they may receive land instead of cash money?

Mr. ASPINALL. I know of no provision in this particular bill because this is purely a money bill.

Mr. HALL. This helps my problem. I appreciate the statement and the legislative record made by the distinguished chairman. I had understood that some of the departments were questioning a precedent of land redistribution out of Federal holdings in lieu of cash in part.

Mr. ASPINALL. Not in this particular legislation.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the statement has been made that these Indians will be relatively well satisfied, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10911

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare a roll of persons who apply for inclusion thereon and (i) whose names or the name of an ancestor of whom appears on any of the ap-

proved rolls heretofore prepared pursuant to the Act of May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602) and the amendments thereto or who can establish, to satisfaction of the Secretary, descent from an Indian ancestor who resided in California on June 1, 1852, and (ii) who were born on or before and were living on the effective date of this Act.

(b) The roll so prepared shall indicate, as nearly as possible, the group or groups of Indians of California with which the ancestors of each enrollee were affiliated on June 1, 1852. If the affiliation of any of an enrollee's ancestors on that date is unknown, it shall be presumed to be the same as that of the ancestors whose affiliation is known unless there is sound reason to believe that it was not such.

(c) Application for enrollment shall be filed with the Area Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Sacramento, California, on forms prescribed for that purpose.

SEC. 2. (a) When preparation of the aforesaid roll has been completed and it has been approved by the Secretary, he shall, for the purpose of determining whether a majority of those participating therein are in favor of accepting the $29,100,000 compromise settlement approved by the Indian Claims Commission on July 20, 1964, in its consolidated dockets numbered 31, 37, 80, 80 D, and 347, conduct a referendum of all adult persons whose names appear on the roll except those whose ancestry is derived solely from one or more of the following groups: Northern Paiute, Southern Paiute, Mohave, Quecham (Yuma), Chemehuevi, Shoshone, Washoe, Klamath, Modoc, and Yahooskin Band of Snakes.

(b) Said referendum shall be conducted by sending, by registered or certified mail, a ballot to the last known address of each person entitled to vote in the referendum, which ballot shall be designed to indicate the respondent's approval or disapproval of the compromise settlement referred to in subsection (a) of this section and shall be returnable to the Area Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Sacramento, California, on or before the date thereon specified.

(c) If a majority of the votes validly cast in said referendum in favor of accepting the compromise settlement, the Secretary shall distribute to each person whose name appears on the roll prepared pursuant to the first section of this Act except those whose ancestry is derived solely from one or more of the groups set out in subsection (a) of this section an equal share of the moneys which were appropriated by the Act of October 7, 1964 (78 Stat. 1033; H. Doc. 399, Eighty eighth Congress, p. 10) in satisfaction of the judgment of the Indian Claims Commission hereinbefore referred to plus the interest earned thereon, minus attorneys fees, litigation expenses (including the reimbursement of funds expended under authority of the Acts of August 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 460) and July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 509), a proper share of the costs of roll preparation, and such amounts as may be required to effect the distribution, provided, however, that the costs of conducting the referendum provided herein shall not be a charge against said judgment.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall distribute to each person whose name appears on the roll prepared pursuant to section 1 of this Act an equal share of the undistributed balance of the moneys appropriated in satisfaction of the judgment of the Court of Claims in the case of The Indians of California against United States (102 Court of Claims 837; 59 Stat. 94; House Document 85; Seventy-fifth Congress, page 4), plus the interest earned thereon, minus a proper share of the costs of roll preparation and such amounts as may be necessary to effect the distribution.

SEC. 4. Each share distributable to an enrollee under sections 2 and 3 of this Act shall be paid directly to the enrollee or, if he is deceased at the time of distribution, to his heirs or legatees unless the distributee is under twenty-one years of age or is otherwise under legal disability, in which case such disposition shall be made of the share as the Secretary determines will adequately protect the best interests of the distributee. Funds distributed under the provisions of this Act shall not be subject to Federal or State income taxes.

SEC. 5. The Secretary is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act, which rules and regulations shall include an appropriate deadline for the filing of applications for enrollment under the first section of this Act and for the return of ballots in the referendum for which provision is made in section 2 of this Act. The determinations of the Secretary regarding eligibility for enrollment, the affiliation of an applicant's ancestors, and the shares of the cost of roll preparation to be charged to each of the two funds referred to in sections 2 and 3 of this Act shall be final. Not more than $250,000 in all shall be available under this Act for the costs of roll preparation and of the distribution of shares.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, through page 2, line 4, strike out all of section 1(a) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That (a) the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare a roll of persons of Indian blood who apply for inclusion thereon and (i) whose names or the name of a lineal or collateral relative appears on any of the approved rolls heretofore prepared pursuant to the Act of May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602) and the amendments thereto or (ii) who can establish, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, lineal or collaterial relationship to an Indian who resided in California on June 1, 1852, and (iii) who were born on or before and were living on the effective date of this Act."

On page 2, lines 8, 9, 10, and 11, strike out all of the second sentence of section 1(b) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"If the affiliation of an enrollee's ancestors on that date is unknown, it shall be presumed to be the same as that of the ancestors' relatives whose affiliation is known unless there is sound reason to believe otherwise. Applicants whose ancestry is derived partly from one of the groups named in section 2(b) of this Act and partly from another group of Indians in California shall elect the affiliation to be shown for them on the roll."

On page 2, line 15, through page 4, line 4, strike out all of section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary shall distribute to each person whose name appears on the roll prepared pursuant to the first section of this Act, except those whose ancestry is derived from one or more of the groups named in subsection (b) of this section, an equal share of the moneys which were appropriated by the Act of October 7, 1964 (78 Stat. 1033), in satisfaction of the judgment of the Indian Claims Commission in consolidated dockets numbered 31, 37, 80, 80–D, and 347, plus the interest earned thereon, minus attorney fees, litigation expenses (including the reimbursement of funds expended under authority of the Acts of July 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 348), August 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 460), and July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 512)), a proper share of the costs of roll preparation, and such amounts as may be required to effect the distribution.

"(b) Persons whose ancestry is derived solely from one or more of the following groups and persons of mixed ancestry who elected to share, other than as heirs or legatees of enrollees, in any award granted to any of the following groups shall not share in the funds distributed pursuant to subsection (a) of this section: Northern Paiute, Southern Paiute, Mohave, Quechan (Yuma), Chemehuevi, Shoshone, Washoe, Klamath, Modoc, and Yahooskin Band of Snakes."

On page 4, line 5 through 14, strike out all of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. The Secretary shall distribute to each person whose name appears on the roll prepared pursuant to section 1 of this Act regardless of group affiliation an equal share of the undistributed balance of the moneys appropriated in satisfaction of the judgment of the Court of Claims in the case of The Indians of California against United States (102 Court of Claims 837; 59 Stat. 94), plus the interest earned thereon, including the reimbursed moneys and unexpended balances of the funds established by the Acts of July 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 348, August 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 460), and July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 512)), minus a proper share of the costs of roll preparation and such amounts as may be necessary to effect the distribution."

On page 4, line 18, strike out "legates" and insert "legatees".

On page 5, lines 4 and 5, strike out "Act and for the return of ballots in the referendum for which provision is made in section 2 of this".

On page 5, line 10, strike out "$250,000," and insert "$325,000".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for preparation of a roll of persons of California Indian descent and the distribution of certain judgment funds.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide for the distribution among the Indians of California of the balances of two claims judgments recovered by them. One is a judgment awarded by the Indian Claims Commission in 1964. The other is a judgment awarded by the Court of Claims in 1944.

This is money that belongs to the Indians. It is not Federal money. The bill involves no cost to the United States.

The 1964 judgment was based on a stipulated agreement between the Indians and the Department of Justice. The judgment was for $29,100,000. It is on deposit in the U.S. Treasury and earns 4 percent interest per year until the money is distributed. After payment of attorney fees and litigation costs, the principal amounted to $26,491,000, and the interest amounted to $3,708,588, making a total of $30,199,588, as of May 23, 1968.

The Indians who are entitled to share in the distribution are the descendants of Indians who were living in California in 1852. This is the date on which the Government took their lands without compensation.

The bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a roll of persons who are eligible to share in the distribution, and to distribute the money in equal shares. The cost of preparing the roll and making the distribution will be paid from

the judgment. This is standard procedure.

A few splinter groups of Indians in California are prosecuting separate claims against the United States. These claims are still pending in the Indian Claims Commission. The splinter groups will retain any judgments they may recover, and will not share in the distribution of this 1964 judgment.

Some individual Indians are dissatisfied with the amount of the $29,100,000 judgment, because they think they should have received more money. They have asked that a referendum be conducted to determine whether a majority are willing to "accept" the judgment. They think that if they vote to reject the judgment the case could be reopened and retried. This would not be possible. The judgment is final. It was based upon a stipulated agreement of the parties, and there is nothing for the Indians to vote on. The bill therefore makes no provision for a referendum. The only thing the bill can do is provide for a distribution of the money now in the Treasury to the credit of the Indians as a group.

The 1944 judgment was for approximately $5,000,000, and most of it has been distributed. As of May 23, 1968, the balance on deposit was $796,616, and the interest was $338,626, making a total of $1,135,243. This sum will be distributed to all Indians on the new roll to be prepared by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I should like to address myself for a few moments to a provision of H.R. 10911 which was not included in the bill as it passed the House today, but which I believe should have been in the bill. As introduced, this bill provided for a referendum of the California Indians to approve the distribution provided by the bill.

We included this in the bill because we felt that we should, at every opportunity, provide the machinery for the beneficiaries of this legislation to exercise their privilege of voting on matters of importance to them.

Unhappily, the subcommittee which heard this measure disagreed with the proposal for a referendum and while I want to make it clear that I am not critical of the subcommittee or of its chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY], I felt and still feel that the referendum provision should have been retained.

After the subcommittee took action on this bill, I took the matter with the full committee and prevailed on my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], to offer an amendment restoring the referendum provision. Regrettably, again we were unsuccessful.

The question which weighed heavily on my mind as we approached the time for action on this bill was whether or not I should take my case to the floor of the House, but as I evaluated the situation I decided that this was a fight which, though worthy of the effort, could not be won. So I decided that I would agree to the bill as it came before the House.

I feel that further action on my part would be futile, and would serve only to further delay the distribution of these funds for which the Indians of California have been waiting so long. The indications we have received through the mail are that the overwhelming majority of the Indians are in favor of this legislation and for that reason, perhaps the referendum would be superfluous.

The action of the House in approving this legislation today does not, of course, prevent further action in future Congresses, but under all of the circumstances, I feel that the bill as it was presented to the House represents the best that can be achieved. The money has been approved. The judgment of the Indian Claims Commission is final and time for all appeals has long since expired. So although I have reservations about the lack of a referendum provision, I am prepared to accept the bill as it is.

LAND TRANSFER TO IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 16065) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States conditions in deeds conveying certain lands to the State of Iowa, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 16065

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (c) of section 32 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1011 (c)), the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to release on behalf of the United States with respect to lands designated pursuant to section 2 hereof, the conditions in those two deeds dated July 29, 1955, conveying lands in the counties of Monroe and Decatur in the State of Iowa to the State of Iowa acting by and through its State board of regents for the use and benefit of the agricultural experiment station of the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, now Iowa State University, which require that the lands so conveyed be used for public purposes and provide for a reversion of such lands to the United States if at any time they cease to be so used.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall release the conditions referred to in the first section of this Act only with respect to lands covered by and described in an agreement or agreements entered into between the Secretary and the university in which the university, in consideration of the release of such conditions as to such lands, agrees—

(1) that all the proceeds from the sale, lease, exchange, or disposition of such lands shall be used by the university for the acquisition of lands to be held for university purposes, or for the development or improvement of any lands so acquired;

(2) that all the proceeds from the sale, lease, or other disposition of lands covered by any such agreement shall be maintained by the university in a separate fund and that the record of all transactions involving such funds shall be open to inspection by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. Upon application, all the undivided mineral interests of the United States in any parcel or tract of land released pursuant to this Act from the conditions as to such lands shall be conveyed to the State of Iowa for the use and benefit of Iowa State University or its successors in title by the Secretary of the Interior. In areas where the Secretary of the Interior determines that there is no active mineral development or leasing, and that the lands have no mineral value, the mineral interests covered by a single application shall be sold for a consideration of $1. In other areas the mineral interests shall be sold at the fair market value thereof as determined by the Secretary of the Interior after taking into consideration such appraisals as he deems necessary or appropriate.

SEC. 4. Each application made under the provisions of section 3 of this Act shall be accompanied by a nonrefundable deposit to be applied to the administrative costs as fixed by the Secretary of the Interior. If the conveyance is made, the applicant shall pay to the Secretary of the Interior the full administrative costs, less the deposit. If a conveyance is not made pursuant to an application filed under this Act, the deposit shall constitute full satisfaction of such administrative costs notwithstanding that the administrative costs exceed the deposit.

SEC. 5. The term "administrative costs" as used in this Act includes, in addition to other items, all costs which the Secretary of the Interior determines are included in a determination of (1) the mineral character of the land in question, and (2) the fair market value of the mineral interest.

SEC. 6. Amounts paid to the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of this Act shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

U.S. COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2634) to amend section 867(a) of title 10, United States Code, in order to establish the Court of Military Appeals as the U.S. Court of Military Appeals under article I of the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask someone about the present terms of the judges now on this court.

Mr. PHILBIN. The judges are appointed for a period of 15 years.

Mr. GROSS. The bill, then, merely restates language already existing—a term of 15 years?

Mr. PHILBIN. That is true.

Mr. GROSS. Where are the court sessions held?

Mr. PHILBIN. The court sessions are held in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. Exclusively in the District of Columbia?

Mr. PHILBIN. Yes. It is the highest appellate court of the military services to which the members of the armed services may appeal, and it has jurisdiction over all matters pertaining to the dispensing of justice to those who are in the armed services.

Mr. GROSS. For what purpose do they travel, then, if the sessions are held in the District of Columbia?

Mr. PHILBIN. The court sits here. You are speaking about those who, like law officers, might be assigned to handle

trials, courts-martial, and so forth, in other places?

As the gentleman knows, there is a judicial body that handles those trials and courts-martial under the code. The court referred to in the bill is an appellate court, such as the U.S. Court of Appeals.

Mr. GROSS. But the members of the court do not travel as do judges within a certain specified circuit?

Mr. PHILBIN. No, they do not travel. They are here in Washington as an appellate court dealing with final appeals.

Mr. GROSS. I do notice in the bill that provision is made for travel allowances.

Mr. PHILBIN. They have normal traveling allowances.

Mr. GROSS. But they do not travel?

Mr. PHILBIN. Well, they travel in a limited way. I do not believe they have extensive travel, or need extensive travel allowances. I believe they would be limited to attendance at meetings of the Judicial Council and/or the Bar Association, and similar professional meetings.

Mr. GROSS. They would be limited to what?

Mr. PHILBIN. To attendance before the judicial council, and possibly some official conventions at which judges would be expected to appear to discuss matters of interest to judges. Under Article 67 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, they meet annually with the Judge Advocates General to make a comprehensive survey of military justice operations.

According to the information I have, that would be very limited, and also involves a limited allowance. Not much expenditure for that purpose is anticipated.

Mr. GROSS. Would this bill give members of this court retirement benefits that they do not presently enjoy?

Mr. PHILBIN. They have always had retirement benefits.

Mr. GROSS. They already have them?

Mr. PHILBIN. They have. This bill would permit a retired judge to be called back on the authority of the chief judge to help work on the backlog of cases that they now have, and in that way help to dispose of the backlog that exists at the present time. That is about all the bill does.

Mr. GROSS. It does not change retirement benefits in any way?

Mr. PHILBIN. No, it does not change retirement benefits in any way, I may say to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. These judges enjoy the same benefits as do the Federal circuit and district judges?

Mr. PHILBIN. No, the judge would come back and serve during this interim period. He is already on retirement and receiving retirement benefits, but would be getting no additional salary or emoluments of any kind as a result of his service.

Mr. GROSS. I am not talking about those who are retired. I am talking about provisions for retirement for those now active.

Do these military appeal judges have the same retirement benefits as do the district and circuit judges?

Mr. PHILBIN. No, they have less than the regular retirement benefits that the other members of the judiciary have.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, do they make a contribution to any retirement fund?

Mr. PHILBIN. They have less than the regular benefits that are received by other members of the Federal judiciary. They make contributions to the Federal civil service retirement fund.

Mr. GROSS. They have 15-year terms?

Mr. PHILBIN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Because the other body has refused to approve legislation giving them permanent appointments; is that correct?

Mr. PHILBIN. There was some bill pending here a few years ago to give them life tenure, but it was not passed by the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, S. 2634 is a bill that will permit retired members of the Court of Military Appeals to return at the request of the chief judge to help with the work of the court. In order to give such judges the necessary assistance each retired judge who is serving may have an assistant in a grade of not more than GS–9. With only three judges on the court there is not enough flexibility in the staff to provide a retired judge who is recalled with the necessary help. The chief judge will be responsible for the work of the assistant and when his services are no longer needed the chief judge will terminate them.

The workload of the court has increased from an average of 60 cases a month to 76 cases a month in the past year and a quarter. The current estimates are that this load will increase 25 percent more. This bill which the Senate has approved now will provide the extra flexibility which may be needed in the court. The price of this flexibility is only the price of one GS–9 or $9,000 a year per judge. I think this is reasonable and fair.

One of the other purposes of the bill is to make it abundantly clear in the law that the Court of Military Appeals is a court although it is a court established under article I of the Constitution.

The Court of Military Appeals is the highest court to which boys in our armed services can appeal to get justice.

At present it is running behind because of the very heavy workload being imposed upon it due to the war and increased military personnel.

It is estimated that there will be a 25-percent increase in the work of this court by the end of the year.

This bill will authorize the chief judge of the court to call back one retired judge to help clear up the growing backlog of work.

The retired judge will not receive compensation above his retirement benefits and the only cost to the Government will be for a law assistant for the judge at a GS–9 rate with a salary of $9,000 a year whose services will be terminated when there is no longer need for his work.

Our boys in the service are making great sacrifices for the country and for us. We owe them a great debt, and the least we can do for them is to assure them of prompt, speedy justice when their cases are before this military court of last resort.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2634

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 867(a) (article 67(a)) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) There is a United States Court of Military Appeals established under article I of the Constitution of the United States and located for administrative purposes only in the Department of Defense. The court consists of three judges appointed from civil life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of fifteen years. The terms of office of all successors of the judges serving on the effective date of this Act shall expire fifteen years after the expiration of the terms for which their predecessors were appointed, but any judge appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of his predecessor. Not more than two of the judges of the court may be appointed from the same political party, nor is any person eligible for appointment to the court who is not a member of the bar of a Federal court or the highest court of a State. Each judge is entitled to the same salary and travel allowances as are, and from time to time may be, provided for judges of the United States Court of Appeals, and is eligible for reappointment. The President shall designate from time to time one of the judges to act as chief judge. The chief judge of the court shall have precedence and preside at any session which he attends. The other judges shall have precedence and preside according to the seniority of their commissions. Judges whose commissions bear the same date shall have precedence according to seniority in age. The court may prescribe its own rules of procedure and determine the number of judges required to constitute a quorum. A vacancy in the court does not impair the right of the remaining judges to exercise the powers of the court.

"(2) Judges of the United States Court of Military Appeals may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, or for mental or physical disability, but for no other cause.

"(3) If a judge of the United States Court of Military Appeals is temporarily unable to perform his duties because of illness or other disability, the President may designate a judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to fill the office for the period of disability.

"(4) Any judge of the United States Court of Military Appeals who is receiving retired pay may become a senior judge, may occupy offices in a Federal building, may be provided with a staff assistant whose compensation shall not exceed the rate prescribed for GS–9 in the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, and, with his consent, may be called upon by the chief judge of said court to perform judicial duties with said court for any period or periods specified by such chief judge. A senior judge who is performing judicial duties pursuant to this subsection shall be paid the same compensation (in lieu of retired pay) and allowances for travel and other expenses as a judge."

SEC. 2. The United States Court of Military Appeals established under this Act is a continuation of the Court of Military Appeals as it existed prior to the effective date of this Act, and no loss of rights or powers, interruption or jurisdiction, or prejudice to matters pending in the Court of Military

Appeals before the effective date of this Act shall result. A judge of the Court of Military Appeals so serving on the day before the effective date of this Act shall, for all purposes, be a judge of the United States Court of Military Appeals under this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING THE PARTICIPATION OF LAW OFFICERS IN COURTS-MARTIAL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15971) to increase the participation of law officers and counsel on courts-martial, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 15971

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 47 (Uniform Code of Military Justice) of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 801(10) (article 1(10)) is amended by inserting the words "or special" after the word "general".

