United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, June 27, 1968*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Restore unto me the joy of Thy salvation; and uphold me with Thy free spirit.—Psalm 51: 12.

Almighty and most merciful Father, ever moving among Thy children and forever seeking entrance into the hearts of men, we pray for the world in which we live, a world in which we do not get along together in the spirit of brotherhood. Too often persons resort to procedures which produce pettiness in people, multiply the miseries of men, and add to the bitterness which blights the bright hopes of Thy children. Forgive, O Lord, forgive and restore unto us the joy of Thy salvation.

We pray for ourselves in this world that with a new spirit in our hearts, a new song on our lips, and a new strength in our hands we may work together to lift the fallen, hearten the disheartened, and give faith and hope to those whose spirits are low.

Lift up our heads, O Lord. Better still, lift up our hearts that we the Representatives of our Nation may lead our people to a better life for all, a higher hope for all, and a fuller faith for all.

In the name of Him who lived His faith to the very end we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 3931. An act to amend the act of April 3, 1952;

H.R. 8581. An act to amend section 11-341(b) of the District of Columbia Code which relates to the sales price for the reports of the opinions of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit; and

H.R. 13373. An act for the relief of Richard C. Mockler.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 17268. An act to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17354. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 17734. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 17354) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior 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. HAYDEN, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 17734) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mrs. SMITH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1514. An act relating to the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts in the District of Columbia; and

S. 1628. An act to authorize suits in the courts of the District of Columbia for collection of taxes owed to States, territories, or possessions, or political subdivisions thereof, when the reciprocal right is accorded to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

THE LATE HONORABLE GORDON L. McDONOUGH, OF CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the House of Representatives of the death of our former esteemed colleague, the Honorable Gordon L. McDonough, of California, who passed away Tuesday evening, June 25, 1968.

Funeral services will be held Friday, June 28, at 11 a.m., at St. Ann's Catholic Church, Tenley Circle, Wisconsin and Nebraska Avenues NW., Washington, D.C. Interment will be in California.

Gordon served the 15th District of California with distinction in the House of Representatives for nine terms, serving in the 79th through the 87th Congress from 1945 through 1962. He was an active and prominent member of the House Banking and Currency Committee and was the ranking Republican on the House Subcommittee. He also served on the House Science and Astronautics Committee, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and on the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

Prior to his service in the House of Representatives he was a member of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors from 1933 through 1944, and served as chairman. He was active in many civic organizations and will be remembered in Los Angeles for the many public service duties he performed for all the people.

Gordon was a devoted public servant and a fine legislator. I feel honored to have been his friend and to have had the opportunity of serving with him in the House of Representatives.

He is survived by his loyal and devoted wife, Catherine Ann, two daughters, Mrs. Richard H. Miller and Mrs. John Mannelly, of Los Angeles, and five sons, Gordon, Vincent, and Thomas, of Los Angeles, and Paul and James, of Washington, and 31 grandchildren. They have the deep and heartfelt sympathy of Gordon's friends everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL].

Mr. ROYBAL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from California in expressing my deepest sympathy to the surviving family of Gordon McDonough. I remember Gordon very well as he served with distinction for 12 years on the board of supervisors of the county of Los Angeles starting in 1933. His dedication to his work and the excellent job that he did were so very much appreciated by his constituents, that they sent him to Wash-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ington, to represent them in the House of Representatives where he again represented them with distinction for 18 years.

Mr. Speaker, Gordon McDonough was indeed one of the most outstanding legislators that the State of California has ever produced. His death is a great loss not only to his family and friends, but to the city of Los Angeles, to the State of California and to the Nation.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from California and others in extending to the family of Gordon McDonough my deepest sympathy at his passing.

Gordon was a Member of the House when I came here. I quickly developed a close friendship with Gordon and our families became well acquainted. I quickly learned to respect his character and to have great admiration for his point of view on legislative matters. He was an outstanding Member of this body in every respect. He was a devoted family man and a friend of all of us. When he left this body, he left a fine mark for others to match.

I say again that the Nation has lost a fine citizen and we have lost a good friend. I extend to his family and to his loved ones our very deepest sympathy.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from California and his colleagues from his State and the distinguished minority leader in their expression of sorrow over the death of a man I learned to love and admire in the House of Representatives. He was a fine Congressman and an outstanding American.

I extend my deepest sympathy to those he has left behind.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to learn of the passing of my dear friend and our former colleague, Gordon McDonough. He and I not only served together but, more so, there developed between us throughout the years a very close feeling of respect and friendship.

Gordon McDonough was an ideal legislator, dedicated to his work in committee and on the floor of the House. He was a man who was serious in the performance of his duties, a man who studied legislation and knew the legislation coming out of committee and under consideration by the House. He made his mark in outstanding contributions during his 18 years of honorable and trustworthy public service.

He and Mrs. McDonough lived a beautiful life as husband and wife, an example for all others to follow.

We all grieve at the passing of Gordon McDonough. I join with my colleague from California and others in extending to Mrs. McDonough and her loved ones my deep sympathy in her great loss and sorrow.

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

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. BOGGS. I should like to join in the remarks made, and particularly the remarks just made by the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Gordon McDonough was a dedicated Member of this body. He was on the floor constantly when he served here. He represented his constituency with ability and, as the Speaker said, he was a man devoted to his duties.

I might say also that he was a man who made friends easily. He had a great many friends. During his retirement he would come back occassionally. As all Members know, he would come by to visit with us. I enjoyed those visits immensely.

I am indeed sorry to learn of his passing, and I join the distinguished gentleman from California in extending sympathy to his family.

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

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it was with genuine regret and a deep sense of loss, so far as I am personally concerned, that I read in the paper this morning of the passing of Gordon McDonough.

One of the privileges I have had here in the House of Representatives has been the opportunity to serve with great people. I say that advisedly, because in my time just about every Member of this House has been a great person. They have been great people not only because they have been statesmen dedicated to the welfare of their country; they have been great people because they have been good people, decent people, honest people, God-fearing people, family-loving people. Gordon McDonough was that sort of person.

I am proud and happy to call him friend, and I am sorry indeed at his passing.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I rise today to pay homage to a late colleague and former fellow member of the California delegation, the Honorable Gordon L. McDonough.

Gordon McDonough was a man whose career exemplified devotion to duty and love of country. It was my privilege to serve with him for 10 years, and I can testify that his selfless efforts in behalf of his constituency and our State of California will long be remembered.

Gordon McDonough pledged his life to public service. Before entering the House in 1944, he rendered distinguished service to Los Angeles County as a member of its board of supervisors and in several other capacities. Here in the House, he became senior Republican on the housing subcommittee.

To his wife, Catherine Ann, and other members of his family, my wife joins me in extending our most heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to my dear friend and former colleague, the Honorable Gordon L. McDonough, who served as a most distinguished Member of the House of Representatives from California from 1945 until 1962—the 79th through 86th Congresses.

He served on many committees in the House with great distinction and has always been a valued member of the Republican Party. He was a dedicated statesman, who through actions and words proved that he believed wholeheartedly in the great principles upon which our Nation was founded. He demonstrated, in everything he did, his ideals for liberty, respect for truth and love of justice. He was a great help to me when I first came to Congress.

Gordon was a devoted family man and a wonderful husband and father. I am privileged to have his son, Gordon L. McDonough, Jr., and his fine family residing in my congressional district.

Mrs. Smith joins me in expressing our deepest sympathies to his dear wife and family. We feel a deep sense of personal loss. We hope that his family will find comfort in their great sorrow in knowing that Gordon left behind him many, many devoted friends and a true example of American statesmanship at its best.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sorrowful sense of personal loss that I learned of the passing of the Honorable Gordon L. McDonough, and to his widow and other loved ones I extend my deepest sympathy. When I came to the 81st Congress and was assigned to the Banking and Currency Committee Gordon was in his third term in the House and on that committee. He was kind, gracious and helpful to me in every way and I came to number him among my dearest friends. When I last saw him not many months ago he seemed in happy spirits and robust health, and the announcement that he had passed on came as a shock. Hanging on the wall of my office in the Rayburn Building is a photograph of members of the Housing Subcommittee taken in Los Angeles some 15 years ago. That photograph will continue to hang on the wall of my office as long as I am here, and often I will look at it and seeing therein the picture of Gordon McDonough as he looked then in all the majesty of his presence will relive the days of one of the precious friendships of my years in the Congress. He was a brilliant legislator, a dedicated American and a priceless friend.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all my California colleagues, as well as those other Members of Congress who were privileged to know former Representative Gordon L. McDonough, were saddened to learn of his death this past week.

Although Congressman McDonough's remarkable service in the House ended just as mine began, I nonetheless enjoyed the pleasure of his friendship. He resided in my 31st Congressional District, and I was honored to know him, his wife Catherine Ann, his son Gordon, Jr., and his six other wonderful children. My wife, Betty, joins me in expressing our deep sorrow to his family on their great loss.

Los Angeles' 18th Congressional District was indeed fortunate to be represented by Congressman McDonough for 18 years, from 1944 to 1962. Previous to his service in the House, he was active in Los Angeles' civic life, serving three 4-year terms as a member of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors and

as chairman of both the county flood control district and the county sanitation district.

A member of the original House Space Committee, Representative McDonough, on his retirement, was the senior Republican on the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency. His entire career was marked by energy, courage, and dedication. And, although in our two-party system one might have differed with his philosophic views, one could never doubt the integrity with which he held them.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life, character, and service of the late Honorable Gordon L. McDonough.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement on Monday, July 24, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1368) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1969, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 1368

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of the Government for the fiscal year 1969, namely:

SEC. 101. (a)(1) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities (not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1968 and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority would be available in the following appropriation Acts for the fiscal year 1969:

Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;

Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriation Act;

Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;

Public Works for Water and Power Resources Development and Atomic Energy Commission Appropriation Act;

Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;

Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act; and

Legislative Branch Appropriation Act.

(1) Appropriations made by this subsection shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriation Act.

(3) Whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted under an Act listed in this subsection as passed by the House is different from that which would be available or granted under such Act as passed by the Senate, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the lesser amount or the more restrictive authority.

(4) Whenever an Act listed in this subsection has been passed by only one House or where an item is included in only one version of an Act as passed by both Houses, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House, but at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the one House, whichever is lower: *Provided,* That no provision which is included in an appropriation Act enumerated in this subsection but which was not included in the applicable appropriation Act for 1968, and which by its terms is applicable to more than one appropriation, fund, or authority shall be applicable to any appropriation, fund, or authority provided in this joint resolution unless such provision shall have been included in identical form in such bill as passed by both the House and Senate.

(b) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities which were conducted in the fiscal year 1968 and are listed in this subsection at a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate or the rate provided for in the budget estimate, whichever is lower, and under the more restrictive authority:

Activities for which provision was made in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1968;

Activities for which provision was made in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1968;

Activities for which provision was made in the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1968;

Activities for which provision was made in the Military Construction Appropriation Act, 1968;

Activities for which provision was made in the Department of Transportation Appropriation Act, 1968;

Activities under the Higher Education Act of 1965;

Activities under the National Defense Education Act of 1958, as amended;

Activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961;

Activities (grants for college work-study program) under part C, title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended;

Activities (grants for land-grant colleges) under section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended (7 U.S.C. 329);

Activities under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, as amended;

Activities, other than grants, of the domestic agricultural migratory workers health program of the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

Activities, other than grants, related to regional medical programs of the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

Activities under sections 3, 4, 7, 12, and 13 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended;

Activities under the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965; and

Activities under the appropriations for "Ship construction" and "Research and development", Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce.

(c) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities for which disbursements are made by the Secretary of the Senate, and the Senate items under the Architect of the Capitol, to the extent and in the manner which would be provided for in the budget estimates for the fiscal year 1969.

(d) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing activities under sections 104 and 105 of the Manpower Development and Training Act, but at a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate.

SEC. 102. Appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall remain available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) enactment of the applicable appropriation Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) July 31, 1968, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 103. Appropriations and funds made available or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in subsection (d)(2) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, but nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds or to permit the use, including the expenditure, of appropriations, funds or authority in any manner which would contravene the provisions of title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968.

SEC. 104. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 105. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 106. No appropriation or fund made available or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity which was not being conducted during fiscal year 1968.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the joint resolution is engrossed, read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD in connection with the joint resolution continuing appropriations, and insert pertinent tables and figures.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I do not object to the unanimous-consent request that Members may revise and extend their remarks, but I was not aware of the fact that the joint resolution continuing appropriations would be adopted without debate.

I have no objection to considering the joint resolution in the House. Was that the request?

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot read the minds of Members. The Chair is sitting here, observing, and will protect the rights of Members.

Seeing no Member rise, the Chair acted in the next parliamentary procedure.

The Chair will always lean over backward to protect the rights of all Members.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, it was my

understanding that the joint resolution was to be considered under the 5-minute rule. Some Members, I know, desire to discuss it.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the action by which the joint resolution was engrossed, read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table, is vacated.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the end of the fiscal year on June 30. Thirteen regular, annual appropriation bills for fiscal year 1969 are scheduled for passage prior to the end of the session.

Eight of those bills have been passed by the House.

Three of those bills have been passed by the other body.

With the transportation bill which was reported today by the Committee on Appropriations, the committee will have considered nine bills for 1969. The four remaining bills not yet reported require authorization. One of the four—the District of Columbia bill—could be considered, but additional revenue should be provided before the bill is actually considered.

Only one of the regular bills, the Treasury and Post Office Department bill, has been enacted into law. The other body has sent us two other regular bills which are now ready for conference—the bills for Agriculture and Interior. We are moving toward the conclusion of the appropriations work for the session insofar as the House is concerned.

This continuing resolution provides that the Government may operate through July 31—for 1 month. It provides that nothing shall contravene the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 which was passed last week. Further, whatever expenditures take place in July under the resolution will have to be charged to the appropriations eventually made by the Congress, so they may be reduced pursuant to the expenditure reduction legislation. Also, no new starts are permitted in this legislation.

Insofar as I am able to say, there is no objection from any source to the consideration and passage of this legislation.

EXPENDITURE ACT REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATION BILLS, BASED ON HOUSE ACTIONS

Mr. Speaker, specifically as to House actions in the eight appropriation bills—certain actions in other bills may also have some effect:

First, $6,178 million of the $10 billion new budget authority reduction figure has been achieved. The transportation bill reported from committee this morning proposes another $267 million reduction.

Second, based on tentative approximations, some $1,732 million of the $6 billion outlay—expenditure—reduction figure has been achieved. The transportation bill reported from committee this morning proposes cuts that are estimated to reduce 1969 expenditures by approximately $304 million. In addition, reductions in expenditures that would have been made in 1969 from obligating authority requested in, but cut by the House from the second supplemental bill, 1968, may roughly approximate another $186 million.

It may be that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] will wish to say something at this point. I shall extend my remarks and include selected excerpts from the committee report and a table summarizing the bill totals.

Excerpts from the committee report:

This is the customary type of resolution brought before the House on the eve of the new fiscal year to avoid interruption of continuing governmental functions. The authority conveyed by this resolution is necessary to provide for the interim between June 30 and final approval of the applicable annual appropriation acts for the fiscal year 1969, which begins on July 1, next. The resolution follows the basic form and concept of similar resolutions of past years. Last year's initial continuing resolution became Public Law 90–38, approved June 30, 1967.

The time period covered by the accompanying resolution is limited to the month of July, 1968. There would be no need for an extension beyond July 31 if all the appropriation bills are sent to the President before the national political conventions.

SCOPE OF THE RESOLUTION

Comporting with continuing resolutions over a period of many years, including last year, the emphasis in the resolution is on the *continuation of existing projects and activities* at the lowest of one of three rates, namely, the current (fiscal year 1968) rate; the budget request, where no action has been taken by either House; or the more restrictive amount adopted by either of the two Houses. The whole thrust of the resolution is to keep the Government function on a minimum basis until funds for the full year are otherwise determined upon.

In those instances where the applicable 1969 appropriation bill has passed both Houses but not cleared conference, and the particular amount or authority therein differs, the pertinent project or activity continues under the lesser of the two amounts and under the more restrictive authority.

In those instances where a bill has passed only one House, or where an appropriation for a project or activity is included in only one version of a bill as passed by both Houses, the pertinent project or activity continues under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House, but at a rate for operations not exceeding the current fiscal year 1968 rate or the rate permitted by the one House, whichever is the lower.

In those instances where neither House has passed the applicable appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1969, appropriations are provided for *continuing* projects or activities conducted during fiscal year 1968 at the current rate or the rate provided for in the budget estimate for 1969, whichever is lower, and under the more restrictive authority.

The resolution does not in any way augment the appropriation for a given project or activity in the regular bills for the fiscal year 1969. In the words of section 105 of the resolution itself:

"SEC. 105. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law."

In other words, while this resolution—as in the case of similar resolutions of previous years—does not enumerate *specific* amounts that may be obligated and expended for the countless activities of government during the month of July (or such shorter period as the resolution may operate as to particular departments or agencies), the controlling factor, known to all who have any responsibility for the management of the programs or the obligation of the funds, is that whatever is used during this interim must be taken out of, or charged against, whatever amount is finally appropriated, or otherwise made available, for the whole years, as may be reduced pursuant to the expenditure reduction legislation.

Section 101(b) of the resolution is drawn along the conventional lines of similar past resolutions, and, generaly, encompasses those activities to be considered in connection with appropriation bills not yet reported from the Committee. This includes a number of items that had to be laid aside for lack of legislative authorization at the time the appropriation bills in which they normally would have been considered were reported earlier in the session.

Only one appropriation bill—the *Treasury-Post Office bill*—for fiscal year 1969 has cleared Congress. Thus prompt enactment of this resolution is the proper course of action under the circumstances. *Section 102 provides that the resolution ceases to apply* to an agency or activity concurrent with approval by the President of the applicable appropriation bill in which provision for such agency or activity is made. Thus *the scope of the continuing resolution constricts as each bill is enacted; the resolution will be wholly inoperative after the last bill for 1969 is approved, or July 31, whichever first occurs.*

Section 104 is standard in continuing resolutions, and is self-explanatory.

Section 106 is also standard in continuing resolutions, *forbidding* the use of funds provided in the joint resolution to *initiate any new project or activity or to resume any which was not being conducted in fiscal 1968.*

Common, of course, to all appropriations and funds that are used in 1969 for payment of salaries of civilian and military personnel will be the extra compensation, commencing in July, that must be paid as a result of the comparability pay increases granted pursuant to Public Laws 90–206 and 90–207. There is no administrative discretion in the matter of the extra payments to personnel. The line-item budget estimates for 1969 did not make specific allowance for these added costs (shown only as a 1-line item of $1.6 billion within the January budget totals), causing the committee to include, as section 303(a) in the pending Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill for 1968, a provision authorizing deficiency apportionments for 1969 to the extent any such pay increases cannot be absorbed within funds otherwise available.

EXPENDITURE CONTROL ACT REDUCTION PROVISIONS

The provisions of title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 concern reductions in civilian employment, require a reduction of not less than $10 billion in new budget (obligational) authority for 1969, a reduction of not less than $6 billion in budgeted 1969 outlays (expenditures and net lending), and specific recommendations for recisions of $8 billion of previously granted obligational authority. These provisions introduce a new dimension to budgets of the departments and agencies of government in the fiscal year 1969 beginning on July 1, next. They cast something of a shadow over not only the unexpended carryover balances in innumerable accounts across the government but also over many of the specific appropriation and fund amounts now pending consideration at various stages in the legislative process. This underscores and emphasizes the fact that, whereas in previous years departments and agencies operating under a continuing resolution were required to hold obligations and expenditures to *not in excess of* the lowest of one of two or three rates, those minimums, with the aforementioned title II in the picture, take on something of the nature of "maximum minimums."

In this general connection, section 103 of the joint resolution follows the stereotyped form of provious continuing resolutions in waiving the time periods set forth in 31 U.S.C. 665(d)(2) for the submission and approval of papers on the apportionments of funds. This in nowise waives the basic requirement in the law for the apportionment of funds over the year by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, but merely dispenses with considerable paper work that as a practical matter cannot be usefully applied to 31-day temporary appropriation provisions. But in view of the title II reduction provisions applicable to fiscal 1969, the committee has attached to section 103 a proviso that: "nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds or to permit the use, including the expenditure, of appropriations, funds or authority in any manner which would contravene the provisions of title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968."

SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATION BILL TOTALS OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY, 90TH CONG., 2D SESS., AS OF JUNE 27, 1968

[Does not of course include any "back-door" type budget authority; or any permanent (Federal or trust) authority under earlier or "permanent" law [1] without further or annual action by the Congress]

	New budget (obligational) authority (all figures are slightly rounded)		
	Bills for fiscal 1968	Bills for fiscal 1969	Bills for the session
A. House actions:			
1. Budget requests considered	$6,796,295,000	$54,060,171,000	$60,856,466,000
2. Amounts approved by House	6,426,465,000	[2] 47,372,815,000	53,799,280,000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests	−369,830,000	[2] −6,687,356,000	−7,057,186,000
B. Senate actions:			
1. Budget requests considered	6,818,092,000	10,316,207,000	17,134,299,000
2. Amounts approved by Senate	6,453,116,000	8,593,779,000	15,046,895,000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests	−364,976,000	−1,722,428,000	−2,087,404,000
4. Compared with House amounts in same bills	+26,652,000	+11,463,000	+38,115,000
C. Enacted:			
1. Budget requests considered	79,781,000	1,959,885,000	2,039,666,000
2. Amounts enacted	79,381,000	1,780,653,000	1,860,034,000
3. Comparison with corresponding budget requests	−400,000	−179,232,000	−179,632,000

[1] For fiscal 1969, according to the January budget, total new budget (obligational) authority is tentatively estimated at $214,600,000,000 ($201,700,000,000, net of certain budget presentation adjustments), of which $141,500,000,000 is for current action by Congress and $73,100,000,000 would become available under permanent law.

[2] Includes committee reported amounts for Transportation bill (subject to floor action). $6,445,069,000 of this figure would count against the "not less than" $10,000,000,000 cut pending in the tax bill; the $6,445,069,000 figure includes $2,685,000,000 of participation sales authorization reduction and $126,500,000 (committee bill, $256,000,000) stricken on floor point of order on State-Justice bill.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last two words.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has just reported, this is the usual continuing resolution made necessary because we have not completed action in the Congress, and there have not been signed into law yet all of the appropriation bills that will be required to provide the funds for the continued operation of the Government in the 30 days of the new fiscal year which will begin July 1 next.

Mr. Speaker, I think the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations might not wish to say this himself, because he is the chairman of the committee, but I can say on his behalf and on behalf of the committee that we do not feel the Appropriations Committee is responsible for this problem.

This House has already completed action on eight regular appropriation bills coming out of our committee so far this calendar year. The House has completed action on two supplemental bills reported by our committee—an urgent supplemental which has been in conference for many weeks now and the second supplemental bill which cleared this House several weeks ago and only cleared the other body yesterday. The Committee on Appropriations has been diligent and on target all year. And with respect to the four remaining regular bills we are ready to mark those up and report them to the House, but they are being delayed because of circumstances beyond the control of the Committee on Appropriations. The four remaining bills, excluding the DOT bill which cleared the committee today and which will be on the floor next Tuesday, are: District of Columbia, Department of Defense, foreign aid, military construction, and, of course, there will be a final supplemental.

But the record will show that eight of the regular appropriation bills and two supplemental bills have already cleared the House and by next Tuesday the score will be nine out of the 13 regular bills have cleared this House, leaving only four to go.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I support this continuing resolution. It runs only until July 31. It does not affect or make any change in the bills that have already cleared this House, because the spending limitations fixed in those bills are not changed by the resolution. The continuing resolution merely permits the expenditure of the funds in accordance with the provisions of the bills that have already cleared the House and, as I said before, that is eight.

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Appropriations cleared the ninth bill this morning, which is a bill providing the appropriations for the Department of Transportation. That bill will be on the floor next Tuesday. When it is cleared, we will then have only four regular bills to be approved.

I would like to say a few things about the general situation which confronts the House. Members should be made aware of exactly where we stand with respect to appropriations and spending cuts so as to estimate our chances of meeting the goals the Congress assumed in adopting the tax bill and spending limitation which was enacted by the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968.

As I see it, there are two goals Congress set for itself under that legislation: First, to reduce new obligational authority by $10 billion; and second, to reduce spending by $6 billion. Before the action of the House yesterday on the Labor-HEW appropriation bill, new obligational authority had been reduced $6.3 billion below the budget, leaving only about $3.7 billion to go in order to reach that $10 billion goal. But the action of the House yesterday forced a retreat. That action restored $195 million of the NOA that had previously been cut on the 8 regular bills. So, we go down from $6.3 billion in aggregate cuts to $6.1 billion.

Today's action of the full committee on the Department of Transportation bill will, however, put us back up even with where we were before the action of yesterday, and slightly in advance of that position, because that bill recommends cuts of $267 million and when we take that into consideration you will see that NOA cuts are back up to $6.4 billion, including those in the DOT bill and assuming the House follows the recommendations of its Committee on Appropriations next Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. JONAS was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the four regular bills left involve $84,271 million of budget requests and that includes $1.5 billion on the wrapup supplemental: the District of Columbia bill in the amount of $177 million, the Department of Defense bill in the amount of $77 billion, foreign aid in the amount of $3.4 billion, and military construction in the amount of $2,051 million.

Mr. Speaker, in order to reach the $10 billion cut in NOA we, therefore, have to cut out of the remaining $84,271 million to be considered another $3,556 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we can do that if we make up our minds to do it, because we have attained a reduction in NOA, assuming the action of the committee of today will be approved next week on the Department of Transportation bill, of $6.4 billion out of $57 billion.

We will have to cut an additional $3.5 billion out of the $84 billion yet to be considered, but of course $77 billion of this is for the Department of Defense.

Turning to spending, let us see what we have done so far toward hitting the goal of $6 billion in spending cuts.

Out of the nine regular bills that have passed the House, or will have passed if the House approves the Department of Transportation bill next week, spending cuts aggregating $2.2 billion will have been made in this House, leaving $3.8 billion to be cut in spending out of the remaining $84 billion yet to be considered, if we are to reach that $6 billion spending reduction goal.

As the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means said, when he had the conference report on the floor recently, the House and the Congress ought to make these cuts. We ought to make these reductions. We should not leave it to the President to make them.

But we have our work cut out ahead of us, and it will be a tough job to cut $3.8 billion in spending out of the remaining four bills, and the wrap-up supplemental. We can do it. I believe the Committee on Appropriations will make the recommendations, but we cannot force the House to accept them.

By restoring $194.7 of the NOA cuts the committee had made, the House took a backward step yesterday. It is going to take cooperation on the part of the House, and of all Members who feel that Congress should accept the responsibility it assumed last week. If we will all just cooperate with the Committee on Appropriations, we can attain this goal and make the necessary reductions right here in Congress where they ought to be made.

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

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

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the gentleman from North Carolina to yield to ask him, as well as the chairman of the committee, to answer a question if I may propound a question.

Mr. JONAS. I will be happy to have the distinguished chairman propound his question.

Mr. MILLS. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget informed me that he understood the intent of Congress as to the limitation in title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968, and the apportionment requirements of the Antideficiency Act, that he would enforce the provisions in this manner. Is the purpose of the provision in the bill relating to the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act intended to require the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to take into account the limitation in title II of the act in the period the continuing resolution is effective in the same manner as he said he would after the appropriations are passed?

Mr. JONAS. Answering for myself—and then I will yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]—it is my intention that he do that, and it is my understanding that it is the intention of the Committee on Appropriations that he do exactly that. We tried to make that clear in section 103 and in the report of the committee on this resolution.

Now I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. I would say to the gentleman from Arkansas that in my opinion the very definite answer to his question is "yes."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I thank both gentlemen.

Mr. JONAS. May I say in addition to that that we have a very good hold on the Director, and on the administration, in that this continuing resolution will expire July 31. I am going to suggest to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that if a renewal of this continuing resolution becomes necessary, before we bring another resolution to the floor we have the Director of the Bureau of the Budget before the committee, and have him inform us of the actions he has taken under the apportionment requirements of the statute.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The joint resolution 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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and include pertinent extracts and tables at this point in the RECORD in connection with the House joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1969

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 17354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Messrs. KIRWAN, MARSH, FLYNT, JOELSON, MAHON, REIFEL, MCDADE, HARRISON, and JONAS.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPOSAL FROM NATIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILES OF BERYL ORE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 14367), to authorize the disposal of beryl ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, with a Senate amendment thereto, and disagree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "by negotiation or otherwise," and insert "by public advertising for bids and sale to the highest responsible bidder,".

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on December 14, 1967, the House passed H.R. 14367, a bill to authorize the disposal of approximately 9,888 short tons of beryl ore now held in the national and supplemental stockpiles.

The bill that passed the House contained the usual provisions permitting flexibility to the Administrator of the General Services Administration to dispose of this metal. Permitting this flexibility has allowed an orderly disposal of the stockpile surpluses and has made possible the sale and disposition with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets in accordance with the basic provisions of the Stockpile Act.

When the bill reached the Senate floor on April 26, 1968, it was amended to require the sale to be made by sealed-bid basis only to responsible bidders.

In their disposal sales of approximately $3 billion, the General Services Administration has normally viewed competitive selling methods, including sealed-bid sales, as the most efficient means of carrying out the intent of the Stockpile Act. There are circumstances, however, when such a procedure would run contrary to its legal mandate to avoid a disruption of the market.

When these situations present themselves, General Services Administration adjusts its selling methods accordingly. This was true in the disposal of aluminum. The procedure was worked out with the aluminum industry to absorb into the normal market channels over a period of years some million tons of aluminum. The alternative to this would have been for GSA to dispose of this commodity in relatively small amounts as the consumer market permitted. This would have involved, of course, a tremendous administrative expense over a much longer period of years.

So, gentlemen, you can see that sales of the various commodities in the stockpile require individual consideration and we should not be bound by any precedent as to the method of sale. To require an inflexible method of sale would, in itself, thwart the very nature of the basic laws which require sales to be made without market disruption.

As I have said earlier, the GSA has normally viewed the competitive selling method as the most efficient means of carrying out their responsibilities, and they expect to do so in the case of beryl ore. And at this point, I must say that beryl ore is needed badly by those holding contracts for some of our more important missiles and the release of this material is absolutely essential for our national defense purposes.

Our committee feels that we should be very careful not to establish a precedent

which might impair needed flexibility in the disposal program and possibly be disruptive in its effects on the markets. Therefore, I strongly recommend that we send this back to the Senate in the hope that the bill can be passed.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the subject of H.R. 14367.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 17268) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 5 over to and including line 10 on page 2 and insert:

"SEC. 2. Section 712(e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by striking out '$85,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$100,000'."

Page 2, after line 10, insert:

"SEC. 3. Title VII of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 718. The Comptroller General, in cooperation with the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall undertake a study to determine the feasibility of applying uniform cost accounting standards to be used in all negotiated prime contract and subcontract defense procurements of $100,000 or more. In carrying out such study the Comptroller General shall consult with representatives of the accounting profession and with representatives of that segment of American industry which is actively engaged in defense contracting. The results of such study shall be reported to the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date, but in no event later than eighteen months after the date of enactment of this section.'"

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the Senate amendments in a little more detail than the Clerk simply reading them by title?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, I shall be very glad to.

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the other body amended the House-passed Defense Production Act in two respects: first, to provide an increase in the authorization of funds for the Joint Committee on Defense Production from $85,000 to $100,000. This increase was necessitated by the recent pay raise. This amendment passed the other body without dissent. Second, Members will recall that the House-passed Defense Production Act called for the Comptroller General to develop uniform accounting standards to be applied to all negotiated prime contract and subcontract defense procurements in excess of $100,000. Under the House-passed language they are supposed to develop uniform accounting standards and make recommendations on the promulgation of such standards within 1 year. The Senate amendment on this subject called for the Comptroller General, in cooperation with other agencies of Government, industry, and representatives of the accounting profession, to undertake a study to determine the feasibility of developing standards for negotiated defense contracts, and within 18 months the GAO is required to report to the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Armed Services Committee of both bodies.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if I understand the distinguished gentleman from Texas correctly, this simply lengthens the time by 18 months, but in addition to that the study will determine the feasibility rather than mandatorily develop the guidelines in the GAO, is that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct. Also it provides that industry will be conferred with, and representatives of the accounting profession, in addition to the Government.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I think the last comment is very salutary and appropriate.

I really find no objection to the extension of time and the slight increase of funds.

Mr. Speaker, was the action of the Senate germane to the House-passed resolution?

Mr. PATMAN. It was germane and unanimous.

Mr. HALL. I am not interested in whether the other body was unanimous or not, Mr. Speaker, but were there not some legislative restrictions as this bill left the House, based on points of order and matters that were germane to the House bill?

Mr. PATMAN. None, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the explanation, I believe this bill should pass. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the minority believes the recommendations made by the Senate are acceptable and urges passage.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 5404) to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 12, insert:

"'(4) to foster and support the development and use of computer and other scientific methods and technologies, primarily for research and education in the sciences;".

Page 2, line 13, strike out "'(4)" and insert "'(5)".

Page 2, line 25, strike out "'(5)" and insert "'(6)".

Page 3, line 8, strike out "'(6)" and insert "'(7)".

Page 3, line 12, strike out "institution," and insert "institution and appropriate".

Page 3, line 13, strike out "and private contractor".