(2) Section 816 (article 16) is amended to read as follows:

"§ 816. Art. 16. Courts-martial classified

"The three kinds of courts-martial in each of the armed forces are—

"(1) general courts-martial, consisting of—

"(A) a law officer and not less than five members; or

"(B) only a law officer, if before the court is assembled the accused, knowing the identity of the law officer and after consultation with defense counsel, requests in writing a court composed only of a law officer and the law officer approved and the convening authority consents;

"(2) special courts-martial, consisting of—

"(A) not less than three members; or

"(B) a law officer and not less than three members; or

"(C) only a law officer, under the same conditions as those prescribed in clause (1)(B); and

"(3) summary courts-martial, consisting of one commissioned officer."

(3) Section 818 (article 18) is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "However, a general court-martial of the kind specified in section 816(1)(B) of this title (article 16(1)(B)) may not adjudge the penalty of death."

(4) Section 819 (article 19) is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting the following sentence in place thereof: "A bad-conduct discharge may not be adjudged unless a complete record of the proceedings and testimony has been made and the accused was represented or afforded the opportunity to be represented at the trial by counsel having the qualifications prescribed under section 827(b) of this title (article 27(b)) unless, in time of war, counsel having such qualifications cannot be obtained on account of physical condition or military exigencies, and in such event the convening authority shall make a detailed statement, to be appended to the record, stating why such counsel could not be obtained."

(5) Section 825(c)(1) (article 25(c)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "before the convening of the court," in the first sentence and inserting "before the conclusion of a session called by the law officer under section 839(a) of this title (article 39(a)) prior to trial or, in the absence of such a session, before the court is assembled for the trial of the accused," in place thereof; and

(B) by striking out "convened" in the last sentence and inserting "assembled" in place thereof.

(6) Subchapter V is amended by striking out the following item in the analysis:

"826. 26. Law officer of a general court-martial."

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

"826. 26. Law officer of a general or special court-martial."

(7) The catchline and subsection (a) of section 826 (article 26) are amended to read as follows:

"§ 826. Art. 26. Law officer of a general or special court-martial

"(a) The authority convening a general court-martial shall, and, subject to regulation of the Secretary concerned, the authority convening a special court-martial may, detail as law officer thereof a commissioned officer who is a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State and who is certified to be qualified for that duty by the Judge Advocate General of the armed force of which he is a member. A commissioned officer who is certified to be qualified for duty as a law officer of a general court-martial is also qualified for duty as a law officer of a single-officer or other special court-martial. A commissioned officer who is certified to be qualified for duty as a law officer of a special court-martial is qualified for duty as a law officer of any kind of special court-martial. However, no person may act as a law officer of a single-officer general court-martial unless he is specially certified to be qualified for that duty. No person is eligible to act as law officer in a case if he is the accuser or a witness for the prosecution or has acted as investigating officer or as counsel in the same case."

(8) Section 826(b) (article 26(b)) is amended by striking out the figures "839" and "39" and inserting the figures "839(b)" and "39(b)", respectively, in place thereof.

(9) Section 829 (article 29) is amended—

(A) by striking out "accused has been arraigned" in subsection (a) and inserting "court has been assembled for the trial of the accused" in place thereof;

(B) by inserting ", other than a single-officer general court-martial," after "court-martial" in the first sentence of subsection (b); and by amending the last sentence of subsection (b) to read as follows: "The trial may proceed with the new members present after the recorded evidence previously introduced before the members of the court has been read to the court in the presence of the law officer, the accused, and counsel for both sides.";

(C) by inserting ", other than a single-officer special court-martial," after "court-martial" in the first sentence of subsection (c); and by amending the last sentence of subsection (c) to read as follows: "The trial shall proceed with the new members present as if no evidence had previously been introduced at the trial, unless a verbatim record of the evidence previously introduced before the members of the court or a stipulation thereof is read to the court in the presence of the law officer, if any, the accused and counsel for both sides,"; and

(D) by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) If the law officer of a single-officer court-martial is unable to proceed with the trial because of physical disability, as a result of a challenge, or for other good cause, the trial shall proceed, subject to any applicable conditions of section 816 (1)(B) or (2)(C) of this title (article 16 (1)(B) or (2)(C)), after the detail of a new law officer as if no evidence had previously been introduced, unless a verbatim record of the evidence previously introduced or a stipulation thereof is read in court in the presence of the new law officer, the accused, and counsel for both sides."

(10) Section 835 (article 35) is amended by striking out the second sentence and inserting the following in place thereof: "In time of peace no person may, against his objection, be brought to trial, or be required to participate by himself or counsel in a session called by the law officer under section 839(a) of this title (article 39(a)), in a general court-martial case within a period of five days after the service of charges upon him, or in a special court-martial case within a period of three days after the service of charges upon him."

(11) Section 838(b) (article 38(b)) is amended by striking out the words "president of the court" in the last sentence and inserting the words "law officer or by the president of a court-martial without a law officer" in place thereof.

(12) Section 839 (article 39) is amended to read as follows:

"§ 839. Art. 39. Sessions

"(a) At any time after the service of charges have been referred for trial to a court-martial composed of a law officer and members, the law officer may, subject to section 835 of this title (article 35), call the court into session without the presence of the members for the purpose of—

"(1) hearing and determining motions raising defenses or objections which are capable of determination without trial of the issues raised by a plea of not guilty;

"(2) hearing and ruling upon any matter which may be ruled upon by the law officer under this chapter, whether or not the matter is appropriate for later consideration or decision by the members of the court;

"(3) if permitted by regulations of the Secretary concerned, holding the arraignment and receiving the pleas of the accused; and

"(4) performing any other procedural function which may be performed by the law officer under this chapter or under rules prescribed pursuant to section 836 of this title (article 36) and which does not require the presence of the members of the court. These proceedings shall be conducted in the presence of the accused, the defense counsel, and the trial counsel and shall be made a part of the record.

"(b) When the members of a court-martial deliberate or vote, only the members may be present. After the members of a court-martial which includes a law officer and members have finally voted on the findings, the president of the court may request the law officer and the reporter, if any, to appear before the members to put the findings in proper form, and these proceedings shall be on the record. All other proceedings, including any other consultation of the members of the court with counsel or the law officer, shall be made a part of the record and shall be in the presence of the accused, the defense counsel, the trial counsel, and, in cases in which a law officer has been detailed to the court, the law officer."

(13) Section 840 (article 40) is amended to read as follows:

"§ 840. Art. 40. Continuances

"The law officer or a court-martial without a law officer may, for reasonable cause, grant a continuance to any party for such time, and as often, as may appear to be just."

(14) Section 841(a) (article 41(a)) is amended—

(A) by amending the first sentence to read as follows: "The law officer and members of a general or special court-martial may be challenged by the accused or the trial counsel for cause stated to the court."; and

(B) by striking out the word "court" in the second sentence and inserting the words "law officer, or, if none, the court," in place thereof.

(15) Section 842(a) (article 42(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Before performing their respective duties, law officers, members of general and special courts-martial, trial counsel, assistant trial counsel, defense counsel, assistant defense counsel, reporters, and interpreters shall take an oath to perform their duties faithfully. The form of the oath, the time and place of the taking thereof, the manner of recording the same, and whether the oath shall be taken for all cases in which these duties are to be performed or for a particular case, shall be as prescribed in regulations of the Secretary concerned. These regulations may provide that an oath to perform faithfully duties as a law officer, trial counsel, assistant trial counsel, defense counsel, or assistant defense counsel may be taken at any time by any judge advocate, law specialist, or other person certified to be qualified or competent for the duty, and if such an oath is taken it need not again be taken at the time the judge advocate, law specialist, or other person is detailed to that duty."

(16) Section 845 (article 45) is amended—

(A) by striking out the words "arraigned before a court-martial" in subsection (a) and inserting the words "after arraignment" in place thereof; and

(B) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) A plea of guilty by the accused may not be received to any charge or specification alleging an offense for which the death penalty may be adjudged. With respect to any other charge or specification to which a plea of guilty has been made by the accused and accepted by the law officer or by a court-martial without a law officer, a finding of guilty of the charge or specification may, if permitted by regulations of the Secretary concerned, be entered immediately without vote. This finding shall constitute the finding of the court unless the plea of guilty is withdrawn prior to announcement of the sentence, in which event the proceedings shall continue as though the accused had pleaded not guilty."

(17) Section 849(a) (article 49(a)) is amended by inserting after the word "unless" the words "the law officer or court-martial without a law officer hearing the case or, if the case is not being heard,".

(18) Section 851 (article 51) is amended—

(A) by amending the first sentence of subsection (a) to read as follows: "Voting by members of a general or special court-martial on the findings and on the sentence, and by members of a court-martial without a law officer upon questions of challenge, shall be by secret written ballot.";

(B) by amending the first three sentences of subsection (b) to read as follows: "The law officer and, except for questions of challenge, the president of a court-martial without a law officer shall rule upon all questions of law and all interlocutory questions arising during the proceedings. Any such ruling made by the law officer upon any question of law or any interlocutory question other than the factual issue of mental responsibility of the accused, or by the president of a court-martial without a law officer upon any question of law other than a motion for a finding of not guilty, is final and constitutes the ruling of the court. However, the law officer or the president of a court-martial without a law officer may change his ruling at any time during the trial."

(C) by striking out the words "of a general court-martial and the president of a special court-martial shall, in the presence of the accused and counsel, instruct the court as to the elements of the offense and charge the court" in the first sentence of subsection (c) and inserting the words "and the president of a court-martial without a law officer shall, in the presence of the accused and counsel, instruct the members of the court as to the elements of the offense and charge them" in place thereof; and

(D) by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) Subsections (a), (b), and (c) do not apply to a single-officer court-martial. An officer who is detailed as a single-officer court-martial shall determine all questions of law and fact arising during the proceedings and, if the accused is convicted, adjudge an appropriate sentence. Such single-officer court-martial shall make a general finding and shall in addition on request find the facts specially. If an opinion or memorandum of decision is filed, it will be sufficient if the findings of fact appear therein."

(19) Section 852 (article 52) is amended—

(A) by inserting the words "as provided in section 845(b) of this title (article 45(b)) or" after the word "except" in subsection (a)(2); and

(B) by inserting immediately before the period in the first sentence of subsection (c) the word ", but a determination to reconsider a finding of guilty or to reconsider a sentence, with a view toward decreasing it, may be made by any lesser vote which indicates that the reconsideration is not opposed by the number of votes required for that finding or sentence."

(20) Section 854(a) (article 54(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Each general court-martial shall keep a separate record of the proceedings in each case brought before it, and the record shall be authenticated by the signature of the law officer. If the record cannot be authenticated by the law officer by reason of his death, disability, or absence, it shall be authenticated by the signature of the trial counsel or by that of a member if the trial counsel is unable to authenticate it by reason of his death, disability, or absence. In a court-martial consisting of only a law officer the record shall be authenticated by the court reporter under the same conditions which would impose such a duty on a member under this subsection. If the proceedings have resulted in an acquittal of all charges and specifications or, if not affecting a general or flag officer, in a sentence not including discharge and not in excess of that which may otherwise be adjudged by a special court-martial, the record shall contain such matters as may be prescribed by regulations of the President."

(21)(A) Section 869 (article 69) is amended by adding the following new sentence at the end thereof: "Notwithstanding section 876 of this title (article 76), the findings or sentence, or both, in a court-martial case which has been finally reviewed, but has not been reviewed by a board of review may be vacated or modified in whole or in part, by the Judge Advocate General on the ground of newly discovered evidence, fraud on the court, lack of jurisdiction over the accused or the offense, or error prejudicial to the substantial rights of the accused."

(B) The first sentence of section 873 (article 73) is amended to read as follows: "At any time within two years after approval by the convening authority of a court-martial sentence which has been referred to a board of review the accused may petition the Judge Advocate General for a new trial on grounds of newly discovered evidence or fraud on the court."

SEC. 2. (1) Except for subsection (21) of section 1, this Act becomes effective on the first day of the tenth month following the month in which it is enacted.

(2) Subsection (21)(A) of section 1 becomes effective upon the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) Subsection (21)(B) of section 1 shall apply to all court-martial sentences approved by the convening authority on or after, or not more than two years before, the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, delete lines 18 through 22 and substitute therefor the following:

"(3) Section 818 (article 18) is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof:

'However, a general court-martial of the kind specified in section 816(1)(B) of this title (article 16(1)(B)) shall not have jurisdiction to try any person for any offense for which the death penalty may be adjudged unless the case has been previously referred to trial as a non-capital case.'

On page 3, delete lines 7 through 12 and substitute therefor: "827(b) of this title (article 27(b))."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed primarily to let the law officers in courts-martial assume a larger role in the proceedings. By so doing it is expected that the court-martial proceedings will be able to be conducted more expeditiously with the law officer making necessary preliminary and post-trial decisions. By providing ample opportunity to decide questions of law in advance, the court-martial itself should proceed more expeditiously. This would mean added savings in that the officers called to sit on the courts would not have to spend their time waiting outside while the law officer makes necessary rulings. Most of the rulings will have been made in advance. This will mean that the law officer will then operate in more of a role of a trial judge.

In addition, the accused is given the opportunity of waiving trial by court-martial with the trial to be held by the law officer instead. As the language is now this provision for the waiver of trial by court-martial is as close as possible to the Federal rule of criminal procedure for the waiver of trial by jury.

The bill provides that a special court-martial may not adjudge a bad conduct discharge unless the accused is given the opportunity of being represented by a legally qualified counsel.

The bill also extends from 1 to 2 years the time within which a new trial may be granted in cases reviewed by a board of review. In those cases not reviewed by a board of review—which would generally include those tried by any court-martial not involving a punitive discharge or confinement for 1 year or more—the Judge Advocate General is given broad authority to vacate or modify the findings or sentence because of newly discovered evidence, fraud on the court, lack of jurisdiction, or error prejudicial to the substantial rights of the accused.

I think all of these matters are very decided improvements to our court-martial system.

One of the amendments to the bill would permit the accused to waive trial by a full court-martial and have the trial by the law officer alone, just as the defendant in a regular criminal case can waive trial by jury. On April 8, 1968, the Supreme Court in United States against Jackson found that part of the Federal Kidnaping Act to be unconstitutional that provided for the death penalty by the verdict of the jury. The Supreme Court ruled that this provision interfered with the right to trial by jury, since it put pressure on an accused to waive trial

by jury in order to avoid the death penalty. The first amendment would avoid this problem in connection with the waiver of court-martial by an accused by not allowing waiver where the death penalty is possible.

The second amendment removes an exception so that there always will be legal counsel required to represent an accused where a bad conduct discharge may be adjudged. The bill as originally drafted provided an exception in time of war when the convening authority cannot readily have a lawyer available to represent the accused. By this amendment the exception is deleted and a lawyer must represent the accused at all times if a bad conduct discharge can be adjudged.

These amendments have been cleared with the Judge Advocate General of the Army who has also obtained the consent of the Judge Advocates General of the Navy and the Air Force.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, it has been 18 years since adoption of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, which greatly improved this Nation's system of military justice. This was the outgrowth of the many bitter complaints made by service personnel who had served in the Armed Forces during World War II and against the manner of administering a system of military justice which had changed little since the Revolutionary War.

The first major revision of the Uniform Code of Military Justice was suggested in 1953, when the code committee, composed of the Judge Advocates General of the Armed Forces and the judges of the Court of Military Appeals, proposed 17 changes. Since then the code committee has continued to recommend necessary changes, and it has sought enactment of two specific measures I have sponsored in the House.

The bill which is before us at this time, H.R. 15971, is a culmination, but not a conclusion, of these many years of effort to modernize and revamp our system of military justice. Not only has the bill received the endorsement of the code committee, but it is also supported by such organizations as the American Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association, the Florida Bar, Brooklyn Bar Association, the State Bar of Georgia, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, New York County Lawyers Association, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Veterans of World War I of the United States, and the Committee on Military Justice of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

As noted in the committee report on this bill, the Department of Defense favors and urges its passage, and I am glad that the committee unanimously recommends its enactment.

I look on H.R. 15971 as on the first of many revisions that will now be made in the Uniform Code of Military Justice. I feel it is a good first step. Many revisions have been proposed which are not included in this present bill, and I want to point out that many of the proposals are in my omnibus bill H.R. 226, which I introduced on the first day of this Congress. I am hopeful the committee will be able to consider further appropriate and necessary revisions early next year.

The enactment of H.R. 15971 will permit the procedure for trials by special and general courts-martial to conform more closely with the procedure used in the United States District Courts in the trial of criminal cases. The bill will enhance the effectiveness and prestige of the law officer, and his role will more closely approximate that of a civilian trial judge.

An outstanding provision provides for attorneys for the accused in all cases where a bad conduct discharge can be awarded, which brings the military procedures more nearly in line with recent civilian court procedural changes.

The need for passage of this legislation came in part from a series of decisions by the United States Court of Military Appeals which expanded the role of the law officer and increased his responsibilities. But under present law the law officer is hampered by provisions which it is felt unnecessarily limit his authority to perform judicial functions which are customary and essential. An example of this can be seen in the fact that a law officer presently cannot pass on challenges for cause even though the reasons for the challenges may affect all members of the court. The Court of Military Appeals has asserted that under the circumstances it would be preferable if such challenges for cause were passed on by the law officer rather than the members of the court.

Maj. Gen. Kenneth J. Hodson, the Judge Advocate General of the Army, who represented the Department of Defense before the House Armed Services Committee, advised us that:

> The desirability of procedural and substantive changes contained in this legislation has become clearly evident in the conduct of criminal trials under the present rules, which have proved somewhat unwieldy and cumbersome when applied to the present day concepts of the distinction between the role of the law officer and that of the court-martial members.

As far as cost is concerned, the Department of Defense has told us enactment of H.R. 15971 will cause no apparent increase in the budgetary requirements of the various services in implementing it, and actually the legislation may save the Government money since it streamlines procedures and eliminates much time that is now wasted when, under present law, the full court is convened and then dismissed to wait outside—sometimes for a considerable period—before simple matters that under this legislation will now be attended to by only a law officer.

The support for this legislation has been almost unanimous from every quarter, and the need for its enactment is apparent. I urge my colleagues of the House to vote for the passage of H.R. 15971.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

ARMS TO JORDAN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it was most disturbing to read in the press last Friday that the United States is quietly rearming Jordan to her military capability level of last June and rearming her with U.S. jet fighters and other military equipment.

As we approach the first anniversary of the 6-day war, it is the height of folly for the United States to be rearming Jordan, a nation which only 1 year ago used U.S. armaments to attack Israel and since then has engaged in innumerable terroristic attacks on Israel. That outbreak of war 1 year ago should have exploded the theory that American arms shipments extend American influence to restrain the Arab States. That mistake must not be repeated.

I have sent a telegram to Secretary of State Rusk again stating my opposition to the decision to rearm Jordan.

The telegram is as follows:

MAY 31, 1968.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

I am strongly opposed to apparent U.S. policy of rearming Jordan to capability level of last June, as reported in the press. U.S. arms were used in Jordan's attack on Israel. Increased Arab strength only increases risk of future attacks. I call on you to cease arms shipments to Jordan.

WILLIAM F. RYAN,
Member of Congress.

VOTING RIGHTS FOR 18-YEAR-OLDS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, last week the President of the United States endorsed the proposal for 18-year-olds to have voting rights throughout the entire Nation. We in Georgia have provided this right for 18-19-, and 20-year-olds for more than two decades. Probably, I am the one Member of the House of Representatives who voted earliest under this measure, for in 1944 at the age of 19 I voted for a President of the United States, as well as local and State officeholders.

Earlier, I introduced a joint resolution—House Joint Resolution 977—a proposed constitutional amendment to extend this right to all persons throughout the United States at the age of 18.

I commend the President for this forward-looking and farsighted approach to extend voting rights to 18-year-olds. Personally, I can stand before this body and say that I took a greater interest in civic affairs and in political affairs during my senior year in high school and as an 18-year-old because I knew full well

and I would be able to take part in the elective process. The youth of this country are mature enough to have a part in helping to chart the course of this Nation.

I hope my resolution, which was introduced earlier, will be the resolution selected to pass this Congress to grant 18-year-olds the right to vote, inasmuch as Georgia did pioneer voting rights for 18-year-olds and I am the member of the House who first exercised this right.

If, for political reasons, the President would prefer to have a Democrat rather than a Republican author this measure, I certainly hope he will select a Georgia Democrat, inasmuch as we in Georgia did pioneer this effort and have proven its value.

NEED FOR A BROAD SWEEP ATTACK AGAINST CRIME IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, for some time, there is and has been an obvious need for a broad sweep attack against crime in the streets of Washington, D.C. Additional police must be made available and put into the streets. This, however, is only a first step. Improvements must be made in all aspects of the law-enforcement process in the city. Gilbert Hahn, the chairman of the Republican Party in the District of Columbia, made a forthright statement last week calling for a doubling of the District police force as a prompt method for curbing crime. An enlargement of the force would have an immediate effect on stopping criminals. But Mr. Hahn also pointed out the need for improvements in the courts, in the rehabilitation and probation system and long range remedies for the root causes of crime. This is a practical, realistic approach. Legislation has been introduced by Members of Congress to improve the law-enforcement process. Other Members and myself have sponsored legislation providing for additional judges, for improvement of the juvenile court system, for relieving the Court of General Sessions of paternity and nonsupport cases which add unnecessarily to their backlog and others. These bills will all materially assist in reducing crime in the street.