Page 3, strike out lines 17 to 23, inclusive, and insert:

"'(b) The Foundation is authorized to initiate and support specific scientific activities in connection with matters relating to international cooperation or national security by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such scientific activities. Such activities when initiated or supported pursuant to requests made by the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense shall be financed solely from funds transferred to the Foundation by the requesting Secretary as provided in section 15(g), and any such activities shall be unclassified and shall be identified by the Foundation as being undertaken at the request of the appropriate Secretary."

Page 4, line 12, after "Board" insert "and the Director".

Page 5, lines 10 and 11, strike out "and be responsible for".

Page 5, line 19, after "education," insert "research management,".

Page 6, line 4, after "Colleges," insert "the Association of State Colleges and Universities,".

Page 8, line 9, strike out "14" and insert "15".

Page 9, strike out all after line 23 over to and including line 8 on page 10 and insert:

"'(e) The Director shall not make any contract, grant, or other arrangement pursuant to section 11(c) without the prior approval of the Board, except that a grant, contract, or other arrangement involving a total commitment of less than $2,000,000, or less than $500,000 in any one year, or a commitment of such lesser amount or amounts and subject to such other conditions as the Board in its discretion may from time to time determine to be appropriate and publish in the Federal Register, may be made if such action is taken pursuant to the terms and conditions set forth by the Board, and if each such action is reported to the Board at the Board meeting next following such action.'"

Page 13, strike out lines 21 and 22.

Page 13, line 23, strike out "(2)" and insert "(1)".

Page 14, line 1, strike out "(3)" and insert "(2)".

Page 15, after line 19, insert:

"(d) Section 11 of such Act is further demanded by striking out the word 'and' at the end of clause (h), by striking out the period at the end of clause (i) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word 'and', and by inserting at the end thereof a new clause as follows:

"'(j) to arrange with and reimburse the heads of other Federal agencies for the performance of any activity which the Foundation is authorized to conduct.'"

Page 15, strike out lines 1 and 2, and insert:

"SEC. 11. Effective September 1, 1968—

"(1) section 14 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is repealed, and notwithstanding the provisions of the first section of this Act, until such date the provisions of section 3(a)(9) of such Act of 1950 shall remain in effect for the purposes of such section 14; and

"(2) sections 15, 16, and 17 of such Act, and all references thereto in such Act, are redesignated as sections 14, 15, and 16, respectively."

Page 15, line 4, strike out "redesignated as section 14 and is".

Page 15, line 7, strike out "14" and insert "15".

Page 17, line 25, strike out "Sections 16 and 17" and insert "Section 16".

Page 18, line 1, strike out all after "1950" down to and including "15" in line 3.

Page 18, line 5, strike out "the section redesignated as section 15" and insert *"such section."*

Page 18, line 7, strike out "14" and insert "15".

Page 18, after line 7, insert:

"SEC. 14. Subsection (a) of section 17 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) To enable the Foundation to carry out its powers and duties, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, the sum of $525,000,000; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and each subsequent fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law. Sums authorized by this subsection shall be in addition to sums authorized by section 201(b)(1) of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966."

Page 18, line 8, strike out "14." and insert "15".

Page 19, line 4, strike out "15." and insert "16".

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the minority on the Committee on Science and Astronautics do agree with the Senate amendments and have no objection to this procedure.

Mr. MILLER of California. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is it the intent of the chairman of the committee to insert in the RECORD a detailed explanation of the Senate amendments?

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes, I will insert that at this point:

H.R. 5404 amending the National Science Foundation Act passed the House on April 12, 1967, on a rollcall vote of 391 to 22. The bill makes a number of improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and culminates an extensive study of the Foundation which the committee began in the fall of 1964.

For the most part, the Senate adopted the House bill. However, it did make a number of changes, most of which merely clarify the role and responsibilities of the National Science Board and the Director of the Foundation.

The most significant of the Senate amendments occurs in section 17—page 20 of the bill—whereby the Senate provides for annual authorization of funds for the Foundation.

In view of the new applied research responsibilities of the Foundation and the other changes made by this bill, I believe annual authorization is necessary in order to provide an indepth review of the Foundation's programs.

I would also emphasize that although this bill authorizes certain new functions, it is not an appropriation bill and it does not appropriate any additional money.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, would the chairman of the committee at this point in brief terms explain what the Senate amendments do?

Mr. MILLER of California. The Senate amendments are procedural. The only amendment that is important is, this will set up authorization for the National Science Foundation and will give to the Committee on Science and Astronautics the right to review annual requests for authorization legislation, something which the committee has long felt should be done.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, on an annual basis, the Committee on Science and Astronautics will consider the program of the agency?

Mr. MILLER of California. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And it will report a bill on an annual authorization basis each session of Congress?

Mr. MILLER of California. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Will this be by line item or total dollar amount?

Mr. MILLER of California. I presume it will be by line item.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I ask one other question. The annual authorization requirement does, I think, give to the legislative committee new responsibility, but with that new responsibility comes the need and necessity for prompt action on the annual program of the agency.

Can we have the assurance of the committee that the annual authorization legislation will be handled promptly at the beginning of each session?

Mr. MILLER of California. I can give that assurance. It will be handled with the greatest of facility we can give it. We do have the authorization bill for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I have not decided yet just what procedure we will follow, but I am under the impression we will appoint a subcommittee to handle this new authorization legislation, so that they can be handled within the same time frame and brought to the floor as quickly as possible.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLLECTION, COMPILATION, CRITICAL EVALUATION, PUBLICATION, AND SALE OF STANDARD REFERENCE DATA

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6279) to provide for the collection, compilation, critical evaluation, publication, and sale of standard reference data, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 7, strike out "1968." and insert "1969."

Page 4, line 9, strike out "1968" and insert "1969".

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—it is my understanding that the minority members of the committee do agree to the Senate amendments and have no objection to the procedure the chairman is taking.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct. We have consulted with them.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Will the chairman insert in the RECORD an explanation of the Senate amendment?

Mr. MILLER of California. I shall be happy to.

The standard reference data bill was passed by the House on August 14, 1967, on a rollcall vote of 319 to 2, and the bill authorized a $1.86 million program in fiscal year 1968.

A year has passed since the House action and the fiscal year is now almost at an end. Therefore, the Senate amended the House bill by substituting fiscal year 1969 for fiscal year 1968, and it authorizes the same $1.86 million in fiscal year 1969.

I might add that the President's budget request for the standard data program in fiscal year 1969 was $2.7 million. Consequently, by adopting this bill today we are reducing the program almost a million dollars from the amount requested.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN H.R. 5404 AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE AND AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

The Senate version differs from the bill as passed by the House in the following respects:

First. The Senate adds a new section 3(a)(4) authorizing NSF to foster and support the development and use of computers and other scientific methods and technologies, primarily for research and education in the sciences.

Second. In section 3(a)(6)—3(a)(7) of the Senate bill—the NSF is required to maintain a program to determine the total amount of money for research received by each educational institution, nonprofit organization, and private contractor in the United States. The Senate version differs in that only amounts received by educational institutions and appropriate nonprofit organizations need be determined.

Third. In section 3(b) the Senate bill differs from H.R. 5404—passed by the House—by requiring that when the NSF supports scientific activities relating to international cooperation or national security at the request of the Secretary of State or Defense, such activities shall be unclassified, funded solely by the re-

questing Secretary, and shall be identified as to the requesting Secretary. The Senate bill also authorizes the NSF to undertake at its own initiative, support of activities relating to international cooperation or national security. H.R. 5404 as passed by the House merely authorizes NSF to support such activities at the request of either Secretary.

Fourth. In section 3(d), H.R. 5404—as passed by the House—provides that the Board shall recommend and encourage the pursuit of national policies for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences. The Senate version states that the Board and the Director shall perform this function.

Fifth. In section 4(c), the Senate adds "research management" as a field from which Board members may be drawn and adds the Association of State Colleges and Universities as an organization which may recommend to the President nominees for Board membership.

Sixth. In section 5(e), H.R. 5404 as passed by the House provides that the Director shall not make any grant, contract, or other arrangement without the prior approval of the Board if such award involves a new type of program, or a total commitment of over $2,000,000, or over $500,000 in any 1 year, or a commitment of such other amount or amounts and subject to such other conditions as the Board shall determine and publish in the Federal Register.

The Senate bill provides that the Director shall not make any award without prior Board approval, except that an award involving less than $2,000,000 or less than $500,000 in a year may be made pursuant to terms and conditions set forth by the Board, provided that each such award is reported to the Board at the next meeting. The Board may lower—but not raise—these dollar limitations by publishing such lower limitations in the Federal Register.

Seventh. The Senate adds a new section 11(j) of the act which authorizes the Foundation to arrange with and reimburse the heads of other Federal agencies for the performance of any activity which NSF is authorized to conduct.

Eighth. Both versions of H.R. 5404 abolish the NSF's weather modification authorization in present section 14, and also delete section 3(a)(9) on the same subject. However, the Senate provides that these deletions shall not occur until September 1, 1968, while the House action makes them effective upon passage of the bill.

Ninth. The House bill continues the permanent appropriation authorization in present section 17. The Senate would substitute in section 17 a requirement for appropriation authorizations, and authorizes for fiscal year 1969 the sum of $525,000,000.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER EXPENSES OF CONDUCTING STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 179, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 1591) on the resolution (H. Res. 1196) providing for further expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 179, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1196

Resolved, That for the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 179, Ninetieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $75,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditures in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, delete "$75,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$60,000".

On page 2, line 7, add the following:

"SEC. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 1592) on the resolution (H. Res. 1198) to provide funds for the Committee on Agriculture, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1198

Resolved, That, effective June 1, 1968, the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 83, Ninetieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed an additional $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of accountants, experts, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

SEC. 4. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, delete "$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$40,000".

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I have a question, Mr. Speaker. Both of these resolutions, House Resolution 1196 and House Resolution 1198, refer to funds being paid by the committees—and I find no objection thereto—"out of the contingent fund of the House." Are these not the same funds that we had to pass a special resolution for on yesterday, allowing them to borrow about $2.5 million in order to pay for the clerk hire of the House?

Mr. FRIEDEL. What we did last night was out of the contingent funds, and this money will come out of the contingent funds. This is the usual procedure.

Mr. HALL. I know it is the usual procedure, but that is not the answer to my question, and maybe one should not expect it, but if the gentleman's statement is correct that it is the same fund, it is in pretty bad shape. So how can we vote this additional money, even though the committee did a good job of paring down the committee requests, if the fund is "busted," without borrowing more?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Then, it will be put in in a supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. HALL. But the supplemental appropriation bill is not yet law.

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. And there is no indication that it may be law before the using committees will need to begin to use these funds in part, according to the statement in the bills. Is that correct?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct. They have been using the money and this money is to sustain them for the rest of the year.

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

Mr. HALL. I will be glad to yield to gentleman from California if he can clear up whether the contingent fund of the House is the same as that which the Clerk of the House uses to pay the employees of the House.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. The contingency fund had a balance in it and, because the payroll had to be paid, they borrowed from the contingency fund to pay the payroll until the second supplemental was passed, but this is the same fund. However, it has a balance in it.

Mr. HALL. This is not the one that was defunct and for which we had to borrow in order to pay the bills of the Clerk

of the House that were expected to come due on July 1, as of last evening. Is that a good statement?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. The fund depleted was the payroll fund for clerk hire and other expenses and not the contingent fund.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that explanation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be permitted to sit on Monday, July 1, during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT TO PROCLAIM AUGUST 11, 1968, AS "FAMILY REUNION DAY"

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 165), authorizing the President to proclaim August 11, 1968, as "Family Reunion Day."

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. RES. 165

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating August 11, 1968, as "Family Reunion Day", and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 2986, TO EXTEND PUBLIC LAW 480, 83D CONGRESS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2986) to extend Public Law 480, 83d Congress, for 3 years, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist upon the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. POAGE, GATHINGS, JONES of Missouri, PURCELL, BELCHER, TEAGUE of California, and Mrs. MAY.

AMERICANS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ACTION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, on this date 10 years ago a small group of concerned Americans gathered. Their concern was the future of our Republic with its system of checks and balances—and the continued freedom of those who would inhabit it.

From that meeting a new political force appeared, Americans for Constitutional Action—ACA. Its announced goals—active support of our Constitution and to further its aims by helping those who believed in it seek or retain congressional seats.

Working with persons of both national parties—ACA has steadily increased its assistance to constitutional conservatives through a variety of programs geared to individual use.

Many of us in both Houses have received their biannual Distinguished Service Awards throughout the years offered and value them as a reminder that we have retained our faith in the wisdom of the Constitution.

I am sure that many of my colleagues join me in saluting ACA today for what it has accomplished thus far—for the real help given to so many and the future assistance to all those who will follow.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICANS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ACTION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, today we are observing an important milestone in our country's political history. A major positive force in American politics is observing its 10th anniversary. Americans for Constitutional Action—ACA—under the inspired leadership of Adm. Ben Moreell, has served and continues to serve its purpose admirably.

Dedicated to promoting responsible, constitutional government, ACA has supported candidates of both parties, awarded recognition to Members of the Congress who have upheld the precepts of constitutional government, and provided a rallying point for responsible opposition to the dangerous trend toward arbitrary, centralized Federal power.

Because of the restrained and reasonable approach of ACA, and the fact that it concentrates its time and energy in supporting candidates and officeholders dedicated to sound, conservative principles rather than in promoting publicity for itself, it is possible that some Americans are unaware of the indispensable work this fine organization is doing.

For this reason, I am taking advantage of this 10th anniversary to publicly salute Americans for Constitutional Action and commend them for the high ideals they stand for and the remarkable achievements they have to their credit.

To the distinguished Americans who serve on the board of trustees, to the competent and courteous members of the Washington staff, and to the thousands of concerned citizens whose contributions have kept ACA alive and growing, I extend my sincerest congratulations and thanks. Ten years of impressive achievement now lie behind you. In the crucial years of national decision which lie ahead, your role promises to be even more important and even more impressive.

SUPPORT FOR LYNDON JOHNSON'S PROPOSAL TO LOWER THE VOTING AGE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has focused the Nation's attention on one of the greatest inequities in our national life—the barriers we have erected between the voting booths and the 18-year-olds who wish to vote.

The President has performed a great service to the Nation by asking Congress to vote a constitutional amendment that will permit tens of thousands of young Americans to have the opportunity of voicing their political convictions by voting for the candidate of their choice.

Our voting laws desperately need revision. For too many years we have allowed outmoded regulations to block the way to young people who have proven their maturity and sound judgment as citizens of this country.

The President has reminded us of the fact that many of these same young people whom we have denied the right to vote are now serving their country on the battlefield in Vietnam. He has reminded us further that many of these same young people are taxpayers, who deserve a voice in how the Government spends their hard-earned money. If our courts and our schools regard the 18- to 21-year-old group as responsible adults, then I think we in Congress should join this cause.

I also think we must realize that this Nation enjoys the benefits of having developed a remarkable mature and knowledgeable youth generation that deserves a more meaningful voice in the Nation's affairs.

I believe we will be a better nation for passing this constitutional amendment. And I join with President Johnson and urge my colleagues to enact it promptly.

TRIBUTE TO MEMORY OF LAMINE GUEYE OF SENEGAL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I should like to pause a moment to pay tribute to the memory of Lamine Gueye, President of the National Assembly of Senegal, who passed away on June 10. Lamine Gueye was born 76 years ago in the French Sudan and lived to become President of the legislative body of an independent Senegal. After receiving a doctorate in law from Paris, President Gueye engaged in the practice of law but soon entered political life. He served as mayor of the important Senegalese town of St. Louis and also as mayor of Dakar for 16 years. Immediately following the Second World War he was a member of the French National Assembly. In 1960 Mr. Gueye contended with Leopold Sedar Senghor for the Presidency of the Mali Confederation. He lost the election but in a pragmatic, patriotic way that was so typical of him he immediately forgot the rancors of the campaign and loyally served his Chief of State and his country as President of the National Assembly.

We had the pleasure of welcoming him as a leader grantee to the United States in 1965. Madam Gueye also came to our country as a leader grantee in her capacity as a prominent figure in the Senegalese National Red Cross.

It is therefore fitting that we stop to pay tribute today to the memory of this great African statesman and friend of America.

PELLY COMMENDS ICC REQUEST FOR TRAIN STUDY

Mr. PELLY. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, 99 years ago a golden spike was driven into the ground near Ogden, Utah, marking the connection of East-West railroad service. Today, in less than a century, train passenger service is far from golden. In fact, Ogden, Utah, has become known by travelers on the Union Pacific's train No. 6, between Los Angeles and Omaha, Nebr., as the site of a 35-minute dinner break.

This is only one example of hundreds which could be cited of the deterioration of rail passenger service. It is well known to the Nation's train travelers that the Southern Pacific, in its desire to discontinue its New Orleans to Los Angeles train, the Sunset, even eliminated sleeping and eating facilities. Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, under ICC regulations, even cattle are to be fed and watered every 24 hours; the same provisions do not appear necessary for humans by some passenger train carriers.

So, today I commend that part of the Interstate Commerce Commission's recommendation which calls for a study to be made either by Congress or by the Department of Transportation on the need for a national railroad passenger system.

Mr. Speaker, modern rail transportation is vitally needed in the United States. There is no doubt that faster and sometimes less expensive transportation is available. But, there is a segment of our population that wants and deserves train transportation, and it should not be the prerogative of the management of some carriers to cause disouraging discomforts in their quest to discourage passenger service. And, there is the national need in time of emergencies which must be remembered.

I have discussed this problem with the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS], and urged him to investigate this problem. His committee has a grave responsibility to seek a solution for the plight of the train traveler.

LACK OF DEBATE ON CONTINUING RESOLUTION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised, and regret to say no longer shocked, to find that the House proceeded in a disorderly fashion by taking up the continuing appropriation before the 1-minute rule. I had waited around last night believing this was scheduled at that time, and was anxious to participate in the debate. The Republican leadership was not informed of this procedure nor was the ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee, the committee handling the bill.

This is a serious matter, and it should never have been passed in such a fashion.

I want to read the following from the UPI wires of June 25:

> The White House indicated Tuesday that it might be months before President Johnson reaches any decision on where to cut $6 billion from his budget for fiscal 1969. White House Press Secretary George Christian said he did not see how the President could make any cuts until all appropriation bills for the budget have been approved by Congress.

Now fiscal year 1969 begins on July 1, and if there is any real cutting of expenditures, it is already planned and in being.

The answer is that the President is not about to abide by this restriction of the Congress and now apparently he openly states it.

This needed to have been discussed during the debate on this continuing resolution because Congress has the right to do something about it and get hold of this situation.

I might say I am writing to the President to find out the correctness of this press release. This matter is approaching a point where possibly impeachment proceedings may be the only way to get the President to abide by the laws.

CONGRESSMAN SMITH INTRODUCES KIOWA, COMANCHE, AND APACHE TRIBE JUDGMENT FUND LEGISLATION

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which authorizes payment by the Government of $6 million in judgment funds to the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Oklahoma.

The Indian Claims Commission has found that these tribes are entitled to a judgment award of the above moneys, and the judgment has been entered on dockets 258 and 259. The Congress appropriated the funds necessary to pay these funds this year, and the President signed the payment bill into effect on June 19, 1968.

The bill authorizes payment to the members of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Oklahoma on a per capita basis based on the enrollees of the tribes appearing on a roll prepared in accordance with the act of September 21, 1959, and approved by the tribes on May 20, 1960. The roll is authorized to be updated to include the addition of newborns and the deletion of decedents as of the date of enactment of the legislation.

In keeping with our American principles of government and fair play, I am pleased to introduce this important legislation which will meet the requirement of equity and responsibility. I am grateful for the privilege of serving these tribal members of our American Indians, most of whom live within the congressional district that I represent. The Indian people of Oklahoma have a long and distinguished heritage, but the history of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache tribes stands out as a credit to my State and our Nation. I urge speedy action on this measure by my colleagues.

AMERICANS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ACTION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an important date and to salute the Americans for Constitutional Action. On June 27, the ACA will observe its 10th anniversary. I join with its many friends throughout the Nation in congratulating

the organization upon its first decade of public service. Also to extend my personal good wishes for its continued success.

The ACA performs an important function. It is a nonpartisan organization dedicated to promoting a better understanding of the Constitution and our Republic. The ACA has achieved a splendid record for integrity, as well as the clear and concise reporting of the programs it conducts to perpetuate constitutional government.

We are proud of the work the ACA is doing. Its high ideals and purposes are essential to the understanding of freedom and responsible government. I certainly commend those in charge of the organization for their devotion to the public weal and for the efforts they make in explaining the broad ramifications of traditional Americanism.

I also wish these leaders and the ACA well in their future endeavors. Theirs is a vital task. In seeing to it that the Nation is informed, it is necessary to know the forces at work that keep the Republic functioning as it was conceived and formed when the Founding Fathers drafted the first government of its kind in the history of the world.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the President of the United States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. 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. 213]

Ashley	Holland	Resnick
Baring	Howard	Scheuer
Bolling	Jones, Mo.	Steiger, Ariz.
Bow	Karsten	Sullivan
Burton, Utah	Kornegay	Taft
Corman	Laird	Thompson, N.J.
Downing	Long, La.	Vanik
Edwards, La.	May	Watkins
Evins, Tenn.	Mayne	Willis
Hansen, Idaho	O'Hara, Mich.	
Hawkins	Passman	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 402 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1401 UNTIL MIDNIGHT, JUNE 29

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight, Saturday night, June 29, to file a conference report on Senate bill 1401, to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate today on the legislative appropriation bill.

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

There was no objection.

VIVA HEMISFAIR! VIVA HENRY!

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it was my real privilege to be able to visit HemisFair '68 in San Antonio, Tex., last weekend, and there on Sunday, the 23d, participate in Henry B. Gonzales Day. To say he is held in high esteem by his fellow citizens is an understatement. He is a real hero to his people. Again and again we heard shouts of "Viva Henry!"

My reason for taking this time today is to say to the House that those who supported the funding for HemisFair need never apologize to anyone at any time. Without detracting from our neighbors to the north, HemisFair has everything you could find at Expo '67 without having to walk several miles to see it. HemisFair is compact and yet contains a wide variety of attractions. With the theme, "Confluence of the Americas," HemisFair is a brilliant meeting ground for all countries and all peoples to display and compare history, religion, cultures, and, not to forget, the people's pleasures.

Some of you may be wondering why a Missourian is so lavish in his praise of a Texas fair. My reply is this fair earns the praise of anyone who visits it. Every exhibit I visited was excellent. Most refreshing of all is that you can walk the grounds, and the business district of San Antonio, and never find a hippie or a beatnik.

We know our Members will have no free time from now until after October 6, when HemisFair closes, yet I hope you will not neglect to urge your constituents to this year re-visit America, including HemisFair, to see the most interesting, exciting, brilliant, and impressive series of exhibits which make up HemisFair '68.

CONGRESSMEN SHOULD BE PUT ON RECORD

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the performance of our House of Representatives yesterday was disgraceful.

We spent over $17 billion of the taxpayers' money, but could not get enough Members to stand up and have a record vote.

Amendments were adopted increasing the bill by millions of dollars, and this after all of the hot air in the debate supporting a tax increase which was supposed to include budget cuts.

I think the House rules should be changed in two major respects. First, all legislation appropriating money should require a record vote of the Members. Second, because of the "sweetener" technique where much of the bad is included in good, for purposes of passage, it seems to me this lumping together business should be discontinued and prohibit more than one executive department in single appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, in 1965 I introduced House resolutions in an effort to accomplish amending the House rules along these lines, and I am today again introducing identical resolutions to meet this problem.

Obviously the merits of appropriations for the FBI should not be saddled with questionable funds for some State Department program. And whenever taxpayer funds are voted, the American people are entitled to know who voted for the spending and against the spending, as a matter of record.

HENRY B. GONZALEZ DAY AT THE HEMISFAIR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I gladly join the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] in his comments upon our visit to the Hemisfair on the weekend just passed. Particularly were those of us from the House delegation thrilled with the reception that was given to our colleague, HENRY B. GONZALEZ, on the day designated as "Henry B. Gonzalez Day" last Sunday at the Hemisfair.

This fair is truly an exciting exhibition. Indeed, it surpasses all of the other international fairs that I have been privileged to attend. I believe all of us who might see it would appreciate and applaud the U.S. exhibit at the Hemisfair, dedicated as it is to this great melting pot of ours consonant with the Hemisfair theme, The Confluence of Civilizations.

The entire exhibit stresses the strength of the United States derived from this melding cauldron into which have been poured so many diverse metals which create the American alloy, stronger and

more durable than any one of its ingredients.

The U.S. exhibit demonstrates the great progress that has been made in blending and weaving into the mainstream of American life these divergent strands of thread that have become together the great and colorful fabric of American life.

The exhibit does not ignore our problems, but its theme is both honest and hopeful.

I think it is a great exhibit and one that all of us in the Congress should see, and I believe that once seeing it, everyone of us would agree that our Government's money was well spent.

The HemisFair itself is fully worth the visit.

TEXAS HEMISFAIR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I, too, was privileged to visit HemisFair in San Antonio, Tex., last weekend with several of our colleagues including the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] who is absent today by necessity and who told me last evening that he had to be away; our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN]; the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]; and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] who has just spoken with eloquence, and with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT]. Together with our wives we visited HemisFair.

It was indeed an amazing thing—even for those of us from Texas who, of course, may be afflicted with bias. HemisFair offers more than we are able to recite to you here but I give you assurance that it will afford you a most wonderful experience.

I am quite a long way from that area, but the reception there—the tribute paid to our colleague, HENRY B. GONZALEZ, was an experience. It was inspiring to see the wonderful response to a Member who represents them here in the House of Representatives. It was an outpouring of appreciation—yes, affection for a dedicated public servant.

I hope all our colleagues will have the opportunity to go to Texas to the HemisFair this fall. I know you will be highly pleased and I can assure you the "red carpet" will be laid out for you.

LES ARENDS—25 YEARS AS WHIP FOR REPUBLICANS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, for 25 years, a quarter of a century, our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, has served the Republicans in the House of Representatives as our whip.

He has served not only me, but my predecessors, with loyalty, wisdom, skill, and with dignity.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, wish to express my appreciation to LES ARENDS on this occasion. I speak as well for those who for one reason or another cannot be here just now.

Mr. Speaker, LES ARENDS has been and is a good friend of mine and, as I said a moment ago, no one could ask for more in the way of loyalty or service or assistance.

I congratulate and commend LES for this long and able service which I think is a record in the House of Representatives for the job of whip—I know on our side of the aisle—and I suspect the same is true for the Democrat side of the aisle.

I praise LES ARENDS for his great accomplishments of the past and wish him the very best in the future.

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

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

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure to take the floor and pay a tribute to a man who is to continue in our midst. Generally, our remarks are directed to those who are retiring or have passed away.

I am pleased to say a word about my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, who has for a quarter of a century been our whip on the Republican side of the aisle.

As the regional eastern whip of the organization, I know something about the way in which he has conducted the duties of his office. His lashes as whip have never been biting—he has always attempted to steer the Members on this side of the aisle through friendly persuasion. I believe he has done a truly effective job. I knew the name of LES ARENDS long before I came to this House. I knew much about him. He has certainly measured up to the wonderful things that I had heard about him. I consider him among my closest friends in this House, and I look forward to having him serve here for many years to come.

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

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to and expressing commendation for our great friend LESLIE ARENDS, of Illinois. As one of the members of the whip organization, I have been in touch with this gentleman for nearly 10 years. I have found him a delightful person with whom to work, a man who is dedicated, not only to his party, but also to his country. He has rendered great service to his Nation in his capacity not only as a Member of Congress, but as part of the leadership on our side of the aisle.

I would like to join my colleagues, in congratulating LES ARENDS for having served in this capacity for a quarter of a century, and also in expressing our desire that he commence and continue to serve for another quarter of a century.

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

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve under LES ARENDS' leadership now for 8 years. Prior to that time I had the benefit of his counsel during the days when I was contemplating and undertaking a campaign. It has been a great rewarding experience for me, and I know that I speak for my colleagues from Illinois in expressing appreciation for the great leadership to his country that LES ARENDS has provided.

I share the feelings just expressed by the gentleman from Ohio. In respect of LES ARENDS, 25 years is just a good beginning.

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

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to have the opportunity of saying a few words with regard to the minority whip on this occasion. The 25 years of service as minority whip is a new record.

I would like to say that I have had the privilege of working with this distinguished and dedicated American for some 8 years as assistant whip, and since that time as part of the leadership. He is a member of the Coordinating Committee on which I have the privilege of serving with the leadership, as well.

I would like to say to my good friend LES that I wish, as I know all Members of this House wish also, that he shall have the opportunity of serving the Congress many, many more years in the dedicated fashion that he has served it in the past.

I congratulate him for the manner in which he conducts that office.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we Members of the House all like LES ARENDS, of Illinois. It is a pleasure to have LES ARENDS continue his duties as Republican whip.

We of the progressive wing of the Republican Party like Congressman LES ARENDS just as much as the conservative wing of the Republican Party.

I hope LES ARENDS will continue for many years as Republican whip even though the pay is zero, the hours long, the chase hard, and in the end usually the thanks are also zero, and the leadership gets the credit for successes. Congressman LES ARENDS is the "but if" section of the Republican Party. If there is a close vote loss, LES ARENDS gets the "but if" routine from everybody. "But if," so many were not absent—"but if," LES ARENDS had used more pressure instead of understanding the Member's problems in the district back home, "but if" LES ARENDS was not such an agreeable, friendly guy, and so forth. In fact, it is a whip with a pleasant ring of cheerfulness that Congressman LES ARENDS wields. It is not a whip that stings at all. We Republican Members like LES ARENDS and hope that he will continue his friendly, zig-zag course, which always keeps his actions within the bounds of

the possible and keeps a wry smile in the face of defeat, and a surprised happy look on manna from the skies on occasional unexpected victories.

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

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the aisle wish to join the minority Members in congratulating LES ARENDS on attaining 25 years of service as whip with the minority party. We join in wishing him well for another 25 years as a leader for that Grand Old Party which fortunately for us will likely remain the minority party.

Seriously, we of the majority party, have often wished that LES ARENDS were on our team instead of on the opposing team. So we salute a worthy adversary, but a great American, nevertheless.

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

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

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join our colleagues in congratulating LES ARENDS. I think we have been very fortunate to have a man of his disposition and his caliber in the Congress of the United States. I just want to add my voice from the Minnesota delegation in congratulating LES ARENDS and thank him very much. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, one of LES ARENDS' best friends.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that LES ARENDS does not have a better friend in the House than GEORGE MAHON. We came here together. We have enjoyed a close association and friendship for nearly 34 years. We have often discussed the problems which confront our country in the legislative area and otherwise. I continue to take great pride in the accomplishments and sterling qualities of this very outstanding American citizen, friend, and legislator.

Congratulations, LES.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to LES ARENDS. I knew LES even before I came to the House as a Member. We became acquainted shortly after he entered Congress in 1935, when I was serving as secretary to former Congressman Edwin M. Schaefer.

After I entered the House as a Member in January 1945, my first committee assignment was on the old Military Affairs Committee. I served on that committee with LES, and for the past 22 years I have served with him on the Armed Services Committee. He is also a member of another committee on which I have the privilege of serving, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

If I have any criticism at all of LES, it would be that he has been too efficient and too effective as minority whip, and sometimes we on the Democratic side of the aisle have felt the results of his efficiency.

I join my colleagues in paying tribute to and offering sincere congratulations to a great legislator, and to a really true friend.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, anyone who can survive for 25 years as Republican whip in the House of Representatives has got to be good. In many ways, the job of whip is a thankless assignment that involves a lot more than just taking polls, calling Members to the floor, and putting out notices of the program for the following week. And I must say, the title "whip" is really a misnomer. You just do not line up Members—especially if you are in the minority—by applying the lash.

Believe me, it will not work, as LES ARENDS can attest.

What success in the office of whip—or any other position of leadership—requires is a personal facility for conciliation, for bringing together divergent views through reason and, may I say, through an ability to persuade. As one of LES ARENDS' earliest supporters for the position he has held for 25 years—longer than anyone else in the history of the Congress—I think I can qualify as an expert on the outstanding job he has done.

In the many legislative battles, during the time I served as majority leader and minority leader, he was my strong right arm on the floor of the House.

And I know, first hand, how much new Members have benefited from the generously given counsel by my colleague; sound counsel born of knowledge gained through experience.

Beyond that, I know of the contributions he has made as a member of the Republican leadership which met regularly with President Dwight D. Eisenhower during his 8 years in the White House, contributions which he continues to make as a member of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership in its meetings since General Eisenhower's tenure.

Beyond my respect for LES ARENDS as a distinguished legislator is my affection for him as a close, personal friend. Ours is a friendship that dates back to the days when we met as freshmen of the 74th Congress.

The district he has represented through the years—the 17th of Illinois, and the one I represent—the second of Indiana, are adjacent.

As a result, it has been my pleasure to meet and know many of his constituents, and I can assure you that many of mine know and admire LES ARENDS as a result of the many times he has visited with us.

All you need to do to know LES ARENDS is take him on in a game of golf. You will find him a fierce competitor who plays by the rules of the game, for fun or for keeps.

This is the LES ARENDS I know, and I am proud to have him as a friend.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the occasion of the 25th anniversary of my good friend and colleague from the State of Illinois, LES ARENDS, as the Republican whip. Since his election as whip in 1943, he has distinguished himself in the service of the Republican Party in particular and the Congress in general.

Few Members of this great body can boast of the dedication to service and country which accounted for his rise, in less than 10 years in these Chambers, from freshman Congressman to minority whip, one of the most responsible positions in the Congress.

LES ARENDS developed his talents and abilities well as he grew up in his home district, the 17th Congressional District in Illinois. He received his college education at Oberlin College in Ohio, and pursued graduate studies leading to a LL.D. degree at Illinois Wesleyan University.

In 1934, LES ARENDS came to Congress to serve the people of his area and to assist in the great task of charting a course for our Nation, then barely regaining its footing after a devastating depression. Since that time we have fought a world war and have experienced a wealth of other national and international crises. In each new Congress since that one in 1934, LES ARENDS was there to provide dynamism and strength to the efforts of the Congress in meeting our problems, national and international. He has, further, been a man of integrity and action in the cause of the Republican Party, and deserved well the recognition bestowed on him in his 1943 election as minority whip.

In 1952, I came to this House, and as a freshman Congressman was grateful for the leadership and interest shown by this veteran in newly elected Members. Nearly 16 years later, as we finish the second session of the 90th Congress, I find that his interest in his colleagues and in the work of the House has grown even deeper and more devoted.

His dedication to the work of Congress and to the principles of the Republican Party continues to be filled with the same zeal that we find in ourselves in those first few years here—a zeal which sometimes fades with the passing of time. LES ARENDS has grown with the times; he has become, in the years that he has spent in this Chamber, more determined than ever in his drive to move America forward. He has, in his 25 years as the Republican whip, furthered the cause of republicanism, and therefore, the great political system which is unique to our country.

For some years now I have served under LES ARENDS as the regional whip for the States of Michigan and Wisconsin and I have always been impressed by the enthusiasm and interest he has shown in his work. It has been one of my greatest pleasures to have served with the gentleman from Illinois, and I look forward to many more pleasant and productive years as this Nation and its people move forward.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the opportunity I have had to serve as a regional whip under LES ARENDS has been a source of real pride. It has been an experience which has been made pleasant and rewarding because of his leadership. His long tenure of service is due primarily to his devotion to the duties of whip which he has performed faithfully and conscientiously. Probably no leader has dedicated himself more to his job than has LES ARENDS. During the years I have

served him as a regional whip, I have yet to find one instance where there was an error in judgment or a lack of attention to every single detail. In addition to being a perfectionist, he has a personality which is ideally suited to the demands of the office. I am pleased to add to the tributes which are being directed to him at this time in recognition of his great contribution to the legislative process over these many years. And I certainly extend to him my congratulations and best wishes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join in this richly deserved, spontaneous tribute to my dear, valued friend, committee colleague, and colleague in the House for many years, LES ARENDS.

The bonds of warm, loyal friendship hold us closely together in this great legislative body, and it is an honor and high privilege for me to add my sincere expressions to the remarks made so aptly and so eloquently by our able, esteemed, distinguished friend, the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

LES ARENDS is one of the finest gentlemen that I have ever known. He is warm, friendly, and courteous by instinct, and he is a great human being, considerate and generous of impulse.

He is an engaging companion and a loyal friend, possessed of a keen, alert mind, outstanding ability, a great American, totally dedicated to his district, State, and country.

Throughout the years of his distinguished service, he has made many splendid, enduring contributions to the procedures and efficiency of the House and to the defense, progress, and advancement of the Nation.

In the field of defense and security alone, these contributions have been truly magnificent, and they have been commendably motivated solely to keeping our great country strong and enduring, not only militarily but materially, and spiritually as well, so that no enemy, or combination of enemies, can ever successfully challenge or endanger the safety of our shores and homes, the national interest and security, and the freedoms we so dearly prize.

I could not speak too enthusiastically or stress too much the loyalty, the patriotic spirit, the fine personal qualities, the many outstanding achievements of this very dear friend and admired and beloved colleague.

Heartiest congratulations to him, his lovely wife and family, and all his dear ones, and his constituents on this occasion, when he is so proudly and joyfully hailed and saluted by his colleagues, regardless of partisan labels.

Today, we pay tribute and honor to a cherished friend and great American, LES ARENDS.

I wish for him and his family continued good health, success in his endeavors, and real peace, contentment, achievement, and happiness for many years to come.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, LES ARENDS has completed 25 years as Republican whip in the House. To be recognized for a position of leadership by his peers is a remarkable achievement in itself, but when it extends for 25 years it is all the more outstanding.

I have only been in the House for 1½ years, but I have become well acquainted with LES ARENDS as our whip. In times of trouble—needing advice—or frivolity, LES has been there.

I commend LES for these 25 years of service, but moreso I commend the Republicans in the House who have seen fit to keep him in this position of leadership.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in paying tribute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. His 25 years of service as Republican whip is only one of many records set by him in service to the people of this Nation. It is a great honor to serve with this dedicated American and to have him as a friend.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in paying tribute to my good friend, LES ARENDS. Since I came to Congress, now nearly 8 years ago, I have served on the Republican whip organization. LES has been a real friend and adviser to me. I know of no Member of this House that has been more generous with his time and help than has LES. I recall as a freshman in this House, now many years ago, LES would always take time to explain the complex procedures of this body, and give me advice and assistance in the problems that faced me. I shall always be grateful to LES ARENDS, and wish him every success and many more years in his position of leadership. I have enjoyed knowing him, and my service under him on the whip organization has been most enjoyable.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] for his long service as Republican whip.

Having served longer than any other whip is a tremendous record, one which will probably never be excelled in length of time.

Length of time is of small moment, however, when the quality and dedication of his service is evaluated. The excellence of his performance is also unexcelled. He has served several floor leaders all with consistent competence and dedication.

I am grateful for the special opportunity to serve with and for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. He has added stature and respect to the important function of party whip.

I wish for him many more years of service in the House and as Republican whip.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in extending my heartiest congratulations to our distinguished colleague, the Honorable LESLIE ARENDS on the occasion of his 25th anniversary as Republican whip of the House. I have been privileged to serve with him on the House Armed Services Committee and have enjoyed working under him in the 89th Congress as assistant whip of the New York delegation.

LES ARENDS' personal attributes are well known to us all. The genuine affection and respect which he commands on both sides of the aisle is the mark of distinction which should be an inspiration to all of us here and indeed to all Americans who follow in his footsteps.

It is my hope that the district he so capably represents in Illinois will continue his service in the Congress for many, many more years.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in my 16 years as a Member of this body, I have participated in dozens of oral tributes paid by the membership to distinguished colleagues. In adding to the justly deserved accolades paid to my good friend, LES ARENDS, I do so with an unusual degree of pleasure.

Just yesterday I happened to make the statement in the Republican Cloakroom that if I were asked to name the man I thought was "the nicest guy in Congress" I would name the smiling and kindly gentleman from Illinois, LES ARENDS. Today I am motivated to make that statement publicly as a part of the RECORD, because, Mr. Speaker, there could be no nicer man alive or one I respect more than our Republican Party whip, the Honorable LESLIE C. ARENDS.

Party responsibility is one of the principal pillars upon which free government is built. Without a division of responsibility between those who propose and those who conscientiously oppose when the national need requires it, we would have no democracy. The result would be either the sterility of a government dominated by narrow ideas and ideals, or it would be the chaos of too many ideas channeled everywhere, but getting nowhere. LES ARENDS has been the type of man who has understood partisanship and has served it well, but at the same time he has been a great respecter of the individual Member's sincerely held views or opinions.

In my experience in this body, I know of no person who has contributed more to free and honest government, or who has more justly earned the deep respect and love of his colleagues.

I am proud to consider myself a friend of the man who has ably served the Republican Party for 25 years as its whip—the nicest guy in Congress—the Honorable LESLIE C. ARENDS.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join in this tribute to one of our most outstanding colleagues, LES ARENDS. His efficiency and effectiveness as Republican whip are well known.

This effectiveness would not have been possible were it not for his pleasant manner and agreeable personality.

LES has certainly contributed greatly not only to our party, but to our Nation, in the years that he has served in the Congress. I hope that we may have many more years of service together in the House, and wish him very well in the future.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I find great pleasure in this opportunity to offer a few words of commendation and praise to our highly respected colleague and Republican whip, the Honorable LES ARENDS, of Illinois. I think back to when I first came to this Congress, now almost 10 years ago. I guess I shall always remember the gracious welcome and most thoughtful offer of assistance that he conveyed to me on the opening day of

that session. I am sure that I speak for a good many Members of this House when I say that new Members have always found sound and reliable counsel from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] during their first session, when such counsel is of great help and importance.

It has already been mentioned that the assignment of whip is a difficult one. It takes great diplomacy and finesse to accomplish the objective of the whip assignment and still keep everybody happy. The many testimonials offered here today attest to the fact that he has performed with great proficiency and finesse.

One could go on at great length in talking about the outstanding qualities and character of this man. May it suffice for me to say that my days here in this House have surely been made more productive and more pleasant by the fact that I have been able to number him as one of my friends. It has been my experience that his concerns always gave consideration to my wishes and welfare. While my life as a Member of Congress has been greatly enriched, probably it is more important that this country, his district and State, and, in fact, the entire world have been enriched because of his dedication to the best interests of all of our people.

I want to extend to him and his family my fondest hope that the future will hold for him many more years of service to his country, and that they may be as rewarding and satisfying to them as his services have provided satisfaction and comforts to all who have known and worked with him.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues and pay tribute to my friend and colleague, LES ARENDS. A man of sterling qualities. LES ARENDS has served his country, State, and party long and well. The fact that the Republican membership of this body has elected and reelected him as its whip for the past 25 years is evidence of the confidence and high regard in which they hold him. He has that rare ability to counsel, not demand; to reason, not to dictate.

LES ARENDS has not only served the Republican Party ably, his sage advice has saved many new Members from political embarrassment.

I salute you LES. May you serve the Republican Members in this body for many years to come.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to join the distinguished minority leader in saluting our dear friend and colleague, LES ARENDS, for his 25 years of service as Republican whip. As one who has had the opportunity to work closely with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois in our day-to-day efforts to move forward with the business of the House of Representatives and the business of the country, I can say without hesitation or equivocation that he has always put the business of the country above party or self.

He has served is party and this House well and ably during his 25 years as whip. He is a stanch Republican, but more than that a great and patriotic American.

We look forward to many more years of distinguished service from our good friend. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Michigan has taken the time to allow us to express these sentiments today. I am very proud to be able to join in congratulating our friend, LES ARENDS, on this occasion.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our esteemed friend and long associate, LES ARENDS.

We have a saying in my part of the country that "a man's word is his bond." I have found this true in my contacts with the able and distinguished gentleman from Illinois who is respected by everyone.

I congratulate him, the Republican Party, and our country by reason of his leadership and his service in this body on the occasion of his 25th anniversary as the Republican whip in the Congress.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to join in the accolades that are being bestowed upon the distinguished minority whip, the Honorable LES ARENDS, upon this 25th milestone of his service.

The best testimonial to LES ARENDS' effectiveness is the number of times he has been reelected to this responsible position.

From a more personal standpoint, few Members of the House have been more helpful to me than has the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. He, in large part, is responsible for the cohesiveness and the esprit de corps that has been developed on this side of the aisle under the able leadership of the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

When I came here as a fledgling Member, LES ARENDS was never too busy to give me words of advice and counsel which quite possibly saved me some embarrassing votes later on. His parliamentary genius and ability to foresee complicating circumstances and to put first things first are recognized by all who have been privileged to serve under his guidance.

So I count it a privilege to join today in honoring the distinguished minority whip, a Congressman's Congressman and an outstanding and helpful gentleman who does credit to his State, to this body, and to the party in which he serves.

My only hope is that his status can be elevated from the minority to the majority in the new 91st Congress opening in January.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] is presently in his 25th year as Republican whip in the House of Representatives. I am pleased to join with my colleagues today in honoring the gentleman for his remarkable record. No other Member of this body, past or present, has served as party whip for such a long period of time. As a relative newcomer to the House, I look with considerable awe upon my colleagues, such as the gentleman from Illinois, who have managed to survive politically for 25 years and more. To be returned to the House election after election is in itself a great tribute. But, it seems to me, it is an even greater tribute to a Member of this body to be elected, Congress after Congress, to an important position of party leadership. In every Congress since 1943 the gentleman from Illinois has been selected by vote of the Republicans in this body to the position of party whip. This speaks more highly of LES ARENDS and more effectively dramatizes the confidence, esteem, and respect in which he is held than any words of mine can do. I salute the gentleman for having served for such a long period of time, and I salute him for having served so well. Obviously, had he not carried out the functions of the important office he holds with great skill and dedication, he would not have been returned to it with such regularity. It is my privilege to serve as an assistant regional whip and work under the gentleman's direction. I can personally testify to his effectiveness. I can further testify that, in terms of genuine concern for the House of Representatives and its Members, the gentleman from Illinois has no superiors. We as a party are fortunate indeed to have him here, but in a larger sense, the House of Representatives as an institution is fortunate that he serves here. May LES ARENDS be with us for a long time yet, and may his kind increase.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it has been my great pleasure and honor to serve as one of the assistant Republican whips under the able leadership and direction of the Honorable LESLIE C. ARENDS, of Illinois. I considered it a great honor to have been appointed to this job and I have enjoyed my position immensely.

On thing that I have observed is the very fine and excellent way in which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] conducts the office of whip on the Republican side. He is a person dedicated to the minority party, always is faithful to the principles and policies as enunciated by the leadership and uses all of his efforts in getting as many Republicans as possible to support the Republican cause.

I had previously served as whip for 4 years in the Pennsylvania State Legislature and I know what a trying position the office of whip is. The whip is the good right arm of the floor leader, and I have often said that a floor leader is as strong as his whip.

I would say that the reason for the strong Republican position in this session of Congress has been because of the able direction of the whip organization as led by the gentleman from Illinois. The Congress has certainly been well rewarded by his presence here and he has been a devoted servant to his party, to his State, and to the Nation.

It is my great pleasure to join with others in celebrating his 25th anniversary as whip.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, there are a few jobs more important, and more thankless, than that of party whip. For 25 years LES ARENDS has quietly and conscientiously held the reins on Republican House Members, applying the whip when needed. The thanks we owe him is long overdue and entirely inadequate, but certainly most sincere.

As a personal note, may I add that I have had frequent occasion to visit in Illinois' 17th District, since my daughter and family reside there. I know of the high regard with which he is held by the

"folks back home," and indeed they are fortunate to have had LES working for them in Washington since 1935.

We House Republicans are fortunate, also, to have had LES as our whip this past quarter century. We salute you, LES, for a job well done.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is a wonderful thing just to serve in this House of Representatives and particularly so when we can be a party to history in the making. I recall the day in this House when the late distinguished Speaker, Sam Rayburn, exceeded the record of Henry Clay for serving longer than any other man as Speaker.

Today is another memorable one, for my neighboring colleague, who has represented the 17th District of Illinois so ably for 34 years, has now served as whip of our party in this body for longer than any man in the history of our country. Twenty-five years is a mighty long time, but how much more dramatic when we consider his 25 years in a leadership role as whip of his party.

We all have a great affection for LES ARENDS. I can recall his taking me under his wing when I came to this body as a freshman Member. I have always appreciated his willingness to spend time with the junior Members and give of his best advice and experience, acquired over the many years he has been here. Now, it is my good fortune under his tutoring to serve in his whip organization, and I hope the association will continue for many years to come. I want to extend my heartiest congratulations to my leader and great friend, LES ARENDS, on his most notable achievement.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper, to paraphrase another great statesman from Illinois, for this House to honor today LES ARENDS. It is further fitting and proper that this honor come from both sides of the aisle. I do not believe that another American in the history of our Nation has served his party as whip longer than LES ARENDS. This Congress and this Nation can be proud of the courtly and gentlemanly manner in which the gentleman has served as whip. He has always added luster, and reflected great credit on the House of Representatives as an institution—the people's institution.

We admire LES ARENDS, because without question, he has always placed the welfare of our country and the House of Representatives above any other consideration. He has upheld and protected the prerogatives and honor of the House of Representatives. LES ARENDS has been a warm personal friend to all of those who served with him. This House is a greater body because LES ARENDS has served for 25 years as whip of his party—as majority whip and as minority whip.

When I first came to this House in January 1947, one of the men who stood out was LES ARENDS. I did not hesitate to seek his wise counsel and advice. He was particularly kind, courteous, and encouraging to the young and new Members of the House.

On this day, LES, when you have reached 25 years of continuous service as whip, may I congratulate you. Mrs. Dorn and my people whom I represent, and who have permitted me to remain here and vote very much as you have voted, join with me in wishing for you every continued success, much admiration, and highest esteem always.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to the many others who have spoken out in tribute to our esteemed colleague, LES ARENDS, who has served the Congress and his party with a devotion and dedication envied by most of his fellow Members, and certainly admired by all.

It is my understanding that a thorough study of the evolvement of the duties of a party whip has shown that our colleague has held this vital position longer than any man on either side of the aisle. I would add that I would believe that he has been as effective as any other man who has ever held the position, and far and away more effective than most. I salute LES ARENDS, and hope that he will continue to serve the Nation of his party for many more productive years. I have many fond recollections of LES giving assistance to a new and naive Wisconsinite who came to Congress in January 1961, and I shall never forget the trouble he took to make me feel at home. I salute his 25 years as Republican whip, but I also salute LES ARENDS the man.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, as one of the junior Members of this great body, I want to join with his many friends and admirers in this tribute to the distinguished minority whip, LES ARENDS.

LES has been as thoughtful, kind and considerate to all of the Members, both freshmen and senior, as is humanly possible. His patience, his advice, his helpfulness have been constant. He has earned the gratitude, respect and warm friendship of every Member on this side of the aisle, although as the distinguished Speaker has so aptly said, his duties as whip sometimes require that he crack the whip.

I believe it fair to say that this tribute to the distinguished Member from Illinois is unreservedly joined in by every Member of the House on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I join with other Members of the House today in heartiest congratulations to LES ARENDS on the 25th anniversary of his service as a Republican leader in the House of Representatives.

LES ARENDS has served well and faithfully both as a Republican leader and as the Representative of his district in Illinois. His friends in Congress and throughout the country are legion and I am sure they would want to be included with all of us in congratulations and good wishes on this occasion.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, LES ARENDS is a native of Ford County in Illinois and in his warm personality, his friendliness, his open and honest approach to people and to problems, he truly represents the spirit of the five men and women of the county where he was born. I am happy to join my colleagues in a salute of appreciation and of affection to him on the completion of 25 years of service as the Republican whip of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

Joseph Cannon, of Illinois, was Speaker of the House in four Congresses. Henry Rainey, of Illinois, was Speaker of the House in the 73d Congress. James Mann, of Illinois, was minority floor leader of the House from the 62d to the 65th Congress. Adolph Sabath, of Illinois, was elected a Member of the House in 24 Congresses, a record. Thomas O'Brien, of Illinois, was a Member of tremendous influence in many Congresses, was a determining factor in the election of Sam Rayburn as majority leader, leading to his eventual election as Speaker of the House.

In this select group of sons of Illinois, among the "immortals" of the House must be included LES ARENDS. A quarter of a century as the whip of one of the two great parties, a quarter of a century of uninterrupted leadership in the Congress of the United States, is a record that stands out as the sun in the skies.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to join my colleagues in paying tribute to LES ARENDS of Illinois for his remarkable record of 25 years as Republican whip in the House of Representatives.

The fact that Republicans in every Congress since 1943 have seen fit to place their trust in LES ARENDS' leadership is a compliment which I cannot match with words. Personally, I owe a great deal to the gentleman. The quality of his guidance; the skill and dedication which he brings to the job has been a source of inspiration to many of us during this last quarter century. Regardless of whether one is a veteran of 2 or 20 years, he can appreciate the value of such a friend and colleague.

LES ARENDS has served this House and our country long and well. May he continue to do so for another 25 years.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the Honorable LES ARENDS, the gentleman from Illinois, who has earnestly served the Republicans in the House of Representatives as our party whip for the past 25-years. I have found LES ARENDS to be a delightful person to work with, a man who is dedicated not only to his party, but also to his country. He has rendered a great service to his Nation in his capacity, not only as a Member of Congress, but as the party whip. His efficiency and effectiveness as Republican whip are well known to his colleagues; this could have only been made possible by a man whose sincerity and pleasant personality are of the highest degree. This distinguished gentleman is one of the most dedicated Members of the House.

During my service in the Congress I know of no person who has contributed more to free and honest government, or who has more justly earned the deep respect and admiration of his colleagues.

While my years as a Member of Congress have been greatly enriched through my association with LES ARENDS, it is more important that this country, and the entire world, has been enriched because of his dedication to the best interests of all our people.

I take great pleasure in congratulating and commending LES ARENDS for his long and able service. I also want to extend to him and his family my fondest apprecia-

tion for his continuing efforts. I hope that he may be privileged to serve many more years in the House, and wish him and his family well, in the future.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a proud day for our Republican whip, my colleague from Illinois, LES ARENDS. Indeed, it is a proud day for the Congress of the United States that we can honor LES ARENDS on the 25th anniversary of his service as Republican whip of the House.

As a fellow Representative from the State of Illinois, I feel that we have a special asset in Congressman LES ARENDS. He is part of the leadership which is consulted and which helps to formulate policy in the Congress and in the Nation. In addition, he is a courageous and independent thinking citizen. LES ARENDS helps to guide the legislative branch of our Government along the path of sound lawmaking and in its policy decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I have never found Congressman LES ARENDS at a loss for words to express himself clearly and emphatically in behalf of those principles to which he has adhered throughout his public career. He has brought dignity, honor, and respect to these legislative halls and he has exhibited a warm friendship for me and many others in the Congress.

Congressman LES ARENDS is thoughtful, considerate and, when occasion requires it, he is deeply compassionate and understanding. I have personally appreciated these qualities in my friend, LES ARENDS, and I am happy to publicly attest to this appreciation.

The youth which he exhibits in his lively stride and in his pleasant sense of humor as well as with his youthful and attractive wife, Betty, give assurance that he will continue serving as one of America's great political and legislative leaders for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate LES ARENDS on the 25th anniversary of his Republican leadership in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, as one of the members of the Republican whip organization, I am proud of my commander in chief, LESLIE C. ARENDS. He is the epitome of what a whip should be. My service as a member of his organization has been an enjoyable one and I have learned much about the workings of Congress and our democratic system of government. He truly should be called Mr. Whip.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join with everyone on both sides of the aisle in once again extending congratulations to my colleague from Illinois, LES ARENDS, as he completes 34 years in Congress and 25 years as Republican whip in the House.

LES ARENDS is almost legendary in the Land of Lincoln, and only four Members of the House have served longer than he has here in Washington, an inviable record which attests to his faithful service and leadership ability. It is, of course, impossible to measure his endless contributions to the welfare of the people of his district and State and the Nation in general throughout the years. It has been said, however, that friendships are the true reward of public service, and if this be true, then LES ARENDS is rich, indeed, for no one commands greater respect and affection both at home and here in Washington.

LES has served as whip longer than any person of either party in the history of the Congress, and I predict that he will serve for many years to come. I consider it an honor and a privilege to be included among his host of friends.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks and express their views on this occasion.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Members have heard me say on a number of occasions that the middle aisle means nothing where friendship is involved. This is one of those occasions where on both sides of the aisle and in both bodies we rise and express—and those who do not speak it, in their minds express it—the deep friendship and sentiment and respect that we all have for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

I know something of the responsibility of leadership, having been majority leader for over 16 years and then, during the 80th and 83d Congresses, when our Republican friends led the House, when I served on that occasion as minority whip. It is a very responsible position. LES ARENDS performs his duty with dignity and with strength.

I admire him not only as a legislator and a great man, but also I deeply value the friendship that exists between us.

Twenty-five years of occupying the position of whip has carried with it many great responsibilities. I agree with the statement made by the distinguished minority leader, that our good friend LES ARENDS has occupied the position of whip, either majority or minority, longer than any other man in the history of the House. The statement is correct. I know, I occupied the position of majority leader for the longest period in the history of our country.

So our dear friend has been honored by his party, and he has also served this House and this country with diligence, and has occupied that position longer than any other man, as I see it now in looking back through history, longer than any other man in the entire history of the country, either whip of the Republican Party or whip of the Democratic Party.

It is a pleasure to me to express, speaking for the Democrats, if I may—and I know I do—to convey to LES ARENDS our deep feeling of respect and friendship, and to congratulate him on the outstanding service he has rendered as whip to his party and as a Member of this great body. We are all honored in having a friend like LES ARENDS.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the observations of our Speaker and the complimentary comments of our Speaker reflect the views of all of LES ARENDS' friends in the House on both sides of the aisle.

The tribute from the Speaker, as he has so well expressed it, I am sure, means a great deal to LES ARENDS, perhaps more than words of anybody else in the House of Representatives.

Inasmuch as I have already asked for and received unanimous consent for all Members to extend their remarks on this matter, I think it appropriate to conclude at this point with the wonderful tribute paid by the Speaker of the House to a most deserving gentleman, our dear friend, the gentleman from Illinois, LES ARENDS.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

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

There was no objection.

ENLARGING THE AMERICAN FRANCHISE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 334)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The ballot box is the great anvil of democracy, where government is shaped by the will of the people. It is through the ballot that democracy draws its strength, renews its processes, and assures its survival.

Throughout the life of our Republic, no single, enduring question has so engaged generation after generation of Americans as this: Who among our citizens shall be eligible to participate as voters in determining the course of our public affairs?

On four occasions we have amended our Constitution to enlarge or to protect that participation. In recent years, Congress itself has been attentive to sheltering and assuring the free exercise of the right to vote.

Such a concern is altogether fitting. Under a government of, by, and for the people, the right to vote is the most basic right of all. It is the right on which all others finally stand.

Such a right is not to be idly conferred or blindly withheld. But the stability of our Republic from the beginning has been served—well and faithfully—by the willingness of Americans to lay aside the constraints of custom and tradition and heed the appeals of reason and reality to welcome into the American electorate those of our citizens fitted by the precepts of our society's values to participate in the exercise of the ultimate right of citizenship.

At the inception of the Republic, the promise of the new Nation was strengthened because our forefathers cast aside tests of religion and property.

At midpassage, America's moral strength was fortified when the test of color was removed by the Fifteenth Amendment. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 has reinforced this principle for all time.

At the beginning of the modern era in this twentieth century, reason and reality wisely prevailed when the women in America—through the Nineteenth Amendment to the Constitution—were granted the equality of citizenship so long denied them.

In 1961, the Twenty-Third Amendment to the Constitution gave citizens of the Nation's capital the right to vote for President and Vice President.

Four years ago, the Twenty-Fourth Amendment struck down the tests of the poll tax which had for almost a century disenfranchised thousands of Americans.

ENLARGING THE AMERICAN FRANCHISE

In all these instances time has affirmed the wisdom and the right of these decisions to enlarge participation in the Nation's affairs. Time, too, has already affirmed the wisdom and justice of our continuing efforts in the last decade to perfect, protect and shelter the right of all citizens to vote and to put an end to the unconscionable techniques of studied discrimination.

Today, I believe it is time once more for Americans to measure the constraints of custom and tradition against the compelling force of reason and reality in regard to the test of age. The hour has come to take the next great step in the march of democracy. We should now extend the right to vote to more than ten million citizens unjustly denied that right. They are the young men and women of America between the ages of 18 and 21.

The practice of admitting young Americans to the electorate at the age of twenty-one has its roots in the dim and distant mists of medieval England—but it is a practice and limitation without roots in the American experience.

Throughout our history as a young Nation, young people have been called upon by the age of eighteen to shoulder family responsibilities and civic duties identical with their elders.

At the age of eighteen, young Americans are called upon to bear arms.

At the age of eighteen, young Americans are treated as adults before many courts of law and are held responsible for their acts.

The age of eighteen, far more than the age of twenty-one, has been and is the age of maturity in America—and never more than now.

Reason does not permit us to ignore any longer the reality that eighteen year old young Americans are prepared—by education, by experience, by exposure to public affairs of their own land and all the world—to assume and exercise the privilege of voting.

The essential stability of our system is not served, the moral integrity of our cause is not strengthened, the value we place on the worth of the individual is not honored by denying to more than ten million citizens—solely because of their age—the right to full participation in determining our country's course.

This denial of the right to vote limits our democracy. It diminishes every modern concept of citizenship.

The young people of America in this decade are far more ready, far better qualified, far more able to discharge the highest duty of citizenship than any generations of the past.

We know—and the young men and women know also—that this is so.

They are better educated than their counterparts of a generation ago. They graduate from high school and enter college in greater proportions. Already this group—although many have not yet completed their schooling—have a higher education level than the general electorate.

Mass communication and greater opportunities for travel expose them earlier and more frequently to the issues of the day than the young men and women of the 1940's, or even the 1950's.

The young men of today serve their Nation in uniform with the same devotion as their fathers and brothers of earlier days showed. But duties unknown a decade ago have summoned the devotion of young men and women alike, by the tens of thousands. Their participation in the Peace Corps, in VISTA, and in other community ventures has elevated our national life and brought new meaning to the concept of service.

For myself, I deeply believe that America can only prosper from the infusion of youthful energy, initiative, vigor and intelligence into our political processes.

We live in a world that is young and growing younger each year. Of all nations, none has more generously invested in preparing its young people for constructive citizenship and none has been more faithfully served by its young than has America.

Today, the young people of America are asking the opportunity to give of their talents and abilities, their energies and enthusiasms, to the greater tasks of their times. I believe their proper request can and must be properly answered by a national affirmation of our faith in them. For a nation without faith in its sons and daughters is a nation without faith in itself.

WHAT I PROPOSE

I accordingly propose that the Congress of the United States approve and submit for ratification of the legislatures of three-fourths of the States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide, as follows:

The right of any citizen of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age if a citizen is eighteen years of age or older.

In proposing submission of such an amendment I am mindful that:

—The State of Georgia since 1943, and the State of Kentucky, since 1955, have permitted eighteen year old residents to vote.

—The two new States of Alaska and Hawaii have permitted nineteen and twenty year old residents, respectively, to vote.

—The first proposal for such an amendment was advanced in 1942 by Senator Arthur Vandenberg.

—President Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his 1954 State of the Union Address, urged an Amendment to lower the voting age to eighteen.

—In the 90th Congress, more than fifty proposed Constitutional Amendments to extend voting rights to eighteen year old citizens have been introduced, and many of these measures have broad bi-partisan support.

The concept has been tried and tested. Its merit has been established. Its rightness is now beyond dispute.

FULL PARTICIPATION IN OUR AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

The time has come to grant our youth what we ask of them but still deny to them—full and responsible participation in our American democracy.

In this year of national decision, as Americans in every State prepare to choose their leadership for the decisive and fateful years before us, the Congress has a rare opportunity through the submission of this amendment to signify to our young people that they are respected, that they are trusted, that their commitment to America is honored and that the day is soon to come when they are to be participants, not spectators, in the adventure of self-government.

Every time before, when America has extended the vote to citizens whose hour has come, new vitality has been infused into the lifestream of the Nation, and America has emerged the richer.

Now the hour has come again to take another step in Democracy's great journey.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 27, 1968.*

L. B. J.: A PRESIDENT WHO UNDERSTANDS YOUNG PEOPLE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, in this Nation the age of adult responsibility is 18. In almost every significant area of life, the 18-year-old must bear the legal and social obligations of adulthood. That he generally shoulders these obligations with competence, intelligence, and patriotism few among us would doubt.

Yet, in only two States of the Union, Georgia and Kentucky, can the 18-year-old exercise the most fundamental right of citizenship—the right to vote, to have a voice in the many governmental policies and programs which so intimately affect his own life and welfare. Through most of our country, a young man or woman is graduated from high school infused with an interest in the affairs of government, then must face the frustration of inability to effectuate his enthusiasm through participation in the political process.

A constitutional amendment such as that proposed by the President in his message will preserve that youthful enthusiasm and channel it to the benefit of the entire electorate. I strongly support the President's recommendation

that we take action now to guarantee the right to vote to our citizens between the ages of 18 and 21.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I support the President's recommendation to permit 18-year-olds to vote and concur in his view that this should be done by a constitutional amendment.

We have never had a better informed generation of young Americans than we have today in this country. They have been prepared well for participation in the Nation's decisionmaking procedures.

The interest of 18-year-olds in the political process is evident in their active participation in political campaigns. Their interest in public affairs and their potential for contribution at home and abroad are manifested by the dedication of thousands to programs like the Peace Corps and congressional and Government internships. And, of course, their capacity for commitment to the high aims and goals of our society is nowhere more forcefully demonstrated than in their splendid service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Our young people of 18, 19, and 20 are bound like the rest of us by the decisions which are reached by Government, and those decisions often affect their futures drastically. Surely they should also be allowed to participate in the choice of political representatives who make those decisions, including the President and Vice President of the United States.

I hope we will soon see favorable action on the proposed constitutional amendment.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has taken a major step forward to strengthen democratic life by asking Congress to consider a constitutional amendment that will lower the voting age to 18. The President is absolutely right in making this request—a request long overdue.

More than 10 million young Americans between 18 and 21 are now unable to participate fully in the political life of this country. Yet, many of these same young people are being called upon to defend America's freedom around the world.

I think we would all agree that there is no outstanding virtue that endows a 21-year-old with superior wisdom and intelligence as he goes into the voting booth.

America can take pride in producing the best informed youth generation in its history. These young people have proven their dedication, time and again, to the cause of progress and justice in America's society. They have earned the right to vote.

I feel certain that an overwhelming majority of my colleagues agree that these young people should be given the opportunity to vote in our elections. And I believe that their parents, as well as an overwhelming number of Americans share this belief.

I commend President Johnson for his leadership in proposing this vital legislation. I hope and expect the Congress will not delay its passage.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has submitted to Congress one of the most important and vital matters dealing with our democratic life.

The full participation of the American people in the right to vote is fundamental to the political processes in the United States.