Other legislation such as a bill to authorize police reserve forces which would place more patrolmen in the street merits prompt attention. The detention center and the juvenile rehabilitation facilities must be enlarged and improved. A long range lasting reduction in crime will require such a broad sweep attack.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 160]

Abernethy	Flynt	Monagan
Anderson, Tenn.	Ford, Gerald R.	Montgomery
Andrews, Ala.	Ford, William D.	Murphy, Ill.
Ashley	Fountain	Murphy, N.Y.
Ashmore	Fraser	Nichols
Bates	Gardner	O'Hara, Ill.
Belcher	Gettys	Olsen
Bell	Gilbert	O'Neal, Ga.
Berry	Griffin	O'Neill, Mass.
Bingham	Gurney	Passman
Blackburn	Hanna	Pickle
Blanton	Hansen, Idaho	Podell
Bolling	Harrison	Pool
Bolton	Hawkins	Pryor
Bow	Hays	Rees
Brasco	Henderson	Reid, Ill.
Brinkley	Herlong	Reifel
Brooks	Holifield	Reinecke
Brown, Calif.	Holland	Resnick
Burton, Calif.	Howard	Reuss
Burton, Utah	Hungate	Rivers
Cabell	Ichord	Ronan
Carey	Jonas	Rooney, N.Y.
Carter	Jones, Ala.	Rosenthal
Celler	Jones, Mo.	Roth
Clawson, Del	Kelly	Roybal
Cohelan	Kupferman	Schadeberg
Collier	Kuykendall	Scheuer
Colmer	Kyros	Selden
Conyers	Landrum	Stafford
Corman	Leggett	Steed
Cramer	Lennon	Stubblefield
Cunningham	Lloyd	Taft
Dawson	Long, La.	Taylor
Delaney	Lukens	Teague, Tex.
Dent	McDonald, Mich.	Tenzer
Diggs	McMillan	Utt
Dow	Macdonald, Mass.	Waldie
Dowdy	MacGregor	Wampler
Dwyer	Machen	Watkins
Eckhardt	May	Whalley
Edwards, Calif.	Miller, Calif.	Willis
Evins, Tenn.	Minshall	Wilson, Charles H.
Farbstein	Mize	Wolff
Fino		
Flood		

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 296 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

AMENDING NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES ACT OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 11308), to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965.

SOLUTION TO PROBLEM OF POVERTY MARCH ON WASHINGTON

Mr. GATHINGS. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, last week Mrs. Gathings and I took a tour of the New England States. It was a most enjoyable trip.

On Friday we spent the night in a thriving little city of Gorham, N.H., at a very lovely and fine motel. The lady who jointly with her husband operated the motel said to me: "Now, you know, I have an awful time getting someone who will work. What needs to be done in this country is to have people send the want ads from their newspapers to their Members of Congress."

We went on to Boston, where we spent Saturday night and Sunday morning, I happened to pick up the Boston paper and I looked for "Help Wanted" advertisements bearing in mind what that fine lady had said.

Boston is a city, Mr. Speaker, that is typical in this Nation, a fine city, a marvelous city, but we will find the same situation not only in Boston, but throughout the country in that business establishments cannot get people to take jobs that are open.

Here is the Boston Sunday Globe of June 2, 1968, and starting on page 6 and going all the way through to page 22, we find the section for "Men Wanted." There are 16 pages in this paper in which employers are crying for help. Some of these ads read as follows:

Insurance field sales manager, production clerk, designers, checkers, draftsmen, personnel opportunities, purchasing sub-contractor, supervisor, manager, account clerk, night steward, houseman, hotel clerk, architects, structural designers, office services manager, accountant, maintenance mechanic, stock managers and assistant stock managers, salesmen, custodians, janitors, maintenance men, trainee positions, plumbers, electricians, painters, automobile casualty underwriter, unskilled men to learn pouring and checkout work, warehousemen, laborers, non-technical sales, no experience required ($175 weekly salary plus bonus and commission), woodworkers, radio mechanics, assistant to executive, cooks, and electricians. Here are some of the leads in small ads: laundry workers (salary $80 to $100 weekly), buyer, office man, foreman, warehouseman, order clerk, assistant laundry superintendent, collector, unskilled male, custodian, accounting clerk, guard, TV road man, maintenance man, remodeling carpenter and medical technician.

Another section of the Globe, section 2, consists of "Help Wanted" ads for females. There are 7 pages of opportunities for women. For the female here is a list of some of the openings:

Nurses, key punch operators, clerical—experienced or trainee, accounts clerk, laboratory technicians, bookkeepers, assistant bookkeepers, general office, cashier, typists, secretaries, payroll accounts payable, technical typists, saleswomen, modeling, waitresses, personnel assistant, secretary to patent attorney, physical therapist, clerk typist, legal secretary, and hostesses.

The jobs are plentiful—all kinds of them.

Mr. Speaker, there is a poor people's encampment in Washington. It seems to me the answer to the march on Washington would be: Why not take some of these jobs and go to work? America is a land where all of our people, the well-to-do

and the poor alike, can get ahead by and through their own efforts—hard work. Let us keep it that way.

DESIGN FOR ALL AMERICANS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 324)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

To most Americans, a stairway poses no problem. A narrow doorway is little more than an inconvenience. But for more than 20 million of our citizens, these simple structures bar the living of a normal life.

One in every ten Americans suffers from some disability which keeps him from using buildings designed—not cruelly, but thoughtlessly—only for the physically fit. Problems in the design of our buildings pose the greatest single obstacle to employment of the handicapped.

If we are to give the millions of handicapped Americans the opportunity to live life to the fullest, we must not put unnecessary barriers in their path.

We want our schools, libraries, office buildings, theaters, museums, stadiums and transportation systems to be accessible to all.

In 1966, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare appointed a National Commission on Architectural Barriers to Rehabilitation of the Handicapped. I am pleased now to transmit to the Congress the report of that Commission entitled "Design for all Americans."

The report shows increased awareness of the problems by State and local governments, architects, and the general public. In the past year, the General Services Administration has substantially modified its design standards to give more consideration to the handicapped.

But the report also shows that a substantial task lies ahead.

—In many cases, State laws are sadly inadequate. Some cover only State-owned buildings; others do not spell out the needed standards.

—No school of architecture gives special or continuing attention to the problem of accessibility.

In the next thirty years, more buildings will be constructed in this country than have been built in the past two hundred years. And as we go about this tremendous task, we must make sure that the needs of the handicapped are not overlooked.

I commend this Report to your attention.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 3, 1968.*

UNITED STATES-JAPAN COOPERATIVE MEDICAL SCIENCE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 325)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

We in America are fortunate that our lives are almost completely free of the scourges of cholera, leprosy, exotic viruses, and parasitic diseases. Some of our citizens are still struck by tuberculosis and malnutrition, but we are making significant progress against them.

Yet in Asia today, millions are killed or crippled by those six diseases. They also continue to pose a serious threat to our fighting men stationed in Southeast Asia.

The U.S.-Japan Cooperative Medical Science Program was begun in 1965 to find ways, through medical research, to eliminate or control those diseases.

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress today the annual report on that program. In slightly more than a year since the research efforts began

—Fifteen separate conferences dealing with specific diseases have been held in the United States and Asia.

—Contracts and grants were awarded for further intensive study of each disease.

—Additional steps were taken toward the development of a vaccine capable of conferring long-term immunity against cholera.

I believe you will find this report encouraging and enlightening, and I commend it to your attention.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 3, 1968.*

AMENDMENT TO TVA BRIDGE ACT

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8953) to amend the act of November 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 773), providing for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges by the Tennessee Valley Authority, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 8953

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of November 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 773), be and is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That (a) whenever, as the result of the construction of any dam, reservoir, or other improvement under the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, or amendments thereto, including any improvement of the navigable channel to accommodate the growth of navigation or changes in navigation requirements within the reservoir created by any dam in the custody of the Tennessee Valley Authority, any bridge, trestle, or other highway or railroad structure located over, upon, or across the Tennessee River or any of its navigable tributaries, including approaches, fenders, and appurtenances thereto, is endangered or otherwise adversely affected and damaged, including any interference with or impairment of its use, or, in the judgment of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, needs to be raised, widened, or otherwise altered to provide the navigation clearances required for completion of the navigable channel to be provided by such improvement, to the extent that protection, alteration, reconstruction, relocation, or replacement is necessary or proper to preserve its safety or utility or to meet the requirements of navigation or flood control, or both, the owner or owners of such bridge, trestle, or structure shall be compensated by the Tennessee Valley Authority in the sum of the reasonable actual cost of such protection, alteration, reconstruction, relocation, or replacement: *Provided,* That in arriving at the amount of such compensation the bridge owner shall be charged with a sum which shall equal the net value to the owner of any direct and special benefits accruing to the owner from any improvement or addition or betterment of the altered, reconstructed, relocated, or replaced bridge, trestle, or structure. The Tennessee Valley Authority is empowered to contract with such owner with respect to any such protection, alteration, reconstruction, relocation, or replacement, the payment of the cost thereof and its proper division, which contract may provide either for money compensation or for the performance of all or any part of the work by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

"(b) In the event of a failure to agree upon the terms and conditions of any such contract, or upon any default in the performance of any contract entered into pursuant to this Act, the bridge owner or the Tennessee Valley Authority shall have the right to bring suit to enforce its rights or for a declaration of its rights under this Act, or under any such contract, in the district court of the United States for the district in which the property in question is located. In any such proceeding the court shall apportion the total cost of the work between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the owner in accord with the provisions contained in this section. The Tennessee Valley Authority's share of the cost of any such protection, alteration, reconstruction, relocation, or replacement, under any contract made or judgment, award, or decree rendered under the provisions of this section may be paid out of any funds available for carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, and appropriations for that purpose are hereby authorized: *Provided,* That, prior to such alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of said bridges, the location and plans shall be submitted to and approved by the Secretary of Transportation in accordance with existing laws."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the legislation, but in order that we might have debate on the bill, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the bill, as reported, would remove an overly restrictive requirement in the TVA Bridge Act of 1941. That act provides that the costs of bridge alterations, which arise from the construction of dams and navigation improvements, must be paid out of the earnings of the Tennessee Valley Authority. This bill would provide that such costs may be paid out of any funds available, including appropriations, for carrying out the provisions of the basic TVA Act. Under present law, appropriated funds cannot be used to pay the TVA's share of bridge alteration costs unless there is a judgment or award of a U.S. district court. If TVA and the bridge owner are able to reach a voluntary agreement as to the work to be done and the division of cost, the Federal share of the cost must be paid out of TVA's earnings.

However, TVA has no surplus earnings available for payment of its share of the cost. Under covenants entered into by TVA with holders of its bonds, power revenues can be used only for power system purposes. TVA's nonpower earnings, primarily receipts from sales of fertilizers, are used to help cover the costs of the fertilizer research and development program. Thus, the TVA Bridge Act, in its present form, encourages extensive and costly litigation where voluntary agreements are otherwise possible.

H.R. 8953 also clarifies the TVA Bridge Act by providing in specific terms that the act applies not only to alterations of bridges incident to new reservoir projects, but also to alterations required by realinement or other changes of the navigation channel to accommodate the growth of traffic or changes in navigation requirements within an existing reservoir created by a dam in TVA custody. This amendment restates TVA's interpretation of the act which has been upheld by the courts. However, to avoid further litigation, the committee felt it was appropriate to clarify the language of the TVA Bridge Act.

The legislation does not involve additional Federal expenditures, but rather encourages voluntary agreements where possible and discourages litigation where it serves no useful purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], appear in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to speak on behalf of H.R. 8953 as reported by the Committee on Public Works. The Subcommittee on Flood Control held hearings on this bill on October 31, 1967, and I can say there was no opposition to the legislation then and I know of none now.

H.R. 8953 amends the act of November 21, 1941—16 U.S.C. 831c-1—commonly known as the TVA Bridge Act, to allow TVA's share of the cost of alterations or relocations of certain bridges, whether established by voluntary agreement or action by an appropriate court, to be paid out of any funds, including appropriations, available for carrying out the provisions of the TVA Act.

The present law provides that if any bridge, trestle, or other highway or railroad structure located over, upon, or across the Tennessee River or any of its navigable tributaries is endangered or otherwise adversely affected and damaged by the construction of any Tennessee Valley Authority project, TVA may contract with the owner with respect to any protection, alteration, reconstruction, relocation, or replacement necessary and for the equitable sharing of the cost. As under the Truman-Hobbs Act—33 U.S.C. 516—the bridge owner is charged with the net value of any direct and special benefits accruing to the owner from the betterment of the altered bridge. The law now provides that where the parties are able to reach a voluntary agreement as to the work to be done and the division of cost, the Federal share of the cost must be paid out of TVA earnings.

The act further provides that where no agreement is reached as to the necessary work or apportionment of the costs, either party may submit the matter to the U.S. district court for the district in which the property is located for a declaration of the respective rights under the act and an apportionment of costs. Any judgment of the court may be satisfied out of available appropriations.

During hearings on this bill, it appeared that voluntary agreements for alteration of these bridges are not practicable since TVA has no surplus earnings available for payment of its share of the cost. Under covenants entered into by TVA with holders of its bonds, power revenues can be used only for power system purposes. TVA's nonpower earnings, primarily receipts from sales of fertilizers, are used to help cover the costs of the fertilizer research and development program. Thus, TVA has no surplus earnings available for needed alterations of bridges, and, as previously noted, can use appropriated funds only if there is litigation with the bridge owners. The provisions of H.R. 8953 will remedy this situation by allowing appropriated funds to be used where an agreement is reached. It should be noted that this will bring the TVA Bridge Act in line with the Truman-Hobbs Act where, in similar situations, the Federal share of such work is paid out of appropriations.

H.R. 9053 also clarifies the TVA Bridge Act by providing in specific terms that the act applies not only to alterations of bridges incident to new reservoir projects, but also to alterations required by realinement or other changes of the navigation channel to accommodate the growth of traffic or changes in navigation requirements within an existing reservoir created by a dam in TVA custody.

This restates TVA's interpretation of the act, as upheld by the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in a 1961 decision—*Southern Railway Co.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority,* 294 F. 2d 491. The clarification is to avoid similar litigation in the future.

The bill also amends the TVA Bridge Act to recognize the recent transfer from the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army, to the Secretary of Transportation of the general authority for approval of bridge locations and clearances on the navigable waters of the United States. This transfer was made under provisions of the Department of Transportation Act—49 U.S.C. 1655g.

The amendments proposed by H.R. 8953 are remedial in nature and do not call for increased appropriations. In fact, the major thrust of the bill is to avoid litigation in cases where TVA and bridge owners are in agreement on matters concerning bridge alterations and relocations, thereby saving the expense of such litigation.

I support this bill and urge that it be passed.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8953, a bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Bridge Act.

This proposal has been before the House Public Works Committee where it was examined in great thoroughness. It has been recommended for enactment by the committee without dissenting views.

The proposed amendment is supported by all interested Members of the House who represent the TVA's geographical areas.

This is not a bill which would require monetary authorizations. It would place the TVA under the same provisions as in the general law which prevails for all other agencies throughout the country.

The bill would permit the TVA to use appropriated funds for paying its share of the cost of bridge alterations where the division of cost is obtained through voluntary agreements by the parties as well as where the cost apportionment is obtained through litigation. The existing law for TVA provides for such payment only after time-consuming and expensive litigation.

The TVA has established itself as a great and fine national institution. The benefits of its operation have been exciting and widespread.

I urge approval of this proposal to bring the bridge improvement procedures of the Tennessee Valley Authority in line with the general law which applies to other agencies through the country.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8953. This act would amend the act of November 21, 1941—55 Stat. 773—providing for alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highways and railroad bridges by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

This legislation would amend the TVA Bridge Act to bring the practices and procedures of the TVA in line with those of the other agencies of the government in regard to replacement of bridges.

Under existing legislation, in cases where the TVA and the bridge owner come to an agreement on distribution of costs in bridge replacement cases, the TVA must pay for its share from earnings. In 1941, when the original TVA Bridge Act was passed, the TVA had earnings. Now, all the TVA's revenues are earmarked for debt retirement and payments to the treasury.

The proposal would permit the TVA to pay its share of bridge replacement costs from any funds, including appropriated funds, as other agencies do under the government's general bridge legislation. The proposal provides for no new authorizations. Any funds required would be sought under regular appropriations procedures.

Under existing law, the TVA can pay its share of bridge replacement from appropriated funds only after court litigation. In cases where agreement can be reached between parties, the proposed changes would eliminate the need for costly court litigation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STAGGERS). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the

House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 8953, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

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

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

There was no objection.

TAX INCREASE AND EXPENDITURE CUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend President Johnson is reported to have stated that he would now accept the $6 billion expenditure cut which is contained in the conference report now pending. That, of course, includes the increase in taxes on the American people. Mr. Johnson also is reported to have said that if such a bill comes to his desk for signature, he would sign it and then proceed to consult with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget as to where the Federal expenditures would be cut.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the President's basic statement. He has now broken his silence on whether or not he would accept a $6 billion cut for fiscal year 1969, but I would also observe—and I have issued a statement on Friday which I will put in the RECORD—that he is putting the cart before the horse when he says that he will wait until he signs it before he consults with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget as to where he is going to cut the expenditures. I think the House needs to be reminded—and certainly the news media and the country need to be reminded—that we have been horsing around on this question of doing something about our Federal deficit for well over 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, it has been as long ago as 2 years that as the ranking Republican on the Joint Economic Committee I stated that even if we cut expenditures along the line which I thought were absolutely essential it still would be necessary, probably, to have a tax increase in order to get at the serious problems of inflation, high interest rates, gold flow which result from the cumulative deficits.

Mr. Speaker, the Johnson administration, very cleverly, has horsed this fiscal problem around in the ensuing 18 months. Certainly, it has now avoided doing anything in fiscal 1968 to show a desire to follow fiscal responsibility. Here it is June 3. We have 27 days left before fiscal 1968 terminates. So, obviously, the President is not going to cut back anything in fiscal 1968. In fact, we know that far from cutting by $4 billion, as he said he would last August he increased expenditures over the figure he gave us in his January budget by $7 billion, an $11 billion discrepancy which means that any deficit for fiscal 1968 now is around $25 billion—the highest by far of any deficit since World War II.

Mr. Speaker, this cut that is included in the pending conference report, $6 billion, relates to fiscal 1969—not fiscal 1968. And, as I pointed out on May 14 when I took the floor of the House to explain why I could not sign the conference report, and why I was not about to sign it, unless the President spoke up, I pointed out at that time that half of fiscal 1969—6 months of fiscal 1969—will be under a different administration. The Johnson administration has only 6 months of fiscal 1969.

Mr. Speaker, because of the nature of Federal spending the expenditure and budgetary procedures and laws, the President of the United States could continue spending in the month of July, which is next month, and which is the first month of fiscal 1969, at the same level or at an increased level, even with a $6-billion expenditure cut in the law.

He could continue to do that for the month of August, he could continue to do it for the month of September and for the month of October. In fact, he could continue to do it for the month of November if he were inclined to do so. But, I would point out that this is an election year and the election would have come and gone. But he could continue to spend at a higher level for fiscal 1969 than that amount which was projected in the budget message that he sent to the Congress in January, even with the $6 billion cut.

Mr. Speaker, there have been some Members of the House who have taken the floor to express concern that by improving the expenditure cut we were, in effect, giving to the President of the United States an item veto, and as I pointed out they regrettably are accurate.

This constitutes an item veto which is granted to him unless we tie down the cuts in line items. I would even be for the item veto, if that is what it were, because we have allowed ourselves to get in such a fiscal crunch that this kind of emergency procedure becomes necessary. But what I am pointing up is that without further Presidential or congressional action no cutting of expenditure levels can be assured.

Let me also say that these arguments which have been advanced against giving the President the item veto come from the Democratic leadership and from the Democratic Members of Congress. They are the ones who are in fact saying that this Congress under its present leadership is not exercising its responsibilities and, therefore, we do not want to give the President that power in this area. What a sham.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the correct way to proceed, of course, is for the Congress to exercise its prerogatives and responsibilities even under the present leadership, to cut back on an item-by-item basis where these expenditure cuts are going to occur.

I might add also cutback in appropriation bills—I might also add cutback in the original authorization bills. But I would make this further observation: that we have never in the Congress developed the procedures, the machinery, to create a legislative budget. We have already passed the power to set spending levels to the President. His carryover balances of unused power to spend exceed $200 billion, which is above the figure of the $186 billion expenditure level that he has given us in his budget message this January for fiscal 1969.

And already we have passed some appropriation bills. If we pass all of his requests, or even cutting requests by $20 billion, he still will have power to spend of over $400 billion. I would argue, as I have in the past, that the executive, the President, whoever he is, needs a certain amount of flexibility in deciding what will be spent for programs. If we have a breakthrough in a military weapons system he could accelerate expenditures, or if a weapons systems become obsolete we should cut back on them, and probably eliminate them. And so it is across the board in any area of expenditure, the executive ought to have a certain flexibility. But on the other hand, Congress ought to have its judgment expressed on what the total expenditure level for any given year should be in relation to our anticipated income. Our failure to do this is what creates the fiscal problem in which we find ourselves, the accumulated deficits over periods of years, and the heavy deficit that now looms before us.