In his proposal today to amend the Constitution so that 18-year-olds may be allowed to vote, President Johnson has demonstrated his vision and leadership in strengthening the fabric of our democratic society.

I fully support him in this urgent matter.

Earlier in the 90th Congress I introduced a joint resolution to lower the voting age to 18 years.

This Congress has the unique opportunity to extend the voting franchise and to eliminate the last vestiges of discrimination against many of our citizens in the important matter of the right to vote. I think we must face the fact that some 10 million of our young ciizens are being discriminated against.

In effect, we have told these young men and women that while they are old enough to go to Vietnam and risk their lives in democracy's cause, they are nevertheless too young to exercise the wisdom and judgment necessary to vote for public officials. This is, indeed, discrimination. And the 90th Congress must help bring it to an end.

I commend the President for his forthright leadership in this matter. I am hopeful that the 90th Congress will act quickly and overwhelmingly to pass this important legislation.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as one who has long favored and cosponsored legislation to permit 18-year-olds to vote I would like to take this opportunity to speak in support of President Johnson's call for a constitutional amendment to carry out this proposal.

Throughout our history, we have continuously broadened participation in democracy by extending the right to vote to an ever increasing number of our citizens.

In colonial times, religious and property qualifications were eliminated as prerequisites for voting. In the last century, we did away with the color of a man's skin as a barrier to voting. In this century, women were granted the right to vote. Most recently, barriers such as the poll tax were outlawed by the 24th amendment.

Now, I firmly believe, the time has come to extend voting rights to our young people between the ages of 18 and 21. Democracy will surely gain from this action, for it will rejuvenate the democratic process with an infusion of fresh blood, new thinking and moral energy.

It is my hope that the House will give this legislation the earliest possible consideration and that it will be forwarded to the States for ratification at the earliest possible date.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, young people are becoming more interested and more involved in the political process. They have studied the issues and they are familiar with the candidates.

While they actively participate in political campaigns—often without compensation—they cannot support their candidates at the ballot box.

Because I think it is essential that we retain the interest and enthusiasm of these college-age citizens I am today introducing a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution making citizens who have attained 18 years of age eligible to vote in Federal elections.

I urge prompt action on this measure.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the President for his message to the Congress calling for legislation to lower the voting age to 18. With the President's leadership and under his sponsorship the legislation will be given the consideration it deserves.

On February 21, 1967, I sponsored House Joint Resolution 342 to lower the voting age to 18. Over 50 other proposed constitutional amendments to change the voting age have been sponsored by Members of the House on both sides of the aisle.

The President in his message to Congress today stated:

> Today, the young people of America are asking the opportunity to give of their talents and abilities, their energies and enthusiasms, to the greater tasks of their times. I believe their proper request can and must be properly answered by a national affirmation of our faith in them. For a nation without faith in its sons and daughters is a nation without faith in itself.

The arguments for and against lowering the voting age have been stated and restated many times, by past Presidents, by Members of Congress, by the youth of our Nation, and by organizations throughout the United States.

The President has today gone further by expressing his personal faith in our youth and asking the Congress to declare its faith in our young people. I believe that the 10 million citizens between the ages of 18 and 21 deserve the right to vote and will respond by exercizing that right with responsibility, thereby bringing new life and energies to our democratic system.

In these troubled times, proposed legislation will give us the opportunity to bridge the "generation gap" by reaching out to the youth of the Nation and not merely allowing them—but asking them to join hands in the process of self-government and share in the establishment of the goals necessary for the improvement of our society.

I urge my colleagues to support the President's proposal to amend the Constitution and to broaden the base of our democratic system.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can rely on strong bipartisan backing for the President's proposal to extend the franchise to 18-year-olds.

Millions of adult citizens—most of whom are as well-informed and as concerned about political affairs as their parents—are now barred from full participation in our Nation's political processes because of their age. Young people of 18, are as mature today as those of 21 were a generation or two ago.

The continuing concern expressed by our youth on numerous national issues reflects their deep and abiding interest in the political process. We can expect no more of any voter than that he be informed and sensitive. Our young people score high on both counts.

There is little apathy to be found in

this group, and there would be even less if 18- to 21-year-olds were given a political voice. Our idealistic young people could be expected to take to heart the responsibility given them, and to cast their votes with exceptional care.

It is essential that our young people be given political responsibility at a time when they are ready and willing to exercise it. The constitutional amendment proposed in the President's message would accomplish this purpose. I fully support such an amendment and sponsored House Joint Resolution 842 proposing its adoption.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, the President's message to Congress urging action to lower the voting age to 18 deserves our prompt consideration and attention.

We are faced today with a politically active and politically responsible group of 18- to 21-year-olds that is being denied the right to influence events about which they have concern and interest at least equal to our own.

This group of more than 10 million young adults is comprised largely of high school graduates and college students who have reached a higher level of education than has ever before been attained by Americans of their age bracket. The education in history, political science, and civics to which these young people have been exposed has encouraged their unprecedented involvement in political affairs and in other activities of national significance.

Thus, we find young people volunteering for military duty, participating in the Peace Corps, serving in VISTA, and working in Headstart centers.

These young adults are active because they feel a sense of responsibility to their country. They are interested because they have recently learned about the dynamics of their Government.

Indeed, it is an anomaly that they cannot vote and thereby fully participate in the political process. Voting has often been called a privilege, rather than a right. But if any group has ever shown that they are worthy of this privilege, it is today's young adults.

Some may say that 18-year-olds are not wise enough to vote intelligently. I must agree with President Franklin Roosevelt, who once said:

> We know that wisdom does not come necessarily with years, that old men may be foolish and young men wise.

We should act now to provide our young people the opportunity to participate in the affairs of their Nation at a time when their interest in politics and social affairs is at its peak.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has proposed a constitutional amendment that will serve to strengthen our society's most fundamental machinergy for a democratic life—the right to vote.

I strongly support this proposal because on January 10, 1967, the first day of the 90th Congress, I introduced House Joint Resolution 18, to accomplish this very thing.

The President has proposed lowering the voting age to 18.

This proposal is urgently needed to correct long years of injustice against young Americans who have been excluded from the most important aspect of our political process.

The fact is that our courts treat 18-year-olds as adults. And our schools treat 18-year-olds as adults. We accept their tax money and their participation in our Armed Forces. If we accept from them this evidence of their maturity and involvement in our Nation's life, can we continue to deny them their right to vote?

I think the answer is obvious. And as the President noted in his message to Congress on this matter, the time has come to act with wisdom and compassion in broadening the base of our political life by including 10 million young Americans who are now excluded.

I think the American people strongly endorse President Johnson's proposal. And I think the President deserves the highest commendation for submitting this legislation at this time. There can be no excuse for delay or retreat on this matter. We have waited far too long to do what is right.

I believe the 90th Congress has a unique opportunity to be remembered as the Congress which brought new vigor and participation into the Nation's political bloodstream. I am proud to support this constitutional amendment. And I urge my colleagues to join in promptly enacting it into law.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am for the proposed amendment to the Constitution which would extend the right to vote to citizens between the ages of 18 and 21 in all elections. The amendment is patterned after the 15th amendment, which secured the right to vote for our black American citizens, and the 19th amendment, which secured the right to vote for our women citizens.

Some people believe that the question of voting age should be left up to the States to decide. I do not agree. When we deal with an issue involving such a fundamental human right as the right of citizens to vote, a Federal constitutional amendment is an appropriate vehicle to secure this right.

It is important that our young people be able to participate in the decision-making processes of our society, the most basic of which is the voting process. Our young people are prepared by education, a greater sense of maturity, and by their large stake in laws which affect them—military service, the payment of taxes, and other matters—to exercise this responsibility. If we deny them the right to vote, they must seek other channels for expressing their views and influencing decisions of Government, including various forms of protest. Some of these forms of protest, we have seen, are destructive to our social order. Guaranteeing the right to vote for citizens between 18 and 21 may well help to direct the energies and ideals of our young people into more constructive channels.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support to the proposed constitutional amendment which would give the 18-year-olds the right to vote. The lowering of the voting age is in line with modern trends. Although only two of our States, Georgia and Kentucky, at the present time permit voting at age 18, our two newest States, Alaska and Hawaii, permit voting at age 19 and 20, respectively. Recently, a special parliamentary committee in Great Britain made a study of the legal age of majority for various purposes and recommended that the age for voting be lowered to 20, and for certain other purposes to age 18. The committee gave as reasons the "better education of the young, their greater affluence and sophistication, and earlier physical maturity." Eighteen-year-olds can vote in the Soviet Union and in several of the South American countries. On April 26, 1968, the Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women, which was created by an Executive order in 1963, approved the following recommendations based on a special task force study:

> In view of the downward trend in the age boys and girls mature, * * * all disabilities of minority [should] be removed at least by age 18.

The study included consideration of age for purposes of voting.

A Gallup poll last year showed that 64 percent of the people favor lowering the voting age. It is apparent that a large majority of our people will want Congress to approve this proposed amendment for submission to the States. It is my hope that it will be ratified at least in time to permit 18- to 21-year-olds to vote in the next presidential election in 1972. These younger Americans are prepared for this responsibility today. We must provide the means by which they can fulfill this responsibility of citizenship.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has submitted an historical proposal to the 90th Congress. His request for a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18 must be considered landmark legislation that will long be remembered by the American people.

The President deserves the warm support not only of all Americans, but of all Members of this Congress for his awareness of the strong desire on the part of our young people to participate in our democratic processes through voting.

Today's youth have proven themselves to be responsible and dedicated citizens. Many of them are being called upon to defend freedom in Vietnam and do so with unprecedented bravery and valor. Others are serving their country in the ghettos of our cities as members of the VISTA program, and in the remote areas of the world in the Peace Corps. We can be proud of this generation of young Americans. And it seems to me we have an obligation to them to insure that they participate fully in the democratic process.

American youth are deeply involved in our country. They are concerned about what is happening in our cities and across the Nation and they want to express their point of view and be part of finding solutions to the problems. And they want to vote.

Last year when I introduced House Joint Resolution 348, to lower the voting age to 18, I said that American youth is "well-informed, well-versed in the American political process, and eminently qualified to participate in that process

through voting." In my congressional district, they have even formed "Make It 18" clubs.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to enact promptly President Johnson's proposal for a constitutional amendment. By so doing, we will strengthen our democratic system and provide a real voice to millions of young Americans who want their convictions to be heard by their votes.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, many years ago, during World War II, the State of Georgia set the minimum voting age at 18. The slogan which was popularly used to support this legislative action at the time was "Old Enough to Fight, Old Enough to Vote."

Since that time not a few logicians among us have pointed out that a person old enough to fight is not, in fact, necessarily old enough to vote. After all, we can all readily agree that the qualifications for good soldiers and good voters are hardly identical.

Nevertheless, this catchy, perhaps oversimplified slogan has a certain real validity.

Of course, persons lacking the qualifications to be voters should not be granted this important responsibility—but if, in fact, Americans 18 to 21 are informed and responsible enough to vote intelligently, then the fact that they are fighting and dying for their country certainly is relevant to the issue of whether they should be permitted to vote.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the maturity and responsibility of our young people is beyond serious question. Thus, the real question becomes: "Should those who fight and die for their Nation share in the making of decisions which affect their lives and property?"

I think the answer to that question requires that we all support the President's proposal to amend the Constitution to lower the voting age.

POINT OF ORDER WITHDRAWN

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws his point of order.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 18038) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 18038, with Mr. MURPHY of New York in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is the usual annual bill for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1969, which begins July 1. It thus provides for one of the three branches of Government.

Conforming to the long practice, it provides for all activities except the appropriations for the other body; it is the custom to leave those for the decision of the Senate. It includes the House of Representatives, the Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, the Architect of the Capitol, the Government Printing Office, the General Accounting Office, and a number of items of a joint character between the two Houses such as joint committees, and so forth.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE BILL

The bill as reported for 1969—again, excluding items for the Senate—totals $247,497,349 in new budget—obligational—authority.

The bill as reported for 1969—again, above comparable budget—obligational—authority for the current fiscal year 1968 to date of $228,260,330, which does not count some $4,874,875 pending in the House version of the second supplemental bill for fiscal 1968 for these same items.

The bill as reported is $9,665,182 below the budget estimates of new budget—obligational—authority for fiscal 1969—$257,162,531—considered by the committee. It is $16,113,182 below the requests including the House Office building remodeling item which is classified as liquidation cash rather than new budget authority. Amounts relating solely to the Senate are, of course, not encompassed in the comparisons.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the committee has made a grand total cut of $16.1 million from the requests.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take much time of the Committee but there are a few highlight items that I might touch on. The printed committee hearings are available and the committee report elaborates in detail. I might just say that the explanation for a good many of the line-item increases above last year's appropriation, or portions of them as the case may be, represent the effects of mandatory-type costs such as wage board and within-grade salary increases; annualization of the civilian pay increase effective last October; and specific resolutions of the House, or laws, authorizing additional allowances of one kind or another. Perhaps the largest single increases over last year relate to the general pay bill and congressional printing and binding costs.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the committee has tried to adopt an austere approach to the items in which we had some discretion, but at the same time tried to make reasonable provision for the operating needs. In view of the general pay raise legislation; the rising costs and volume of printing; the specific enactments of the House granting additional allowances for official expenses of one kind or another; in view of these and similar facts, the committee was not able to avoid some increases over last year.

But, Mr. Chairman, we have nonetheless made a lot of reductions.

Mr. Chairman, there are no major remodeling or construction projects in the bill. The committee has deferred funds requested for projects that involve costs in the range of $132 million.

There are no funds in the bill for the Madison Memorial Library Building; nothing for a new Government printing plant; nothing for general remodeling of the Longworth House Office Building into three-room Member suites, and certain related items. Nor were funds sought or allowed to extend the west-central front of the Capitol.

Mr. Chairman, the committee is also recommending continuation of the restriction against any special allowance for congressional summer interns in Members' offices. But this, of course, does not preclude a Member from employing one or more summer interns on the regular office clerk-hire roll within the statutory limits otherwise applicable.

Another item that came in for considerable attention in the committee was the matter of the skyrocketing deficit in the operation of the restaurant and other dining facilities on the House side. The latest estimate is that the deficit for fiscal 1969 could reach $536,000. In the current year, 1968, it will approximate $375,000.

The loss in fiscal 1967 was $243,597; in 1966, $219,257; in 1965, before the Rayburn facilities were opened, $144,091; in 1964, $111,372; in 1963, $140,190; in 1962, $43,034; and so on.

There has been some loss in every year, but, as the figures show, it is now skyrocketing. A number of factors have always combined to bring about a loss, one major reason being the fact that most of the business is concentrated on the noonday meal. In the last few years, the payroll cost has more than doubled—more employees, partly because of more facilities, and general pay increases for both overhead and management-type personnel as well as for foodworkers.

The committee felt that something had to be done to sharply reduce and contain the deficit. The committee felt that a loss of over half a million dollars is wholly unacceptable. So, what we have done is to allow $175,000 as an interim amount; asked the Architect to take whatever reasonable steps he can now take to effect economies in the cost of

operations; and we have called on the General Accounting Office to launch a full-scale study of all phases of the operation. The study and recommendations will encompass any and all matters pertinent to a possible private concession arrangement, if such is found feasible without a direct subsidy, and recommendations for any improvements if the operation is continued under direct management.

I might say right here, Mr. Chairman, that the committee made some preliminary exploration of the possibilities of putting all dining facilities out on private concession so as to avoid, if possible, any direct subsidy. Several proposals were received. Two or three tentative proposals in particular were interesting enough to lead the committee to conclude that an in-depth study should be made.

We have not lost sight of the fact that basic to the proposition—is the need for satisfactory service to Members, Hill employees, and others who use the facilities, and the welfare of the employees in the various dining facilities.

GROWTH OF THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. Chairman, as with the national budget generally, the budget for the legislative branch has also grown over the years. The committee report, on pages 4 and 5, illuminates some of the general reasons for this growth.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, much of the work of Congress is done in its committees. Their staffs and their expenses have grown. Not counting substantial items such as printing funded separately in a lump sum, House committees are spending about $9,500,000 a year and employing approximately 525 people. This does not include joint committees.

But the work of Members is everywhere—in their offices; in their districts; in their committee rooms; and on the floor of the House. The average House Member now serves in excess of 450,000 people; there are currently 96 congressional districts with more than 500,000 constituents.

When the second House Office building for Members was completed in 1933, our national population was about 125 million. The average congressional district had about 287,000 constituents. Today the national population is just over 200 million, or an average of over 450,000 per district. The country is much bigger and growing. Thirty-five years ago, Members of the House had one room for themselves and their office help. Even today, not all Members have a three-room office suite.

When the second office building was completed in 1933, the Federal budget was about $4.6 billion. Today, on the new budget basis, the appropriations requested for 1969 exceed $200,000,000,000. As the National Government has enlarged, national legislative responsibilities have increased many times over.

When the second office building was completed in 1933, each Member of the House was limited by law to two office clerks. Today, because of constantly increasing burdens, much longer sessions of Congress, and the vastly changed situation otherwise, the law allows Members from the larger districts up to six times as many clerks, subject however to an overriding salary ceiling that as a practical matter precludes hiring that many by all but a few Members.

Committees and Members wrestle with an ever-increasing volume of complex problems encompassing all manner of legislation with impact of one or another kind on the people.

If Members will turn to pages 5, 6, and 7 of the committee report, they can see just on those three pages, a simple capsule listing of the principal increases and decreases from the current year appropriations, and the cuts from the budget requests, and what they are for. I will not repeat all of them here; they are readily listed in the report.

But taking the bill by its major subdivisions as we show on page 2 of the report of the committee, there is a total of $85,039,420 for the House of Representatives; $12,311,229 for various items of a joint character involving both Houses; $12,442,900 for the Architect of the Capitol; $565,000 for the Botanic Garden; $40,638,800 under the Library of Congress; $39,000,000 under the Government Printing Office; and $57,500,000 for the General Accounting Office.

HOUSE ITEMS

As to items under the "House of Representatives" heading, there is nothing in the way of services that have not previously been authorized. There has been a gradual growth in the recurring charges, however—including some in the 90th Congress, as shown on page 438 of the hearings—which accounts for much of the substantial increase allowed over fiscal 1968.

JOINT ITEMS

As to the various items falling under the joint section of the bill, beginning on page 9, there is nothing much to be added to what the report says.

Certain expenses of the Capitol Police are in the joint section of the bill. There are now 292 authorized police positions on the House side. There are 201 currently authorized on the Senate side, making a currently authorized strength for the Hill of 493 police. To this would be added 45 or so men generally on detail from the Metropolitan Police during the sessions.

The Capitol Police are moving toward a professional-type, trained force, under a career police officer. In view of the rioters and demonstrators who keep making trouble here on the Hill, I think this a decided step in the right direction.

THE ARCHITECT

As to the section of the bill beginning on page 15, for the Architect of the Capitol, as I noted earlier, there is nothing in the bill in the way of major remodeling or construction. There are, however, as there have been for some years, a number of minor repair and improvement items necessary to keep the physical plant on Capitol Hill in reasonably good order.

I might say that we have allowed funds for certain police and disbursing office facilities; for improved lighting and electric clocks and legislative call systems in the Longworth Building; and a couple of other items, all shown in the list on page 11 of the report.

We have not allowed any funds to remodel the Congressional Hotel, or for a tunnel from the hotel to the Cannon Building. That was a part of the general Longworth remodeling proposal, which we have deferred—without prejudice, I might add.

A very unsatisfactory situation of many years standing has been, and continues to be the lack of adequate restrooms for the visting public in the Capitol Building. We have asked the Architect to explore for any nooks and crannies in which more restrooms could be installed, and to make a complete sketch of present facilities that might be opened for general use.

THE LIBRARY

Mr. Chairman, in the Library of Congress, a great national institution, which begins on page 19 of the bill, the work situation is fairly characteristic and not entirely unpredictable. Established in 1800, the Library is the Nation's largest research library. In the nature of the case, a library has only one way to go—to get bigger all the time.

Some budgetary increase is necessary just to maintain current levels. About $1.5 million of the increase over 1968 is for mandatory-type increases that are not subject to administrative discretion.

It has been said that the Library needs roughly 44,000 additional square feet of space each year. Money is in the bill for more rental space as a stopgap solution. But the housing, the servicing, and the managing of an ever-growing collection of the magnitude of what this one is apt to be, say, 25 years from now compels the need of finding ways to automate. Otherwise, there is cause to wonder whether it would be practical to supply space enough to house the collections and employees enough to service them.

So we have enlarged the funds for the automation study program. It is a complex undertaking and it will be expensive. But it is expected to provide information on techniques and procedures that will be of value to other libraries as well.

Some of the increases allowed for the Library relate to growing workloads in the Copyright Office and in the catalog card sales work. Both of these activities turn a profit for the Government.

We have tried to make reasonable provision for the valuable services rendered by the Legislative Reference Service, which says it continues to be swamped with congressional requests.

We provided the full budget request for the wonderful program of books for the blind, which, as Members will recall, was enlarged 2 years ago to extend to others so physically handicapped that they cannot enjoy normal reading.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Mr. Chairman, for the section of the bill covering the Government Printing Office, which is on pages 24 and 25 of the bill, there is little to add to what the report says. It includes printing and binding for Congress. There is an increase recommended. Congress is talking more; holding more hearings; printing more bills, and so on. And wages

are up. Much of congressional work is overnight printing—or short deadline in any event—and that costs money. But it is a vital item of expense. And quick service is important.

This section of the bill includes the Superintendent of Documents activity, which turns a profit. In other words, they recover more to the Treasury through sales of publications. Recently, their costs have been creeping up on income; they have a survey underway on repricing of publications.

The Public Printer has been saying for several years that his present physical plant is inefficient, and that he could save millions of dollars if he had a new, modern plant. We have not, however, allowed the funds for plans and specifications. For one thing, the Joint Committee on Printing has not approved selection of the proposed new site which the law requires as a condition precedent to appropriations for the project.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Mr. Chairman, the final section of the bill, on page 26, provides for the General Accounting Office, a highly essential instrumentality of legislative oversight in checking the efficiency of Government operations and procedures and the propriety of Goverment expenditures and in assistance to Congress and its committees otherwise.

Some increase was allowed. The expenditures of Government are growing, and as they grow, and more new and enlarged programs are adopted, a greater load is put on the General Accounting Office.

There is considerable discussion in the hearings about the nature and scope of the very extensive—and expensive—review and evaluation study ordered in the basic antipoverty legislation last year. There is also something in the report of the committee, in which we raise the question, as a general proposition, whether the Congress ought to follow the precedent established in the OEO amendments of placing, by statute, specific responsibilities on the Comptroller General for evaluating the efficiency and effectiveness of entire major programs with statutory reporting deadlines. Of course, we are not against—we are for—adequate audits of the expenditures, but such statutory directives might tend to diminish the flexibility of the Office in examining all the programs and expenditures of the Government. And if carried too far, it would in substance considerably duplicate the expense of oversight staffs and special "investigative" committee expenditures.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, there are many details to this bill even though it is a relatively small bill. I will be glad to try to answer any questions. I might say in closing that so far as I am aware, the committee is either unanimous, or perhaps I should say, about as unanimous as it is reasonable to expect in a bill dealing with a multiplicity of items.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Alabama, for yielding, to ask how we stand financially with respect to the Rayburn Building. Have all the claims or suits that have been filed in connection with the construction of the Rayburn Building been settled?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Are you referring to the garages?

Mr. GROSS. No, I am referring to the building itself.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. My information is that all the money that is needed has been appropriated. There may be a few items still in dispute between the architect and the contractor. I do not think the one big claim has been finally disposed of.

Mr. GROSS. I would hope there is a dispute with respect to the new tunnel between the Rayburn Building and the Capitol. Apparently the rain of last night, as usual, flooded the tunnel for one of the cars was not operating this morning.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I do not have any details on that.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The information we have is that there is a claim pending, and has been pending for some time, with the contractor for the Rayburn Building. It has not yet been finally settled. It was settled in favor of the Government but has since been appealed to the U.S. Court of Claims where it is still pending.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, has this happened several times—water coming into the new tunnel between the two buildings.

Mr. YATES. That was not called to the attention of the committee. But in view of the interest of the gentleman from Iowa, we will look into it and try to ascertain the facts for the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Did McCloskey, the general contractor, build that tunnel, does the gentleman know?

Mr. YATES. I do not believe so; it was as I recall a separate contract and a different contractor.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I should like to ask about the telephone appropriation on page 7 of the bill. Does that include new telephones such as I hear are being installed across the way with blue buttons on them?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I do not know anything about blue buttons on telephones across the way. There is money in this bill to take care of the telephones needed on the House side. We do not go beyond the center of the Capitol in our examination of the expenditures.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that the other body will add to the bill whatever they want to put in it. I do not like that procedure, but that is the way it is done. What I am trying to get at is, whether this bill provides for the installation in the House office buildings of the so-called panic buttons that are reportedly being installed in the Senate offices.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I have said to the gentleman that I know nothing about a blue button or a panic button on the Senate side. We do not have hearings on the Senate housekeeping projects.

Mr. GROSS. Then this does not provide, as far as the gentleman knows, for a panic button for each Member of the House?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. A panic or blue button was not mentioned to our committee. Like the gentleman, I would like to know what they are.

Mr. Chairman, the Architect supplied me with a copy of a letter which he sent to the Speaker, outlining the steps he proposes, effective next Monday, in relation to House dining facilities as a result of the action of the committee on the budget for dining facility operations.

Under leave granted, I am including it in the RECORD for the information of Members and others.

The letter follows:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL,
Washington, D.C., June 25, 1968.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: You will recall that the Committee on Appropriations, Legislative Subcommittee, has recently conducted some study into the possibilities of reducing the annual operating deficits of the House Restaurant facilities.

Our estimate of the deficit for the coming fiscal year is $536,000. This figure was increased from $400,000 to give effect to increased wage rates ordered by the District Government for their wage board foodworkers effective in July, 1968 (which rates, as you know, are used in establishing rates for our restaurant employees) and a further increase in rates in October, 1968 when restaurant employees are scheduled to come under the Coordinated Federal Wage System developed by the Civil Service Commission at the request of the President.

In their report on the Legislative Branch Appropriation Bill, 1969, the Committee outlined the following primary conclusions and actions:

1. The Committee felt that something must be done to sharply reduce and contain the deficit, stating that a "loss of over half a million dollars is wholly unacceptable".

2. Made preliminary explorations into the possibility of the restaurants being run by outside concessionaire.

3. Requested the General Accounting Office to launch a full scale study of all phases of the operation as soon as the House passes the Legislative Branch Appropriation Bill, expressing the desire that the study move along expeditiously so that if a concession arrangement is eventually decided upon, it would be available well in advance of consideration of the necessary legislation early in next session.

4. Allowed $175,000 which, in the meantime, in combination with whatever reasonable steps the Architect can now take to effect economies, "should be adequate for the necessities."

5. Directed the Architect to effect such economies.

In order to attempt operation within the $175,000 allowance during the next 6 or 7 months, we propose taking the following actions, *effective July 1, 1968*, to effect economies in operations (all these measures, except closing the third line in the Longworth cafeteria, were presented to the Appropriations Committee during their consideration of this matter):

Estimated savings on annual basis

Menu price increases:	
20-percent average on table service; 10-percent average on cafeteria and carryout service	$165,000
Closing all units on Saturdays, except main dining room in Capitol, the Longworth cafeteria, and the Longworth carryout	26,000
Closing Longworth and Rayburn cafeterias one-half hour earlier:	
2:30 p.m. instead of 3 p.m. weekdays, 1:30 p.m. instead of 2 p.m. Saturdays	25,000
Closing the Main dining rooms in the Capitol at 3:30 p.m. instead of 4 p.m. each day, Monday through Thursday	9,000
Closing all carryouts at 4 p.m. instead of 5 p.m. weekdays	6,800
Closing Members' private dining room in Capitol on Fridays (it is now closed on Saturdays and there is little demand for its use on Fridays)	2,500
Discontinue Members' private dining room in Rayburn Building and use that room for special functions (it is now used sparingly by Members)	20,000
Closing third line in Longworth cafeteria (short order line)—It is now closed September 1 to January 3 each year	$15,700
Total estimated annual savings	270,000

By using the $536,000 estimated deficiency figure for the next fiscal year and applying the loss ratios which prevailed in the current fiscal year, it is estimated that $325,000 of the $536,000 would be required for the period July 1, 1968 to February 8, 1969. The $325,000 required for this period, less the $175,000 allowed by the Appropriations Committee, leaves a balance of $150,000 which must be saved by effecting economies in operation.

The measures outlined are estimated to save $270,000 as indicated on an *annual* basis. On the part-year basis, July–February, savings are estimated to amount to about $160,000. This amount compares favorably with the $150,000 required to be saved.

We also intend making other savings where possible and the Manager has been so instructed.

Unless you have objections to these changes or some counter suggestions, I will order the Manager of the Restaurants to proceed promptly with them effective July 1st.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. GEORGE STEWART,
Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], has already very eloquently and explicitly expressed to you the contents of the bill before us. In view of the detailed and impressive manner that he has gone over the subject, there seems little purpose in my taking a lot of time to further elaborate on the moneys provided in this bill.

Possibly it might be said that there is no bill that will come before the House this year that relates as directly to the functional necessities of the Congress to operate effectively and efficiently.

Your chairman has very diligently directed the subcommittee hearings, followed by preparation of the report and the bill, in compliance with the objective of adequately providing for the needs and functional operations of the House and the Congress. Every Member of this House should be grateful to him, and to the other members of the subcommittee, who have all kept your best interest, as well as that of the Nation, in mind at all times.

I can heartily endorse the contents of the bill to you. It does provide adequate funding of the essential activities and, at the same time, is in compliance with the budgetary problems which require that this Congress must do its best to curtail expenditures to the very minimum in order that inflation may be stopped, and economic security established. Therefore the committee has very carefully reviewed all expenditures, making reductions wherever possible and providing increases where necessary. All of these actions are specifically identified on pages 5, 6, and 7 of the committee report.

May I suggest that you review carefully each of the selected items listed. The net results of these actions are expenditure reductions amounting to approximately $9,833,000, with a grand total reduction in the new budget obligational authority of $16,113,182.

It should be emphasized that the appropriations in this bill provide for a substantial amount of public and Government services that are not confined entirely to the operation of the House or the Congress.

The Library of Congress, as an example, provides innumerable supplies of library material to depository libraries throughout the country, with sales of library catalogs, cards, and Government publications. The Library also provides copyright services, aid and assistance to the blind. It is significant to note that there accrues to the Treasury of the United States, through the various sales of material, about $17,800,000 in profits over and above the administrative expenditures.

The General Accounting Office performs highly essential services in checking the efficiency of Government operations and procedures. They are most productive in saving taxpayer dollars, as well as accomplishing more proficient operation of the varied departments and agencies. It has been estimated that the General Accounting Office, by virtue of its work and recommendations, has accomplished expenditure savings that approached $200 million during the past year. These services are truly in the best interest of the general public in providing proficiency to the administration of the vast field of Government services and activities.

I would recommend to my colleagues that they direct some attention to the item beginning on page 4 of the committee report entitled "Growth of the Legislative Budget." It identifies the extent to which Government has grown—as exemplified by a total Federal budget of $4.6 billion in 1933 which now, on the new budget basis, has a total request for 1969 in excess of $200 billion.

This growth, of course, requires additional work on the part of each Member, and their staffs, as well as the staff requirements of the respective committees. The budget increases contained in this bill reflect very realistically the effects of numerous House actions and the inflation that has been prevalent throughout the country in recent months and years. It becomes very clearly evident what the effects of salary increases, together with any new positions, are on the total budget requirements.

This House could do well by carefully reviewing these effects on the cost of our own operations, for they are identical with the problems that confront every individual, business enterprise, and Government agency throughout the country as they are called upon to meet these continuing increases in costs of their livelihood and operating expenses.

In compliance with the nationally recognized budget problem and the resolution passed by the Congress last week, your committee has not included any moneys for major remodeling or construction projects. It is most unfortunate that our country should find itself in such fiscal distress these days that it becomes necessary to not consider funding worthy and needed projects such as the Madison Memorial Library Building, general remodeling of the Longworth House Office Building, reconstruction of the west front of the Capitol, and the intern program. The need for these construction projects is obvious, but it did seem to the committee that this is not the appropriate time to consider such expenditures.

This further serves to identify the need for establishing a fiscal policy that will accommodate the pertinent needs of the day in compliance with the growth and progress of the country. Moneys have been provided for the most essential repair projects that will serve the present needs and will not need to be redone in the event of a major remodeling project in the Longworth Building at a later date. They are listed in the chart at the bottom of page 11 of the report.

In this connection let me briefly refer to the recent experience with regard to claims filed by the Baltimore Contractors, Inc., in connection with the construction of the underground garages. These claims, at the time of the hearings, totaled $5,021,000 in addition to the amount of the original contract as amended, which anyone will recognize as being an excessive amount in connection with a contract which totaled only a little over $12 million in the first instance.

Therefore, the committee has included language in the report which reads that it "expects the Architect to spare no reasonable engineering, architectural, or legal effort to make sure that the Government's interest is fully protected, and will request progress reports from the Architect as significant decisions are taken."

One of the main concerns of the subcommittee, as your chairman has properly stated, was that of the continuing growth in the deficits as applied to the operation of the House dining facilities. I should express my agreement with the action taken, and will expect that the

recommended study should provide a solution which would substantially diminish and, hopefully, eliminate entirely this deficit problem. The subcommittee consisting of the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman YATES, and the gentleman from North Dakota, Congressman ANDREWS, did an excellent job in exploring the problem.

The operations of the Library of Congress have been adequately funded with an increase of over a half-million dollars to provide services, in the form of talking books and other reading material, for the blind and physically handicapped.

The Government Printing Office and all of its activities, including the Superintendent of Documents, has been funded adequately to meet the needs and the requirements of the Congress and the other agencies which depend on the Government Printing Office for printing. There is no money provided for plans or specifications for a new Government printing plant.

It might be said that we have been generous with the General Accounting Office in our response to their request for moneys. It appeared to the committee, however, that with the many additional assignments that are directed to the General Accounting Office in connection with new programs and new Government activities, as well as the war in Vietnam, that it was most essential that the General Accounting Office be adequately funded. I have previously mentioned that their investigations result in substantial savings in expenditures and so serve the taxpayer well.

Many of the new programs have required substantial auditing and investigation in order that the intent of Congress be carried out and the expenditure of moneys be properly accounted for. A recent additional workload directed to them has given cause to the committee to question whether the Congress in the future should direct to this agency assignments which require an evaluation of the efficiency and the effectiveness of entire major programs. This is the case with the recent assignment given to them by legislation in connection with the Office of Economic Opportunity programs and, if carried further, could diminish their effectiveness in examining the program and expenditures of the many other Government agencies. It would seem to me, in view of the substantial savings they have accomplished in their respective activities, that their regular workload not be diminished in order to accomplish these assignments—which might better be done by oversight staffs and investigative committees.

I also found occasion to make note of and state, during the hearings, that where these new major programs require extensive auditing to effect efficiency operation, that such expenditures should be charged to the moneys appropriated to the program itself. To not do so, leaves a deficient accounting of the total administrative expenses for the program, which can only serve to mislead both the public and the Congress.

It should be noted that the war in Vietnam, with the many reports that there is a great volume of corruption and black market activities, has placed a substantial additional burden on the General Accounting Office. This is another field which surely should not be neglected, in view of the criticisms that have indicated substantial volumes of U.S. supplies reaching enemy hands. Your committee spent considerable time exploring this subject with the General Accounting Office, and it is my opinion that there is yet much to be done by way of correcting these most undesirable practices.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this briefly covers the essentials of the Government expenditures contained in this bill, and I heartily recommend its approval by the House.

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

Mr. LANGEN. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman and the committee for the interest they apparently are taking in the deficits in the House eating establishments. This situation has reached the point it must be cured. I simply want to commend the gentleman and the committee for the interest they are presently taking, as evidenced by the remarks made by the gentleman from Alabama and by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LANGEN. I thank the gentleman for those comments. I am glad to know he finds the committee efforts to be worthwhile. I believe we have set up a process whereby we are going to be able to get a very accurate evaluation of the operation of the restaurant, together with recommendations for the future which, as I stated earlier, I hope will completely eliminate the deficit and still provide the service needed for the membership.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I am curious to know whether the provision on page 9 of the bill, the administrative provision, means there is any change in the procedure for paying salaries, or whether this is language necessary to the bill for the continuation of what is already being done?

Mr. LANGEN. I do not have a copy of the bill before me, but as I recall there is no change in the method of paying salaries.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, this is the traditional language that the committee used year in and year out for the purpose of providing for this payment.

Mr. GROSS. Somehow I have missed it in years gone by. On page 7 of the bill there is $560 for postage for the Postmaster. I am curious to know why a Postmaster needs $560 for postage.

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

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps that is a question to which the gentleman can supply the answer at another time.

Mr. LANGEN. I am just locating it now that I have a copy of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. The item is on page 7 of the bill at the bottom of the page.

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

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

Mr. YATES. This is usual, also, just as the language I previously spoke to the gentleman about and about which he raised a question. This is the type of appropriation for postage stamp allowance which is made annually. It is nothing unique and is not higher or in an unusual degree than in other years.

Mr. LANGEN. May I say in more specific response to the gentleman from Iowa that this amount of money is equivalent to the postage or stamp allowance made to each Member. This is so that in the event an airmail or special delivery stamp is needed or that kind of letter is necessary they will have the money for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. I can understand postage for other officials of the House, but I still find it difficult to see why the Postmaster needs $560 worth of stamps.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to make another little comment with regard to the point the gentleman from Iowa properly has raised. Generally folks wonder why there are any postal allowances at all in a bill of this kind, because they assume that we send all of our mail out under a frank and consequently it does not cost us anything to mail these letters. The fact is that the House has to reimburse the Post Office Department for every last letter that is sent out. Of course, the allowance or the use of the frank covers only regular mail. In view of that, that is why these other little figures are in there. It is in order to take care of airmail and special delivery when that is needed.

Mr. ANDERSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

AIDS TO THE POOR—NEED FOR A BETTER PERSPECTIVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, men and institutions owe a duty to the public commensurate with the power which they possess. The press of the country has tremendous power and has a great responsibility. In the realm of public opinion it is preeminent.

The newspapers of Washington and the press of this city, in view of the great power which they have, owe a great responsibility to the people of this city, to the rich and to the poor alike. I have no doubt but that they are undertaking to fulfill that responsibility. I am not a newspaperman and if I were I doubt that I could tell the press how to run its business. People in the publication business, like the rest of us, no doubt have their problems.

So the remarks which I make are made in great humility.

It does concern me that the press of Washington may not to the fullest extent be exercising its great power to influence this city for good.

Mr. Chairman, I was looking over three Washington papers today. One of them has on its front page a series of pictures of destruction and chaos.

Mr. Chairman, anyone from afar seeing these pictures—and I am sure they reflect the correct situation at a given point in the city—would probably be dissuaded from coming to Washington with a school group or with one's family. The pictures are correct but somehow it

would be good if we could put the whole situation in good focus so that the beauty and virtue and grandeur could show through along with the evidences of chaos.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that all of us have the responsibility for trying to put things into proper focus, so that people outside the city of Washington would not be unaware of the true situaiton. Somehow all should be reminded that there is some good along with the bad.

The poor people who run business establishments and those not so poor have been badly hurt by a situation which has been possibly a bit overplayed—by a situation which has frightened the local residents and a situation which has frightened people into changing their plans about coming to Washington.

Mr. Chairman, the tourist trade here, I believe, formerly ran into the sum of about $400 million a year. I do not know what it will run this year. But I know that the loss of the tourist trade hurts and will hurt the small people of Washington, including the poor.

Now, I have before me another Washington paper and one of the headlines—which is not so big—is "House Cuts School Education for the Poor." The headline is not in error but the impact of the headline will tend to be misleading to the reader, especially the poor.

Mr. Chairman, this kind of thing is what we hear repeatedly. And it is not necessarily incorrect even though it can be very misleading at times.

Then, here is another headline on the front page of another Washington paper saying, "The Poor People Sue Freeman To Buy Food." I assume they did and this is news and must be printed. The headline inevitably suggests that this cruel Government is being sued by the poor. Yes, this is news. But somehow it would be good if an image could be reflected of the Secretary of Agriculture in his true role as one who has helped and is helping in providing hundreds of millions of dollars in milk and food and assistance to great numbers of poor people at home and abroad.

I am not being critical of the press. I do not know how to run the press; in fact, I often wonder if we know how to run such an organization as the Congress. We have many deficiencies. I am speaking in all humility. We must keep the press free and unfettered. What we need is a way to put the whole picture in better perspective.

Then, another headline of another paper says, "School Aid for Educating the Poor Is Slashed." This tends, in my opinion, to make the casual reader think, and especially the poor, that Congress is heartless, that Congress is thoughtless, unconcerned and unaware of the needs of the poor of our country.

Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that the press would want to do all it could to engender, not a spirit of degradation in the city, but a spirit of hope. I doubt that the poor are able to find on frequent occasions explanations of what is being done in their behalf, reasons for hope and respect for their government and their institutions.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The taxpayers of this country are digging down into their pockets every year and paying increasingly large sums in taxes with which to help the poor.

People who pay the taxes to help the poor ought to be given some recognition. Those who receive the benefits from the taxpayers and from the Government and from the Congress and from the executive and legislative branches, those who receive these benefits should not unwittingly be led to believe, that they should despise their Government.

One great literary man had one of his characters say:

> I hate ingratitude more in a man than lying, vainness, babbling drunkenness, or any taint of vice whose strong corruption inhabits our frail blood.

Let us do what we can to engender in our country a spirit of gratitude for what the Government—the most generous Government in the world—is doing for the poor and all citizens generally. No doubt many efforts are misguided but the generous spirit is bona fide.

If Congress cuts the budget some on requests made for the poor, it is not because the Congress despises the poor, it is because the Congress wants to try to help the poor by maintaining the stability of the Government upon whom the rich and poor alike must rely.

It would be well, of course, to point out when we talk about some cut that is made that usually the cut is made in the budget for the current year, and usually the figure—not always—is above the figure for the prior year. Huge increases which are slightly pruned often may appear to those who are unfamiliar with the situation as irresponsible slashes.

One would believe, if he were not somewhat aware of the facts, that yesterday Congress took out the dagger from its sheath and stabbed the poor in the back. How bad, how dangerous to have that sort of sentiment prevail, especially when we had nearly $3 billion more in the bill yesterday than we had last year. This figure to be strictly accurate needs some adjustment downward but I am speaking in broad terms.

The bill provided the sum of about $17 billion. Great portions of that total are for benefits to the poor to one degree or another. There were some reductions in certain areas but in the overall there was a sizable increase.

I have often wished that there were some way to dramatize the amounts that remain after the cuts are made. This may be impossible but it would be worth a try.

Perhaps there should be some way for the poor people in Washington and elsewhere to get a better grasp of what is being done in their behalf so that they could better evaluate what is not being done.

I have said repeatedly on the floor, but I do not know that I have seen a headline to the effect, that the President's budget proposes aid and benefits in a general way to the poor for the fiscal year which begins on July 1 in the estimated total sum of $27 billion. I believe that our citizens need to be aware of this. Some of the efforts are ill-advised but they are being sincerely made. We are dealing in large figures and they are increasing rapidly—too rapidly.

Now, of course, just doles to the poor are not what we seek because the greatest thing that we can do for the poor is to help them help themselves, and that is the thrust of much of what is now being undertaken by our Government.

So I would just hope that we could find a way to inform the poor of the country that they have a compassionate Congress, that the businessmen are compassionate, that the professional men are compassionate, that the poor people are compassionate, that the rich people are compassionate, and that we have a great people, and that we ought to take pride in our institutions, and try to build them up, not tear them down.

But if we do not nourish the things that are good and if we think only of the things that are bad we make a grave mistake. If we throw the spotlight on the bad without helping the people understand the true picture, we do them a great disservice.

So I rise, not to be critical of the press—I commend the press for the great job it is undertaking—but I would just hope that the press can find a way to put our problems and our actions in better perspective.

It seems that a better atmosphere could be generated—and among the people who have the power to generate that better atmosphere are the people who publish newspapers.

I remember a high school oration in which the words were spoken—"The press is mightier than the sword."

Yes, the press is mightier than the sword. It is mightier than a gun.

It is mightier than the demonstrators.

It is mightier than the Poor People's March.

It is mightier than the Congress.

I would hope that the Congress and the press would do their best to create a better image of what we are trying to do for all our people and let everybody know of the sincere and generous efforts which are being made at all levels to improve the stability and quality of American life.

That will be a glad day, a day when we can hold our chin a little higher and say, "Thank God I am an American."

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman I want to associate myself with the remarks of our great chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. Certainly, he has performed a great service to the House of Representatives and a great service to the country by the very eloquent manner in which he has expressed the attitude of the Congress toward the public needs and the extent to which this is a generous country to all of its citizenry.

I do not think it could have been done better with any other choice of words, which serves to indicate the effectiveness of his services as chairman of the

Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives with regard for the poor, the problems of the Nation, and the problems of all its citizens.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect and the highest regard for the good chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas. I know the heavy burdens he carries as chairman of the committee, I appreciate his worries, his concerns and his heavy responsibilities. I would not want to add to them, but I feel I must speak in reply to some of the things he said. The gentleman stated he is not critical of the press. He said he is not critical of the rich. He said he is not critical of the poor. I can only assume that it was I of whom he was critical because it was I who criticized the committee yesterday for not providing the funds for the poor children of this Nation.

While I have not read the stories in the newspapers to which the gentleman refers, I did read a couple of stories in the paper this morning, and I, too, am critical of the press, but for a different reason. I do not think the press told the story of what happened on the floor of this House yesterday as fully as it should have.

No, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe we can expect the people of this country to be pleased with everything this Congress does, and to be grateful for whatever appropriation is made, no matter how meager. Public education is the foundation of this democracy. I repeat what I said on the floor yesterday, that in cutting $135 million—I think ultimately it was $127 million after the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD]—but in cutting $127 million from the appropriation of title I of ESEA, that a body blow was struck by this House against the children who live in the underprivilege areas of the cities and of the rural areas. I would have preferred to see a much stronger story than appeared in the press in this city yesterday, because education is so essential to carrying on the responsibilities of our citizenry, for carrying on the traditions of this country, for continuing to make this country the greatest Nation in the world. All children should share equally in the opportunity this Nation offers to a good education, and that is one of the aims of title I of ESEA.

I am as proud and as pleased of the United States and of its traditions, its rights, and its freedoms as is the distinguished gentleman from Texas. I believe that if the United States is to continue to progress, to move forward, it must be made up of citizens who can assume the responsibilities of this Nation. And that goal can be reached only with a well-educated citizenry.

Yesterday I pointed out in my speech that this House must choose priorities. It had under consideration two education bills. One was title I, ESEA, from which this committee, the Appropriations Committee, had slashed $135 million. The other was Public Law 874, which this committee had granted, I think it was, something like 87 percent of entitlement, and which later this House raised to 100 percent of entitlement.

Compare the two types of education bills: In one case you have education funds made available to the underprivileged kids of this country. The other bill makes funds available for areas which are well to do, generally, areas which have Federal stations, bases, or some other Federal installation. In the areas where money is directed under title I of ESEA unemployment is as high as 50 or 75 percent. In the 874 areas employment is full.

Where should the education money go? What are our priorities? Of course, it should go to underpriviliged areas in the same proportion, at least, as the other bill, and I think that a press that is critical of the action this House took yesterday is justified.

I have had my experiences with the press, too. Like the gentleman from Texas, I have run for office many times. I, too, bear scars from press reports I considered unfair and I bear many of the blows that the press has given to me from time to time. And, of course, which of us would not want a favorable story occasionally. But I still insist that a free press, telling the truth as it is, relating the true facts and not intermixing its reporting with editorial policy is essential in a free democracy and is one of the glories of this country. Yes, we ought to point out the areas in which the press is wrong if we can do so. As the chairman stated, the press being free, has responsibilities. But if it tells the truth, the press has a right to be critical. It is our privilege to criticize the press when we believe it to be wrong. I say the press should continue to tell the truth as it sees it about what goes on in this Congress.

And I think it deserves to be critical of what happened here in the House yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of my good friend from Illinois I think very graphically illustrate the very point which the distinguished Chairman of the full committee [Mr. MAHON] of Texas, was making.

The gentleman stands up here and complains about something that was not put in the bill, but he never said one word about what was added over last year to continue this progress in education. Two billion dollars was added to education alone. The gentleman knows that. He knows the bill is not through. The gentleman knows the other body is going to work on this bill, and I have never seen them send one back with less than what we sent over.

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

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

Mr. YATES. The gentleman knows of the great affection I have for him. We have worked together on several subcommittees for several years and have always enjoyed each other's fellowship even though we have not always shared each other's views. Apparently this is one of the issues on which we differ. I was not aware that the cut had been purposefully made in the expectation that the Senate would restore the full amount of the budget, but even if that be true, we in the House have our own responsibility and we must address ourselves to the question of whether this vital educational program has been adequately funded. It is obvious that a recommendation by the administration of 53 percent of entitlement is woefully inadequate. Rather than cutting this bare-bones budget recommendation, the committee should have increased it. This is not the usual educational program but one that requires particular attention. But what did the committee do?

I recommended that title I of ESEA be brought to the House with $127 million less than was in the program for fiscal year 1968, a drastic reduction.

Mr. CASEY. I know that. I do not deny that.

Mr. YATES. I think that ought to be made clear.

Mr. CASEY. I know that, but the gentleman never said a word about the other $2 billion that was added to education this year in this bill. The same newspapers—perhaps not the same people, but the same newspapers, and they have columnists who have these philosophies and different philosophies—will next fall, when I am running and when the gentleman is running, will be screaming about how much money we spent over the amount last year. That was illustrated yesterday or the day before when we were debating this bill on health, education, and labor.

People do not realize how much a billion dollars is.

A stack of one-thousand-dollar bills of not quite 8 inches is $1 million. A billion-dollar stack of those one-thousand-dollar bills would be as high as the Washington Monument. We had a bill before us yesterday with 17 of those stacks, and three of those stacks were new ones over last year. That is coming out of the pocket of every man, woman and child in this country. We have to be reasonable. I am with the gentleman. I want to see this country have the best education in the world. But we have to do it within our resources.

I cannot send my kids to some of the best colleges. I have too many of them to send there, as the gentleman well knows. I resent it when some of our bachelor colleagues here try to tell us, who have a little more experience in that line, about the children's welfare and how much more interested they are in the welfare of our children than many of us. I assure the gentleman when we get back to a point where we have plenty of money and do not have this type fiscal difficulty, the gentleman will see me, as he is, urging all the programs that our school system and schoolchildren can absorb.

But let us take credit for what we have done under these conditions. That bill had in it aid for the halt, for the lame,

for the blind, the stricken, the old, the poor, the illiterate, and even some for the highly brilliant to keep this country growing and to keep it going. That bill has jumped, as the gentleman knows, and it should, and it should be one of our prime responsibilities. It has grown tremendously. As the chairman recited during general debate, it has leaped, and probably before long it will amount to $40 billion. That is fine. That is what makes this country great. That is developing our human resources. But, by the same token, let us not just throw only bricks. We should give ourselves a little credit for what we did.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield. I give the gentleman a little credit for what he did.

Mr. CASEY. As little as possible; yes.

Mr. YATES. I am willing to give credit when it is due. But as the gentleman well knows, the Congress must weigh priorities. In the civil rights debates in the past and particularly from our good friends——

Mr. CASEY. It has nothing to do with civil rights. Every child in this country, regardless of color, deserves the best education he can absorb.

Mr. YATES. Of course. The gentleman is making my argument for me.

Mr. CASEY. That is correct.

Mr. YATES. And that is why I say we should have put the money in the bill yesterday for title I, and that is why I say the press is justified in criticizing our failure to do so.

Mr. CASEY. They may be justified in criticizing that point, but the point the chairman was making is they should give use credit for what we have done.

Mr. Chairman, no criticism of the gentleman from Illinois is intended. On the contrary he is to be commended on the vigor with which he advocates greater effort in the field of education and welfare for the people of this country

It is true that the bill of yesterday does not please all, but I restate that it does mark further progress for our Nation in the field of health, education, and welfare.

Mr. YATES. I think that we can agree on that proposition, that Congress should be commended when it acts wisely and should be criticized when it acts unwisely. But is it not the right of the press to make that decision?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE].

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, all I know is what I read in the newspapers. I have appreciated this discussion. I think the critical comments of our press certainly serve a useful function. We all realize the great value it has. The Members recall that I had a survey made at the time we were considering the congressional ethics, a survey of possible ethical questions that might involve the press, and civil rights have been brought into this discussion, too.

I would hope that the Supreme Court, which tends to consider more problems today than it did previously, and now finds it can reach discrimination whether it is being done by a public body, a Government, or done by private bodies, private individuals, in housing, may someday want to consider the whole question of the very valuable free press we need and the problems of censorship, which can be just as onerous, whether done by the Government, a public body, or by a private individual.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that funds were not included in the legislative branch appropriations bill for the congressional summer intern program.

I realize that it is possible to compensate congressional interns from existing appropriations for clerk-hire.

However, in a busy office, handling the volume of legislative business, correspondence, casework and other activities, there is no possible way to fulfill the objectives of the congressional intern program as authorized by House Resolution 416, of the 89th Congress from existing funds. My experiences with the congressional intern program have demonstrated to me conclusively that this is one of the most worthwhile activities available to the young people of America. The congressional intern program provided an excellent training ground and gave to these young people a fuller understanding of our representative republican form of government.

In addition to the benefits which redounded to the young people, who had the privilege of serving in our congressional offices, I also was able to gain the benefit of important research and other assistance which my own college interns provided.

In my opinion, the value of the summer intern program is both immediate and far reaching. It benefits those who are here today, as well as the citizens of tomorrow who are to follow in our places. It seems to me quite shortsighted and poor economy on our part to withhold funds which the congressional summer intern program requires.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of the contingent fund herein appropriated shall be available for the purposes of House Resolution 416 of the Eighty-ninth Congress relating to the hire of student congressional interns.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REES

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES: On page 6, strike lines 17 through 20.

(Mr. REES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment would do is to strike the restrictive language under miscellaneous items which states that no part of the contingent fund can be spent for the legislative internship program for this coming fiscal year.

What this amendment would do is to strike that restrictive language so that those Members of Congress who believe the congressional internship program is a good program can utilize the $750 and can have congressional interns work in their offices.

As Members know, this program was created by House Resolution 416 in the year 1965.

As a result of the program, I think that some of the most brilliant college students in this country have had an opportunity to come to Washington and work in the offices of the Members of this Congress. I found as a Member of Congress that my interns were very capable. I found that after just a few weeks they were able adequately to draft legislation. I found after their 10 weeks of internship that they certainly had a far better concept of what we are doing or trying to do here and what the legislative process was in the United States. I know that looking at their careers since then this experience has been good for them because these youngsters that we bring here tend to be leaders. They are leaders in their universities, and when they graduate that they will tend to be leaders in their communities.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this is also a good program for us here because we become very insular as Members of Congress sitting here on this Hill. It is good for us to have some bright young minds coming in from our universities and working with us. It gives an opportunity for an exchange of dialog about what we think and about what they think and what might be happening in our universities. Under the student internship program, if you do not want an intern, you do not have to take one. A lot of us who believe in this program and believe it serves a good purpose would like to have the ability to have that $750 and have that one slot filled. We are not saying that with this amendment anyone here has to have an intern; what we are saying is those of us who want and believe in an internship program should be able to have a college intern.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think this item ties in with the budget crisis. I do not think that $750 spent in my office for an intern is going to make or break the U.S. Government. I do think that today when we talk about the alienation of youth and the older people of this country and we talk about the problems of our country and the problems of our universities, the best thing that could ever happen to this Congress would be to have the availability of a viable internship program. For that reason I have introduced an amendment which would strike out the restrictive language so that we can continue the internship program, which is a part of the law of this House, restored for this summer.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to include in my remarks my newsletter "Congressman REES Reports," of April 1, 1968:

WHERE HAVE ALL THE INTERNS GONE?

The soft patter of young feet will be muffled around the halls of Congress this year—the men who run the establishment just don't like college summer interns.

For the past several years, in a rare burst of enlightenment, Congress has allowed $750 to be spent by each member to add a student

intern to his Washington office staff for ten weeks of the summer college recess. There will be no $750 this year. Those of us who liked the enthusiastic, probing, fresh and invigorating presence of one or two college students around our offices doing routine chores, opening mail, researching issues, chasing down bills, asking questions, and learning about our political processes, will be sadder. Life will be duller. A lot of us wonder how intellectually-aware and curious college students threatened and freaked out the old establishment to such an extent that the funds for the program were cut off.

The establishment is not known for being particularly frugal on its physical monuments—witness the $100 million-plus new monstrosity, the Rayburn House Office Building; the spending of close to $6 million to remodel the Cannon House Office Building; or the proposal to remodel my own office building, Longworth, to the tune of $6.9 million. But when it came to spending $750 per Congressman for a student intern, the stern facts of fiscal life, the grim necessity to cut the Federal budget to help our massive $30 billion effort in Vietnam, were evoked.

But why the intern program? I felt the intern program was one of the finest programs we had. In these days when alienation between youth and their elders is so widely discussed, isn't it an absolute necessity to have bright students, leaders in their universities, and in a few years, leaders in this nation, spend ten weeks of a summer absorbing the kaleidescope of American government in Washington? What is more important to us, a few massive marble blocks stuck onto the Capitol and the House office buildings, or the possibility of motivating an inquiring, alert young mind? I believe that the future of this country lies in brains and not bricks.

Young, inquisitive minds, perhaps more attuned to the brutally-realistic problems of 1968 than we, are not tranquil minds. They do not take for gospel all that is fed to them by their elders. Their orientation is today, not ten, twenty, thirty or forty years ago. And this is the real reason the internship program was terminated. Some interns had the audacity to make waves.

Last summer a group of interns concerned by our government's policy in the Vietnam war decided to circulate a petition in opposition to the policy. They planned to present this petition to the President when he met with the students participating in intern programs throughout the legislative and executive branches, as he did annually. Another group of interns who supported this Nation's Vietnam policy started their own petition. The White House, disturbed, canceled the meeting with the President. The congressional establishment were furious, probably thinking the place for the interns was silently listening to briefing sessions and addressing letters in their congressmen's offices—to be seen and not heard.

The final supplemental appropriation bill passed last December 22, the final week of the session, struck out funds available for the congressional student intern program. An irritant had been erased. Washington summers on the Hill would be peaceful and the disturbing element of the student interns would be a phenomena of the past.

There is still a ray of hope, though. Some universities have made funds available to sustain their own interns in congressional offices for the summer. If any members still have salary not already committed to their regular staff operations, they may use this to pay an intern. So, hopefully, there will still be some youthful exuberance wafting through the Halls of Congress, asking embarrassing questions, constantly probing and perhaps, quietly protesting what they feel may be wrong with our country, by signing petitions.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment raises a question that has been discussed for several years. The committee does not think that this is the proper time to spend up to $327,000 a year for a summer intern program. We are trying to economize in every way possible.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing to prohibit a Member from putting a young man or a young lady on his payroll at any salary he sees fit, within the limits of the law, and calling him an intern, or a clerk, or whatever he wants to call him. Congress, I think, has been very generous with the Members. Each Member is entitled to 11 employees in his office or, if his district has more than 500,000 population, he can have 12 employees.

Here is a good place to save $327,000. Our committee is almost unanimous in opposition to this program.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I want to say to the gentleman from Alabama that I congratulate the Committee on Appropriations for including in this legislation a prohibition against the use of funds for the so-called college intern program. In my 12 years in this body I believe that if I were asked to cast a vote on the biggest waste of money ever engaged in by this body, it would be the expenditure of money in this so-called college intern program. And, we are talking about the financial condition of our country. I, for one, would express the hope that some day we should attain more reasonableness in the appropriation of funds for use by Members of this body. I cannot conceive the necessity for having all of the clerk hire which we now have to use and to expend these funds on college students who are here for a period of only 2 weeks and who, some of them, during the period of 10 weeks may have learned their way around the Capitol at the expense of $300,000 or $400,000. I think this is unconscionable and I commend the gentleman from Alabama and the committee for taking the action which they have taken and I hope the amendment is voted down.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Is it not true that the effect of this amendment if it is adopted is merely to increase the clerk hire of the Members of Congress because the chairman of this subcommittee has already indicated that every Member of Congress can put a person on his payroll and call him an intern or any other appropriate title if he so desires?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. The Member could give him any title he wants to.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a good thing to eliminate this program, because these boys are so smart and know so much that if we had not terminated this program the Speaker's job would have been in jeopardy.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. So I say, Mr. Chairman, I think we can save $327,000 here, without jeopardizing the activities on Capitol Hill at all.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I support my chairman in opposition to the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. REES]. Actually, this does not rule out the intern program. There are, in fact, a great many of them here already. They are working in offices on the regular congressional payroll, as my colleague has previously pointed out. To continue this program merely adds to the office expense of each congressional Member.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the time element involved, in my opinion, it is too late to reinstitute the full intent of the intern program. We are requesting all other departments and agencies of the Government to reduce their expenditures and have, in fact, cut back on their personnel. Certainly, in view of those circumstances, it behooves this House of Representatives and Members of Congress to also apply the same criteria which we are imposing upon the various agencies and departments of the Government. This would indeed be undercutting the $6 billion expenditure reduction which we just recently voted. Certainly we should abide by the same criteria that we are demanding of the rest of the Federal Government to follow.

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

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this observation to the gentleman from California, that the addition of another person to the payroll without an increase in the amount allowed to each Member cannot be a function of this committee in the handling of this bill. It is beyond our capability and beyond the jurisdiction of our particular subcommittee to authorize an additional position. Such an authorization is the function of the legislative committee and requires separate legislation.

I hope the gentleman from California understands this.

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

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I share the views of the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], and the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN], but I would like to contribute one addition. As a Member in the Congress representing more than one-half million people I do receive clerk hire for the employment of 12 people. However, I have only one room in which to put them. Therefore, even if the amendment of the gentleman from California should be adopted I would

have no space to put the extra person. In my opinion space is a crucial problem for the Members of this body and especially for those of us without a three-room suite provided those with additional seniority.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for his pertinent remarks and I think there are a great many more Members who have had this same experience.

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

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, chairman of the full committee.

Mr. MAHON. I want to concur, Mr. Chairman, with the sentiments of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota on the matter of the special congressional intern allowance. Congress is undertaking to impose some degree of budgetary restraint on the various departments and agencies of the Government, and we certainly ought to defeat this amendment in order to demonstrate that we are willing to sacrifice something ourselves in the effort to bring some stability to our fiscal affairs.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the full committee for those very significant remarks. The bill is only in compliance with the demands that the committee has been making on other departments.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, is it not true that under this program only Members of Congress who wish to have an intern for the summer months would take an intern, and if they did not like the internship program and if they did not have room for them in their offices because their offices are too crowded, that they do not have to do so?

But there are some of us who believe in the fact that there is a gap between, say, the Members of the Congress and the college and university students, that this is a way to bridge that gap, and because of that we ought to be able to have college interns in our offices during the summer months.

Mr. LANGEN. I would say in reply to the gentleman from California [Mr. REES], it is already possible to do that. If you budget the money for your staff correctly, you can add an intern. I might add that I have one on my staff right now, mostly because I have managed my allowance so that I have money allowance to pay him.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I will make it 15 minutes.

Mr. MOSS. If the gentleman will yield, will he give us 20 minutes, so that we have enough time to speak? The gentleman has spoken twice on the subject.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I do object, in view of the increased number of people who are on their feet now. I do object indeed.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I further make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

One hundred and one Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WHITENER yielded his time to Mr. Moss.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment without the slightest illusion that it will be adopted.

But I point out that this type of action is a demonstration of cynicism by this House.

If there were any interns here in the last year who in any way brought discredit upon the House that was the responsibility of the Member who selected them.

But the need for a better dialog between our young men and women in the universities with our generation who represent them has never been greater.

I happen to have an intern in my office and I carefully programed to provide for it because I feel it is a valuable addition. I have interns on both of my subcommittees and I intend to continue to seek to accommodate fellowships and interns whenever and wherever possible.

The plea here that we are doing this cutting to save money is specious. It is being done to punish a group of people because their conduct did not accord with the views of some Members of this body who just are not in touch with reality, as they regard the generation which tomorrow will start taking over this Government of ours.

I think it is time that you face the facts that that is what you are really doing.

The $375,000 can be wasted away in a thousand different avenues here in Washington, so that was not the prime effort against which the language in the appropriation was directed. It was a vote of no confidence in the young men and young women of America. I think we ought to recognize that it was also a vote of no confidence in the judgment of the Members of this House who selected those who served as their interns.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE].

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the very difficult job that faces the Committee on Appropriations in making cuts where necessary. However, I cannot go along with any criticism of this program.

The young man who is the administrative assistant in my office now originally came as an intern. This program has been most helpful to me and helps to bridge the generation gap that has been referred to before.

I think it is a very worthwhile program and I regret that the need to economize forces us to cut it down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not prevail, even though I want to take this opportunity to join with the gentleman from California in commending the work that the interns have done.

I believe I have as large an intern program as there is on the Hill. I had 10 interns last year and I have seven this year. I would have a lot more if I could get the additional space for them; space which time and time again I have pleaded with the Speaker for.

The only reason I am opposing the amendment is because of the economic crisis and the tight financial condition that we find ourselves in. Although I realize this is a small amount of money, I think we have to set an example here in the Congress. I hope that not only will this amendment be defeated, but that other amendments will be offered here and passed to cut down and pare down on this legislative appropriation. Everyone seems to be for economy until it comes up in their own backyard. We should be putting our own house in order first.

As I have said, but for the economic crisis, I would be strongly backing the intern program. I agree with the gentleman from California that, in general, the interns on Capitol Hill have done an outstanding job. I have had an intern program ever since I first came to Congress. It has proved exceptionally beneficial to me, and I feel it has been of great value to these young boys and girls. I have never, in my 10 years in Congress, experienced any trouble with my interns, and, on the contrary, have found them industrious, hardworking, and responsible. I have been able to give them meaningful tasks which they have consistently carried out in a manner demonstrating both their abilities and their interest in having an opportunity to play a role in the governmental process. I believe that this program is as valuable an educational experience as any young student can obtain today, and look forward to the time when our financial conditions allow for a resumption of this important program.

I understand that there is an item in here for 78 additional policemen. It has become a hazard to come to work here at the Capitol every day because there are so many policemen around that you trip all over them.

My statement is not made as a criticism of the abilities of our Capitol Police force. Rather it is directed to the fact that we already have too many Capitol Hill policemen and we do not need 78 more.

Furthermore, these policemen, I believe, should be taken out of the patronage system and put on a civil service system, like any other police force in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN].