Quoting the Secretary of the Treasury in his testimony before the conferees, he said that without this fiscal package which sits in the conference, the deficit for fiscal 1969 will be $31 billion. This is on top of the $25 billion deficit for this year.

So I again advise my colleagues that I would vote for a $6 billion cut, and the tax increase; I would vote for this fiscal package if the President will sit down and work out where $6 billion cuts will be made—and that means beginning right now. The time is already too late. To plan for expenditures for just next month requires work right now. And if the President waits another week or so there is nothing he can do about cutting back expenditures for July. He should be doing this cutting in consultation with the Members and the leaders of Congress on both sides now. He should have done it last week, last month. And here we sit.

Now, one final item, I have been receiving a lot of calls, and I know a lot of other Congressmen also have from various interested groups, if that is a good way to describe them, who want to see us take affirmative action on this fiscal package. Many of them are very fine bankers. The point I have made to these gentlemen—and I want to make it here publicly—they have to be just as interested in cutting expenditures as they seem to be interested in having a tax increase.

I would make this observation: Corporations do not pay taxes, really. They collect taxes. They have to pass the taxes on to the consuming public in the price they charge for their goods and services. There is only one real taxpayer in this country, or any other country, and that is the individual human being.

So it is one thing if we are talking about passing on increased taxes to the

general public, which these financiers are, and it is another thing to talk about cutting back expenditures in which maybe these financiers might be interested in as the cuts relate to particular programs. And I am beginning to wonder because they have not been present in the past 2 years trying to help those of us cut back expenditures, those of us who felt that it is the total spending in our society that is in error, particularly Federal Government spending. The first place to begin to cut is where we have double-barreled deficits in our international balance of payments through overspending by the Government abroad which adds to our deficits in our domestic budget as well.

The first place to begin is to cut back troops in Europe and foreign aid. I say that as one who thinks foreign aid has an important part to play today and it is important to the United States to have good foreign aid programs—but not at the level of $5.5 billion. This level can be cut and improve the programs. The Clay Commission report, back in 1962, recommended cutting it back to around a $2 billion level. I think this would improve the program.

But again talking to these people who are so anxious to have the tax increase bill to pass—where are they when it comes to getting the Johnson administration and this Congress to cut back on the troops in Europe? Where are the Western European financiers, by the way, when it comes to our talking about pulling back troops in Europe—all of a sudden they lose interest in the fiscal problem that faces this country and our international balance of payments.

Apparently my good friends from New York begin to lose interest when it means cutting back some of our foreign aid programs—and maybe it is that they are reluctant to see public works cut back, because they have an interest in those projects; or in the space program; or the farm program; or in research and development.

All I am saying is, it is important for those who are interested in getting the tax increase bill through to help the Congress and to push the President toward a line item area for cutting.

My final observations are these—and I have made them before—the President is exhibiting gross demagoguery, and so has his administration, when every time we talk of cutting he says, Well, yes, it will have to come out of the poverty program—out of the hides of the poor.

All I can say is that this is completely unnecessary—and not that we could not spend that money more wisely—but I have listed over $15 billion of cuts that could be imposed almost immediately without even touching the poverty program and without even touching health, education, and welfare.

We need help. This Congress needs help from these pressure groups outside of the Congress, of the administration, to get to the cutting of expenses and to spell out in detail where we are going to cut $6 billion.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman from Missouri for having put his finger on several sensitive nerves, one of them being the foreign bankers who are now so interested in promoting a tax increase bill in this country. Of course, they would rather have taxes raised on the American people than to see American troops pulled out of their countries because they help the economies of their countries to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is absolutely right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STAGGERS). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. The date of June 12 has been set for a tentative vote on this so-called tax package. Are not the Members, I would ask the gentleman from Missouri, the Members of the House of Representatives entitled to assurance in the next few days, certainly prior to June 12, from the Democratic leadership of the House and Senate, as well as the President of the United States, that a minimum of $6 billion in spending cuts will be made and guidelines as to where we can expect these reductions?

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is absolutely right. We must put this line item approach into agreement and we also have to have an agreement on timing. As I say, if we toss this around until June 12, it will be too late really to make practical cuts for the first month of the fiscal year 1969; namely, July. The longer we delay on where we are going to cut, the longer you can almost say, the expenditure level for fiscal year 1969 will start out with a complete ignoring of any $6 billion cut. The entire $6 billion would actually be put in under the following administration, the following 6 months. And if this is done we will not be hitting at the inflationary forces which is the sole reason behind our doing anything.

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

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

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able gentleman for yielding.

I just wanted to ask two questions of my knowledgeable colleague. One is would he be favorable to an amendment, if one could be properly inserted in the conference report, which would forbid the President in making the so-called $6 billion spending cut, to cut anything which has heretofore been provided by the Congress in the field of health, education, poverty, and welfare?

Mr. CURTIS. Well, let me say this. Only from the standpoint that there has been demagoguery on this issue. I do think this is an area, in my own judgment, where we could spend money more wisely. But I have pointed out in relation to the $15 billion cut—not $6 billion—$15 billion cut—that I have suggested here, entirely apart from the Vietnam war, and from the poverty, health, education, and welfare areas, if this would get votes on the gentleman's side of the aisle, and we could get agreements as to where these cuts are going to be, I would do a lot of things. I happen to agree with the President's rhetoric about the seriousness of domestic inflation and our international balance of payments.

As I said during the debate on whether it would be a $4 billion or a $6 billion cut, I said that even a $6 billion cut is too little and too late. We have already taken out of the hides of the poor a 5-percent cut through inflation, and we are going to take another 5 percent this year even with the tax-expenditure package. It is greater than that, really, because inflation hits the lower income groups the most by its very nature. Inflation is a tax on consumption. It is a consumer tax, for the lower income groups 100 cents out of the dollar has to go for consumption. These people cannot invest. An investor can make some money on inflation. Why, then the poor get hit 100 percent by the tax of inflation. If that agreement would get votes on the gentleman's side of the aisle, for the expenditure cuts and tax increase, yes. But I am afraid there are those who do not quite agree with me on this matter or on other economic subjects.

Mr. PEPPER. I am pleased to hear the gentleman take that sympathetic view in relation to the problems of the people of our country.

One further question, if the gentleman will yield further.

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

Mr. PEPPER. The distinguished gentleman is a member of the Ways and Means Committee. Am I correct in my recollection that we have not had a tax increase in this country since 1962?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not know that we increased taxes in 1962 except to extend the excise taxes.

Mr. PEPPER. And we made a cut that is generally said to be a $20 billion cut in taxes in 1964?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, but that was on the theory—and, thank goodness, it was the theory that I advanced that prevailed—that if we lowered the rates, we would take more money from the people. It was a reduction in rates, but it was on the theory that by lowering the rates, we would increase economic activity and thus end up with more revenues. But the gentleman is correct. If we had the same rates, we would not have had the same economic growth. Nonetheless, this is true. There was a tax rate reduction in both 1962 and 1964.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to ask this followup question, if I may: If I recall correctly, the Vietnam war has been a real burden to us since approximately 1962? It has stepped up year after year.

Mr. CURTIS. The real expenditures hit around 1965, I would say, September 1965.

Mr. PEPPER. It has been increasing as we have gone along.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not have the figure, but the amount we have had to expend for the war since 1962 with our spending about $30 billion a year now, must total some——

Mr. CURTIS. Around $100 billion.

Mr. PEPPER. Around $100 billion.

Mr. CURTIS. That is true.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

(At the request of Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CURTIS was granted 1 additional minute.)

Mr. PEPPER. We have spent about $100 billion on the war. During the war we cut $20 billion in taxes. And yet for 2 years the Chief Executive has been asking this Congress to give him a little 10-percent surtax increase, and the Congress is now saying, "We will not even give you that unless you cut spending by 6 billion." I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Let me say to the gentleman, people have made money on this war. Do not kid yourself. And the taxes to the Federal Government have increased as a result.

The Federal revenues have continued to go up even with these lowered tax rates, but this President cannot live even within these revenues, so I do not go along with the business of Congress not wanting to increase the rates. One reason why Chairman MILLS was reluctant to press the tax increase was, as he said, if we increase the rates, we might throw the country into recession. This could be. The Federal tax rates are still too high. I would argue that in the long run we ought to be reducing our Federal tax rates even more, and we would end up with more revenue because we would expand the base.

Hereafter follows the remarks I made in the press release I referred to:

PRESIDENT MUST CONSULT WITH CONGRESS ON EXPENDITURE REDUCTIONS

I am pleased that President Johnson has broken his silence and said that he would sign the Conference Committee Bill providing for a 10% tax increase coupled with $6 billion in spending cuts.

However, to ensure its passage, the President must immediately consult with Congressional leaders, to determine exactly where and when the cuts will be made.

The President in his press conference last week put the cart before the horse. He said that if the tax bill passes Congress and comes to him, he would then consult with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and determine where cuts would be made.

But it is possible that the tax bill will never get to him unless the President consults with the leaders of Congress as to where the cuts will be made.

Time is of the essence. These decisions must be made immediately. It requires time to schedule cuts and every day the President waits before consulting with Congressional leaders to determine where the cuts will be made is another day wasted in attempting to come to grips with inflation.

In order for the cuts to be effective in hitting at inflation they must begin immediately. The President has wasted so much time that fiscal 1968, which ends June 30, 1968, is gone, but inflation is upon us right now. The cuts must be made effective beginning July 1, which is less than a month from now.

THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE STAFF REPORT ON THE ARNHEITER MUTINY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STAGGERS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I recently informed the House of my intention to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD all information I could gather which would tell a side of the so-called Arnheiter mutiny which has not been told previously.

I wish to make it clear that I am making no attempt to pass judgment upon any of the individuals involved in this case. Rather, my purpose is to serve objectivity.

Some months ago a member of the Armed Services Committee staff was designated by its chairman, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, to conduct a staff survey of the Arnheiter case. An exhaustive study was made and the Department of the Navy also studied the situation extensively.

The staff report has been summarized to me with these words:

There was nothing illegal about the procedures used by the Navy in this case. Command of a ship is not a right, but a privilege to be exercised with responsibility. The best summary of the situation is contained in the letter of March 13, 1967, written to Lt. Cdr. Arnheiter by Capt. R. G. Alexander:

"You must face the fact that you were, in the majority opinion, including my own, brought down by your own actions and not by faulty procedures or disloyal subordinates."

This fact has been abundantly clear to those who have read the Navy files in the matter, and have not been changed by anything brought out elsewhere.

The fact of the matter is that Arnheiter was assigned the dull, dirty task of patrolling an area from ten miles off shore on out to sea and to search the area by radar. Instead he mutinied and went in close to shore to try to find shore bombardment action. He was not supposed to engage in shore bombardment unless he was specifically ordered to do so; instead, he fired on the shore contrary to orders. He interfered with those who were there legitimately, once even crossing the line of fire of another ship. In order to cover up his true position, he filed false position reports.

Within 20 days after he took up his position off the coast of Southeast Asia, the admiral responsible for his operations there had to send an officer to be sure that Arnheiter really understood his operational orders. It was these things, together with the reports from the commanding officers of the ships with which he had caused such interference, that were the most damaging items leading to his removal. They were also completely independent of any alleged mutiny among his junior officers. On the contrary, these indicate that Lt. Cdr. Arnheiter was himself in mutiny against the Navy's way of fighting the war in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, my desire to serve objectivity can best be accomplished, however, by inserting the complete staff report into the RECORD for all to judge for themselves. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I submit herewith the entire staff report with an appendix. I am hopeful that it will be carefully read by all who are concerned with this matter:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1968.

Memorandum for: Honorable L. Mendel Rivers, Chairman, Armed Services Committee.

Re: Lieutenant Commander Marcus A. Arnheiter.

On December 22, 1965, Lt. Commander M. A. Arnheiter assumed the command of a radar picket escort ship (DER), the U.S.S. *Vance*. In so doing, he achieved a privilege he had sought for a long time.

Command of a ship of the United States Navy is a high privilege, not a right. That privilege is increased whenever the ship is taken into military operations, and especially military operations which are carefully circumscribed by higher authority.

The responsibility accompanying that privilege is absolute, according to Navy Regulations, and the authority of the commanding officer is commensurate with that responsibility.

On the *Vance*, this responsibility was for about 14 officers and 150 enlisted men, living together for long periods of time in cramped quarters, as well as for the ship. In addition the responsibility was to employ the ship, its officers and crew in accordance with the operational orders.

The *Vance*, as a radar picket escort ship had two main attributes: first it was able to stay on station for extended periods of time because of its diesel engines; and second it had special radar equipment enabling it to provide air and surface surveillance. It also carried sonar equipment to provide submarine detection capability.

The mission of a radar picket escort ship is "to carry out ocean surveillance; to detect air, surface, and submarine activity; to counter sea infiltration efforts; and to operate offensively against submarines."

When the *Vance* was assigned to South Vietnam activities, its primary purpose to stay at sea using its radar to locate ships and its sonar to locate submarines which might be coming in from the sea carrying contraband to the Viet Cong.

The operation in which the *Vance* was engaged is called Market Time. Officially, operational headquarters for Market Time were in Saigon and known as CTF 115. The *Vance* was also responsible, as a picket escort, to a squadron commander for destroyer escorts located at Subic Bay, in the Philippine Islands. The Commanding Officer of the squadron was Commander Milligan. The Commander of the destroyer flotilla at Subic Bay was, at first, Rear Admiral Irvine, who was later relieved by Rear Admiral King.

The operational orders for Market Time were issued by CTF 115 in Saigon. These orders divided the coast of South Vietnam into several areas, running from the border with North Vietnam to the border with Cambodia. The *Vance* was initially assigned to an area roughly centered on Qui Nhon and over 90 miles long. This area was zoned lengthwise to provide for the radar picket escort patrols in the seaward portion and the inshore zone within 10 miles for patrol by the Navy Swift boats, Coast Guard patrol craft and Vietnamese Navy patrol craft.

The Commanding Officer of each DER, as the senior U.S. Navy officer in the area was charged with cooperating with the Vietnamese Navy and for this purpose a Vietnamese Naval liaison officer for the area was located on board his ship. This officer supplied not only interpretations but also intelligence of the local areas.

The local Coastal Surveillance Centers provided cognizance and coordination of forces afloat within each area.

The radar picket escorts were required by CTF 115 to report their position to that headquarters each midnight. In addition the operational orders required each ship to report when it moved out of its assigned area. This report was to be made to the Coastal Surveillance Center, which in turn was to relay the report to CTF 115. In line with its responsibility to keep a plot of all ships in its area, the local Coastal Surveillance Center required all ships, including the radar picket ships, to report their positions every two hours.

A group of ships separate and distinct from the Market Time ships was designated for shore bombardment (naval gunfire support). These ships reported to a separate and distinct organization in Saigon. In case any Market Time ships should ever have to engage in such operations, the rules of engage-

ment were spelled out clearly. Such operations were either assigned in advance by headquarters of CTF 115, or were urgent for example—when the ship was fired upon or when friendly forces were fired upon. In addition the rules for stopping and boarding any ships under its surveillance operations were spelled out for Market Time ships.

The Market Time operational orders also clearly spelled out the radio communications channels the radar picket escort in a given area was to monitor at all times, and the other channels to guard when needed. An appropriate anti-submarine sonar watch was also required.

While this was the first assignment Lt. Commander Arnheiter had had on Market Time, it was not the first for the *Vance*. The *Vance* had had a prior assignment there, during which it had received the Engineering "E" Award, and was considered the ship to beat to win the coveted "E" as the outstanding ship. Its former Commanding Officer had received a commendation for the *Vance's* performance on the earlier patrol.

It was against this background that the *Vance*, commanded by Lieutenant Commander Arnheiter arrived on Market Time patrol on January 20, 1966.

Within twenty days of its arrival, the Admiral commanding CTF 115 had to send an officer to the *Vance* to be sure that the operational orders were understood because of reports that the *Vance* hadn't been complying with the rules. Commanding officers of destroyers operating near *Vance*, when they returned to Subic Bay for rest and recreation, reported to the squadron commander that the *Vance* was up to unusual actions in its patrol. A destroyer division commander also complained about the *Vance*. The parent squadron chaplain in Pearl Harbor heard from the families of some of the men on the *Vance* that there were unusual doings on board the *Vance* and that morale was getting low. The chaplain of the escort squadron to which the *Vance* was assigned made his usual rounds of all the ships in the squadron, staying two weeks on each ship. When he returned to Subic Bay, he reported to the squadron commander that the commanding officer of the *Vance* was acting in an unusual way and that morale on the ship was low. A second officer of the squadron staff, without knowing about the chaplain's report, also spent several days on the *Vance* and made the same kind of a report.

On March 29, 1966, the squadron commander consulted with the flotilla commander, Rear Admiral Irvine who was in the process of being relieved by Rear Admiral King. It was decided to send a request to the Bureau of Naval Personnel in Washington for orders removing the commanding officer of the *Vance* upon its arrival in the Philippines for a two week period of rest and recreation, pending an investigation. These telegraphic orders were received. The *Vance* arrived at Manila on March 25, and returned to Market Time under another commanding officer on April 13, 1966.

VIOLATION OF ORDERS AND REGULATIONS

During the period Lt. Commander Arnheiter was in command of the *Vance*, he violated many orders and regulations.

1. *Removal of ship from assigned area.* The *Vance*, as a radar picket ship, was assigned that portion of the patrol area three to patrol beyond 10 miles off shore. Instead during January 20 to February 8 Lt. Commander Arnheiter continuously brought his ship in close to shore looking for gunfire support missions. Although required to report to the Coastal Surveillance Center and to headquarters CTF 115 when he crossed out of his assigned area, he failed to do so.

2. *Gunfire support missions.*

a. On January 27, *Vance* locally requested gunfire support missions, and in return was asked by an air control spotter to be available for such support on an hour's notice for the next morning. When asked to furnish help by the air spotter, the *Vance* did not arrive for more than two hours, or too late.

b. Thereafter on January 28, *Vance* asked *Mason*, a destroyer which was close to shore on an assigned gunfire support mission, for permission to join in on the mission. *Vance* stayed around *Mason* seeking such an assignment from about noon to sunset.

c. On January 29, *Vance* appeared near the *Mason* and shortly began firing on the supposed site of a machine gun. *Mason* received a gunfire support mission, and requested *Vance* to move as *Vance* was fouling the *Mason's* range.

d. On January 30, *Vance* asked U.S.S. *Bache*, a destroyer, for a gunfire support mission. Although none was given, *Vance*, started firing at the shore. Officers of both the *Bache* and the *Vance* reported that the only signs of life in the area were sparks flying from bullets ricocheting on the rocks in the area. There was no fire in the area on the *Vance* or on friendly troops. *Mason* officers were worried since First Air Cavalry Division troops were in the area and in a very fluid situation. While *Mason* received friendly front line position reports, *Vance* never requested such reports.

e. On February 1, *Vance*, on its own, undertook a gunfire support mission of a building which was a religious shrine. During an orientation trip of January 21 and 22, (made with Lt. Ward of the Junk Division to show where the Viet Cong had been noted) Lt. Ward pointed out the shrine to Lt. Commander Arnheiter as being in an area where the United States did not want to have any firing as we wanted to win over the local people. During January 27 to February 10, while in that area, *Mason* reported not seeing any activity around the *Vance's* target.

f. On February 1, *Vance* asked *Mason* for a gunfire support mission. At that time, *Vance* fouled the *Mason's* firing line. Even when warned by *Mason*, *Vance* continued to cross the line until it took up the position sought by Lt. Commander Arnheiter. *Mason* immediately ordered *Vance* to leave the area.

g. In connection with one of these incidents on February 1, the Executive Officer had to take the bridge to bring the ship around when it almost ran aground, since Lt. Commander Arnheiter was preoccupied with describing the events over the ship's intercom.

h. In performing these gunfire support missions, *Vance* was out of its assigned area offshore. It had to drop guard on some required communications channels in order to come up on the gunfire support channels. It interfered with the operations of the ships regularly assigned to the gunfire support mission since they not only had to respond to the *Vance's* constant pleas for missions, but they also had to be vigilant as to the *Vance's* position at all times. Primarily, though, it engaged in gunfire support missions without the prior approval of CTF 115, and without notifying CTF 115.

i. On the other hand, when Lt. Cdr. Arnheiter was asked to protect a Vietnamese Navy headquarters in case of Viet Cong attack, he went off on his own to chase three junks. This happened on the night of February 2, 1966. The local Coastal Surveillance Center asked *Vance* to protect the Vietnamese Navy Junk Headquarters inside a bay. Lt. Commander Arnheiter was told that there might be a regiment of Viet Cong in the neighborhood which was planning to overrun the headquarters. The *Vance* entered the bay, lowered its motor whale boat to act both as a spotter in case of the necessity of firing and to be a decoy. Then, finding three junks on its radar, the *Vance* steamed some ten miles north, leaving the whale boat and the headquarters unprotected for four hours.

3. *False Position Reports.* On January 28 and 29, the *Vance* sent false position reports to the local Coastal Surveillance Center. If the reports to the Coastal Surveillance Center had been accurate, they would have indicated that the *Vance* was off of its expected patrol and engaging in unauthorized gunfire support missions.

4. *Relations with Vietnamese Navy.* When the *Vance* spotted three junks in a bay area, it went in after them. The junks were beached and the men (10 on each junk) ran ashore. Lt. Commander Arnheiter ordered the Vietnamese Liaison officer to go in shore after them, and he refused. Lt. Commander Arnheiter called him and described him in writing as yellow and cowardly. The liaison officer returned to his headquarters as quickly as possible, and the Vietnamese Navy thereafter refused to send a liaison officer to the *Vance* while it was in any of three areas. When the *Vance* returned to these areas even after the change of command, it was still some time before a liaison officer was permitted to ride on her. The *Vance* had to be redeployed immediately after February 8 to a distant area so as to be able to have a liaison officer on board.

5. *Boarding of Foreign Merchantman.* On February 1, in the evening, the *Vance* challenged a foreign merchant vessel. Without waiting to get orders from CTF 115, the *Vance* had the merchantman boarded. When subsequently asked by CTF 115's Operations Officer why he had not asked orders from CTF 115, Lt. Commander Arnheiter replied that the ship was just about to go over the line into international waters, and he couldn't wait. This boarding, contrary to the operational orders, could have caused an incident with a third country.

6. *Unreported Radar Difficulties.* From January 31 until February 10, the surface radar was acting below standards, if operational at all. Although this was the main piece of equipment with which the radar patrol picket ship was to stand its patrol at sea, this failure was not reported until February 10. When the officer sent by the Admiral commanding CTF 115 came on board for a visit on February 8, the rotating screen, which had been removed, was replaced during his visit so that it would appear to be operational.

7. *False Spare Parts Report.* On February 26, *Vance* was requested by the organization that was charged with providing the *Vance's* logistics supply, for a listing of the critical spare parts on board for its diesel engines. The report transmitted did not list all of the parts, although the draft had been properly prepared by the Engineering Officer. Lt. Commander Arnheiter listed only those parts which he thought could be released without endangering the mission of the *Vance*.

8. *Failure to Maintain Proper ASW Watch.* The Operational Orders require appropriate ASW precautions at all times. Yet, shortly after Lt. Cdr. Arnheiter took command of the *Vance*, Lt. J. G. Merkel, the ASW officer, was given the additional duty of being the ship photographer. This responsibility became a full time task. And consequently he was not able to devote the time required to his ASW duties. The enlisted men under the ASW officer became so discouraged that all put in for transfer to other duty as soon as the first opportunity presented itself. Yet, Lt. Commander Arnheiter criticized the ASW officer because his men were not interested in the ship. The necessity of paying special attention to the ASW crew members was pointed out by the inspection report made of the *Vance* just after it had been released from the shipyard in Pearl Harbor in late December, 1965. This inspection report was approved by Lt. Commander Arnheiter on January 18, 1966.

* * * * *

On the basis of any of these derelictions of duty and violation of regulations, there was adequate grounds alone for questioning the desirability of having Lt. Commander

Arnheiter continue as the commanding officer of a ship.

Since much has been made publicly of the condition of the *Vance* when Lt. Commander Arnheiter took over her command, an examination of the record is worthwhile.

THE "VANCE"

When Lt. Commander Arnheiter assumed command of the *Vance*, it had just returned from its prior deployment in Southeast Asia. During this period it never missed on operational commitment because of material failure, even when the tempo of operations approached 80 percent time underway. During this deployment, the *Vance* received at least nine commendations for her operations. She also was awarded the squadron engineering "E" for FY 1965.

Following this deployment, the *Vance* underwent a short overhaul in the shipyard at Pearl Harbor. It was inspected on December 14 and 15, 1965. The inspection report dated January 5, 1966, thereafter listed the *Vance* as in excellent condition "and reflects with credit on the Commanding Officer and his crew." An administrative inspection by the Commander of the squadron to which the *Vance* was attached, also listed the ship as being in excellent condition, with ship cleanliness receiving a mark of 94 percent and General Maintenance also a mark of 94 percent. Spiritual Activities and Religious Activities was marked 100 percent. This report, dated January 7, 1966, was forwarded by Lt. Commander Arnheiter with an endorsement dated January 18, 1966.

PERSONAL BACKGROUND

There have been numerous rumors about failures of Lt. Commander Arnheiter's personal background. These have nothing to do with the reason for his relief and their effect on his career would have been mitigated if his performance and command had been satisfactory, so there is no point in covering them in detail here.

However, it is true that his record was very spotty, and that he was passed over once for promotion from Lieutenant Junior Grade to Lieutenant.

These factors merely point out that the Navy was taking a chance when it assigned Arnheiter to command.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER ARNHEITER'S LEADERSHIP

In addition to the major command failings—that is, violations of orders—listed above, there were numerous items reported during Arnheiter's brief period aboard the *Vance* having to do with personal glorification, communicating with and judging his officers and men, improper use of funds and equipment, and effectiveness of programs. Some of these appear rather petty. Taken together, however, they reinforce the conclusion that Arnheiter was incapable of providing the leadership required of a commanding officer.

Some of these items are summarized briefly below.

A. Lt. Commander Arnheiter left the ship's postal revenues $11 short by sending his Change of Command program to over 100 people without reimbursing the ship for the postage.

B. CTF 115 did not authorize use of ship's boats as decoys and, in fact, there were specific instructions not to expose the boats, or even the ships to Viet Cong fire. Arnheiter used his boats as decoys without authorization.

C. Upon assuming command of the *Vance*, Lt. Commander Arnheiter made an inspection tour of the ship which included five minutes in one of the four engine rooms. The only other time he visited the engine rooms was another five minute tour after the stay in the shipyard for further repairs. The engineering staff was not able to obtain the necessary down time to provide proper maintenance on the engines. During the orientation cruise of January 21 and 22, Lt. Commander Arnheiter took the *Vance* one to two thousand yards off shore at a time when both engines on one shaft were out of operation and the top speed the ship could have obtained was seven knots. The area was held by Viet Cong, who at that time were quiet under a Tet truce.

D. At both Pearl Harbor and Guam, Lt. Commander Arnheiter had both polaroid and movie film purchased out of the ship's operating funds. The total was around $400. At first Lt. Commander Arnheiter's explanation was that this film was needed for intelligence purposes. However, when the Executive Officer explained that exposed film was supposed to be sent undeveloped to a designated intelligence office, Lt. Commander Arnheiter refused to so transmit the film. Instead he sent it in prepaid mailing envelopes to the mainland of the United States to be developed and delivered to his home address. Later Lt. Commander Arnheiter explained that this film was for public relations purposes—that Saigon had asked for information on Market Time operations. The operational orders of Market Time, however, clearly state that CTF 115 will provide photographic assistance for public relations purposes.

As has been pointed out, Lt. Commander Arnheiter had the ASW officer assume the role of public relations officer, a task which soon became a full time responsibility. This officer was constantly on call to take pictures, and the call "Merkel, bridge, provide" came to be well known throughout the ship.

The Navy has not received any of these pictures or film.

E. Lt. Commander Arnheiter took $950 from the ship's recreation and welfare funds (then totalling about $1300) to buy a speedboat for water skiing. Section 1241(a) of the regulations relating to Unit Recreation funds prohibit the expenditure of welfare funds for items, such as boats, which can be obtained by appropriated funds. In addition the regulations require the ship's Recreation Committee (enlisted men) to meet and pass on recommendations and then the ship's Recreation Council (officers) to meet on the recommendations. The committee never did meet on this proposal and the officers met only as they were sitting around the wardroom table. While there were times when the speedboat was used for water skiing, a machine gun was put on the bow and it was frequently for operational purposes, such as chasing junks. Evidently it was Lt. Commander Arnheiter's intention to use it as a decoy so as to make the Viet Cong show where they were hiding along the shore, thus giving the VANCE an opportunity to open up its guns against those positions. In order to accomplish this it was planned that the speedboat would carry the largest American Flag that the ship had on board.

F. Arnheiter caused much resentment from the first with a program called "All Hands Aft" on Sunday. This was a compulsory divine service for all hands who could be spared from operations. The biggest resentment came from the Catholics on board who felt that they were being forced to attend Protestant services. Lt. Commander Arnheiter has cited the services at the U.S. Naval Academy and the prayers on the opening of Congress as indicating his right to have the services. However, the U.S. Naval Academy did not require all midshipmen to attend the Protestant services, but had the Catholics and all denominations attend services of their own choosing. The opening prayers in Congress do not have compulsory attendance, and are given by clergymen of different faiths. However this one episode caused some of the men to write back to their families and, in turn, caused the officer commanding the destroyer escorts from Pearl Harbor to write to Lt. Commander Arnheiter to go easy on the services. Lt. Commander Arnheiter then turned the services into "moral guidance" sessions.

The Navy Regulations dealing with the responsibilities of the Commanding Officer, is Article 0711 "Observance of Sunday." Section 1 clearly provides:

"Divine services shall be conducted on Sunday, if possible. All assistance and encouragement shall be given to chaplains in the conduct of these services, and music shall be made available if practicable. A suitable space shall be designated and properly rigged for the occasion, and quiet shall be maintained throughout the vicinity during divine services. *The religious tendencies of individuals shall be recognized and encouraged.*"

This provision is based on Title 10, United States Code, Section 6031(b):

"The commanders of vessels and naval activities to which chaplains are attached shall cause divine service to be performed on Sunday, whenever the weather and other circumstances allow it to be done; and it is *earnestly recommended to all officers, seamen, and others in the naval service diligently to attend at every performance of the worship of Almighty God.*"

Both the statute and the regulations are very careful to *encourage* attendance at divine services and not to make the attendance compulsory. Yet this latter is precisely what Lt. Commander Arnheiter did.

The first "All Hands Aft" was held on January 2, 1966, and the program consisted of:

a. The singing of patriotic songs: "My Country 'Tis of Thee" and "The Battle Hymn of the Republic."

b. A talk by Arnheiter on the role of prayer and worships in the country's military history.

c. The singing of the hymns "O God, Our Help in Ages Past", "Faith of Our Fathers", and the Navy Hymn, "Eternal Father Strong to Save".

d. Prayer of benediction of Arnheiter.

On subsequent Sundays the services were led by Lt. Commander Arnheiter, or by another officer.

The reaction of the part of the Catholic members of the officers and crew was instantaneous and strong yet Lt. Commander Arnheiter did not waiver on his course until he received the letter from the destroyer escort commander in Pearl Harbor.

G. Shortly after he took command, Lt. Commander Arnheiter believed that he was not getting the proper response out of the officers to some of his desires, so he instituted a "Boner Box." Each evening those who were found guilty of violating some command or precept were fined 25 cents, and the money put into the box. Such fines, though minor, are still a violation of the military code. Some of the items for which fines were levied included serving green beans instead of asparagus as provided on the menu, not using a knife properly, and appearing at dinner in a sweat shirt. Later this box was supplemented by a chart in the wardroom indicating the dereliction of the officers. The money collected was used to furnish cigars to the officers (which were then free to Lt. Commander Arnheiter). The officers resented the box and chart as being childish and undignified.

H. During the stopover in Guam on the westward deployment, the *Vance* had to go alongside a pier for further repairs. While it was laid up, there was a Mess Night attended by all officers except the most junior. The orders for the Pacific Fleet called for one-third of the crew to be on the ship at all times. This was important; if fire should start, a ship in "cold iron" condition is unusually vulnerable.

The Mess Night was planned by Lt. Commander Arnheiter as a formal dinner for the officers. He set the menu with a different wine with each course. At the end of the evening, following many a suggestion from Lt. Commander Arnheiter, some of the officers tried to take the candelabra from the Officers Club to put in the wardroom of the

Vance. Lt. Commander Arnheiter didn't stop them, but, according to his own statement, went to speak to the Club Manager and only later when his officers pointed out to him that the episode had been seen, did he have the candelabras returned. However, the next morning a coffee pot of the kind Lt. Commander Arnheiter had sought for his use on the bridge happened to appear on board the ship. It was not returned.

I. Arnheiter gave candy to children on junks. But instead of paying for candy, he had the candy condemned as unfit for human consumption and then given to the children. There was also some change in entries in the books for the ship's mess, at Lt. Commander Arnheiter's order, too, which resulted in a lower payment by him of his first share in January 1966.

J. Following each of the shore bombardments that he engaged in, Lt. Commander Arnheiter sent statements to the public relations office of CTF 115 (not official reports to the commander of CTF 115) which were thought to be highly exaggerated by both his own officers and by the officers of the ships nearby that witnessed the exercises.

K. Toward the end of the three months, Lt. Commander Arnheiter had his officers prepare an 8-page recommendation for him to receive the Silver Star or the Legion of Merit for his gunfire support missions. The terms of the citation were actually the words of Lt. Commander Arnheiter, and in the opinions of the officers were grossly exaggerated.

L. After listening to the witnesses, and their attitudes, the Hearing Officer found:

"During cross-examination of witnesses LCDR Arnheiter displayed an acid, harsh, repetitious and unforgiving attitude in pursuing points—even points in his favor. His impatience was continuously obvious and he frequently interrupted the witness before the answer was well along. At least two witnesses, including the Executive Officer, testified that this was the normal way he acted during his time on *Vance*. He would not stand for anyone disagreeing with him except the Executive Officer, and then only in private."

This finding was specifically approved by the convening authority as based both on the observations of the Hearing Officer and on the record. This attitude of Lt. Commander Arnheiter is even more evident when the tapes are heard, especially in his cross-examination of the Executive Officer.

There are many other items which could be included. The outstanding and typical ones have been covered.

NAVY PROCEDURES

After the request for the relief of Lt. Commander Arnheiter went from the command at Subic Bay to the Bureau of Naval Personnel in Washington and was approved, a single officer was appointed to investigate the circumstances surrounding the relief.

Article C–7801(4) of the Bureau of Naval Personnel Manual provides for "Detachment of Officers for Cause." Subparagraph (d) thereof provides the procedures and section 2 is for the instances where speed is mandatory. It states:

"Where speed is mandatory, because of any emergency, impending extended deployment of the ship or squadron to which the officer is attached, or other urgent reason, the request for detachment may preliminarily be made by message, stating briefly the reasons and the nature of the urgency. Appropriate action will be taken, but in all cases the command must also promptly submit a detailed letter as outlined below. Final action will be taken only on the basis of this letter which, with the officer's statement, can be made a part of his official record."

In this case speed was considered mandatory. The *Vance* was about to return for an extended deployment. The apparent problems could not be allowed to continue (if they were true) with the ship in the military operations of Market Time.

In Article C–7801(4)(a) the general policy of not allowing detachments for cause is set forth but with the following exception:

"An exception to this policy might be the case of an officer whose repeated misconduct while assigned to a relatively independent, isolated area has caused considerable damage to the prestige of the Navy."

A further provision is subsection (1) of Article C–7801(4):

"*Detachment by field orders*. Where commands issue summary detachment orders for reasons of the types contemplated in this Article, substantially similar procedures should be followed in requesting that the Chief of Naval Personnel confirm such orders."

Under this provision, the local command itself had the authority to summarily detach Lt. Commander Arnheiter if it chose to exercise that power.

With the relief of Lt. Commander Arnheiter, he was temporarily assigned duty in Subic Bay pending investigation. No finding of cause was made at that time.

Although Article C-7801 does not call for a Judge Advocate General Manual investigation, the Navy utilized the provisions of Chapter VI of the Manual of the Judge Advocate General to establish an informal investigation; it also utilized Part II of the Chapter to establish an informal one-officer investigation. The officer appointed was the commander of a destroyer squadron, and the former commander of a destroyer. Article C-7801 makes no reference to any Court of Inquiry.

Immediately following the relief of Lt. Commander Arnheiter, the commander of the destroyer escort squadron, Commander Milligan, went on board the *Vance* and requested any statements, pro or con, any person on the ship might desire to make about the circumstances surrounding the relief of Lt. Commander Arnheiter. He received about 35 statements which were turned over to Captain Witter who had been named to conduct the JAG Manual investigation. These statements were, in turn, made available to Lt. Commander Arnheiter and to his counsel prior to the first session of the investigation. The hearings ran six and a half days, were recorded on tape and transcribed onto over 400 pages of single-spaced transcript. Unfortunately one of the tapes did not record and that portion of the hearing had to be reconstructed from memory by the Hearing Officer. Twenty witnesses were heard and Lt. Commander Arnheiter testified in his own behalf. All of the witnesses were subject to cross-examination not only by Lt. Commander Arnheiter's counsel, but by Lt. Commander Arnheiter himself, who used the opportunity of cross-examination to, in effect, testify at that same time. A large part of the testimony was caused by Arnheiter's repeated and lengthy attempts to go over and over matters or earlier testimony. The Hearing Officer had the opportunity to see and evaluate all who testified.

The Investigating Officer reported on April 27, making 40 findings of fact, giving 12 opinions and 4 recommendations. He recommended that the removal from command be sustained, and that Lt. Commander Arnheiter not be assigned command either ashore or afloat. The convening authority at Subic Bay reviewed the case on May 23, 1966, and in general concurred with the findings and opinions, adding some 10 findings of fact and 5 opinions. In addition it was found that Lt. Commander Arnheiter revealed a gross lack of judgment, a complete inability to command and lead people and a lack of integrity.

These findings, opinions and recommendations, then became the letter of recommendation, and was referred to Lt. Commander Arnheiter. He responded thereto with a document 4 inches thick.

On August 30, 1966, the Commander of the Cruiser-Destroyer Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet concurred in the relief from command of *Vance* but recommended that Lt. Commander Arnheiter be returned to command of another destroyer escort in his Force. All of the records were then reviewed by the Chief of Naval Personnel and, on September 9th, he determined that the detachment was to be held as being *for cause*. Since the issue of another command in the Pacific Fleet had been raised, the Chief of Naval Personnel requested that the Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet review and endorse the investigation report. At the request of the Commander in Chief, Commander Cruiser-Destroyer Force rereviewed that report and, on November 1, 1966, reaffirmed substantially his earlier conclusions. On January 20, 1967, the Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet reviewed the case and recommended that the relief should be sustained for cause and that Lt. Commander Arnheiter not be reassigned to a command. On June 29, 1967, the Chief of Naval Personnel reaffirmed his decision that Lt. Commander Arnheiter's detachment from *Vance* was *for cause*.

A careful examination of the regulations, the Manual of the Judge Advocate General and the hearings leads to the only conclusion—that Lt. Commander Arnheiter was given the opportunity to have his say as specifically provided.

In addition to all of these formal reviews, the case has been reviewed several times in the Office of the Judge Advocate General, in the Office of the Secretary of the Navy and by the Secretary of the Navy, himself. Every opportunity has been provided to be sure that the treatment afforded Lt. Commander Arnheiter was fair to him.

This Committee has instructed its staff to make a complete and thorough evaluation of the case. All of the documents on file in the Department of the Navy have been examined, and most of the tapes relating to the actual hearing have been heard. Lt. Commander Arnheiter was specifically invited to provide the committee with any facts he had not previously filed with the Navy. His 12-page reply was argumentative and did not provide any new facts.

THE ROLE OF CAPTAIN ALEXANDER

It is not known where Captain Alexander first entered into the career of Lt. Cdr. Arnheiter. It is known, however, that during the time that Lt. Cdr. Arnheiter was trying to get a command designation, Capt. Alexander was the head of the section in the Bureau of Personnel responsible for the assignment of destroyer officers. Captain Alexander wrote to Lt. Cdr. Arnheiter on August 18, 1964; telling him to be patient in seeking a destroyer command. When Lt. Cdr. Arnheiter's name was proposed for command, it came before a three-man board in the Bureau, on which Captain Alexander sat. Of the three members, only Captain Alexander voted to allow Lt. Cdr. Arnheiter to assume a command. The board's decision was overruled by the next higher authority, with the ruling that Lt. Cdr. Arnheiter might be given a command only in an emergency. When the *Vance* needed a new commanding officer to replace the man who had been on her for more than two years, it was Captain Alexander who originated the orders assigning Lt. Cdr. Arnheiter to her.

While Capt. Alexander was a staunch supporter of Lt. Cdr. Arnheiter for a long period of time, on March 13, 1967, after reviewing the entire file, he wrote to Lt. Cdr. Arnheiter the best summary of the Navy's position in existence. His letter is set forth in Appendix A. Subsequently, Captain Alexander reversed his position again to provide a passionate defense of Lt. Cdr. Arnheiter.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions 1 through 5 from the letter of Capt. Alexander to Lt. Cdr. Arn-

heiter of March 13, 1967 give as good a summary of the situation as can be found:

1. ". . . Command is a high goal which exposes an officer to evaluations for which excuses and allowances are seldom acceptable. You were given your chance. . . . You failed in command and have been reevaluated by your seniors. . . . But based on my own judgment I conclude your seniors are correct."