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to oppose the able leadership of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS]. We have been over this ground many times. I would like to say that we have had a wonderful experience with our interns. We have had our industries support us with private money for groups of high school teachers that we have had down here for the summer as interns. I believe it was very worthwhile, and I would urge a similar program to be continued.

At the present time, I have four college people in my office this minute for the summer. One was editor of the school magazine at Smith. One was the editor of the school paper at Rutgers. One goes to Columbia Law School. You have to be able to become involved with this young generation. They are wonderful. They are invigorating. I think it is good for the whole country to continue the intern program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment, not because I am opposed to interns—I have had them in my office and they were very satisfactory—but I am opposed to it because this is not the time to increase Members' clerk hire. If the gentlemen from California, either one of them, want interns they have a perfect right to put the interns on their payroll and pay them out of the regular allowance that all Members have.

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

Mr. JONAS. I have only a minute and a half.

Mr. MOSS. If you had listened, you would have heard me say that——

Mr. JONAS. I do not yield any further to the gentleman. I heard what he said. I am saying to the Members of the Committee and the gentleman from California that he can have as many interns as he desires to pay out of his clerk hire.

If this amendment is approved it means, in effect, that the House is adding or increasing the Members' clerk hire. This is not the time to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] that this is not really a question of economy. If it is, it is false economy. Rather, it is really a question of attitude. The student congressional intern program is an investment in the youth of this country. Used constructively, the talent of young men and young women from our colleges and universities can make a valuable contribution to the work of the Congress. At the same time the program will give to those young students an insight into the workings of government.

We face a serious alienation of young people today from our Government. It is essential that this bridge exist.

Let us look at the background against which the summer intern program was cut out last December. If I recall correctly—and I am sorry we do not have before us the report on that supplemental appropriation—the words were blocked out in the committee print, but beneath the ink, the language certainly indicated dissatisfaction with the fact that some interns had expressed views which some Members regarded as unpopular or as perhaps not consistent with their own ideas about Vietnam. Last summer interns organized forums and roundrobin letters which disturbed some Members. That was the crux of the matter and the real reason why the intern program was eliminated in a fit of petulance on the part of the House in reaction to the fact that so many interns, like young people all over the country, and like 80 percent of the voters in the recent Democratic primaries, expressed doubts about the Vietnam policy.

I urge that we restore the funds for this program. The amount of money, $327,000, is a worthwhile investment in the future leadership of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD].

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield briefly to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the largest congressional district in this country as far as population—about 700,000 people. I have two interns in my office this summer. They are doing a good job. I put them on the regular payroll. I see no reason to add the additional internship program.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I would make this additional point. This on-again off-again situation with respect to the intern program because of the shortage of funds may have had one salutary effect. As the gentleman from New Jersey suggested, it has been my experience also that various private groups and the universities have been attempting to find funds to continue this program because they feel is very important. I share this feeling. I have had interns in my office since my election in 1963. I have an intern this year under the general clerk hire allowance.

I believe it is a useful program and good for the country, but it has been my experience that the universities and the private groups have been making an additional effort this year to raise the funds to bring college students to Washington, because they were aware there would not be sufficient funds through the Congress for this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MACHEN].

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. As one of the originators of the intern program that was adopted, I hae been very much in favor of it. As has been said here earlier, I think it is a shame for the House of Representatives to go on record as gagging, and using this as a gag, the sum of $327,000—gagging our young people because of the actions of a few interns last year.

I have an intern program I use within my own allowance. We tried to get a change in the rules so we could have an extra intern within our own allowance. I never use all my own allowance. We could not get that done. So, regardless of the committee action, it is because of the actions of a few that we are serving notice to the young people of the country that we cannot afford dissent and we want complete control over the people we bring in to see the Government in operation.

We have set up an intern program in every branch of the Government. They have to take a competitive examination. They come from all over the country. Now we say we, the House, cannot have this type program. I just wish there were a way we could get every Member to have to stand up and be recorded on this indictment of youth coming to Washington, all for the sum of $327,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, let me call to the attention of this House that the action taken by the committee is certainly not one in opposition to the intern program. It is merely in compliance with the rest of the actions the committee has taken. There were a great many items requested of the committee that we could not accommodate because it was the decision of the committee that the budget at this moment would not accommodate those expenditures.

I can refer to the addition to the Library of Congress, which is certainly one that serves the entire Nation, but it was the best judgment of the committee that here was an expenditure that would not be appropriate at this time.

The same thing applies to the remodeling of the Longworth Building. Some say they do not have space enough for interns. They might have had that additional space if the expenditure had been made, but again it was the judgment of the committee that this was not the time to make that expenditure.

So this decision on the part of the committee is only in compliance with the general attitude of the committee in trying to respond to the needs of the country, in attempting to curb inflation, be responsive to the resolution that we ourselves adopted just the other day. It would be a shame and a disgrace if, after the action of this House recommending a $6 billion limitation in expenditures, we, were not to make any contribution to that expenditure reduction.

I would suggest it is in our own best interests that this amendment should not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] to close debate.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I believe the issues are clear. We have discussed this question of interns for several months and years.

I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES) there were—ayes 14, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: On page 6, line 20, strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: *"Provided,* That each Member's clerk-hire roll may be increased by one employee for the purposes and to the extent authorized in House Resolution 416, 89th Congress."

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama will state his point of order.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman stating that he would reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to make it possible for Members to place on their staffs during the summer one intern in addition to the regular office clerk-hire roll limitation.

In other words, there are many of us who, because our staff is completely filled, are not able to adjust our clerk-hire allowance in order to compensate a summer intern. This would make it possible for one additional staff member to be added to the staff of a House Member during the period for which the original resolution (H. Res. 416) of the 89th Congress, applied. It would give us an opportunity to adjust our payrolls in order to accommodate an intern during the months of June, July, and August.

It would cost absolutely nothing. Therefore, it is not subject to the objections, which were raised during consideration of the previous amendment, to the effect that a matter of economy is involved. If the last amendment was defeated because of the economy argument, and if that was a sincere argument, there really ought to be no objection to this amendment as a means of solving this problem.

A vote on my amendment will give Members who opposed the last amendment an opportunity to demonstrate whether or not they are willing to encourage young people to learn about government by working in the legislative branch.

In view of the many statements on the floor this afternoon from many Members that they have no objection to the intern program but are only interested in saving money, I hope the chairman will not press a point of order but will accept this amendment as a solution to the problem about which many of us feel very keenly. At the same time this amendment maintains the position of the committee on not spending additional funds.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be accepted.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RYAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I would argue that the amendment is in order because the amendment relates to the purposes of House Resolution 416, which is referred to in the bill, and clearly, if lines 17 to 20 were in order and were included in the bill, then the proviso which my amendment adds to those lines is equally in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair has had the opportunity to study the amendment of the gentleman from New York and the Chair finds the question of one additional employee is, under the subject of clerk hire, within the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration. The amendment of the gentleman from New York would add legislation to an appropriation measure and therefore in violation of clause 2, rule XXI, of the House of Representatives. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDREWS OF ALABAMA

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by by Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama: On page 27, strike out all of the proviso in lines 3 through 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following: *"Provided further,* That the provisions relating to a position and salary thereof carried in House Resolution 905 of the Ninetieth Congress shall be the permanent law with respect thereto."

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer this as a committee amendment to remove a conflict that would otherwise exist with respect to the rates of compensation of the positions listed in House Resolution 1015.

The amendment simply restates the proviso on page 27 to omit all reference to House Resolution 1015. In accord with long practice, the proviso would have made permanent law of the provisions in House Resolution 1015 which the House agreed to on January 15 of this year. That is the usual procedure in such matters.

But on June 11, under authority of the so-called comparability pay provisions of Public Law 90–206, the Speaker issued a determination with respect to salaries of employees of the House, and in section 8 of that determination, made certain determinations with respect to the rate of compensation of the positions covered by House Resolution 1015. And I am advised that those determinations have the force and effect of law, and thus supersede the pertinent provisions of House Resolution 1015.

Thus, it is no longer necessary, or appropriate, to make the provisions of House Resolution 1015 permanent law. This amendment would remove the conflict.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I am in complete agreement with the statement which has just been made by the chairman of the subcommittee and recommend the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 18038) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. CONTE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CONTE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CONTE moves to recommit the bill H.R. 18038 to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 361, nays 22, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 214]

YEAS—361

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Colmer
Conable
Conyers
Corbett
Cowger
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyros
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McClory
McCloskey
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Podell
Poff
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watson
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—22

Buchanan
Cahill
Collier
Conte
Cunningham
Curtis
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Hall
Hutchinson
Kyl
McEwen
Miller, Ohio
Pollock
Pool
Rumsfeld
Scherle
Springer

NOT VOTING—49

Anderson, Ill.
Arends
Baring
Bevill
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Burton, Utah
Carey
Celler
Corman
Cramer
Dent
Dow
Edwards, La.
Evins, Tenn.
Fino
Ford, William D.
Gardner
Hansen, Idaho
Hays
Hébert
Herlong
Holland
Irwin
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kornegay
Laird
McCarthy
Mathias, Md.
Mayne
Morse, Mass.
Nedzi
O'Hara, Mich.
Reinecke
Resnick
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Scheuer
Schweiker
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Thompson, N.J.
Vanik
Watkins

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dent with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Laird.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Schweiker.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Gardner.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Holland.

Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.

Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Mayne.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Taft.

Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Reinecke.

Mr. Vanik with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Karsten.

Mr. Bevill with Mr. Irwin.

Mr. Dow with Mr. Corman.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

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

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 17734, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 17734) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, WHITTEN, SIKES, NATCHER, FLOOD, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, JONAS, LAIRD, LIPSCOMB, and MICHEL.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 17734, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tomorrow, June 28, 1968, to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 17734 making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. HALL, Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the distinguished gentleman from Texas tell us whether or not the conferees have, in fact, met with the Members of the other body? Is the report prepared and ready for filing?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Missouri will yield, the conferees have not met. They have just been appointed. We plan to meet tomorrow morning. However, it was thought that if agreement could be achieved tomorrow, that the report and statement of the managers on the part of the House could be made more readily available to the Members of the House by being filed tomorrow night.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, when will the papers and the statement of the managers on the part of the House be available to Members with relation to the time that the conference report might be called up under this unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MAHON. If the conferees are able to agree, it would be printed in the next issue of the RECORD.

Mr. HALL. It would also be eligible to call it up on Monday, would it not?

Mr. MAHON. It could not be called up until after printing except by unanimous consent.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If the other body is in session tomorrow, it could be printed in their version of the RECORD tomorrow, so that there would be that possibility. But with the House not meeting on tomorrow it would not be in our RECORD. However, it would be in the RECORD for Monday. However, I do not know at this moment whether the other body is meeting.

Mr. HALL. The other body is not in session today and we will not be in session tomorrow.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, according to the statements heard, and our rights as individually elected Representatives, but full well knowing fiscal year 1968 ends next week, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 163

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H.R. 163) to prevent vessels built or rebuilt outside the United States or documented under foreign registry from carrying cargoes restricted to vessels of the United States.

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

There was no objection.

TO AMEND THE ACT OF AUGUST 1, 1958—INJURY TO FISH AND WILDLIFE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 15979) to amend the act of August 1, 1958, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 2 of the Act of August 1, 1958 (72 Stat. 479), as amended (16 U.S.C. 742d–1 note), is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 2. In order to carry out the provisions of this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for each of the two fiscal years immediately following such year. Such sums shall remain available until expended.'"

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend section 2 of the Act of August 1, 1958, as amended, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides."

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman from Michigan whether the Senate amendments are germane to the bill?

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman will yield, I would say that all amendments are germane.

Mr. GROSS. How did the House come out financially?

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman will yield further, I will be most pleased to answer the gentleman from Iowa.

The House bill provided $5 million over a period of 3 fiscal years. The Senate bill provided $3.5 million over the same 3 fiscal years, which was a cut of $1.5 million per fiscal year.

The Senate struck out the labeling requirements that had been inserted in the House. So that all that remains is the authorization to spend $3.5 million a year for each of three fiscal years in extension of an existing program which passed this House in years past unanimously, without the labeling requirements which had been in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his explanation, and withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS UNTIL MIDNIGHT TOMORROW

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow, June 28, to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 1166, NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1968

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1215 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1215

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1166) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe safety standards for the transportation of natural and other gas by pipeline, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now printed in the bill, and such substitute shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN] and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks on the rule for the consideration of the bill, S. 1166, the National Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1215 provides an open rule with 3 hours of general debate for consideration of S. 1166. The resolution also provides that it shall be in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

Authority to improve the public safety now exists in the Department of Transportation. The Department now exercises safety regulation over flammable and other hazardous gases moving other than by pipeline, and safety regulation over pipeline movements of many other commodities including petroleum, but not of natural gas.

There are now over 800,000 miles of gas pipeline in the United States including approximately 63,000 miles of gathering lines, 224,000 miles of transmission lines, and 536,000 miles of distribution lines. These lines range in diameter from less than 1 inch to 42 inches with 48-inch lines under consideration. They vary in condition from old, unprotected lines to new, well-protected lines. They differ in function from low-pressure

transmission lines operated at 1,300 pounds per square inch, which is equivalent to a force of over 93 tons pushing against the pipeline wall over every square foot.

In 1945 natural gas supplied something like one-eighth of the Nation's total consumption of the energy fuels and energy; today it supplies one-third. This tremendous increase in the use of natural gas and the concurrent increase in the number of miles of gaslines makes consideration of the industry's safety record and standards most important.

The purpose of S. 1166 is to provide for the prescription and enforcement of minimum Federal safety standards for the transportation of natural and other gas by pipeline and for pipeline facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1215 in order that S. 1166 may be considered.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I have always been impressed by the corporate concern for safety which the gas companies display for the consumer.

Let there be but one unexplained whiff of gas in a home, and a company crew is dispatched. Obviously, they would not want a neighborhood gas explosion and its predictable effects on future gas hookups.

But when it comes to gas pipeline safety, the gas companies and the transmission companies, which own the long interstate gas lines, are very shortsighted. They have succeeded in diluting the gas pipeline safety bill, which we consider today. Yet these companies will suffer greatly if this crippled bill passes and allows more gas explosions.

The issue before the House is quite simple. It is whether effective legislation for the safety of 800,000 miles of gas pipelines and distribution mains is to prevail or whether a facade legislation, riddled with loopholes, exemptions and obstructionist provisos, is to secure acceptance.

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has conducted hearings which revealed grave dangers in our pipeline system and virtually no meaningful safety regulation by the States. The bill reported out by the committee does not reflect this evidence. It needs strengthening. It needs stronger sanctions.

Violators should not, as they do under the present bill, have an endless opportunity to violate the law with the only discomfort being the requirement to meet a compliance deadline after being notified by a Government official.

What conceivable reason could there be for requiring the Government to notify in advance, and give time for compliance before any penalty is imposed, a pipeline company that is violating the law for the first or the hundredth time? This proviso has been described by my distinguished colleague from Michigan, Congressman JOHN DINGELL, as the "Mad Dog Provision." It is worse than that. The "dog" is not just given one bite, but can bite again and again and he has to be warned, and given time for compliance before he is penalized. This is so whether the violator is an executive, an official of the company or a foreman.

Further, I believe that the democratic process is enhanced within an administrative agency if consumers, or in this case, landowners, propertyowners or tenants, have just as much legal standing before the agency as do pipeline companies. Only in this manner will an administrator be given reason to respect the submission in the docket for proposed safety standards that is sent by people to be protected. Their comments deserve the same standing, with right of judicial appeal, as those of industry.

I do not believe that there can be any moral justification for exempting gathering lines from this safety legislation merely because these lines in most, but not all, cases go through rural areas.

Whether 1,000 people or five people are to be protected, the standards for pipe should be the same. Also, what is a rural area today may be a suburban area tomorrow.

There is no use in giving the Secretary of Transportation a mandate for safe pipelines and then hamstring him with onerous burdens vis-a-vis State action and authority. The burden of proof should be on the States to show they can have equal or better safety standards, enforced, before the Federal Government relinquishes its responsibility.

The massive reduction in authorized funds, almost 95 percent in fiscal year 1969 alone, from the bill passed by the other body is a severe undermining. One can observe economies without going to this extreme.

People in this country are more aware of the discrepancy between what is in the law's preamble and what its provisions and administration reveal. We do not need laws that are form instead of substance. To so weaken this pipeline bill, to strip it of meaningful sanctions, without which law has no meaning, and to starve it from a funding viewpoint, is to perpetrate a deception upon the public.

The danger from gas pipeline explosions can be catastrophic, dwarfing most other manmade disasters by comparison. In Queens, New York, in January 1967, a gas leak led to a rampaging fire that destroyed many homes and could have taken hundreds of lives were it not for alert police and firemen action to evacuate the residents.

On March 28 of this year, a ruptured gas main spewed a heavy concentration of gas into the air on the upper East Side of New York City forcing the police to seal off a nine-block area to avoid a disastrous inferno. First Avenue from 92d Street to 100th Street.

Peoples lives are at stake here. We need a strong, just law; one that is workable and allows the job to be done. There must be adequate authority, adequate sanctions and adequate funds. Pipelines are a massive transport system, going into every State of the Union, under residential and business areas, into the hearts of our towns and cities. Not only must they be as safe as possible, inspected, repaired and, where necessary replaced with newer pipe, but they must not be exposed to become secondary disasters to land shifts—of concern in the West—surface construction and pounding, and so forth.

I was extremely gratified by the gas safety bill. S. 1166, passed by the Senate last September. Not only was that bill a strong one, but it was passed on a rollcall vote of 78–0. For once it seemed that the long-neglected interests of the consumer had been served.

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce succeeded in emasculating the bill beyond recognition. So feeble was the committee's amended version of S. 1166 that Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd called it "worse than an empty gesture."

Clearly, we have witnessed what the New York Times called "capitulation to the industry" and "deference to gas company profits." The major, indeed the only, strong opponents of this bill are the gas companies, with offices and facilities in the West.

Yet it is the people in the East, where the underground pipes are oldest, in poorest condition, and most used, who pay dearly, in both property and lives, for our inaction. Gas explosions in recent years have rocked such cities as Reading, Dayton, New York City, St. Paul, Allentown, Evansville, Pensacola, Passaic, Yonkers, and my own borough of Queens.

This bill, if passed in its present weakened form, will be regretted by every responsible gas company official in this country.

Although I am disinclined to take the role of the defender of the utilities, I think we should save the gas companies from their own folly today by rejecting the committee's bill and passing S. 1166.

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

Mr. Speaker, the pending resolution, House Resolution 1215, provides an open rule with 3 hours of debate on the bill, S. 1166.

The purpose of the bill is to provide for the establishment and enforcement of minimum Federal safety standards for natural gas pipeline facilities and for the transportation and storage of such gases.

The Department of Transportation and other agencies currently have authority to regulate all other modes of transportation. Pipeline facilities are the only transportation facilities not regulated. There are over 800,000 miles of gas pipelines in the United States, some 224,000 miles of transmission lines, and 536,000 miles of distribution lines. They vary from old, poorly protected lines to new, well protected ones. Natural gas now supplies about one-third of the Nation's energy. While the safety record has been good—in the last 17 years only 67 people have been killed by explosions—it is also true that operational failures occur regularly. In almost all cases the leak is repaired before any explosion takes place, but the potential for serious injury and destruction is clearly present.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to establish minimum safety standards by the gathering, transmission, and distribution of natural gas by pipelines used in interstate commerce. Some standards will be retroactive in nature; the Secretary is empowered to inspect pipeline facilities and order the removal or repair of all hazards. These standards are to be promulgated within two years. During this interim temporary standards will be promulgated by the Secretary.

All owners and operators of any pipeline facilities have a number of obligations placed upon them by the bill. They are required to—

First, comply with the safety standards promulgated;

Second, file with the inspection authority, and comply with a plan of inspection and maintenance; and

Third, make available to inspection their records and permit entry for inspection.

Promulgated standards and duties created by the bill will be enforced as follows:

First, the Secretary of Transportation will have jurisdiction over all pipeline facilities subject to the Federal Power Commission; and

Second, for all other pipelines facilities enforcement will be either by the Secretary or by a State agency under either a written agreement between the State and the Secretary, or under a certification of competence to inspect and enforce executed by the State and agreed to by the Secretary.

A number of States have moved to regulate gas pipeline facilities in recent years. Most use as their standard a revised industry-prepared code—but uniformity does not exist. The bill seeks uniformity of standards and enforcement on all pipelines which cross State lines. States will retain the primary role of enforcement of local pipeline safety standards. Within a State, Federal standards may be superseded by State standards and enforcement of them in either of two ways: either by the submission to the Secretary of a annual certification by the State detailing its enforcement activity of its standard, which must at least equal Federal standards, or where a State cannot submit such a certification, through a written agreement with the Secretary for the State to carry out for the Secretary the administration of the Federal standards.

Civil penalties are provided. Injunctive relief may be obtained if a pipeline owner or operator, after notice of a defect in his facilities, has not removed the dangerous condition within a reasonable time. The Secretary may also impose a civil penalty if the condition has not been remedied after notice of its existence. A fine of $500 per day may be levied; the maximum penalty for a related series of violations may not exceed $100,000.

The bill creates the Technical Pipeline Safety Standards Committee. Its purpose is to advise the Secretary on technical matters concerning pipeline operations. The Secretary is required to obtain its views before formally proposing any safety standard. Membership is 15, composed of those from the State inspection agencies, members of the industry, and the general public. All must be experts in the field.

Any persons affected by an order issued by the Secretary may, within 60 days, file a petition for judicial review with the circuit court.

The Secretary is required to report annually on the operation of the program, the safety record, and any recommendations he may have to improve the operation of the program.

Funds authorized for fiscal 1969 are $500,000; for 1970, $2,000,000; for 1971, $3,000,000. The funds will be used for the most part in grants to States, paying up to 50 percent of their increased inspection activities.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to use this time to inquire of the chairman of our committee if it is his intention to finish general debate on this particular bill at this late hour or is it his intention to reserve some of the time for general debate at such time as the bill might be called up the first of the coming week or whenever it is to be reconsidered.

Mr. STAGGERS. In reply to the gentleman, I would say, the intention is to go on to about 5:30 or 6 o'clock and stop for the evening. That certainly would leave some time for next Tuesday.

Mr. PICKLE. I certainly thank the chairman for that statement.

I know that some of the Members are out of town, members of the subcommittee that has considered this bill. The schedule which the gentleman mentioned would reserve time for Members to enter comments during the general debate, and that is certainly satisfactory. I thank the chairman for this consideration.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled at what has been done to S. 1166 by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

In the words of Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd, they have made a regulatory bill into a measure which is "worse than no bill at all."

Mr. Speaker, the most serious defect in the bill which we are considering today is that it would exempt the State from Federal regulation. The committee amendments give the States the power to certify their compliance with Federal standards which is a sharp departure from the version adopted in the other body. The version which they approved gave the Secretary of Transportation the power to decide whether a State's regulation was adequate.

I also have serious reservations about the provisions which exempts gathering lines in rural sections. Thus, if this section remains unchanged, an important segment of the Nation's pipelines will be unregulated.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed at the fact that the committee has cut the amount of money authorized by the other body from $38 million to an inadequate figure of $5.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, each of us is aware of the threat of pipeline explosions and many of our constituents share our sense of concern. I do not think it is good policy to reassure these people by saying that we have passed a bill regulating this industry when in fact we have given our approval to a bill which does not go to the heart of the problem.

Every Member of this House has heard at one time the old slogan "If you are going to do a job, do it right." Unfortunately, this bill is a good example of exactly the opposite philosophy. I cannot too strongly suggest that this bill be sent back to committee with instructions that a bill along the line of the one passed by the other body be approved.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the efforts to strengthen the House committee version of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act. I speak as one whose district has suffered directly from a gas pipeline explosion.

Last December, a residential dwelling in the Riverdale section of the Bronx was wracked by an explosion. A young mother, her 20-month-old son and six others were injured by the blast, the ensuing collapse of the house, and a fire which broke out and which spread to two adjoining houses. What happened in this case could too easily occur elsewhere in my district—or in any Member's district.

This Congress has done much to advance the safety and welfare of consumers. To weaken the Senate bill designed to protect the public from the lurking catastrophe beneath their streets, houses, and businesses would be to reverse a salutary trend. The meat inspection bill was strengthened, not weakened, as it went through the legislative mill. The same was true of truth in lending.

I urge my colleagues to resist the pressures to weaken the pipeline safety bill and to support the amendments being offered to strengthen it.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act, as reported with amendments by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in my opinion falls far short of providing what is so badly needed in this field—strong Federal regulation.

The potential danger from natural gas pipeline explosions is huge, since there are now over 800,000 miles of such pipelines in the Nation, ranging in size from less than 1 inch to 42 inches in diameter. Strong Federal regulation is needed to control this simmering danger beneath our feet.

In South Milwaukee last year, two gas explosions, which came within minutes of each other, wrecked a new $450,000 addition to St. Adalbert's Catholic School and injured 13 persons, including several children. Only the fact that more than 300 persons had been evacuated from the building a half-hour before the blasts saved the community from a terrible tragedy.

The gas company blamed the explosion on gas escaping from a break in an 8-inch pipe that apparently had been weakened by heavy frost.

Basically, both the bill passed by the other body, S. 1166, and the amended measure reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, would direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish minimum safety standards

for gas pipelines, to set up procedures for enforcing these standards, and to provide for penalties for violations. But it is in the application of these provisions that the two measures differ—and the committee's version is much weaker than S. 1166.

To cite one example, S. 1166 provides that the Secretary of Transportation may exempt pipeline already in the ground from Federal safety standards unless he finds that a "potentially hazardous situation exists, in which case he may require compliance." In other words, if a Transportation Department study were to show that 8-inch pipe of a certain age was susceptible to deterioration under heavy frost conditions, then the Secretary would be empowered to order a complete inspection of all such pipe. If such a law were in force last year, it might have prevented the explosion at St. Adalbert's.

Under the committee's version of the bill, however, the Secretary must find "a particular facility to be hazardous to life or property" before he can order action on it; that is, he must pinpoint the trouble before he can direct that it be eliminated. This would seem to require, in effect, that the Secretary monitor the 800,000 miles of existing pipeline in order to find specific hazards—and generally, when he finds these specific hazards, it will probably already be too late.

In addition, S. 1166 provides for fines of $1,000 per day for each violation of pipeline safety standards up to a total of $400,000 for any series of violations. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reduced these civil penalties by half, however, and provided that no penalty could be imposed until the violator was given notice and an opportunity to correct his violation.

Certainly the penalties in the committee's bill are not only inadequate but ineffective. They would permit a company to violate the law with impunity, since once caught it would have a chance to correct the violation before any penalty was imposed.

For these reasons, I urge that the House reject the weak language of the committee's bill and, instead, support the amendments offered to restore the strong provisions of S. 1166.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE BILL ON JULY 2 OR JULY 3

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the House to consider the District of Columbia revenue bill next Tuesday or Wednesday.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia if it is anticipated that committee action will be forthcoming either Friday of this week or Monday of next.

Mr. McMILLAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And the bill will be programed for next week, either Tuesday or Wednesday?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes; at the convenience of the leadership.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Will the report and hearings on the bill be available?

Mr. McMILLAN. We hope to have the report filed at the latest next Monday.

Mr. GROSS. And the bill would be called up on Tuesday?

Mr. McMILLAN. I hope it will not be called until Wednesday. We will take it up when it is convenient.

Mr. GROSS. When will the hearings be available?

Mr. McMILLAN. We will try our best to have them available by that time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is my understanding that the hearings have already been held.

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, the hearings have been held.

Mr. GROSS. The hearings may have been held, but will they be printed and available, and will the reports be printed and available so that we may have a little time to look at them?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I should think we could get the hearings printed. As I look at the schedule, it is at least tentatively agreed upon for next week. It seems to me that it is most unlikely the bill will be reached before Wednesday.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO FILE REPORTS ON H.R. 16024 AND H.R. 16824 UNTIL MIDNIGHT TOMORROW

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have until midnight tomorrow night to file reports on H.R. 16024, the high speed ground transportation bill, and H.R. 16824, the extension of the State Technical Services Act.

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

There was no objection.

NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1968

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1166) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe safety standards for the transportation of natural and other gas by pipeline, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1166, with Mr. GALLAGHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill as reported is to provide the Secretary of Transportation with the authority to prescribe and enforce minimum Federal safety standards for the transportation of natural and other gas by pipeline and for pipeline facilities.

At the present time the Secretary of Transportation has authority to improve public safety as it is affected by transportation by private auto, bus, truck, airplane, ship, oil pipelines, and to some degree by railroad. The only significant mode of transportation over which he has no authority whatever is the transportation of gases by pipeline.

There are now over 800,000 miles of gas pipeline in the United States including approximately 63,000 miles of gathering lines, 224,000 miles of transmission lines, and 536,000 miles of distribution lines. These lines range in diameter from less than 1 inch to 42 inches with 48-inch lines under consideration. They vary in condition from old, unprotected lines to new, well-protected lines. They differ in function from low-pressure distribution lines operated at one-fourth pound per square inch to high-pressure transmission lines operated at 1,300 pounds per square inch, which is equivalent to a force of over 93 tons pushing against the pipeline wall over every square foot. Most of this pipeline system is of recent development.

The testimony of the Secretary of Transportation and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission is that the safety record of the transmission industry has been a relatively good one.

While the number of deaths has been low in relation to other industries, the recital of this fact alone, however, does not indicate adequately the seriousness of transmission systems failures. Over this period there has been an operational failure about every 5 days and a large number of failures during testing. In most cases the gas which escaped as a result of those failures did not ignite. In addition, the danger of injury and death has not been as great in the case of transmission lines which have been located away from areas of population density. When a transmission line failure occurs in a populated locale and ignition follows, the resulting explosion can be highly destructive. For example, the rupture and explosion at Natchitoches, La.,

in March 1965, gutted a 13-acre area, killed 17 people, burned five houses, and melted cars and rocks in the vicinity.

The safety record of distribution systems is far from as good. Secretary Boyd testified that most of the systems have been in existence for many years and much of the original pipe is still in use even though it is now 30 or 40 years old and, in some instances, twice that. He said there is no readily available information concerning accidents and distribution systems as there is in those in transmission pipelines. He pointed out, however, a number of major accidents which have occurred since the first of the year and stated the need for safety jurisdiction over the distribution lines was most necessary.

This bill accordingly proposes to close this gap in legislative jurisdiction and to provide for minimum Federal safety standards. The bill as reported:

First. Directs—section 3—the Secretary of Transportation within 24 months to establish minimum safety standards for the gathering, transmission, and distribution of gas by pipeline or its storage, and for pipeline facilities used in the transportaton or treatment of gas. Provision is made for interim standards. Certain standards apply retroactively and the Secretary otherwise is empowered to order removal of hazards to life or property.

Second. Places a duty—section 8—upon each person engaging in the transportation of gas or who owns or operates pipeline facilities to: First, comply with these safety standards; second, file and comply with a plan of inspection and maintenance required by section 11; and third, permit access to records, make report and permit entry or inspection as required by section 12.

Third. Provides—section 5—for the enforcement of these standards: First, as to pipeline facilities and the transportation of gas, subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission, by the Secretary; and second, as to all other pipeline facilities and transportation of gas either by the Secretary or by delegation to a State agency through either: First, an effective certification by the State agency to the Secretary; or, second, an effective written agreement between the State agency and the Secretary. As here used a State agency may mean a municipality.

Fourth. In addition, the bill provides—section 4—for the establishment of a technical pipeline safety standards committee: section 6—for the judicial review of orders; section 7—for cooperation with the Federal Power Commission; section 9—for civil penalties; section 10—for injunctions and jurisdiction; section 13—for research; section 14—for reports to the Congress; and section 15—for the authorization of the sums of $500,000, $2 million, and $3 million for the next 3 fiscal years.

Just how the standards are to be set up and how they are to be enforced is clearly set out in the committee report and I commend it to the Members for a complete understanding of what is here involved.

The committee made some changes in the bill as it passed the Senate. Those are fully discussed in the committee report and I shall not go into that here inasmuch as I understand that some members of the committee intend to offer amendments bringing the bill as reported more in line with the bill as it passed the Senate.

At the appropriate time I shall offer one committee amendment to the bill which is solely for the purpose of clarifying a cross-reference which is now contained in section 5.

The bill has had quite a hearing in the newspapers in the country. I am sure it is not as bad a bill as has been portrayed in many ways, but in many respects many things could be done to better the bill.

With these words before the committee in the debate, it is hoped it will not run too long today, because I know many Members do want to get home. With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD], the able chairman of the subcommittee who held the hearings and conducted the markup on the bill in the subcommittee.

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

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to commend the gentleman and his committee for bringing forth this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 1166, but ask my colleagues to also support the amendments to be offered to the pending bill to make it similar to the Senate bill, the stronger and truer safety bill.

I commend the chairman and his committee for bringing this much-needed legislation to the floor. In November 1967 I introduced legislation, H.R. 13936, which incorporated features of the administration's request and which would provide for needed safety in the transmission lines of natural gas. The greatest danger exists from existing lines—lines which run under nearly every major metropolitan center—these for all effective purposes are excluded from the pending bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support the amendments to be offered, amendments that will give to the country effective gasline safety and protection. In the bill, as reported, the Secretary of Transportation must find an "actual" hazard before he may act—I believe that he must be given authority to remove a potential hazard. If he is required to find that a particular facility is actually hazardous, then it is probably too late.

The people of my district have very vivid memories of the explosion which occurred in my congressional district in Queens County, N.Y., on January 13, 1967, and they want assurances that we are doing everything possible to insure that there will not be a recurrence of that tragedy. I know that this is true throughout the country.