2. "Your assignment to a command was, quite frankly, a calculated risk. I was happy to support you. After the *Vance* incident, I must ask myself, what sort of risk would reassignment to command detail? Could I support the risk now? I could not."

3. "As CO you had a responsibility to your ship to gauge the effects of your policies on your officers and men and to proceed no faster than could be done without damaging morale. I am not satisfied that your programs were intentionally sabotaged. You claim they were, and admit no responsibility for yourself. This reluctance to shoulder any blame is unacceptable. . . . And you should also ask yourself where the line lies between people being in agreement on a matter and their being in collusion . . . Whether or not there was a degree of collusion does not effect the opinions they held regarding the actions for which you were responsible nor the existence of the actions themselves."

4. "With the best of intentions you were aggressive in action. But there is a limit dictated by good judgment. An excessive zeal in the expending of ordnance is almost as unacceptable as sluggishness. The Navy can condone neither of these in its Captains. The burden of evidence appears to me to indicate that your zeal was excessive and your judgment faulty. . . . The limit of a Captain's action is established by his judgment. A Captain who goes too far in any thing displays poor judgment. Poor judgment is unacceptable."

5. "I am also reluctantly led to the conclusion that the essential facts relating to your exercise of poor judgment in Command are established. A new investigation probably would not introduce anything new on this score. Even if the procedure followed in effecting your relief had been done better, I cannot see how this crucial factor would be changed. . . . You must face the fact that you were, in the majority opinion, including my own, brought down by your own actions and not by faulty procedures or disloyal subordinates."

6. In addition I would agree with the finding of the Hearing Officer that the Executive Officer of the VANCE went above and beyond the call of duty in trying to keep the ship operating as normally as possible in the face of the problems imposed on the ship by Lt. Cdr. Arnheiter.

7. Lt. Cdr. Arnheiter used the high privilege of command, with its absolute responsibility and absolute authority, for his own personal gain.

GEORGE NORRIS,
Counsel.

APPENDIX A

MARCH 13, 1967.

Capt. MARCUS A. ARNHEITER,
c/o Commander Western Sea Frontier,
Treasure Island,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR MARC: The decision behind the writing of this letter has been painfully and carefully arrived at.

My problem has been to weigh your own views of your case, certain irregularities in the handling of the case, the opinions expressed by reviewing officers, and an objective view of my own based on a reading and re-reading of the full record, including the testimony. From all of this I came to the conclusion that your position is not one that I can any longer support. My opinion boils down to the following:

a. As CO you had a responsibility to your ship to gauge the effects of your policies on your officers and men and to proceed no faster than could be done without damaging morale. I am not satisfied that your programs were intentionally sabotaged. You claim they were, and admit no responsibility for yourself. This reluctance to shoulder any blame is unacceptable.

b. With the best of intentions you were aggressive in action. But there is a limit dictated by good judgment. An excessive zeal in expending ordnance is almost as unacceptable as sluggishness. The Navy can condone neither of these in its Captains. The burden of evidence appears to me to indicate that your zeal was excessive and your judgment faulty.

The other allegations against you appear not as significant to me as the above. The essence of your defense is that you were "squaring away" a poor ship and operating it aggressively. I must reluctantly conclude that in my judgment both of these were over-done. The limit of a Captain's action is established by his judgment. A Captain who goes too far in any thing displays poor judgment. Poor judgment is unacceptable.

I am also reluctantly led to the conclusion that the essential facts relating to your exercise of poor judgment in Command are established. A new investigation probably would not introduce anything new on this score. Even if the procedures followed in effecting your relief had been done better, I cannot see how this crucial factor would be changed.

Those who gave testimony unfavorable to you were in agreement about things that happened and also in agreement in their opinions of your leadership which brought about these events. Seeking to upset all of this by establishing collusion among these people will not change the facts of what happened. Remember that the Navy's decision is based on what you did as Commanding Officer, not on what your people thought about what you did. And you should also ask yourself where the line lies between people being in agreement on a matter and their being in collusion. It is a fact that some of your people were in agreement and their opinions became known outside of the Command. Whether or not there was a degree of collusion does not effect the opinions they held regarding the actions for which *you* were responsible, nor the existence of the actions themselves.

In the face of all of this, I suggest you consider whether you have reached a point beyond which you can go no further to any good effect. I do not see how anything you can do could possibly change the decision which has been reached. You are intelligent enough to recognize this. Whether you are able to submit to your intelligence is up to you to show.

Your assignment to command was, quite frankly, a calculated risk. I was happy to support you. After the Vance incident, I must ask myself, what sort of risk would reassignment to command entail? Could I support the risk now? I could not.

I have done what I can for you inside the Navy. My concern for you is well known in BuPers, and I think has helped in ensuring that your case has had a careful, searching look. The importance of adhering as closely as possible to procedures that are designed to minimize doubts in these cases is recognized with renewed clarity. But you must face that fact that you were, in the majority opinion, including my own, brought down by your own actions and not by faulty procedures or disloyal subordinates.

I realize what a hard blow this letter will give you. I want you to know that I have supported you a long way in your efforts to obtain exhonoration, and that I was prepared to go much further so long as my own doubts persisted. Specifically, I have had prepared for use a request for furlough for myself in order that I could be released from active duty obligations in order to assist you, and my intent to do so was known. I will not proceed with that step because I am now convinced that you are wrong and the Chief of Naval Personnel's decision is right.

The foregoing is doubly difficult to write because I have a high regard for many of your attributes. I would like to see them preserved for the Navy. But Command is a high goal which exposes an officer to evaluations for which excuses and allowances are seldom acceptable. You were given your chance. I am not ashamed of my support of you when that decision was made. You failed in command and have been reevaluated by your seniors. I am not ashamed of the support I have given you since then to be certain that the full story was known in the Bureau. But based on my own judgment I conclude your seniors are correct. Therefore, my support can go no further.

As a friend, I urge you to give some thought now to the future. You obviously must prepare for a new career. A part of this preparation will be to let this episode subside. If it does not subside, so that the personal anguish it causes you continues, it may undo you. Your family is entitled to the exercise of good judgment by you to ensure that this does not occur. Men who surrender honorably after a struggle has reached an intelligent limit are usually at peace with themselves. Keep your future responsibilities in mind and weigh your decision carefully.

Very sincerely,

R. G. ALEXANDER,
Captain, U.S. Navy.

THE 22D ANNIVERSARY OF THE ITALIAN REPUBLIC

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, 1946, the Italian people went to the polls and voted away the bankrupt Fascist regime which has led the country astray on the road to war and devastation. The war-weary Italians yearned for a new beginning, and on that day they expressed their faith in parliamentary democracy as the form of government best suited to lead Italy on the road to recovery and peace, while guaranteeing individual freedoms and national integrity.

June 2, 1946, was indeed a new beginning. The remarkable achievements of the Italian Republic in the past 22 years have amply shown that the Italians had made the right choice.

The road was not easy. The fledgling Republic was beset with many problems—political, social, and economic. In the economic realm, everything needed to be done. In 1946, Italy suffered from the ravages of the war added to 20 years of Fascist mismanagement and incompetence. Hunger and disease were rampant. Thousands of homes were mere rubble. One-quarter of Italy's railroad tracks, one-third of its bridges, one-half of its powerplants, two-thirds of its roads were destroyed as a result of the intensive fighting which had taken place on Italian soil.

Today, 22 years later, the accomplishments are there for all to admire. With American aid, mainly through the Marshall plan, and Italian determination, Italy, handicapped by a lack of raw materials, has not only rebuilt its economy but has rendered it extremely competitive in world markets. The north has become a leading industrial center in Europe. Fiat is one of Europe's largest automobile manufacturers and the Italian electric appliance industry has outpaced all its European rivals. Italian textiles and leather goods are appreciated by consumers far beyond Italy's frontiers. The vitality of Italy's growth was illustrated during the past 2 years when Italy's economy remained immune to the stagnation which occurred in France and to the slight recession which hit Germany. Today Italy is one of the most outstanding and active members of the Common Market. This is evidenced by the fact that Italy's gross national product rose 5.7 percent in real terms last year and is forecast to increase 5 to 5.5 percent this year.

Development has been uneven. The south has traditionally lagged behind the north, but great efforts have been made to close the gap. The Cassa per il Mezzogiorno, or fund for the south, was established 15 year ago, as part of a plan to help remedy the disequilibrium between the north and the south. Aid worth more than $2 billion has already been poured into the region to help finance public works and agrarian reform, establish new industries, create vocational and technical schools. Private capital is also solicited. Industries are requested to put at least 40 percent of their new investment into the south. Much remains to be done, but the results are impressive.

These accomplishments are all the more impressive when one remembers that Italy's parliamentary regime has had to face antidemocratic opposition on two fronts. Attacks have come from the extreme right, although recent elections have shown that the monarchists and the fascists have dwindled in numbers. More threatening are the Communists, who never miss an opportunity to discredit the regime and obstruct the normal functioning of government by any devious means at their disposal. In the light of these oppositions, the Italian Republic has shown remarkable resilience and stability. Moreover, in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Italy has been and continues to be a stalwart and loyal Western ally.

Italian vitality and ingenuity have not been confined to economic development and political stability. The postwar era was also a new beginning for the arts. Twenty years of fascist rule had silenced most Italian artists and intellectuals, who found themselves either in jail or in exile.

The establishment of democratic institutions in 1946 guaranteed the freedom necessary for artistic expression. The versatility and creativity displayed by contemporary Italian artists and intellectuals have brought them worldwide acclaim. The poet Salvatore Quasimodo won the Nobel Prize for literature in 1960. The literary works of writers Cesare Pavese and Ignazio Silone have been translated into many languages. Italian movies have won many prizes in international film festivals. Rome and Florence rival Paris in the world of fashion.

True to their humanistic heritage, Italian artists and intellectuals have focused their attention on personal and social problems, problems of change and problems of stagnation with such fancy, imagination, and poignancy, that their works have achieved worldwide relevance and acceptance.

Italy, through the centuries, has maintained an advanced civilization and has served as the font of Western culture. Her legal system is a model for the West, her language is the tongue of music, and her Renaissance stands as one of man's greatest achievements. Her glorious history is reflected today in her bright and beckoning future and in the outstanding accomplishments made during the era of the Italian Republic.

Mr. Speaker, it is, therefore, with pride and admiration that I offer my congratulations to the Italian people and to their leaders, His Excellency, Giuseppe Saragat, President of the Italian Republic; His Excellency, Aldo Moro, Premier of the Italian Republic; His Excellency, Amintore Fanfani, Minister for Foreign Affairs; and his Excellency, Egidio Ortona, the Ambassador of Italy to the United States, whom I have had the pleasure of meeting and welcoming personally to the United States.

On this glad occasion, I pay tribute to the Italian people and their outstanding leaders for the achievements made during the 22-year existence of the Italian Republic, and I extend warmest best wishes to the people of that great Republic as well as to our many friends of Italian descent in my own Seventh District of Illinois, throughout the United States, and all over the world who are joining in the celebration of this anniversary.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO URGES HOUSE SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S HOUSING BILL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 28, the Senate passed President Johnson's housing bill by an overwhelming vote. This action was a magnificent response to the request of the President, made last February, "that the Congress commit this Nation to a massive housing program to wipe out all substandard housing over a 10-year period."

That is an ambitious goal, but President Johnson has never hung back when it comes to meeting the demonstrated needs of the American people. And there can be no doubt that adequate housing is a pressing need for millions of our people.

The unique feature of the bill passed Tuesday is that it is geared specifically to meet the needs of families with low and moderate incomes, including the very poor. For too long, the housing needs of the poor have not received adequate attention through Federal programs. Now, that situation will be remedied.

At this point, the next action is up to the House, and I am confident that we will not be found wanting. I support, and I urge others to support, enactment of this historic bill, which will benefit so many Americans.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON PILGRIMAGE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in furtherance of their dedication to the promotion of national patriotism, AMVETS posts in the Department of Pennsylvania last month launched an Americanism program that will help show many young people the way to the highest standards of morality and citizenship. Conducted by AMVETS and AMVETS auxiliary in cooperation with Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, the George Washington Pilgrimage was undertaken with this stated purpose:

> To instill in the hearts and minds of tomorrow's leaders an appreciation and ardent admiration for the faith, zeal, and character of George Washington, who in the face of tremendous odds and with scant resources, was primarily responsible for wresting freedom for a nation from the impossible historic odds set up by endless generations which had lived in servitude; to trace the youth, training, character development, and growth, and acceptance of responsibility, the vision, and the emergence as a leader of this God-fearing man whose courage, humility, and determination changed the entire course of history.

The 5-day education experience was made available to a group of respected and talented citizen-leaders of the junior high school level. It traced the important aspects and environs of George Washington's life from his birthplace, boyhood home, adult home, and campaign sites of the Revolution to his emergence as first President of the United States.

Designed as a pilot project in restoring and motivating faith and character for the future from faith and accomplishments of the past, the program was so successful that AMVETS is already planning to expand in the years to follow.

America is obligated to AMVETS and to AMVETS auxiliary for this novel approach to giving the youngsters a real understanding of the remarkable life of the Father of our Country. An educational experience for youth into any personality or adventure contributing to the Nation's development would have had

the warm endorsement of George Washington, who included this passage in his first annual message to Congress:

Knowledge is in every country the surest basis of public happiness. In one in which the measures of Government receive their impression so immediately from the sense of the Community as in ours it is proportionately essential. To the security of a free Constitution it contributes in various ways: By convincing those who are entrusted with the public administration, that every valuable end of Government is best answered by the enlightened confidence of the people: and by teaching the people themselves to know and to value their own rights; to discern and provide against invasions of them; to distinguish between oppression and the necessary exercise of lawful authority; between burthens proceeding from a disregard to their convenience and those resulting from the inevitable exigencies of Society; to discriminate the spirit of Liberty from that of licentiousness, cherishing the first, avoiding the last, and uniting a speedy, but temperate vigilance against encroachments, with an inviolable respect to the Laws.

Mr. Speaker, the present is inescapable evidence of future need for greater knowledge of the life and fervor of George Washington, and for the desire to emulate. With God's help, AMVETS will assist in accomplishing this vital mission.

Following is a list of those who participated in the program:

Aungst, Sharon	Lantz, John
Blasy, Arsine	Lawler, Richard
Burd, Theresa	Lenhart, Edgar
Eichelberger, Lucy	McCloskey, Timothy
Hippensteel, Cynthia	McDonald, William
Kavanagh, Freda J.	Mowday, Dennis
Nolan, Barbara Ann	Riesch, Edward
Porter, Joan	Rothman, Steven
Riccardi, Amelia M.	Sheeler, David
Coover, Douglas	Sheppo, Douglas
Hughes, Dennis	Stovall, Jeffrey
Hughes, Robert	Thomas, David
Koal, Philip	Turner, Michael

THIS IS AUSTERITY?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, with President Johnson demanding a 10-percent increase in Federal taxes, it is interesting to note that his new Ambassador to France, Sargent Shriver, is seeking four additional employees for the already huge Embassy staff in Paris.

His wife, a former Kennedy, is "very active," says Shriver, so he wants a bilingual person at a fancy salary to help her with her social activities.

He insists on a personal, handpicked public relations officer although other ambassadors used personnel of the U.S. Information Service for that purpose.

Shriver is also requesting an additional personal staff assistant, and an extra chauffeur although there are reported to be at least 26 car drivers in the Paris Embassy motor pool.

Secretary of State Rusk ought to acquaint Ambassador Shriver with the fact that he is no longer head of the poverty program, and that padding his new payroll is not to be tolerated.

If this is to be the pattern, there is serious doubt that the taxpayers can stand a further expansion of the Kennedy family in the Federal Government.

HUNGER IN AMERICA

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include certain letters and documents from the Secretary of Agriculture regarding food for the poor people.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, one of the things which has distinguished the United States of America from many countries of the world is our insistence on a free press. The history of the country and the history of the American press provides ample evidence of the wisdom of this policy.

Recently, however, I have detected among many of you a growing disenchantment with the press and a loss of confidence in the integrity, objectivity, accuracy, and motivation of the press. People frequently accuse the press of pandering to sensationalism. I do not share that view, but I do feel that the press—both the broadcast and print media—have become so conscious of the need to entertain people that they have let slick writing and dramatic production become more important than the truth.

All of us, I am sure, can cite numerous instances of where the press has strayed badly. I would like to cite but three. In one instance a reporter for a St. Louis newspaper stated in a dispatch that I was going to offer an amendment to a piece of legislation. I had no intention of doing so and the reporter had neither bothered to call me nor any member of my staff before printing the erroneous report.

In another, a columnst attributed to me a remark that I was telling people from my district that if they came to Washington to visit this summer, they should bring a company of troops along for protection. This was a gross distortion of comments I made in a television interview and was obviously printed to present the columnst's viewpoint without any regard for the accuracy of the report.

The last example concerns a newspaper account which appeared last week in one of the Washington newspapers. In this story, a candidate in the California primary election was said to be paying voter registrars 30 cents for every Negro they registered. The simple fact of the matter is that the voter registration rolls for the California primary election closed in April and any cub reporter should have either known this or found it out and not have printed what was obviously intended by the person quoted to discredit the candidate.

Recently, a national television network carried a documentary on hunger which from many accounts appears to have been grossly distorted. The Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, has cited numerous instances where the network failed to check out material it was reporting as facts and, even worse, failed to present information it had in hand which would have given the public a more truthful picture of conditions.

I am sure that all of us know that there is pathos and drama in poverty in our country without exaggerating it and I believe the Secretary of Agriculture has demonstrated during his years in office that he takes a back seat to no man in his concern for the poor.

I would like to conclude briefly by saying that I feel that in many ways the press is failing in its mission. The press has always contended that if the public knows the facts, the Government will remain honest. I subscribe to that doctrine. My only fear is that too many members of the press are failing to give the public the facts and that in the long run both the press and the public will suffer because of this failing.

At this point I would like to place in the RECORD three documents dealing with the CBS documentary. First is a letter from Secretary Freeman to the president of CBS. Second is a letter from the Secretary to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture and Labor [Mr. PERKINS], and the third is a statement on hunger sent by the Secretary to the press on May 21:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, May 27, 1968.

Dr. FRANK STANTON,
President, Columbia Broadcasting System, New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. STANTON: My disappointment with CBS Reports "Hunger in America" is matched only by my indignation.

For the second time in recent months, the television industry has done a great disservice to the domestic food programs of the Department of Agriculture. But of even more importance, the industry again has done a great disservice to the poor and the hungry of this country.

When the Public Broadcast Laboratory's "Hunger-American Style" was telecast on February 25, I was privately outraged but publicly silent. I was able to excuse the superficial treatment of a complex problem by taking into account PBL's youth, its inexperience, its zealousness and its naivete.

But when I watched CBS compound the superficialities, the misinterpretations and the mistakes of fact of PBL's examination of hunger and food programs, I decided I could no longer remain silent.

"Hunger in America," bluntly and simply, was a travesty on objective reporting. It presented to millions of viewers a distorted, oversimplified and misleading picture of domestic hunger and what is being done to combat it—and it served to further disillusion, disappoint and disenchant those hungry people who now have been told that no one cares, that no one is doing much to help them. This, in turn, can only serve to increase the bitterness and the unrest that so disturbs American society today. I know that this allegation of indifference is untrue. The people of the Department of Agriculture who work so conscientiously to transform humanitarian concern for the hungry into action programs know this is untrue. And those hungry people whom we have reached and whom we have helped—within the rigid limitations of statutory and budgetary restrictions—know this is untrue.

But millions of affluent Americans—and millions of poor Americans who have not yet been reached because we have too few funds and too restrictive authorities— do *not* know this is untrue.

Because of this, Dr. Stanton, I am asking equal network time to refute the errors of fact, the misinterpretations and the misinformation that were dispersed through "Hunger in America" and to assure the hungry of this Nation that the USDA *does* care, that it *is* doing what it can for them . . . that it *wants* to do a great deal more.

I am attaching to this letter a bill of particulars citing the errors in "Hunger in America." At its request, I am filing the same bill of particulars with the House Committee on Education and Labor.

I charge CBS with shoddy journalism. The job of researching for this program was inadequate, and the shallow overview of the problems underscores the danger of beginning with a preconception, only to end with propaganda.

When your researchers first came to our Department last October, our people were delighted to cooperate. The fight to win the war on hunger—the very attempts to call public attention to domestic hunger—have been lonely pursuits, and we welcomed the prestigious interest of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

The last time your researchers called upon our Department for information was nearly two months ago. So far as we are able to determine, no attempt was made to check program allegations against facts after that time.

But this is really beside the point. After five months of researching, CBS ought to have had a much broader, much deeper understanding of the problem and the efforts to solve that problem than was apparent in the documentary aired on May 21.

Nowhere in your program was there a clear explanation of the Federal-State-Local government structuring of the food programs, nor of how this structuring frequently frustrates or delays initiation of food programs.