It is said that a picture is worth a thousand words—here, my colleagues, are actual photographs of the inferno caused by the gasline explosion in my district. Also, we have all received a release by the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union setting forth news clips of similar disasters throughout the country. This can and may happen at any time in any one of our districts. If these were pictures of riots there would be great reaction. For too often the Congress is accused of "reacting" to situations rather than taking the initiative to protect the people before the crisis has occurred. My first bill having to do with gas pipeline safety was introduced early in 1967, after the explosion in Jamaica, and this may be considered a form of "reacting," but there have been numerous explosions since the one in my district, and we are still debating.

This legislation before us today with the correcting amendments must be passed into law now.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the full committee for his kind remarks.

Mr. Chairman, as has been said by the chairman of the full committee, this bill as reported by the House has received some criticism from certain sources of the news media, which I do not think it deserves. As a matter of fact, there is considerable reference to the fact that the other body passed a stronger and better bill. Actually, this is not the case. I support the bill on the floor here, just as I did in the subcommittee and in the full committee, on the basis that I would have an amendment or try to attach an amendment to the bill, which is found, if Members have the bill before them on page 30, line 11.

This deals with the nub, in my judgment, of the entire bill—the entire idea and thrust of the bill. The idea of the bill was that because the various States of our 50 United States had not taken sufficient care of the dangers that are inherent in the carrying of this high-pressure and lethal gas, which can be exploded at any moment and can destroy property and destroy lives, set up by lack of action by the various State regulatory bodies, it is time that the Federal Government enter the void and set up Federal regulations which the 50 States could agree to.

I must say that in the Senate bill, I believe the language they had in section 5 is superior to the language which was adopted both by our subcommittee and by our full committee. I am now talking about the fact that under the bill before you the authorization is given to any State which has a clerk who can type merely to set forth the fact, whether it is a fact or not a fact, that the State, whatever State it is, is in compliance with this bill. Obviously this changed the thrust of the bill.

There is a need in our country to have safe transportation of this natural gas. And by transportation of natural gas I am not just talking about the pipelines. I do not believe that the pipelines have perhaps had as many accidents, and certainly they do not have the opportunity to injure as many people as the distribution lines, which also, within the terms of this bill, transport natural gas, from the

so-called long lines to the homes of the users of natural gas.

I have no quarrel with the pipelines or the distribution companies. I merely point out to the Members of the Committee that if we are to have Federal regulation we must have some way of enticing the States to enter into agreements with the Federal Government. We must give them some incentive to join together in coming under the blanket of Federal supervision.

In the Senate language the enticement or the encouragement for the States to come under the blanket of Federal enforcement and Federal standards as set up by the Secretary of the Department of Transportation is that if they live up to and comply with the Federal standards the Federal Government will provide matching funds up to 50 percent of the funds needed by any one of the various 50 States to come up to the Federal standards that will be promulgated.

Unfortunately, in my judgment, our subcommittee and our committee did not see fit to follow this pattern. Instead, the members of the committee who voted for this section, section 5, stated that any commission or group within a State could merely make out a statement that the State had complied, and the burden of proof that they had not complied would then shift automatically to the Secretary of Transportation.

The language which the Senate sent over, and which I will offer at the proper time as a substitute for section 5, states that the State agency would qualify if they adopted the Federal safety standards. That is No. 1.

No. 2, if they undertook a program satisfactory to the Secretary which was designed to achieve compliance with these standards and with the plans of inspection and maintenance requirements of the company.

No. 3, that the agency agreed to cooperate in a system of Federal compliance with the program.

However, there is one section, Mr. Chairman, which has not had enough emphasis and which I hope to develop, as I say, at the proper time, which has not been emphasized. This is that there was a condition precedent; namely, that before the Secretary of Transportation could enter into an agreement with any State agency he had to be satisfied that they did comply with the Federal standards and that they would thereby be eligible to participate in the Federal grants, that is, the matching 50 percent grants, which would thereby follow in order to induce the States to comply.

If section 5 is not changed, there is no longer any inducement for a State to improve its law in this regard, because it does not have to in order to get certification and to get its share of Federal money. It will get its share of Federal money whether it complies or not.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge our colleagues who are not as familiar with the bill as the members of the subcommittee or the committee to take a close look at this section, because I think in the vernacular of the Down Easter, we either have to fish or cut bait, and unless we are going to have regulation which is meaningful, we might as well have no Federal regulation at all.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues who are here on the floor to take a look at this section and, as I repeat, at the proper time I will introduce an amendment to try to correct this situation.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to say I feel the House version of this gas pipeline safety bill is superior in many ways to that of the other body and has been subjected to some unfair criticism. There are amendments, I am sure, that will be offered, because they were offered in the full committee, but I think the full thrust of the bill will be lost unless we do amend section 5.

Mr. SPINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The industry which brings natural gas from the fields to the homes and industrial users of this Nation has been the subject of phenomenal growth since the end of World War II. Gathering lines which carry the gas from the producing field to the larger, higher pressure lines have doubled and now approximate 63,000 miles. Transmission lines which carry the gas across the country to the local distributors have tripled to reach a present total of 224,000 miles, and lines which distribute the gas to the final customers have increased five times and there are now 536,000 miles of such lines.

In the course of all this expansion the safety record of the natural gas interstate pipelines has been outstanding. It varies somewhat according to the type of line we are talking about, but even the worst critics of the industry are forced to admit that this industry has been diligent in its safety practices and has in fact compiled an impressive record for safety.

Gathering lines have had so little trouble in the past because of their nature and their remote locations that the committee has seen fit to exclude from regulation under this bill all such lines which are found to be in rural areas. The Secretary of the Department of Transportation can make this determination and thus include any gathering line which comes near concentrations of people, or in urban areas.

The last category, distribution lines, is much harder to analyze. There is no doubt that the bulk of the danger lies at this point, where the flow of natural gas must be fanned out widely and piped into the individual home or factory. Determining what causes accidents when so many people and possible causes are involved becomes most difficult. It is also clear enough that here is the place where the most attention to safety must be paid. Certainly we should try in any legislation we pass to help eliminate those situations which endanger citizens because of either weak standards of construction, faulty maintenance, and hazardous situations which develop.

Uniformity of practice in an industry so widespread is desirable. The code which the industry itself devised as early as 1935 and upgraded many times through the years has been adopted for enforcement purposes by 26 States. That is good but obviously not complete. The code itself does not cover everything which should be included in a comprehensive code. So this bill does try to provide for uniformity of standards and uniformity of enforcement. Here is how it goes about it:

First. The Secretary of Transportation will establish minimum standards for the various kinds of pipelines, for storage facilities and some treatment facilities. In addition, the Secretary may move preemptorily to remove specific hazards;

Second. Those engaged in the business must meet these standards, must show a plan for inspection and maintenance, and keep records which are open to inspection;

Third. Enforcement will be by the Secretary for interstate lines. Those within a State can be handled by the State if it certifies to the satisfaction of the Secretary that it has all necessary authority to do what he wants and will actually so enforce. If this does not work, an agreement for part of the job can be made with the State. If the Secretary is not satisfied that the State can or will really do the job, he may step in and take over.

Fourth. There will be a Technical Pipeline Standards Committee, judicial review, civil penalties, injunctions and reports to Congress.

These are the principal features of the bill. I trust you will read this bill carefully. It is an important piece of legislation.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. As a matter of fact, does not the report present the statement that there have been no accidents for 6 years in the gathering lines segment of the industry?

Mr. SPRINGER. And that is true. I would say that before 6 years the accidents were very few, if any, before that time.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel it is necessary to change section 5 to give a Federal tinge to this bill? Do you think it is correct just to have a State clerk making out a certificate that says the State is an accomplice when, indeed it may not be?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think if that wording can be improved; yes. I would want to see the wording of that first.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PICKLE. I would like to inquire about this same point. Because, if, in truth and in fact, what the gentleman has said, that all that would be required would be for some clerk in a State office to fill out a report that the State has met by way of certification the standards required, then I think the committee as a whole would not be for the measure

and would want to see it strengthened. Surely, that should not be the case. I do not understand it that way. I am not a member of the subcommittee, but I understand from reading the report on pages 25, 26, and 27, it talks in terms of sections 5(a) and 5 (b).

Page 26 states that a "State agency which submits annually to the Secretary of Transportation a certification that such State agency—" and it lists the provisions. They are as follows:

(1) has regulatory jurisdiction over safety standards and practices of such facilities and transportation;

(2) has adopted each Federal safety standard applicable to such facilities and transportation as of the date of the certification;

(3) is enforcing each such standard; and

(4) has authority to require record maintenance, reporting, and inspection substantially the same as provided under section 12 and filing for approval of plans of inspection and maintenance described in section 11.

It seems to me that this is a rather detailed certification that a State must make to show that they are actually meeting these standards.

A great deal has been said about whether there ought to be an agreement as opposed to a certification. I do not know that it makes a great deal of difference, really. If there is, I would like for this record to show it, or for someone to point it out to me. I assume that when Members later offer amendments, they will lay that information before the House.

As I understand it, whether it is by way of certification or by way of an agreement, if the Secretary of Transportation signed the agreement, he would then be satisfied about the operations of the standards. If he was not, he would then reject the agreement or the certification and he could call for hearings. It would automatically go to a determination as to whether they were meeting these standards or not. There is a great deal of difference.

A great deal has been said which would leave the impression that this is a very weak approach. If indeed the point was so made that all that would be required would be a clerk to fill out a piece of paper, it would impute to each State that it did not have the good, legitimate, bona fide, safe interest of its citizens at heart. I do not think the gentleman intends to leave that impression, that a State would treat it that cavalierly.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield, I would say that any State is not going to try to fool the Federal Government by saying that they are in compliance with the Federal standards when they are not. But the gentleman is a lawyer. He understands very well the burden of proof. When they enter into an agreement under the Senate language with the Secretary of Transportation, they sit down and go over the matter, and then the Secretary says, "Well, yes, this State is in compliance." But under the language of our bill, the House bill, there is no need for that approach.

The State merely certifies that they are in compliance, and then the burden of proof shifts to the Secretary to show that they are not in compliance.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. I hasten to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I am not an attorney. But I have checked with members of our legal staff, and they have indicated to me that it would not make a great deal of difference whether it was by way of agreement or certification. For that reason I have been for the language of the report and the bill. It would not make that big a difference.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. In answer to the gentleman from Texas, I agree completely with the subcommittee chairman that this tilts the bill 180 degrees. We can have one of two types of regulations: either Federal regulations with the States coming in and complying with the Federal regulations and carrying them out by inspection, by maintenance, and by the other things that are required in this bill, which is what is required under an agreement system; the States must comply, and the States must show that they are complying, and anything that goes wrong at that point is then the responsibility of the person operating and the State.

When you tilt this bill 180 degrees, what happens is this: You are saying that the Federal Secretary, with almost no money, as shown in this bill, and with a penalty provision that applies only after an explosion has occurred, must go out and look at yay thousand miles of pipeline and say to the State, "You are not carrying out your duty at that point," and to shape up. To us, that is one of the key points of this bill.

I agree with the subcommittee chairman when he says section 5 is the key section that we must deal with and that our other amendments work up to and are part of.

What we are pointing out to the gentleman is that under this bill as written—and I agree completely with the ranking minority Member when he stated one of the great problems is in the distribution lines in these cities—if in the city of Baltimore or Boston or any other major city, there is a dangerous situation, either valves, or as happened in Georgia, the line is not deep enough under the ground, or, as in California, where they did not have cutoffs in the right places, and if the States have had this in existence and the States say, all right, we have adopted the standards and we say everything is all right, unless the Secretary goes out and catches them, and gets a specific order against a specific company, we just wait until something happens.

That is entirely different from a Federal regulatory system that says, here are the standards, here are the penalties, and if you do not comply and have not met the standards and brought yourselves up, then when there is an explosion or complaint from somebody, we will apply the penalty against you.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I will yield for a brief question from my distinguished colleague, but I do not think I can take too much time for that.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the statement of the gentleman from Texas, the major problems are in the cities where the pipelines were laid many years ago and where explosions have been occurring with quite some frequency, where conditions have been allowed to obtain and where we have really seriously dangerous pipeline conditions largely because the State public service commissions or public utilities commissions for one reason or another have not demanded the kind of standards, have not demanded the kind of maintenance, have not demanded the kind of inspection required to overcome this dangerous situation.

If we have State certification where the State already is delinquent in doing the job the public expects should be done, this is somewhat ludicrous. The idea here is to have the States come in to the Secretary, according to language in the Senate bill, and have them demonstrate they have adequate systems of maintenance and adequate systems of standards and adequate systems of inspection.

The Secretary can demand they do this or that or the other thing. He would not have that kind of opportunity under the certification provision. The State would not have to come to him and justify that their procedures are adequate. That is a major difference why we prefer this kind of language.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 1166, the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968.

This is a strong bill. This legislation gives new and greatly expanded authority to the Secretary of Transportation in the field of natural gas pipeline safety.

What does the bill do?

First. Directs the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe, within the next 24 months, minimum safety standards for the gathering, transportation, and distribution of gas. Until that time, the Secretary is directed to provide for "interim" safety standards. Both the "interim" standards and the "permanent" standards will apply throughout the Nation. The entire industry in every State will be bound by law to follow these safety standards. Everyone must comply under penalty of fines spelled out in the bill.

Second. Each person—who engages in the transportation of gas, or operates gas facilities, must file certain reports, plans, or records. The industry must permit inspection—not only of plant, equipment, and lines, but also of all files, records, and reports.

Third. Provides for enforcement of these standards and Federal requirements by a joint Federal-State effort. The individual States—those who can

show that an effective enforcement program is being carried out, can by certification or agreement maintain that enforcement program. If the States do not choose to cooperate in this joint enforcement program, then the Secretary of Transportation asserts complete Federal jurisdiction. In either case, the full weight, power, and authority of the Department is behind—not only the safety regulations—but the enforcement program.

Fourth. In addition, the bill provides for the establishment of a Technical Pipeline Safety Standards Committee, judical review of orders, civil penalties, research, and authorization of funds to operate the program.

Others today, have cited the growth of the overall gas industry. The safety record of the industry is also well documented in the hearings as well as the committee report. The entire record shows that this industry has a safety record which is low in relation to other industries.

While we must agree that this safety record is good, this does not indicate to me that we should do nothing. We can take some positive steps because we all recognize the serious potential of danger.

The basic tool in this bill, is the authority given the Secretary of Transportation to set minimum safety standards. This authority is clearly spelled out in the legislation. Every one engaged in the transportation and distribution of gas, must abide by these regulations.

In the enforcement area, this bill recognizes a Federal-State relationship. The hearing record shows that the Department of Transportation has no enforcement agency, expertise or staff. A number of the States have longstanding enforcement programs in effect.

Thus, under this bill, the States are given a role in the enforcement of the safety standards. I find it difficult to understand why there would be those opposed to section 5(a) of the bill. This section provides an arrangement where the safety standards—of the Secretary—will be enforced by a State agency—if that agency certifies among other things, that:

First. It has regulatory jurisdiction by law;

Second. Has adopted each Federal Safety standard;

Third. Is enforcing each such standard;

Fourth. Has legal authority to require the record maintenance, reporting, and inspection provided for in the bill; and

Fifth. Submission of various reports including "such other information as the Secretary may require."

This certificate is not the weak instrument that so many imply. The Secretary may reject it, take such other action as he deems appropriate, including the "assertion of Federal jurisdiction."

I feel that the States should properly be given a role in this safety program. Why should we write a bill that establishes a Federal program with no State participation. We have been moving in that direction too frequently and too far in recent years. It is time that the principle of a Federal-State partnership be restored. Section 5(a) as reported by the large majority of our committee recognizes this principle.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not true, after the States certify, the States also under this bill have the right then to waive compliance with any Federal statutes?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. The Secretary does not have to accept that certificate.

Mr. ADAMS. We come back to the original point again, which is that the Secretary then must go out and catch them, if he feels it is happening and he can find out about it. We have not given him money here to do it. When the States have waived compliance in these areas, he would find that waiver is really in the public interest. Under the agreement procedure the burden is upon the State to come in and show, and to continue to show, it is carrying out these standards, and is not waiving them.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, it is clearly stated in this legislation that the Secretary does not have to accept these certificates.

So far as the waiver is concerned, the individual States will have to apply to the Secretary for the waiver. If he does not want to grant it, he can stay the order. There is plenty of protection for the public interest.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I should like to ask the gentleman from Washington the meaning of some of the language in the proposed legislation, in view of his comments. I refer to page 30, lines 24 and 25, item (3). Can the gentleman interpret that for me, with reference to the State enforcement of compliance with Federal standards?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly. It simply says that the State has to certify it is enforcing such standards. Who is going to find out?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is the gentleman suggesting that the States would certify they are enforcing such standards when in fact they are not enforcing such standards?

Mr. ADAMS. I would say to the gentleman, that is the whole point. If they were enforcing the standards now and were maintaining the standards which they say are excellent in these States, we would not be having the accidents. The whole purpose is to set up standards and to require the States to come up to that level.

I do not say that these are bad men. I do not say that to the gentleman at all. I say they operate under an antiquated system, and this system is what we are trying to correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the point is that we do not now have Federal standards, so each State can enforce such standards as it has or does not have on its own.

Under the language of this proposed legislation I believe it is perfectly clear that the Federal standards will be set by the Secretary of Transportation and the State must certify that it is enforcing those Federal standards. If the State certifies this, then the gentleman's comment does not seem to be appropriate.

Mr. ADAMS. I would say to the gentleman, we remain exactly where the status quo is now, other than having the Secretary say, "You ought to be doing these things."

If the States maintain the same sorts of systems they have now, in inspection and all these other areas, we will not get compliance.

This is coupled with section 9, of which the gentleman is aware, the penalty provision, which says one cannot require any person to do anything until he has been given an opportunity to comply first. So we would not put any pressure on the industry to come up to State standards, and in effect, do not allow the States to enforce them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I should like to pursue this further.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It seems to me that item 2 on page 30 states clearly the individual States must adopt Federal standards; otherwise they will not be certified by the Secretary of Transportation.

Then item 3 says that they must certify that they are enforcing such standards.

The gentleman is either suggesting that either the States will certify they are enforcing the standards when they are not doing so or that the Secretary of Transportation will certify the States when he knows they are not enforcing his standards. Either the State public utilities commissions are assumed to be irresponsible or the Secretary of Transportation is a man of bad character or both. I am not sure I understand who the guilty party is assumed to be in this case.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield for an observation about that?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. My comments were directed to the gentleman from Washington, but I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Washington did not hear all of the testimony, since he is not a member of the subcommittee, but I know the gentleman did a thorough research of the problem.

I know the gentleman who is speaking, a very distinguished and able member of our subcommittee, heard the testimony in which the gas companies of the various States told the story. The one which comes to mind most readily is the one from St. Louis, Mo., which stated they lost x number of CC's of gas and could not account for that gas.

If their reports were to be given to the State, the State could easily take their report in good faith and still be in error. So nobody is saying anyone is out to

trick anybody else. It is just a fact of life that these explosions have occurred, and unless there was some reason for these explosions the Federal Government has no business trying to regulate them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I ask the gentleman if it would not be appropriate for the Secretary of Transportation to set in his standards a standard which would prohibit any loss of gas of the nature he describes so that such a loss would be reported and the Secretary's standard would require the State to require the utility company to correct the reason for gas loss so as to meet the Secretary's standard.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Right. If the gentleman will yield further, however, the State can certify itself out by a waiver of certification. It merely certifies itself it is doing a good job when indeed they might think they are doing a good job but in actuality they might be not complying with the full standards.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then, under this legislation the Secretary of Transportation can accept that State's certification or not, and if he does not accept it, then he is saying that the State is not meeting his requirements and the utilities are not meeting the requirements.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield further, I will point out that the burden of proof, as I said, shifts, and I will say again that the burden of proof shifts from the State, when the State says yes, they are complying and shows how they are under the Senate language, to the burden being on the Secretary of Transportation under our language, showing that the State is not in compliance. That is why I think this is a very important section of the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would say in response to the gentleman, before I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina who was kind enough to yield to me, that there seems to be a basic question here as to whether you trust more the Secretary of Transportation, who has no expertise in this field, admittedly, from his testimony, or some State officials who do have some expertise, because they have been involved in this industry regulation for some time.

Now I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Is it not true on page 32 of the bill the language says that the Secretary may reject the certification?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right. He can reject it.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Does it not also say in the language that the Secretary of Transportation may take "such other action as he deems appropriate to achieve adequate enforcement, including the assertion of Federal jurisdiction"?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right. And he can, as I understand it, under these provisions, go on and close down the distribution system of an entire community.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman asked me originally to reply—and I appreciate the comment of the chairman of the subcommittee—I would like to reply further.

As a simple and practical matter, if you say that the State can certify and then after they certify that the Secretary of Transportation must overturn that, then you have also written in with regard to the existing lines you cannot put in the standards on inspection and on installation and all the key points with regard to existing lines that are in the ground and with regard to the design.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, guns killed 6,000 last year, cars killed 50,000, aviation killed 1,300 last year, tornadoes killed 72 in less hours in May this year, industrial accidents kill 55 a day.

High pressure pipelines have killed 67 people in 18 years, and all but 17 were the result of such occurrences as trucks slamming into pumping stations and other such events having no relationship to standards or enforcement. That entire figure is equivalent to half a commercial planeload.

Statistics on casualties from failures of distribution lines are not available and causes would be difficult to determine in any event. Even proponents label the record very good. All this adds up to some but certainly not unreasonable hazard to life from the system that recovers and delivers natural gas to the consumers of the United States. It makes the odds of being blasted by gas from transmission lines even less than being hit by lightning, and in the city your chances are greater to be hit by a truck.

The fact that the industry has had an exceptional safety record does not argue against concentrating the responsibility for pipeline standards in one place. The Department of Transportation is that place because of its now comprehensive safety function. A scheme to keep standards up to date is worth having. A system of enforcement is desirable. But to make noises as though anyone against any particular arrangement to accomplish this is against motherhood and out to kill off the American public is nonsense, and I denounce it as such whether from Members of Congress or the Cabinet.

The plan devised by the referred Senate bill was workable, and I have no great quarrel with it. But it certainly was not perfect. The bill devised by the subcommittee and accepted by the overwhelming majority of the full Commerce Committee is in my judgment more workable and more adequate to the problem. I am not greatly impressed with the overall performance of State commissioners in this field. Experience gives me less reason, however, to think that I would be overly impressed with the way the Department of Transportation would perform. But I am basically in favor of leaving enforcement responsibility and such other functions of this kind with the States where possible. This is a place it appears to be possible. To suggest that doing so is selling out is unworthy of Members of this House.

It has been forgotten in the splurge of press releases, speeches, and letters to the editor that under both the system provided by S. 1166 and that in the committee bill the ultimate job of enforcement would be done by the States. The only difference is that under S. 1166 the Secretary would make agreements and pay for performance, and under our bill the States would first satisfy the Secretary that they would do everything as he wanted it, and then go ahead. If they will not or do not, he takes over either way.

All of the implications of the high-powered public relations program which has emanated from my colleagues and downtown are that certification by a State that it will do all the things found necessary and desirable by the Federal Government in this field is a capitulation of authority. It is interesting to note that the witness for the Department of Transportation did not view it that way when testifying before our committee. In fact, he went much further than the committee approach and indicated that the Federal Government might be willing to accept a certificate from a pipeline company itself that it had complied with the standards. Here is my exchange with witness Caldwell who accompanied Secretary Boyd at that hearing, as reported on page 25 of the record:

Mr. HARVEY. How many inspectors are you talking about?

Mr. CALDWELL. We did not figure it by the number of inspectors.

Mr. HARVEY. Well, did you just pull the $23 million out of the air?

Mr. CALDWELL. No, we didn't.

Mr. HARVEY. Where did it come from? This is what I want to know. In the letter from Secretary Boyd to Senator Magnuson he set forth all of this information you have given me so far. What I want to know is a breakdown. What sort of inspection are you going to plan? What do you intend to spend the $23 million for?

Mr. CALDWELL. Well now, you put the handle of inspecting on this $23 million.

Mr. HARVEY. I said inspection and enforcement, that is how you labeled it in the letter.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, sir. Actually there would be varying degrees of inspection and enforcement by various people and I cannot tell you the exact number of people that we will have inspecting. This was based——

Mr. HARVEY. All right. How many enforcers, if you can't tell me the number of inspectors, how many enforcers, do you plan hiring for $23 million?

Mr. CALDWELL. It was not figured on the basis of the number of people. It was figured on the miles of pipe and based on a ratio of new construction compared to pipe that is already in the ground.

Mr. HARVEY. Just one more——

Secretary BOYD. Mr. Harvey, if you would let him go on through——

Mr. HARVEY. Just one final question because my time is up here. But did you consider, at all, any sort of a certificate approach to the problem of having these companies who have been uninspected for years signing some sort of a certificate under oath they have complied with the standards and so forth and then making spot inspections instead of hiring all these inspectors?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, sir; this has been taken into consideration and this is one of the strong possibilities.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that whether a certificate of compliance is used, as provided in the House version of this bill, or the agreement method in the Senate version, the ultimate job of enforcement will be done by the States. Section 5(a) should be left as it is in the House version of the bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield

5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KUYKENDALL].

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, it seems we have arrived at another one of our cases here where a great deal of extra intelligence dwells and in some cases omnipotence seems to flow over the line into the District of Columbia when someone becomes a secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I do not happen to agree with this premise, that all the expertise in this great land lies here in the District of Columbia. In fact during the time that I listened to the testimony from downtown the less I think the expertise and intelligence lies here.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out first one of the dangers we face when we come to the consideration of this type of legislation.

After having listened to one Betty Furness and lectures from certain columnists and listening to attempts to create hysteria, I wonder if we have not become victims of legislation by hysteria.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things that this committee is being charged with is abandonment of our duty because we have chosen to say that 63,000 miles of gathering lines outside populated areas may be released from regulation by the Secretary, if he so desires.

Mr. Chairman, there has been no lost-time accidents in gathering lines in this Nation in the last 6 years—no lost-time accidents. I do not know of many activities of this Nation that has that good safety record, including walking down the front steps of the Nation's Capitol. I doubt if they have that good a safety record.

Let me point to this matter of gathering lines—and this is one of the areas that the committee bill has come under attack—the Secretary may designate any area that he wishes as a populated area, without recourse. It states very clearly that any populated area that the Secretary so designates and so defines comes under his regulation.

Now, let us go a step further about the gathering lines in the rural areas of our Nation. Mr. Chairman, the word "lines" means just what it says. Let us remember one thing. We are not talking about highways; we are not talking about canals, we are talking about privately owned pipelines on privately owned lands. Therefore, there is no law of eminent or public domain. In other words, there has to be a contract signed with the farmer or rancher before these gathering lines can be put on his land. The general rule is, among existing companies in this country, that a 2-inch pipeline may not be placed any closer than 200 feet from a farmhouse where they are located in rural areas.

It is true that in a great many instances the farmers do reach agreement with the pipeline companies to locate closer because they get free gas as a result thereof; that is from the gathering line that goes through his property. I do not know of any instance in the rural areas of this country where you would find a pipeline coming closer to a rural dwelling than this distance, particularly with reference to the gas transmission lines.

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

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

Mr. OTTINGER. In most cases with respect to the gathering lines, the subject matter to which I intend to offer an amendment to bring them back into the bill, the gentleman does not feel that a person in a rural area deserves any less protection than a person living in a populated area.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. The question which the gentleman from New York has propounded to me is similar to the question which is often asked, when did you quit beating your wife?

At this point I will repeat to the gentleman a little story about the fellow who had over his doorway a prayer which read as follows:

God protect my home from tigers.

Someone said to him, is not that a rather strange prayer?

He said:

Well, I have not been bothered with tigers at all; it works.

There have been no accidents, I will say to the gentleman from New York, no accidents.

Mr. OTTINGER. If the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate that, but supposing the Secretary finds there is a dangerous situation? Should we really have to wait until somebody is blown up before he takes action?

I particularly believe this becomes pertinent since so many of our rural areas are becoming urbanized at a very fast rate, and the provisions of this bill will require——

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KUYKENDALL].

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Let me point out here that I believe the overall philosophy that this particular incident best represents—and you can find a great many potential injury situations in this Nation, so that if you wanted to waste the taxpayers' money or the consumers' money you could cover them—but I believe we have learned something here in this Congress in the last couple of years; that when you waste the taxpayers' money indiscriminately you get into a fiscal problem and therefore get into the problem of maybe having to raise taxes as we are doing.

And when you start adding regulation after regulation after regulation, that is entirely unnecessary on the private sector, you are going to end up making the consumer pay the bill for nothing.

There have been no accidents. Certainly there are cases where you can build up subdivisions and immediately—immediately—present a request to the Secretary.

I would say to the gentleman from New York that it is a funny thing that this all-omnipotent Secretary of Transportation is all-wise when it comes to dealing with the States, but now the gentleman from New York has lost faith with him entirely when it comes to designating populated areas.

Mr. OTTINGER. If the gentleman will yield further, I would say no, I want the States to have to come to him, because I believe that will make for more efficient regulation. I believe in those States it is unreasonable to expect the Secretary to know about developing rural areas all over this country, and to include them within the coverage of this act.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. I would believe a person buying a home in a new subdivision might well be concerned about this, or a group of persons would be concerned about it, and I believe the State would be concerned about it in its approach to any populated community, and that the Secretary of Transportation is sensible enough to designate what areas are populated, and I happen to think that they would be.

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

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield whatever time he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ADAMS].

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I understand that we are going to go over until Tuesday, and that therefore we will be addressing ourselves in regard to this matter at that time.

But I do not want there to be any confusion among the opponents or proponents, majority or minority, as to the amendments to be offered. Therefore when we go back into the House, Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent that I may insert into the RECORD at this point the five specific amendments that will be offered to this bill on Tuesday.

The first will be by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER], the second by the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS], the third by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the fourth by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD], and the fifth by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ADAMS]—although they may not be offered in that particular order on Tuesday.

The amendments referred to follows:

AMENDMENT TO S. 1166, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. OTTINGER

On page 23, line 14 to line 21, strike "except that it shall not include the gathering of gas in those rural locations which lie outside the limits of any incorporated or unincorporated city, town, village, or any other designated residential or commercial area such as a subdivision, a business or shopping center, a community development, or any similar populated area which the Secretary may define as a nonrural area;".

AMENDMENT TO S. 1166, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. MOSS

On page 25, line 24, strike out "adopted. Whenever the Secretary shall find a particular facility to be hazardous to life or property, he shall be empowered to require the person operating such facility to take such steps necessary to remove such hazards." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "adopted, unless the Secretary finds that a potentially hazardous situation exists, in which case he may by order require compliance with any such standards."

AMENDMENT TO S. 1166, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

On page 28, line 16 to line 22, strike: "each of whom shall be experienced in the safety regulation of the transportation of gas and of pipeline facilities or technically qualified by training and experience in one or more

fields of engineering applied in the transportation of gas or the operation of pipeline facilities to evaluate gas pipeline safety standards,".

AMENDMENTS TO S. 1166, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. MACDONALD

On page 30, strike out line 11 and all that follows down through page 32, line 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"AGREEMENTS WITH STATE AGENCIES

"SEC. 5. (a) Subject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized by written agreement with an appropriate State agency to exempt from the Federal safety standards pipeline facilities and the transportation of gas not subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission under the Natural Gas Act, under which agreement such State agency—

"(1) adopts each Federal safety standard applicable to such transportation of gas and pipeline facilities and any amendment to each such standard, established under this Act;

"(2) undertakes a program satisfactory to the Secretary, designed to achieve adequate compliance with such standards and with the plans of inspection and maintenance required by section 11; and

"(3) agrees to cooperate fully in a system of Federal monitoring of such compliance program and reporting under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

No such agreement may be concluded with any State agency which does not have the authority (i) to impose sanctions substantially the same as are provided under sections 9 and 10, (ii) to require record maintenance, reporting, and inspection responsibilities substantially the same as are provided under section 12, and (iii) to require the filing for approval of plans of inspection and maintenance described in section 11.

"(b) With respect to any State agency with which the Secretary determines that he cannot enter into an agreement under subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary is authorized by agreement to authorize such agency to assume responsibility for, and carry out on behalf of the Secretary as it relates to pipeline facilities and the transportation of gas not subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission under the Natural Gas Act the necessary actions to—".

On page 33, beginning in line 12, strike out "safety program under a certification under subsection (a) or an agreement under subsection (b) of this section" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "such agreement".

On page 33, line 18, strike out "safety program" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "an agreement".

On page 34, strike out lines 7 through 17, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) Where an exemption from Federal standards for pipeline facilities or the transportation of gas is in effect under subsection (a) of this section the provisions of sections 8(a)(1), 8(a)(2), 9, and 10 of this Act, shall not apply. Any such exemption shall remain in effect until a new or amended Federal safety standard for pipeline facilities or the transportation of gas not subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission under the Natural Gas Act is established pursuant to this Act, and such exemption shall not apply to any such new standard or amendment until the State agency has adopted such new standard or amendment pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section. The provisions of this Act shall apply to such standard until such adoption has become effective."

AMENDMENT BY MR. ADAMS TO S. 1166

On page 37 strike out line 15 and all that follows down through and including line 2 on page 38, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 9. (a) Any person who violates any provision of section 8(a), or any regulation issued under this Act, shall be subject to a civil penalty of not to exceed $1,000 for each such violation for each day that such violation persist, except that the maximum civil penalty shall not exceed $400,000 for any related series of violations."