Nowhere in your program was there an accounting of the progress made in feeding programs over the past seven years.

Nowhere in your program was there evidence of the seven-year effort of the Department of Agriculture to obtain broader authorities and increased appropriations for our programs to feed the poor and the hungry.

The tragic paradox of hunger in the midst of plenty is the prime reason I accepted the job as Secretary of Agriculture. Since the day John Kennedy swore me into his Cabinet, I have used every means at my command to resolve that paradox. Moreover, the career people who administer the food programs of the Department of Agriculture share my concern, share my determination, and have been unjustly maligned by your presentation of the Department as an inefficient and an insensitive vehicle for moving food to the hungry.

Year after year, time after time, we have gone before the Congress to plead for more funds, more authority, a more systematized program for feeding the poor. Year after year, time after time, we would have more than welcomed the support of the television industry in our efforts. Where was CBS when we were fighting this lonely battle?

But despite the seven-year delay in your expression of concern for our hungry, despite the funding and the statutory limitations under which we have had to operate we *have* made progress, Dr. Stanton, progress that professional journalistic ethics alone should have required CBS to report.

When I became Secretary of Agriculture in 1961, only 1,200 of the Nation's 3,090 counties had a food program. That program consisted of the distribution of 5 surplus commodities worth about $2.20 per person per month. Only 3½ million people were being reached.

President Kennedy's first executive order doubled the amount and increased the variety of these foods.

Direct distribution provided only nonperishable foods and could not provide the foods necessary for a balanced diet. By executive order, I established a pilot food stamp program that allowed the poor to purchase a variety of foods in grocery stores. A predecessor program of the early forties had been seriously discredited through administrative weaknesses that led to such abuses as stamp bootlegging. Fully aware of this, we administered the new pilot Food Stamp program as carefully and as efficiently as possible. The resulting absence of scandal encouraged public and Congressional confidence, and when President Johnson urged the Congress to make the Food Stamp program a permanent program in 1964, and put the full force of his energy and skills behind its passage, Congress responded favorably. Funding the first fiscal year of the permanent program came to $35.1 million. This year the program is funded at $187.5 million.

Today 2,200 counties, two-thirds of those in the country, have food programs. Some 5.9 million people, nearly double the number seven years ago, are being fed.

Those people still receiving direct distribution of commodities now get 16 different foods worth nearly four times the amount they received in 1961. Food Stamp recipients are now adding to their food dollars by a current rate of almost $17 million a month, or roughly $200 million a year, in additional food purchasing power. Food Stamp Program participants have the opportunity to purchase a much more nutritious diet than those who receive only direct distribution commodities.

In 1962, the peak year of direct commodity distribution, $253 million was spent to feed the poor. This fiscal year, $360 million is being expended in direct distribution and in food stamps, a 42-percent increase in funds.

Furthermore, over the past nine months the USDA has:

1. Began or gained commitments from local governments to begin food programs in over 250 of the 330 poorest counties.

2. Extended food assistance to another one million people.

3. Reduced the amount needed for Food Stamps to 50 cents per person per month for the poorest of the poor.

4. Cut the Food Stamp payment in half for the first month participants.

I have said before, and let me repeat again, that reaching the remainder of the Nation's poorest counties has our top priority. But if CBS's researchers had done their job, they would have known that in some of these areas local authorities simply refuse to cooperate.

Last month we initiated direct federal distribution of food in two counties where we were unable to get a commitment from local government to administer the program. This action was initiated *more than a month* before "Hunger in America" was aired. No mention was made of this, nor of the fact that we have subsequently notified 59 other counties that we will take similar action unless they move to initiate the program. In addition, we are now paying all or part of the food program administrative costs in many of the poorer counties that are cooperating.

The USDA has been using some non-professional aides, recruited from the poor to work in nutrition and to tell the poor about their rights under the Food Stamp Program, and plans to recruit and train hundreds of them within the next year.

Last week I ordered that new foods be added to those now being distributed to 3.5 million poor. These include evaporated milk, instant cereal, fruit juices, canned chicken, and scrambled egg mix. Earlier I had also directed that all allowable enrichment be made of those commodities now, or soon, to be available, particularly to increase the vitamin and iron content so lacking in the diet of the poor. These new commodities will be directed particularly to pregnant women and preschool children, a group where dietary deficiencies can leave the most serious consequences.

This, then, is what we have been able to do with what has been given us by the Congress. The Department is now working to the limits of money and authorities. It is seeking new authorities and more money to help it do a better job.

This help might well have come to us years ago had CBS viewed the problem then in proper perspective and exerted its considerable influence in the right direction.

I look forward to a favorable response to my request for equal time. In this way the true story of hunger in this land, what is being done about it, and what more can be done about it will be made known to the American public.

Sincerely,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, May 27, 1968.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
Chairman, Education and Labor Committee, House of Representatives, Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PERKINS: I am submitting herewith a report on "Hunger in America" which the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives directed me to prepare on May 22, 1968.

The CBS Report, "Hunger in America," prepared by Martin Carr and Don Hewitt, and broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System Network on May 21, 1968, is a biased, one-sided, dishonest presentation of a serious national problem:

1. It contains gross errors of fact that were available to CBS weeks, and in some cases months, before the program was broadcast.

2. Other facts necessary for a balanced presentation of the problem were completely ignored by the producers, although these facts were also available to them.

3. Individual cases were presented in such a manner as to convince an average viewer that they represented the norm for food aid recipients throughout the United States, which they do not.

Many have advised me against making any reply to CBS in this matter. I have been told that no public official, regardless of the merits of his case, can expect to win an argument with a powerful television network. I believe this is true.

Yet an important principle is involved. If the damaging allegations, errors in fact and suppression of known evidence extant in the recent CBS documentary are allowed to go unchallenged, our domestic food aid programs will be damaged beyond repair, and the poor whom they serve will be the losers.

And so Friday in St. Louis, at the request of the CBS-owned affiliate there, KMOX, I attempted to give a partial reply to the show. I attempted to bring forth some of the facts I discuss today. My remarks were cut and edited.

I requested the local interviewer to ask the network to run my remarks. They were not run on the network, although apparently the network was notified, as the edited interview on KMOX was followed by a comment from the network producer of the show, Martin Carr. I am renewing a request for time to reply to CBS today.

I said at the beginning that "Hunger in America" contained gross errors of fact, supression of other facts, and that individual cases were presented as being the norm for food distribution programs throughout the country. I would like to comment on these categories one at a time:

I. GROSS ERRORS OF FACT

1. CBS makes the allegation; "Surplus commodities are foods that farmers cannot

sell and nobody else wants . . . the program consists largely of dumping excesses rather than providing essentials. In April, for instance, the Department of Agriculture distributed 1,400,000 pounds of peanut butter. The program has not changed since it was conceived of in the 1930's."

First, the foods are in over-supply, but they certainly cannot be classified as food "nobody else wants." Today 16 commodities are being distributed. The same commodities are identical in content and purity to those millions of Americans buy at their local supermarkets. They are:

Dried beans, Bulgur, Butter/margarine, Cheese, Corn grits, Vitamin C-enriched mashed potatoes, Cornmeal, Flour.

Chopped meat, Nonfat dry milk, Peanut butter, Dried split peas, Raisins, Shortening/lard, Rolled wheat/oats, Rice.

These commodities provide the following percentages of full daily allowances recommended by the National Research Council: Protein, 99 percent; calcium, 127 percent; iron, 71 percent; food energy, 61 percent; Vitamin A, 38 percent; thiamine, 118 percent; riboflavin, 130 percent; Vitamin C, 30 percent.

2. The program has changed radically—and for the better—since the 1930's. To wit:

As recently as 1960 the poor received only five surplus commodities; lard, rice, flour, dry milk, and cornmeal worth $2.00 per person per month. Now they receive 16, three times that number, worth almost 4 times as much as $7.98 per person per month (as of April).

3. Other changes made in the past year include: Federal financing of direct distribution in those counties that cannot afford to finance their own programs and direct federal distribution in counties that refuse to accept federal help in financing of local programs, two so far, 59 more by July 1, 1968.

4. Further gross errors of fact include the following: CBS states that only 5 million poor people are being helped by existing federal food programs, an error of 900,000. As of March, 1968 5,900,000 were being helped, a fact available to CBS by a single phone call several weeks before the show appeared.

Similarly, the number of counties *not* having food programs is listed as 1,000 by CBS, a 40 percent error. Only 600 counties are without programs. No attempt was made on the network's part to distinguish between high-income counties, which have a relatively lesser need for food programs, and low income counties, where need is greater, and where the bulk of USDA's efforts have been concentrated.

II. THE IGNORING—OR SUPPRESSION—OF KNOWN FACTS AND INDIVIDUAL CASES PRESENTED AS GENERAL TRUTHS

I am well aware of the time limitations under which television must operate. Yet in a one-hour documentary titled "Hunger in America" one would think that two or three minutes could have been spared to point out the following actions, all of which occurred some seven months before the show's airing:

1. That the price of food stamps for persons with no income was reduced to 50 cents a person a month, with a maximum of $3.00 per family per month, regardless of family size.

2. That new food stamp families entering the program have to pay only one-half of the first month's cost.

3. That 2,280,000 needy children are receiving free or reduced price school lunches and that another 96,000—60 percent of the total, are getting free or reduced price school breakfasts.

Instead, the producers cite individual cases, without documentation, and make them appear the norm for the entire food stamp and direct distribution programs.

In its closing minutes the producers make two other highly misleading statements that deserve rebuttal. The first concerns returning Section 32 money to the Treasury:

Our food programs—in common with every other program of the federal government—operated on a finite, rather than an infinite, budget. No law authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to spend as much money as he sees fit to meet any one problem and indeed, if he did so, he would be speedily and rightfully removed from office. Section 32 monies are considered, along with every other dollar the Department spends, in the overall federal budget and charged in the budget as an expenditure. They are subject to expenditure limitations by both executive and legislative action.

The decision not to use some of the Section 32 funds was a judgment of priorities in the effort against hunger and poverty based on these factors.

The funds could not be used for Food Stamps.

Administrative problems—in many cases local resistance, which is rapidly being overcome—precluded expansion of the food program to additional counties. Section 32 money to expand the program into new counties has not been lacking.

The only way in which the Section 32 funds could have been used would have been to add to the variety of commodities being distributed in counties which had programs. While this would have been desirable, it was not judged to be crucial to the food program. This proposal was weighed during the budgetary process against the worth of and the need for other programs for the rural poor—food stamps, housing, educational assistance, manpower training, economic opportunity—all of which must be fit into a finite budget with strict dollar limits to get the best total effort against poverty.

And finally this:

The producers charge that . . . "The Department of Agriculture protects farmers, not consumers, and especially not destitute consumers."

This is a lie.

In the past 7½ years alone this Department has distributed 7.9 billion pounds of food, at a cost of $1,320,560,000 and another $279.7 million worth of bonus food stamps to needy families. My first executive order established this food stamp program, the only answer—short of establishing government-owned supermarkets in every county in the United States—to providing a balanced diet for the poor.

I—more than anyone, perhaps—know that despite all we have done, much remains to be done. I intend to spare no effort while I hold this office to do so; with compassion and within the laws of the United States.

But to say, as CBS did last Tuesday, that all the Nation's efforts to feed the hungry have failed does nothing but undermine—and may ultimately destroy—public confidence in the food programs that have done more to meet the problem of hunger in America than any other effort upon which this Nation has embarked.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee.

Sincerely,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture.

ADDENDUM/INDIVIDUAL CASES

Many individual cases are cited in the CBS documentary. The impression is given that excessive amounts of money are required to purchase food stamps. The law requires a participant to invest in food stamps an amount of money equal to what he has been spending on food. He then receives "bonus" stamps to multiply his food-purchasing power. Families with little or no income—the poorest of the poor—pay only 50 cents per person per month, with a maximum of 3 dollars a month, per family, regardless of how many are in that family.

Without a thorough impartial investigation in the field of the individual circumstances shown in the film, establishing the exact facts is impossible. But, based on the information in the film, the amounts stated by CBS are incorrect. Specifics follow:

* * * * *

MRS. ZANDER: ". . . they (food stamps) cost $70 and I don't have it."

Mrs. Zander said she had 10 children and a husband—a 12 person household. For that number of people, the household income would have to be between $170 and $190 per month, net, to reach a food stamp purchase requirement of $70. Earlier, she said her husband made three to four dollars a day, when working. Even if he worked six days a week, this would mean less than $100 a month.

Either there is considerable income not revealed in the film, or Mrs. Zander is mistaken, based on the information and situation *reported in the film*. . . . The film also reported that Mr. Zander had not worked for 3 or 4 weeks. If that were so, the family would have been eligible for $98 worth of stamps for $3—assuming that his was the only income in the household.

* * * * *

In a fairly long commentary by Charles Kuralt describing the food stamp program, several figures were used—$25, $40, $15—as typical payments by families for food stamps.

Since the context of the Alabama sequence was of dire, rockbottom poverty, it should have been noted that people with virtually no income can get food stamps for much less these figures. Under the reduced requirements instituted last summer to help these people, a family of 8, for example, that has income up to $30 per month, can get $82 worth of food stamps for a token payment of $3. And in many areas, local public charities and groups will make this token payment for families in dire circumstances.

* * * * *

MR. CARLILE: "I don't have the $33 every two weeks (for food stamps) . . . He (her husband) don't make over twenty—twenty-two dollars a week."

Again, as in the case of the Zanders, CBS allowed an obviously mistaken impression of the food stamp program to prevail. This was said to be a household of 16 people. In order to be charged $33 every two weeks for food stamps, income for a family of this size would have to be about $40 a week, double the amount stated in the telecast.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, May 21, 1968.

DEAR CORRESPONDENT: Recent studies of hunger and malnutrition in the United States have drawn new attention to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's food programs.

In an effort to combat misinformation and misunderstanding about these programs, the attached paper has been prepared by the Department to provide a factual background about present food programs, how they were developed and how they are being expanded and improved.

In a time when emotion frequently hampers reason and clouds understanding, I sincerely hope that members of the news media will carefully review "Food and Hunger, USA" and report its contents to the reading, viewing and listening public.

Sincerely,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture.

Attachment.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOOD—HUNGER: 1968

The years of the 60's are a decade of revolutionary change. Every area of public policy demonstrates this characteristic. The unchanging element is that change has not come fast enough. No better illustration of this explosive condition can be found than

in the programs to insure better diets for low income families and for their children when they are away from home.

The vigorous effort to improve the techniques of distributing the nation's food abundance has been exceeded only by the insistence from many groups and individuals that even more needs to be done.

In the span of this decade:

The concept of family food assistance programs has shifted from distributing a few surplus food items to increasing food purchasing power through the use of food stamps; and from supplementing the families food supply to providing a more nearly adequate diet.

The administration of these food assistance efforts has changed from a passive offering to State and local government—"food is available if you are willing to distribute it"—to active encouragement, and the promise that Federal authority will intervene if necessary to make food available to families.

Yet, only as recently as 1964, when it was necessary to gain support in the Congress for passage of the Food Stamp Act, the House of Representatives was told by the Agriculture Committee that the program is voluntary and "is instituted only where the Governor, based on recommendations of the appropriate State agency, has requested the program."

The concept of child feeding programs has been enlarged from the narrow view of providing school lunches, to include school breakfasts and feeding programs for child care activities outside the school system.

These advances can be charted in legislative action. But they also must be measured in the context of victories—and battles yet to be won—to overcome the indifference, active opposition and lack of public confidence in programs; all of which affect the level of funds and the degree of State and local support necessary to transform legal authority into calories and protein.

FAMILY FOOD ASSISTANCE

In 1960, the USDA offered five food items worth at retail about $2.20 per month per person for distribution to families—lard, rice, flour, dry milk, and cornmeal. About 1,200 counties and areas distributed these foods, and participation was about 3.5 million persons in December of 1960.

The first executive order issued by President Kennedy, in January 1961, doubled the number of commodities as well as the amount of food available under the program. Unemployment in 1962 rose to nearly 7 percent. The improved food program reached into a peak 1,800 counties that year, and during one peak month over 7.5 million were served. Average participation in 1962 was 6.5 million people.

At the same time the commodity program was expanded, the Administration also began a pilot food stamp program in eight areas. This pilot effort had grown to cover 43 areas by 1964 when President Johnson requested the Congress to pass the Food Stamp Act as a permanent program to combat hunger.

In the next four years, the Food Stamp program increased more than 20-fold in the number of areas covered, and participation increased seven times over.

Currently, one or the other family food assistance programs is now available—or shortly will be—in 2,400 counties and will serve about 6.1 million persons by the close of FY 68. For comparison purposes, this table will show the progress since 1961:

Fiscal year	Areas			Participation (June) (in millions)		
	DD	FS	Total	DD	FS	Total
1960	1,342	0	1,342	4.3	0	4.3
1968	1,384	1,027	2,411	3.6	2.5	6.1

Both programs operate on the basic premise that their administration and the distribution of food and food stamps rests on a cooperative Federal-State-local structure. State and local governments are responsible for the distribution of food and food stamps, and for determining who is eligible. In the case of the Commodity Distribution program, no specific Congressional mandate exists for this procedure; it developed this way over the past three decades. However, the Food Stamp Act spells out in detail the responsibility of State and local governments, and thus limits the power of the Federal government to operate the Food Stamp program directly.

A second basic premise is that the Food Stamp program will replace the Commodity Distribution program. Stamps help the low income family get a wider and more varied selection of diet, and they utilize a single food distribution system—in this case, replacing a Governmental system for commodities with the highly efficient commercial system.

These two premises have meant that the problems of providing those who are eligible with the opportunity for food assistance are basically different for each program.

FOOD STAMPS

One critical problem with Food Stamps has been to overcome a general public attitude which prevailed in 1960 that a stamp program was unworkable. This view developed from the experiences with the depression-born food stamp activity which started in 1939. It was quietly shelved in 1943 when World War II halted unemployment and appeared to have eliminated the need for food assistance. The program was administratively cumbersome. A family had to buy stamps of one color, which could be used to buy non-surplus food, and they received bonus stamps of another color, which could be used to buy foods which were in surplus supply. The program came under severe attack because it was ponderous, and because adequate safeguards had not been developed to prevent large scale conversion of stamps to cash. Even with all of its problems, the program helped some 4 million persons in 1941.

When the need for the program appeared to vanish, all that remained were the memories of the operating difficulties. In 1960, these memories were very strongly, and the fears which prompt them are still present today. The House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture this year has directed that part of the increase in Food Stamp program funds should be withheld until a number of deficiencies in the program operation are corrected—deficiencies which the USDA uncovered itself and which are being corrected.

The program since 1961 has been uniquely successful; no major scandal has developed in its operation. Strong supervisory, audit and investigatory procedures are constantly underway. It is the most popular, and most sought after food assistance program; more counties always have requested the program than available funds will cover.

With the success of the Food Stamp program reflecting strong administrative control, a number of steps were taken in 1967 to improve the program and extend its coverage. The purchase requirement for the poorest of the poor was reduced from $2 a month per person to 50 cents, with a maximum of $3 per family regardless of size; the purchase requirement for new participants in their first month was cut in half, recognizing the difficulty of putting enough cash together in the same month that past grocery bills had to be paid; and, persons from low income neighborhoods were hired as program aides to work with low income families to explain the program and to create a communication link between these families and local welfare workers.

As a result of these efforts, and an intensified outreach effort conducted through community action agencies, local technical action panels and other public and private groups, participation in the Food Stamp program has increased sharply. In the current fiscal year, the budget for financing the bonus—an average $6 in additional stamps for every $10 spent by participants—was based on an expected increase of 15 percent in areas operating prior to July 1, 1967. However, by February 1968, participation in the "old" areas had increased 22 percent, and particpation in newly opened areas has been greater than past experience would indicate. The result was a budget squeeze which could have amounted to a $10 to $12 million deficit in the program. Prompt action to delay the start of a number of programs by two months, cutting administrative costs to the bone and delaying some payments into the next fiscal year, using emergency authority available under other legislation and seeking standby authority to cover additional deficits, will enable the program to continue. The other option would be to reduce the level of bonus payments, as the Food Stamp Act provides.

The suspicions about the program have not altogether been overcome, however. In 1964, when the first Food Stamp Act was passed, a three year authorization cleared the House of Representatives by a 229 to 189 margin. In 1967, when the legislation was renewed for another two years, a crippling amendment to require States to pay 20 percent of the cost—causing those States to drop out where the program is needed the most—was defeated by an 18 vote margin.

COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION

The Commodity Distribution program is to be replaced by Food Stamps, if and when the funds are provided. Until then, it can be used to fill the gap in food assistance. Currently, 16 commodities are being made available. They are:

Dried beans, Bulgur, Butter/margarine, Cheese, Corn grits, Instant potatoes.

Cornmeal, Flour, Chopped meat, Nonfat dry milk, Peanut butter, Dried split peas.

Raisins, Shortening/lard, Rolled wheat/oats, Rice.

The major problem with the Commodity Distribution program is to obtain wider use among those counties and areas which do not now provide a food assistance program.

In order to encourage local governments to use the program—there is no authority to force them to participate—the USDA in July 1967 offered a target group of 330 counties the funds necessary to pay local administrative costs. These counties are among the 1,000 with the lowest per capita income, and did not have a food assistance program at the start of fiscal 1968. Since that time, over 230 of these counties operate or will start a food assistance program—either commodity distribution or food stamps.

In addition, the USDA has indicated that, if after repeated efforts by Federal and State officials to get a county to start a program, local officials refuse to do so, then the USDA will operate a commodity distribution program independently of the local government until it is willing to assume this responsibility.

In this regard, the Congress has not prohibited direct Federal action—but neither has it authorized it.

Commodities used in this program are acquired by the USDA through price support activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation or the purchase of surplus farm commodities authorized under Section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1935.

CHILD FEEDING PROGRAMS

The dramatic changes in the family food assistance programs have been accompanied by as dramatic, and substantial, change in the programs which provide food service to children when they are away from home. These include authority for:

Special financial assistance to provide free or reduced price lunches to children in schools in low income areas;

School Breakfast programs, available to all children, but giving Federal support to schools in low income areas or those attended by children traveling long distances;

Financial assistance to schools in low income areas to acquire facilities and equipment needed to operate a lunch program;

Financial assistance to States to pay the additional administrative costs of new Child Nutrition programs; and

Financial support for meals in child care activities operating outside the school system.

The only child feeding program available in 1960 was the National School Lunch program. Enacted in 1947, after a number of years as a special program conducted under general authority of Section 32 to dispose of surplus food, the Act provides:

Cash assistance to States on the basis of the previous year's participation in the School Lunch program;

Additional support in the form of food commodities acquired by the USDA.

The Act directs that meals will be served "without cost or at reduced price to children who are determined by local school authorities to be unable to pay the full cost."

This program, as with the family food assistance programs, operates through a Federal-State-local system. The physical operation is the immediate responsibility of the State education agency, which provides assistance to local school districts to establish school lunch programs based on need and attendance. Need, in this case, has been interpreted in the broad sense . . . that is. taking into account all students.

In addition, the Act requires that States match the Federal cash contribution—currently about 4.5 cents per meal—on a 3 to 1 basis.

In addition, the USDA contributes 8 cents worth per meal in commodities. However, the law has been interpreted, based on legislative history, that the child's payment for the lunch will be considered as the State's matching contribution. Only 10 States now appropriate funds for program operations.

At present, the School Lunch program is available in schools attended by 36 million children, of whom about 20 million are estimated to participate daily. The program is not available in schools attended by about 9 million children.

The cost of a lunch today averages between 50 and 55 cents, and the average charge per child is about 28 cents. The difference is made up from the Federal contribution and local funds—except where State funds are made available.

In 1962, a determined effort was made to get the States to do more to bring school lunches to children whose parents cannot afford the cost of a lunch. It met with little success. The Administration changed tactics and requested the Congress to authorize additional funds for this purpose. The Congress amended the School Lunch Act, adding Section 11, to give this authority. The Congress also spelled out specific criteria for the Department to follow in apportioning Section 11 funds among the States.

During the next three years the Department's requests for funds to operate Section 11 were rejected by the Congress. It was only in 1966, after the appropriation bill was amended successfully on the Senate floor, that funds became available.

The major expansion of the programs for child feeding came in 1966 when President Johnson proposed legislation which became the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. The proposal included a School Breakfast program, authority to assist hard pressed schools to acquire lunch facilities, a program to provide lunches for children in programs outside the school and authority to help pay State administrative costs of these programs.

The need for these programs had become increasingly apparent. The files are stuffed with reports from schools telling of the children who come each day with empty stomachs to be taught, and cannot learn because they are aware only of their hunger. Studies of the lunch program made it clear that a large proportion of children of the ghetto, particularly in elementary schools, were denied lunch because the schools could not afford the facilities. Further, the number of requests each year was growing from nonprofit agencies for assistance in providing lunch programs in day care centers and other child activity programs outside the school.

The Congress enacted President Johnson's proposal, all except the program to assist children to obtain lunches in activities outside the school. This provision was not enacted until the current session of the Congress, and then only when the Senate adopted a House bill over the objection of the Senate Agriculture committee.

In the Congress, obtaining the authority for a program is only half the battle. The other half is getting the money appropriated. The Child Nutrition program is a classic case.

CHILD NUTRITION—FUNDS REQUESTED AND APPROPRIATED

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Breakfast program	Nonfood assistance	State administration expense	Special assistance (sec. 11, NSLA)
1968				
Requested	6.5	6.0	2.3	10.0
Appropriated	3.5	.75	0	5.0
1967				
Requested	3.0	1.0	1.0	10.5
Appropriated	2.0	.75	0	2.0

The situation for fiscal 1969 appears to be no different. In the appropriations approved by the House, the funds provided are the same as in fiscal 1968, although the requests by the Administration were twice as large.

SECTION 32

In 1935, the Congress placed 30 percent of the annual customs receipts in a fund to be available to the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage greater use of agriculture's abundance than the commercial market could sustain. Since that time forward, this amendment to the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1935—Section 32—has been the target of controversy. But the controversy usually arose when the means of carrying out the legislation became confused with the purpose.

Section 32 is price support legislation, with particular emphasis on perishable commodities. Neither the law nor the legislative history then or subsequently has viewed the use of these funds in any other way.

Section 32 funds have always received close and continuing scrutiny by the Congress. The purpose is to insure that sufficient funds are available to meet emergencies caused by surpluses and low prices for commodities other than those with price supports.

Over the years, and particularly in this decade, use of these funds to feed the poor has taken on a collateral and supplemental role. For example, Section 32 is the birthplace of all the major food assistance programs. The School Lunch Program began here, as did the prototype and the current Food Stamp Program. Both programs are now funded as regular appropriation items, although the Congress does occasionally transfer Section 32 fnuds to the School Lunch Program. The Special Milk Program also started under Section 32.

The only "permanent" Section 32 activity is the Commodity Distribution Program; and this is a program which Congress has never specifically authorized. Commodity Distribution is a creature of the Executive Branch which has grown on the brief directive that the Secretary may encourage use of surplus products by giving them to needy persons.

Congress in enacting, and the Administration in requesting the Food Stamp Program clearly developed a policy that Section 32 has a limited role in feeding hungry people. The basic program for this purpose is Food Stamps.

There is practical substance to these policy concepts. Perishables, needed for any well-balanced diet cannot be handled in a system that makes deliveries once or twice a month—or even weekly. Families must pick up packages weighing well over a hundred pounds, and some weighing several hundred. Getting these bundles home is a constant problem. The variety, even at 16 commodities, is sharply limited, compared to the range of products available in grocery stores. The USDA-State-local system duplicates the commercial system, and this is needless and wasteful.

Another point which escapes public attention is that Section 32 funds, regardless of the process by which the USDA acquires them, are subject to the same budget considerations as other expenditures and that is to balance all public needs against available resources.

Assistance for equipment

Many schools—and most of them in low-income areas—are unable to provide lunches for school children because they lack the facilities and equipment for food storage, preparation and service.

In FY 1967 about 500 schools in all States, District of Columbia, Guam, and American Samoa received equipment assistance. These schools, serving some 200,000 children, received assistance valued at $711,000.

No food service had been available in 71 of these schools prior to their receiving assistance.

Operation Metropolitan

In the current school year the USDA launched a special project to improve school lunch programs in urban schools. Many of these schools are in impacted areas in large cities, in buildings so old they go back to the time when every child carried his lunch to school. Most have either no lunch facilities or what little they have is grossly inadequate.

No special funds are available for these purposes (except for equipment assistance—and this is meager). The help to schools is being carried out by giving guidance and counsel to school officials, making them aware of the need for adequate school lunches and the possibilities for improvement of the conditions existing.

Fifteen target cities were selected for this special effort, ranging from Boston to Los Angeles and from Cleveland to El Paso.

By the end of February, 184 schools having average daily attendance of about 85,000 children, were cooperating in Operation Metropolitan. More than half of the children were getting either a lunch or breakfast.

In the 15 cities selected for this initial effort, there are over 1,000 schools that have no food service of any kind.

Recent proposals

In recent weeks, a number of proposals have been made by groups seeking to change various aspects of the food assistance programs. The specific proposals, and the prospects for actions, are:

1. Use Section 32 funds to insitute food programs in the 256 counties without food

programs which the Citizens Board of Inquiry states are "areas so distressed as to warrant a presidential declaration naming them as hunger areas."

Of the 256 counties, all but 31 now have a food assistance program, or have indicated they are about to initiate one. Of the 31, all but eight are counties which the Department has already designated as eligible for special financial assistance to pay the cost of a program.

2. Provide free food stamps for persons who cannot afford to purchase them. Or, provide food commodities with Section 32 funds to those who cannot afford stamps.

The Department last year reduced the minimum price of stamps for the poorest of the poor to 50 cents a month per person, with a maximum per family of $3.00 regardless of size.

The Act requires that persons pay what they normally spend for food. In order to speed certification, this amount is determined on the basis of family income studies which show the amount spent for food at given income levels.

3. Provide more and better commodities in counties operating under Commodity Distribution programs, and institute a stepped-up program of consumer education and employ a larger number of community aides from the poor community.

We are presently expanding the commodities provided through this program, particularly to enrich the diets available to pregnant women and pre-school age children. We are raising the iron level of several commodities, and are adding an instant hot cereal, an enriched milk drink and fruit juices. We also are working with FDA to authorize the enrichment of dry milk with vitamins, and providing an instant milk powder which will be easier to use.

4. Provide free and reduced price lunches for every needy school child.

Under the National School Lunch Act, the Congress gave local school officials the responsibility for determining which students should receive free or reduced price lunches. The USDA will send to the States a proposed set of guidelines for determining eligible children, and these guidelines include procedures to insure that children are not singled out and held up to ridicule because they receive free lunches.

The USDA endorses the goal of providing every needy child with free or reduced price lunches. Requests for funds to carry out this goal have been made each year to the Congress under Section 11 of the Act. More funds have always been requested than Congress has allowed.

The USDA also will be working with State governments to get more States to provide funds to help reduce the cost of lunch programs, and direct more help to schools in low income areas.

CALL TO AMERICANS OF GOOD WILL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Bayard Rustin, noted civil rights leader and coordinator of the June 19 march in support of the Poor People's Campaign, issued on Sunday, June 2, a "Call to Americans of good will." The statement describes the conditions which brought about the Poor People's Campaign and the objectives which the campaign seeks.

I include the text of Mr. Rustin's statement from the New York Times of June 3, 1968:

TEXT OF RUSTIN CALL FOR RALLY IN SUPPORT OF POOR

(Text of a "Call to Americans of Goodwill" issued here yesterday by Bayard Rustin, national coordinator of the Solidarity Day March June 19 in Washington in support of the Poor People's Campaign)

On June 19, thousands of concerned Americans will converge on Washington to express their support of the Poor People's Campaign.

They will be drawn from all walks of life, from all races and creeds. They are determined to abolish poverty in this land of plenty. And they are dedicated to the principles of nonviolence, integration and democracy. We call upon all who share these basic commitments to join with us in this massive effort.

WHY WE MARCH

We march to redeem the American promise.

Almost 200 years ago, the Declaration of Independence proclaimed every man's right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. But—

Is there a meaningful right to life when the Department of Agriculture tells us that nearly 20 million Americans are deprived of necessary nutrition because they are poor?

Is there genuine liberty when economic misery turns millions into outcasts who are so despairing that they do not even register to vote?

Is it possible to pursue happiness in the "other America" of the poor when, according to the Council of Economic Advisers, the number of "occupied dilapidated units" in the big-city slums has increased in the last four years?

Is this justice? The richest 10 per cent of the farmers and farm corporations get more than half of a multibillion dollar subsidy, while 82 per cent of the hungriest citizens are excluded from the Federal Government's basic food programs and two out of every three poor children don't even get a free school lunch.

Is this justice? One Federal program has helped over 10 million middle class and rich people to buy their own homes, while only 650,000 units of low-rent housing—usually ugly and segregated—have been built for the desperate.

Let America treat its poor children at least as well as its rich farmers.

Let America subsidize the families in the rotting tenements as least as well as those in the affluent suburbs.

Let us adopt an economic bill of rights.

This must be our goal if the American people is to be fulfilled. We must guarantee that:

Every employable citizen has the right to a meaningful job at decent wages. The poor are not lazy. In fact the vast majority toil long hours at menial, underpaid labor. Their wages must be raised. New careers must be created for them—in building decent housing for all; in raising the level of education, health and social care; in reconstructing and beautifying America. This is not makework. This is meaningful work that goes to the heart of our nation's needs.

Every citizen who cannot work be guaranteed an adequate income as a matter of right. A thousand economists of varying persuasions have called for a guaranteed annual income as morally necessary and economically sound.

We recognize that this economic bill of rights cannot be adopted overnight. And we are not blind to the conservative mood of the present Congress. But we shall not sit back and let the forces of reaction and cynicism win the day. This nation can and must take specific, tangible steps toward redeeming the American promise. We shall therefore make the following immediate demands:

I

We call upon the President and all Presidential candidates to endorse the basic principles of an economic bill of rights.

II

We demand that Congress, in this session,

1. Recommit the Federal Government to the Full Employment Act of 1946 and legislate the immediate creation of at least one million socially useful career jobs in public service.

2. Adopt the pending housing and urban development act of 1968.

3. Repeal the 90th Congress's punitive welfare restrictions, which put a freeze on the number of families eligible for welfare aid, compel mothers of preschool children to seek employment and deny assistance to unemployed fathers unless they can produce evidence of previous employment.

4. Extend to all farm workers the right—guaranteed under the National Labor Relations Act—to organize and bargain collectively.

5. Restore budget cuts for bilingual education, Head Start, summer jobs, Economic Opportunity Act, Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

III

We further call upon the President to declare a national emergency and, under his present statutory authority:

1. Institute food distribution programs wherever severe hunger exists in America.

2. Provide free food stamps to those who cannot afford to buy them.

3. Help poor farmers set up cooperatives.

4. End discrimination in the food offices of the Agriculture Department.

5. Give the poor first priority in existing health programs and create health services in isolated rural areas.

6. Include the poor in the planning and administration of Federal programs at local levels.

7. Organize maternal and child health centers in poverty areas.

To abolish poverty requires a massive, nationwide and integrated effort. By themselves, the poor are neither numerous nor powerful enough to win these advances. Therefore, we march together—black and white, red and brown, country people and slum dwellers, the poor and those who are not poor—because only through such a united effort can we truly overcome.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TENZER (at the request of Mr. DORN), for today, on account of observance of a religious holiday.

Mr. LENNON (at the request of Mr. DORN), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. DORN), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. DORN), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. KYROS (at the request of Mr. DORN), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

Mr. CURTIS, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mr. BURKE of Florida), for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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

Mr. GRAY to extend his remarks following passage of H.R. 13523 today.

Mr. POFF prior to passage of H.R. 17024.

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

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in two instances.

Mr. SCHERLE in two instances.

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. VANDER JAGT.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. RUMSFELD in two instances.

Mr. CURTIS in two instances.

Mr. POLLOCK.

Mr. WYMAN in three instances.

Mr. MICHEL in four instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

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

Mr. CORMAN in five instances.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN in two instances.

Mr. POAGE in two instances.

Mr. RODINO in three instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in three instances.

Mr. LEGGETT.

Mr. JONES of Alabama.

Mr. OTTINGER in two instances.

Mr. CAREY.

Mr. MCCARTHY in 10 instances.

Mr. MONAGAN in two instances.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington in two instances.

Mr. RIVERS in two instances.

Mr. TUCK in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in five instances.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. TENZER in five instances.

Mr. WHITENER in two instances.

Mr. FEIGHAN in four instances.

Mr. EDMONDSON.

Mr. FRASER in two instances.

Mr. HAGAN in two instances.

Mr. GATHINGS in two instances.

Mr. RESNICK.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

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

S. 444. An act to establish the Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area in the States of Utah and Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution regarding the status of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S.J. Res. 175. Joint resolution to suspend for the 1968 campaign the equal-time requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for nominees for the offices of President and Vice President; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

H.R. 15004. An act to further amend the the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities thereunder, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 31, 1968 present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3299. An act to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain lands on the Spokane Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14672. An act to amend the act of February 14, 1931, relating to the acceptance of gifts for the benefit of Indians;

H.R. 14922. An act to amend Public Law 90–60 with respect to judgment funds of the Ute Mountain Tribe;

H.R. 15224. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; and

H.R. 15271. An act to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Spokane Tribe of Indians.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 4, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1896. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, (Properties and Installations), transmitting notification of the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air National Guard, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1897. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of a survey of program loan assistance to Chile, Agency for International Development, Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1898. A letter from the executive director, Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower Training, Inc., transmitting the second annual report of the joint commission, pursuant to the provisions of section 12(c), Public Law 89–178; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1899. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered for certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1900. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1901. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed concession contract to provide certain facilities and services in Curecanti National Recreation Area, Colo., pursuant to the provisions of the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271), as amended by the act of July 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 543); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1902. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of the map, "Major Natural Gas Pipelines, December 31, 1967"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 15562. A bill to extend the expiration date of the act of September 19, 1966 (Rept. No. 1509). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRAY: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 16981. A bill limiting the use for demonstration purposes of any federally owned property in the District of Columbia, requiring the posting of a bond, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1510). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Committee of conference. H.R. 11308. An act to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (Rept. No. 1511). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 17603. A bill to protect the freedom of choice of Federal employees in employee-management relations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 17604. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 17605. A bill authorizing veterans' benefits for persons who served in the local security patrol force of Guam during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 17606. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Negro History

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. POLLOCK:

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 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. HOLIFIELD, Mrs. 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. POLLOCK):

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. FARBSTEIN:

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

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 at 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 reestablished 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 considered 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 too 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 agression, and the welfare and sceurity 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

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 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 instalibility 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." Susequent 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, Tokin 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 throw 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 Rostow 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 resolution 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, sanitated, protected[1] and defended[2] in one of the most forbidding areas of the world, all in fulfilment 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.

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, subpena 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 sales 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 in 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, inquires, 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, subpena 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. 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

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, subpena 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.

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, Catherina 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 Denisovych 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, Kharkov 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 Tartars, 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 Soivet 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,

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 Yuli 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 Urkrainian 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 Zalyvakha, an artist-painter, and about 200 others. One of the well-known prisoners is Yuriy 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 a 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 facsimilies 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 decieive, 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.

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" [3]—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" [5]—yet, 72 per cent of the existing merchant fleet is "composed of obsolescent, inefficient, and uneconomical ships." [6] 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.[7]

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.[8]

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 shiplines 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.[9]

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." [10]

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." [11] 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 vessels 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.

[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*, 60:67, June 27, 1966.

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

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

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 135.

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

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 Giong 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 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 reenlisted 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 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 Agricutture 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 3091 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 paticipating; St. Louis, Missouri with a population of 862,000 and

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 Progam 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 "extravagent 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 alined 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-Youngtown 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 rackeeters 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 perseverence, 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 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 Starmaker 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 convenant 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;

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 wings 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 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 the cities, including our Nation's Capital, the streets may be safe for the criminals, but not for the law-abiding citizens. I deprecate 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, parading 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 aquittal 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! I object! I object! The counsel is leading the witness." "I object—incompetent, 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 McGintys." Just clip the words "prior" and "subsequent" 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 "Sunkissed 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 smiliar 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. Stokeley 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 acccused 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 Cardoza some years ago and so we can well understand why our people are 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 another 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 affairs 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 hullaballo 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 theres' 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 government 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 nations'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 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 marjority 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

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 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 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 at 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?	☐	☐
Guaranteed incomes for the poor?	☐	☐
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 attacks, 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

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 Retrio, 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 Columbia'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 Engineer, 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 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 intrest 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, palacial 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 that 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 Leopaldi, 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 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 disenchant 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.

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.
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.

Trybunu 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.

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 Jagjivan 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—established 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 plant.

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. Soday, 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 representaitves 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 Soday—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, VA.,
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 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 as active a 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 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 as active a 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 employes, a bonus and profit sharing pension plan for employes, and advancement to supervisory positions from the ranks of the employes, 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

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. Trippe 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 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 "governmentese," 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 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 "parrock" 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

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 economy 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:

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 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 Bowman 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 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 hassling 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 Buliding 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 curtailed bus service in the capital by refusing to drive after 6:30 p.m.

Arson is a nightly 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 unnoted.

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.

"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.

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 Strul[1])

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 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.

[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.

But as in every story there's a hero. In this one, it's the supermarket bagboy. Don't attempt any flim 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 newsman 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 resturant, 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 though 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."

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, PUBLIC 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 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

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 procedes 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 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 perpetuators 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.

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 employes 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 employes 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 "severally 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 experienced 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:

VIET 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. Styers, 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 somewhere 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 Styers, 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 Styers 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 Styers, 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 Lilliam Goldberg, of Baltimore and Mrs. Ida Haven, of Albuquerque, N.W., 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