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I am going to make a motion in just a moment to rise, but I would like to state before I do that there has been an understanding between the ranking Member on the minority side, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], and myself that when we resume the debate on this bill next Tuesday that there will be 30 minutes of debate left to be consumed at that time.

I would like to put that in the RECORD.

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

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I concede that we have entered into that argreement voluntarily with the understanding that 15 minutes of the 30 minutes will be reserved for the minority.

Mr. STAGGERS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 1166, the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968.

The tremendous growth of the natural gas industry over recent years has created a need for uniform safety standards regulating the transportation of natural gases. Today there are over 800,000 miles of gas pipeline in the United States, varying in sizes, functions, and condition.

Many of our States have prescribed their own pipeline safety regulations in recent years, but all too often a marked difference is shown from State to State in effectiveness and enforcement of the particular standards. S. 1166 would provide the authority for the Federal Government to insure the public safety by establishing minimum uniform standards. At the same time, however, the bill gives the States an important role in enforcement and in amplifying distribution standards.

The gas transmission industry has maintained a relatively good safety record over the years. However, with the tremendous increase in the use of natural gas, especially in our cities, we cannot afford to subject the public to even the slightest risk of danger that can be prevented.

Mr. Chairman, S. 1166 embodies a very reasonable and practical approach to the problem of safety standards for gas pipelines. Of course, standards by themselves cannot provide absolute protection—there must be a working partnership and atmosphere of cooperation between the Federal Government, the States, and industry in order to attain our goal of insuring the public's safety. S. 1166 would provide the framework for such a program. I strongly urge its passage as recommended by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GALLAGHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1166) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe safety standards for the transportation of natural and other gas by pipeline, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill, S. 1166.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TIME FOR GENERAL DEBATE ON S. 1166

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the Committee of the Whole continues the consideration of the bill (S. 1166) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe safety standards for the transportation of natural and other gas by pipeline, and for other purposes, that the time for general debate be limited to 30 minutes with 15 minutes for the minority and 15 minutes for the majority site.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the majority leader what the legislative program is for the remainder of this week and what is scheduled for next week.

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the minority leader and in accordance with our announcement of yesterday, the House will not meet tomorrow and, therefore, we will not take up the remaining bills that were listed on the program for this week.

The program for next week is as follows:

On Monday, the Consent Calendar, with five suspensions:

H.R. 17872, to amend the National School Lunch Act;

H.R. 17873, to amend the National School Lunch Act;

S. 2837, to establish the Cradle of Forestry in America, Pisgah National Forest, North Carolina;

H.R. 15714, to extend operating life of certain inland vessels; and

H.R. 13844, Federal employees leave for funerals of certain relatives and for National Guard duty.

Also H.R. 17134, Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968—open rule, 3 hours of debate; waiving points of order.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week:

The Private Calendar;

Department of Transportation appropriation bill, fiscal year 1969;

S. 1166, Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968—continue consideration;

H.R. 16361, District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1968—under general rules of the House;

H.R. 14096, penalties for unlawful acts involving LSD and other drugs—open rule, 1 hour of debate; and

H.R. 10564, marketing orders on pears for canning or freezing—open rule, 1 hour of debate.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program will be announced later.

Of course, pursuant to the previous announcement, there will be no legislative business from the close of business on Wednesday, July 3, until noon Monday, July 8.

I would like to advise Members that we may have to request permission to come in early and work late if, after a long day on Monday, we are not able to finish or see that we shall not be able to finish all the business by Wednesday evening. I realize the distinguished gentleman from Missouri has some comments on that matter. I would like to advise that we will only make such request in the event it is obvious we need to do so in order to finish the program by Wednesday evening.

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

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

Mr. HALL. I am glad to comment further. There will be no unanimous consent granted for that purpose if we adjourn in the early hours on Monday.

Mr. ALBERT. That was the reason for my comment. The gentleman had advised me of that and I think we can expect a long day on Monday and, as I said, there is the possibility that we may request permission to come in early on Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important that all Members fully realize that we are to have a fairly full schedule on Wednesday, and should anticipate such a schedule in their planning for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

PRIVATE CALENDAR BILL H.R. 16187 TO BE PASSED OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H.R. 16187 be passed over and not considered when the Private Calendar is called on July 2, 1968.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, JULY 1, 1968

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today that it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the majority leader shed any light whatever on the situation that will obtain about the first of August when a very vital Republican Convention is due to get started? Do you have anything to offer so the Members can make plans?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, at the most recent meeting of the leadership of this side with the corresponding leaders of the other body, everyone was in agreement that we should try to adjourn the Congress by that time. But the gentleman knows, of course, that we will adjourn in due time for the Republican Convention to convene and to hold its sessions in Miami, where the delegates might engage in other pleasant activities to their taste.

Mr. GROSS. But we have no way of knowing at this time whether there would be a convening of the House between the Republican Convention and the Democrat Convention.

Mr. ALBERT. We hope that will be a moot question.

Mr. GROSS. With all my heart I hope the gentleman is correct, that it is a moot question.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

HON. ABE FORTAS AND HOMER THORNBERRY

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, the appointment of Abe Fortas as Chief Justice elevates to this highest judicial position in America one of our most brilliant men.

I congratulate Justice Fortas. This was an outstanding appointment. I am sure Mr. Justice Fortas will perform his new duties in the finest and highest traditions of the office.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time primarily to congratulate my dear friend, our former colleague in the House of Representatives, Homer Thornberry, on his appointment to the Supreme Court and to commend the President for selecting him for this most important position.

Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Homer Thornberry will give to the Supreme Court the character and service of one of the finest men I have ever known.

As a colleague, Homer Thornberry was, in my judgment, an ideal legislator. He approached his work with rare dedication and insight. He demonstrated here in this Chamber those qualities which will make him an outstanding member of the Nation's highest court. Homer is one of the most judicious persons I have ever known. He is cast in the mold of that other great Texan, the late Sam Rayburn. His commonsense, his judicial temperment, and his good judgment were qualities that our great Speaker recognized in him when he first came to the House of Representatives.

After Mr. Rayburn's death, our late President John F. Kennedy, our great and distinguished Speaker, John McCormack, and I and others in the leadership of the House of Representatives never had a more devoted and able friend and assistant in the House of Representatives and on the Committee on Rules.

Homer was always there when needed, always stanch, steadfast, and courageous.

During the first private conversation I had with President Kennedy after his inauguration, a Federal judgeship for Homer Thornberry was one of the topics of our discussion. President Kennedy later told me he had decided to offer Homer Thornberry a judgeship at the earliest opportunity here in the District of Columbia if a vacancy did not develop in his own State of Texas.

It was indeed fortunate that shortly thereafter an opening did become available on the Federal district bench in the State of Texas. President Kennedy appointed him to that position. Of course, he had strong backing both from then Vice President Johnson and Senator Yarborough.

President Johnson long ago recognized Homer Thornberry's qualities. He was the President's Congressman and one of the President's most intimate friends. While the President was still in the Senate, he and I often talked about Homer

Thornberry and how ideally suited he was for a Federal judgeship.

Later on President Johnson elevated him to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and he has now been able to appoint him to the position on the Supreme Court.

I know Homer Thornberry. I know his fiber. I know his character. I have never had a finer friend. I have never known a better man. In my opinion, no more outstanding appointment to the Supreme Court could possibly have been made.

Mrs. Albert and I join in congratulating both President Johnson and Judge Thornberry. We share in the joy that Homer Thornberry's family, his lovely wife, Eloise and his three children, are experiencing on this day. They are among God's chosen people. May He bless them in the years ahead.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. I shall ask permission to file opposing and slightly diverse views on the same subject, including with my remarks pertinent material.

CRONIES ON THE COURT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Yesterday the President announced his appointment of Associate Justice "Abe" Fortas as the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. This appointment is an outrage to all reasonable thinking citizens.

Among others, I had hoped that since the President had taken himself out of the arena of partisan politics, he would forego the appointment and let the new and upcoming administration make the selection. This new administration would represent the new thinking of the country. However, the President chose to revert to his old ways and methods, and showed callous disregard for changing public opinion, the theory of judicial restraint, and perhaps more important qualifications for the bench. By reverting to his old croneyism, Lyndon Baines Johnson may bequeath a legacy of Supreme Court decisions unworthy of any nation's highest tribunal for the next 20 years. This legacy will consist of total disregard of judicial restraint, further eroding of the checks and balances of three co-equal branches of Government, greater destruction of the rights of society against the criminal element, and more indifference to the rights of property.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Abe Fortas as Chief Justice will do just that. The appointment of old croney Homer Thronberry will merely aggravate the situation. One need but refer to the Martindale-Hubbell Law Directory for qualifications—or lack thereof—in this instance.

The blemishes on Abe Fortas' record still remain. They are no different today than they were in 1965 when he was first appointed to the Court. He is still the same old Abe Fortas that was associated with Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Owen Lattimore, Bobby Baker, and Walter Jenkins.

I certainly hope that the other body long deliberates on these two fantastic appointments. I hope that they will refuse confirmation and this blatant croneyism, so that the interests of the American people are protected. We cannot afford "Court by Croney".

Articles from the Chicago Tribune and Esquire magazine follow:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, July 29, 1965]

FIXER ON THE BENCH

Abe Fortas, the man President Johnson has appointed to the seat vacated by Arthur J. Goldberg on the Supreme court, has been a political fixer around Washington since the earliest days of the New Deal more than 30 years ago. He has run some important errands for Mr. Johnson and has had a somewhat dizzying record defending loyalty and security risks.

When, last October, at the height of the Presidential campaign, Lyndon Johnson found himself deeply embarrassed, he turned instinctively to Fortas. The embarrassment was occasioned by the disclosure that Walter Jenkins, Mr. Johnson's most trusted White House assistant, had been arrested for a second time by Washington police on a morals charge.

Jenkins, aware of Fortas' close relationship with Johnson, anticipated the President by telephoning Fortas with the word, "I'm in terrible trouble." Fortas arranged for Jenkins to meet him at the Fortas home in Georgetown, where he poured out his story. The newspapers had got hold of the facts.

Fortas immediately called Clark Clifford, another lawyer with clout, an intimate of Presidents Truman and Johnson, and together they made the rounds of the Washington newspapers, seeking to get the story suppressed. But Mr. Johnson, in New York, learned that the story would shortly move on the wire services. He called Fortas at once and assigned him to go to the hospital where Jenkins had been put in storage and get his resignation. Fortas was able shortly to report that the mission has been accomplished, and Mr. Johnson was able to wash his hands of a scandal.

In previous time Fortas helped Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White, soviet agents, to draft the United Nations charter. He appeared as counsel for Owen Lattimore when that "expert" on the orient had to rush home from Afghanistan to face charges by the late Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy that he had been promoting communist objectives in Asia.

Lattimore termed Fortas a "solid rock" in helping him thru his "ordeal." Fortas' services did not, however, save Lattimore from being indicted on seven charges of perjury arising from his testimony before the Senate internal security subcommittee, nor did it prevent the committee from pronouncing that from around 1930 Lattimore had been "a conscious, articulate instrument of the soviet conspiracy."

"Liberals," however, know their way around Washington, and a federal judge of that persuasion was easily induced to get Lattimore off the hook by finding that the indictment lacked "clarity." The department of justice had suggested that the judge disqualify himself for reasons of manifest bias, but the suggestion was spurned and the case never went to a jury to be heard on its merits. Fortas and his associates represented Lattimore.

The appointment of Fortas has two advantages in the eyes of the administration. It provides the White House with an astute and trusted agent with a sharp instinct for the political angles on the highest court in the land, and it perpetuates the "liberal" majority which holds forth under Chief Justice Earl Warren. If it also pays off a few political debts, who, among friends, is to cavil about that?

[From Esquire, June, 1965]

ABE, HELP!—L. B. J.

(By Charles B. Seib and Alan L. Otten)

Politically, the law firm of Arnold, Fortas and Porter is the most powerful in Washington, D.C. The number-one partner, Thurman Arnold, was a famous New Deal trustbuster and is now recognized as one of the wiliest old lawyers in the Capital. The third partner, Paul Porter, was in charge of price controls during most of World War II and is on a first-name basis with everybody who matters. And the man in the middle, Abe Fortas, an Undersecretary of the Interior in the Roosevelt era, is confidant, adviser, good friend and behind-the-scenes handyman to the President of the United States.

Arnold is a presence. Porter is a hail fellow. Fortas is a dry, quiet, violin-playing legal craftsman. And today, in Johnsonian Washington, the greatest of these is Fortas. Any White House insider, when asked to name the men on whom President Johnson most relies for unofficial help and advice, will almost certainly put Fortas on the list, very likely at the top. But ask just what he does for the President and you'll get a mystifying variety of answers: he's a fixer, the man who takes on jobs too delicate to be done by anyone with official status; he's always close at hand, either actually or at the other end of the phone line, suggesting, reacting, developing; his contacts with the President are only occasional but consequential—a discussion of an important speech or message, a hashing over of candidates for a top appointment, the dissection of a proposed Great Society project.

The President and Fortas are on the telephone together at least once a day and often as many as three or four times. One top White House aide says, "He's as close to Johnson as Bobby Kennedy was to Jack" (an analogy Fortas rejects out of hand). According to another White House staff member, "There is very little of importance that affects Lyndon Johnson that he won't at some point talk over with Abe Fortas." Fortas himself maintains that the relationship has been greatly exaggerated, but members of his own firm report that he is constantly being called out of conferences to take White House calls. Neighbors say the President is a frequent evening guest at the Fortas home.

The "mystery" surrounding Johnson vis-à-vis Fortas is unreal, for there must always be a good deal that is secret or at least never revealed concerning the President and the men who do his personal bidding.

Assigning all the unreliable rumors and obfuscations to their proper place, the following emerges as a fair picture of the Johnson-Fortas relationship:

Fortas is respected by Johnson as an extremely intelligent man who is as knowledgeable as anyone in Washington in the technicalities of government and the law. He has the advantage both of a thirty-year friendship with the President and the independence that his refusal to accept an official position gives him; he owes the President nothing and the President knows it. In this context, his advice is sought on important appointments; on administration policies, particularly in the domestic field; on the content and phrasing of speeches and messages. He is sought out in times of stress, as in the days immediately after the Kennedy assassination and when there is a ticklish job to be done (as when the President needed a trust agreement that would disconnect the family television holdings from high office).

This dependency extends beyond the President. It is clear that when an emergency arises in the Johnson official family, it's Fortas who is called first.

Nothing is more illustrative of this than the Walter Jenkins case. The sequence of events on the day it all came out is revealing.

That morning—Wednesday, October 14, 1964—The Washington *Star*, acting on a tip, sent a reporter to the records of the Metropolitan Police morals squad. There he found that a Walter Jenkins, on the basis of identifying data clearly the one in the White House, had been arrested once in 1959 and again just the week before in the men's room of the Washington YMCA, a notorious hangout for homosexuals. In both cases he had posted collateral, later forfeited, and been released. A *Star* editor called Mrs. Elizabeth Carpenter, Mrs. Johnson's press secretary (George Reedy, the President's press secretary, was out of the city with Mr. Johnson), told her the facts and asked if the White House knew about the arrests and had any comment. Choking down her shock, Mrs. Carpenter said the whole thing was ridiculous but she would look into it. A few minutes later she called back and said that she had talked to Jenkins and that he would be calling The *Star* to deny the story as a case of mistaken identity.

Jenkins never called. But within fifteen minutes Abe Fortas was on the telephone to say that he was coming down to The *Star* at once.

The first edition was about to go to press, but The *Star* decided to hold out the story of the arrest until Fortas could have his say. And within minutes he appeared with Clark Clifford, another Washington lawyer and friend of the President. Jenkins, it developed, had rushed to Fortas' Georgetown home as soon as he had learned from Mrs. Carpenter that The *Star* knew of the arrests. He was distraught, Fortas said, in a state of emotional collapse, and asking for help.

Fortas himself was deeply shocked. He examined The *Star*'s information and conceded that it appeared to be true. In a low, exhausted voice he urged compassion—saying that this was a sick man, a man who had been working day and night ever since Johnson assumed the presidency, a man so devoted to his boss and his job that his wife had to bring his dinner to his desk because he wouldn't take time out for meals. The night of the most recent arrest, Fortas said, Jenkins had gone to a cocktail party after a day of hard work and had a few drinks; he couldn't remember what had happened to him after that. (According to the police records, he went to the YMCA, a few blocks from where the party was held, and was there arrested by morals-squad officers in the men's room in the company of another man.)

Fortas urged The *Star's* editors to think carefully and humanely before they printed the story. He reminded them of Jenkins' wife and six children. He assured them Walter Jenkins would be hospitalized and stated flatly that his days as a White House aide were over.

The *Star* decided not to print the story—a decision consistent with the paper's policy in such morals cases—and Fortas and Clifford went on to present their case before Washington's other papers. As it turned out, United Press International finally broke the story of the arrests that evening, but by then Jenkins was a patient in a Washington hospital and the President, in New York, was about to "accept" his resignation.

The incident illustrates several things about Fortas. First, his role in the official family: when beset by the blackest trouble man can imagine, Jenkins literally ran to him. Second, his high status; although he had not been in touch with the President, he was able to say confidently in the conference with The *Star* editors that Jenkins was finished at the White House—and they knew his word had the stamp of authority.

A top-level White House staff member, thinking back over the Jenkins case recently, said it was easy to understand why the distraught man turned to Fortas when he found himself in deep trouble. "Walter had been with Lyndon Johnson for many, many years," he explained. "And he naturally thought of Fortas just the way the President thinks of him—as the ablest, wisest counselor around." Johnson had this in mind when he offered Fortas—even urged upon him—the job of Attorney General of the United States when Robert Kennedy resigned in the Summer of 1964. Fortas turned it down.

While he won't comment specifically on the offer of the attorney generalship, Fortas was willing in a recent interview to hold forth on the question of going back into the government as a general proposition.

"I have made it clear to the President," he said, "that I'm simply not interested in returning to government. I've been through all that. Now I'm fifty-four years old. I want to be able to give time to my music. I have a law firm with large interests. We've got a lot of fine young lawyers who marry fine young wives and have fine young babies I have my responsibilities here."

As he spoke his eyes swept contentedly over the modern art and comfortable furniture that adorn his office in the high-ceilinged old mansion his firms occupies in the fashionable DuPont Circle area. It was clear that he likes his life's present rewarding course and that it will take something very special—perhaps the Supreme Court appointment for which he is frequently mentioned—to tempt him to change it.

There may be another contributing reason for his decision to stay out of government. President Johnson is a notoriously difficult man to work for—insistent, demanding, hard-riding, sometimes brutal. By remaining with his law firm Fortas can avoid the rigors of a formal working relationship with Johnson and possibly, because of his independence, play an even more important role in national affairs than he could if he took a high administration position.

Although the Fortas-Johnson friendship began back in the Roosevelt days, it became considerably closer after President Kennedy's assassination. Johnson turned to Fortas for help almost immediately after his return from Dallas. On the plane to Washington, the President had considered the need for a blue-ribbon investigation of the assassination that would put to rest forever all questions and speculations. The next night at Les Ormes, his Washington home which he continued to use during the early days of his presidency, he asked Fortas to go to work on what was to become the Warren Commission. That was just one of the assignments Johnson gave his old friend during the period of transition. "You must remember," Fortas said recently, "that there was no functioning White House during that time directly after the assassination. President Kennedy's staff was in a state of shock. Ted Sorensen, who had been the key man on the Kennedy staff, was completely out of action. At the Justice Department, of course, it was somewhat the same thing."

Exactly what Fortas did for the President in that period is not known. But it is interesting to note that less than two weeks after Johnson took office the lawyer notified a Washington court that he was withdrawing as attorney for the President's one-time Senate aide, Bobby Baker, then under Senate investigation. The reason given: "In the crisis of transition, I have undertaken certain assignments" for the President. He expounded no further, but some of his later assignments are indeed known. For example, he took part in strategy conferences when the Democratic Convention in Atlantic City was thrown into a turmoil by the challenge of the Mississippi delegation by civil-rights groups. Also, he and Clark Clifford and White House assistants Bill Moyers and Douglass Cater had weekly strategy luncheons throughout the presidential campaign. In fact, he was in and out of the White House all through the fall, checking on the flood of new scandal rumors released by the Republicans. "We were running a damn vice squad over there the last few weeks of the campaign," an associate recalls. "And Abe was squad leader."

After the election, he and Clifford were asked to suggest ways of streamlining the White House staff and to keep their eyes open for talent to fill a huge backlog of vacancies in key government posts. One important job was filled, by the way, by a bright young lawyer from Arnold, Fortas and Porter—Sheldon Cohen, who became legal counsel and later Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service.

Through it all Fortas continued to function as the President's personal attorney. Soon after Johnson became President, Fortas presided at a meeting at Les Ormes at which an agreement was drafted to put the Johnson television properties into a trust, at least theoretically sealing them off from presidential influence.

The meeting took place in the elegant second-floor sitting room. Two trustees-to-be, A. W. Moursund and J. W. Bullion, Texas lawyers long involved in Johnson affairs, were present. So were Leonard Marks, the Johnson lawyer on television and radio matters, and tax specialists from the Fortas firm. Mrs. Johnson, active head of the television interests, was there throughout, and the President drifted in and out of the sitting room.

The choices facing the conference were clear: the President and his family could keep the stations and operate them, which, in view of the close Federal control of broadcasting, would mean a highly embarrassing conflict of interests; they could sell the properties outright, paying a tremendous capital-gains tax on the great increase in value since acquisition; or they could put them in a trust that would remove them from the family's control for as long as Mr. Johnson held public office. Practically all present favored the trust, and Fortas supervised its creation.

Today Fortas echoes the President's annoyance with criticism of the trust. He defends it as "the tightest, toughest trust arrangement ever drawn for a public official." To those who question the wisdom of appointing a close friend and associate of Johnson to head the trust he says snappishly, "Anyone who says anything like that just doesn't know Judge Moursund."

Despite this spirited defense, some influential voices have been raised against the agreement Fortas devised. The New York *Times*, for one, recently criticized the President because his assets are "in the hands of a trustee who is an old friend and business associate with whom he continues to maintain a close personal relationship," and because much of the fortune consists of television and radio stations, which depend on franchises issued by the Federal Communications Commission, whose members are appointed by the President.

Fortas is considered an expert on the Johnson financial position generally, although he is not inclined to talk about it. When The Washington *Star* was about to publish an exhaustive study of the family wealth, Press Secretary Reedy referred the newspaper to Fortas, who went over the proposed story, line by line, disclosing a tremendously detailed knowledge of Johnson's financial position. During the 1964 campaign, when news stories and Republican campaign speeches about his wealth began to get under Johnson's skin, the White House made public a formal accounting by the firm of Haskins and Sells. It was Fortas who made the arrangements with the accountants and gave them their instructions.

In January, 1964, Fortas stepped into another delicate situation. The Washington *Star* uncovered details of the gift of a stereo record player in 1959 to Johnson, then Sen-

ate Majority Leader, by Don Reynolds, who had written several large insurance policies on Johnson's life. It was a touchy matter because the Bobby Baker story had just broken, and Baker was alleged to have solicited the stereo for Johnson. A copy of The *Star's* proposed story on the gift was taken to the White House and Andrew Hatcher, the assistant press secretary on duty, was asked if the President would care to comment. Hatcher glanced at the story, left the room with it for ten or fifteen minutes, and then returned to say that there was no comment.

But by the time The *Star* executive handling the story got back to his office, Fortas was on the phone to the paper's editor, urging that publication be withheld. When the full facts came out, he said, they would give a different picture of the whole incident. In this case, after a few minor changes, the story was published and proved correct in every essential detail.

On the face of it, Johnson and Fortas are an oddly matched pair, a big, driving Texan and a slight, restrained Memphis Jew. Fortas says that originally it was admiration for Franklin D. Roosevelt that brought them together. They met some thirty years ago, when Johnson was an assistant to Congressman Richard Kleburg, the King Ranch cattle baron from Texas, and Fortas was a Yale assistant professor of law getting his feet wet in the Washington bureaucracy on weekends and vacations. As Fortas recalls it, they were introduced by Arthur Goldschmidt, a Texan and a mutual friend. They soon developed a warm friendship cemented by their commitment to F.D.R. and the New Deal. As each man moved ahead—Fortas through a number of government assignments and then into private law practice and Johnson up the political ladder—the relationship flourished.

One has to go below the surface to find the reasons for their similarities. Both are compulsive workers; Fortas puts in long days at the office, then works beside his phone evenings and weekends almost as feverishly as Johnson. And as with Johnson, his magnolia-tinted charm does not completely hide the tension and drive.

It would be foolish to deny that self-interest, too, has kept them together. Johnson, as an ambitious politician, needed—and needs—trustworthy counsel. Fortas, first as a rising bureaucrat and later as a practicing lawyer, has not suffered from this important friendship. Finally, just as the New Deal drew them together, they still see eye to eye in their political philosophy.

Fortas subscribes completely to Johnson's Great Society approach and sees it as an extension of the pattern set by Roosevelt. "It is New Deal to the extent that it manifests itself in concern for people and in a readiness to put the government to work where necessary to accomplish things for them," he says. "But there is a fundamental difference from the old New Deal philosophy, and it's most dramatically illustrated by the President's insistence on unity and consensus. This, I think, accurately reflects the fact that the country's posture today is such that it can and should move as a whole to do the things that need to be done. Back in the New Deal days some segments of society had lagged so far behind that it was necessary to take measures for them alone."

The first professional service Fortas remembers performing for Johnson was crucial to the Texan's political career. In 1948 Lyndon Johnson, then a member of the House of Representatives, was trying to move to the Senate and was engaged in a bitter primary fight with Coke Stevenson, a former Texas governor. The vote was close and was followed by charges and counter-charges of fraud and vote-stealing. The State Democratic Executive Committee finally decided—29 to 28—that Johnson had won the Democratic nomination, which was then tantamount to election, by eighty-seven votes out of almost one million cast. But the Stevenson forces went to court with charges of fraud in Jim Wells County and threatened to keep Johnson from being certified as the Democratic nominee. A Federal district judge enjoined the state from printing ballots so designating Johnson, pending an investigation.

As he was later to do repeatedly, Johnson turned to Fortas for help. "I was in Dallas taking depositions in an antitrust case," Fortas recalls, "and suddenly I got a call from Alvin Wirtz [a close mutual friend]. 'Lyndon's here in Fort Worth and he's in trouble,' Wirtz told me. 'Come over right away.'"

Fortas managed to extricate himself from his antitrust case and went to Fort Worth where he found a desperate situation. Johnson, at the end of his money and credit, was faced with the danger of having to go through another campaign. A strategy was devised by Fortas and the other lawyers that very night. An appeal from the district judge's ruling was filed in the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals and then Fortas brought the case to Washington, going before Justice Hugo Black, the Supreme Court Justice charged with hearing emergency appeals from that circuit. After Fortas presented Johnson's case, Black ruled that the district judge had overstepped himself, and stayed the injunction.

Although the eighty-seven-vote margin won him the nickname "Landslide Lyndon," which he hates, Johnson easily won the election and his rise to power and the presidency was advanced an important step.

Fortas continued to do chores for Johnson all through his career as Senate Majority Leader and Vice-President, but his role only rarely came to public notice. Senate aides say he was an influential adviser on the two civil-rights bills Johnson pushed through the Senate in 1957 and 1960—measures Johnson was to cite repeatedly as evidence that he had outgrown his Southern background. Fortas proudly states that he backed Johnson's attempt to win the Presidential nomination in 1960. "My liberal friends were startled," he says, "but I told them that I knew the man—that if he were to do only one-tenth of what he actually did but spend more time telling people about what he'd done and what he believed in, people would be falling all over themselves to get behind him. I had the advantage of knowing him and what he stood for."

When Johnson, as Vice-President was head of the government's Equal Employment Opportunity Committee, seeking to reduce discrimination in hiring, Fortas unofficially supervised the early work on policies and regulations. "Any problems we had we were told to 'check it with Abe.'" a staffer recalls.

Fortas refuses to discuss his present work for Johnson. He considers the President as his client, and no good lawyer discusses his client's business. The silence that he—and the White House—observe gives rise to all sorts of conjecture. Early this year, for example, one Washington writer noted that the President's health message had failed to support any campaign to discourage cigarette smoking and suggested darkly: "It may be merely a coincidence that the President's personal attorney and close confidant is Abe Fortas, whose law firm represents Philip Morris cigarettes."

This is recognition in the Washington manner, and it is a sort of backhanded realization of the American dream for the Memphis cabinet-maker's son who began making his living at the age of thirteen by playing the violin at dances and parties.

Fortas' family came to this country from England and went directly to Memphis, where his father's older brother lived. Abe was the last of five children, the second to be born in the United States. His childhood, he recalls, was "as poor as you could imagine," but with the help of his violin he put himself through Southwestern College in Memphis and Yale Law School.

Immediately on graduation from law school in 1933 he joined the Yale faculty, serving as an assistant professor under William O. Douglas, the present Supreme Court Justice. Before long, however, Douglas and other Yale colleagues were in Washington working for the New Deal. And soon they were calling on Fortas for special assignments on weekends and vacations at the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, Securities and Exchange Commission and other alphabet agencies. By 1938 he was ready for full-time Washington work, and Douglas, then chairman of the S.E.C., installed him as assistant director of the Public Utilities Division.

Fortas' sharp legal mind and Southern charm moved him steadily up the bureaucratic ladder. He became general counsel of the Public Works Administration, head of the Interior Department's Coal and Power Division, and eventually Under Secretary of Interior under Harold Ickes.

Soon after the war ended he left the government to form a law partnership with Thurman Arnold and two other former government lawyers (Porter joined the firm a few years later). Today it is a high-powered operation of about forty lawyers, most of them former government officials or teachers, practically all chosen because of their intellectual capacity. Arnold, Fortas and Porter lawyers tend to throw themselves into cases with distinctive fervor. "We're the Avis of the law field," says one partner. "We try harder. We're the firm people come to when they are looking for a miracle."

The business is almost entirely oriented to the Federal Government—cases involving taxes, antitrust suits, savings-and-loan regulation cases, proceedings before the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the like.

The reporter's attempt to link the absence of an anti-cigarette statement in the President's health message with Fortas' representation of Philip Morris illustrates the delicate position he occupies as a man with the President's ear and a lawyer doing business with the government.

There are some who feel that Fortas could be a bit more like Caesar's wife when he gets into such activities as, for example, his work for the cigarette makers, who are wrestling with the government over warnings against smoking on labels and in advertising.

Fortas has described himself as a "meticulous legal craftsman." An associate calls him "one of the most able legal machines I have ever seen." He is rated an outstanding appellate arguer, and one of the best brief writers in the business.

But he is considered a difficult man to work for—demanding, exacting, always after perfection. "Take it back and put some poetry into it," he once told a junior lawyer who had worked up an important brief. He meant the legal work was fine, but the thing needed polish and style.

He is almost unfailingly serious and businesslike. He has no small-talk topic other than his longtime love, music. "I wish he'd laugh more," a long-standing associate says. And another comments, "I can't imagine any better professional opportunity than to practice law with him, but he's the last guy I'd want to spend a weekend with."

Fortas also was the hero in the 1963 Gideon case before the Supreme Court, recently described by The New York *Times* reporter Anthony Lewis in his book *Gideon's Trumpet*. Clarence Earl Gideon, who had been convicted of burgling a Florida poolroom, claimed in a handwritten petition to the Supreme Court that he had been convicted illegally. He couldn't afford a lawyer, he said, and the Florida court had refused to appoint one for him. This denied his constitutional right to "due process of law."

In a proud exercise of American justice, the

Supreme Court accepted Gideon's case and appointed Fortas to argue it. Characteristically, he threw himself into the assignment. "I want this to be a little jewel," he told the assistant working with him on the brief. The result was an historic decision that the "due-process" clause in the Fourteenth Amendment requires that each accused person be represented in state criminal trials by a lawyer whether he can afford one or not. For Gideon, it meant a new trial, with a lawyer, and acquittal.

Fortas has also been involved in a number of the early civil-liberties cases of the McCarthy era, defending government employees and others accused of disloyalty. One of these early cases involved Owen Lattimore, the State Department adviser, a prime McCarthy target. His experience with this case established for him the fact that association with a "cause" case does not necessarily scare away bread-and-butter clients.

The general counsel for Unilever, one of his firm's big accounts, arrived from Holland for a conference with Fortas just as Lattimore was called to testify on Capitol Hill. Fortas told the Unilever man that he wouldn't be able to meet with him since he had to go to the hearing. For lack of anything else to do with his time, the Dutch lawyer went along. There he became so enraged with the McCarthy technique and so impressed with the Fortas performance that he left more enthusiastic about the Fortas firm than ever. Some years later, when Fortas and Porter were on a European trip, they visited the Unilever man at his estate outside Amsterdam and while there noticed a trio of geese parading across the lawn. Their host and his wife informed them that the geese were named Arnold, Fortas and Porter. They hastened to explain, however, that this was a compliment, since geese traditionally have warned of barbaric invasion, and the law firm was doing the same thing in handling civil-liberties cases.

Perhaps the firm's victories in "cause" cases have convinced businessmen that Arnold, Fortas and Porter was an aggressive, sharp group of lawyers. Or perhaps the firm's deep roots in government service and impeccable political ties are its main selling points. Whatever the reasons, Arnold, Fortas and Porter has clearly prospered. The firm represents a number of giant companies, and Fortas himself sits on the board of Federated Department Stores, Greatamerica Corp. and several banks and insurance companies.

Fortas and his wife, a small, dynamic woman who smokes cigars and is recognized as one of Washington's leading tax lawyers, lead a quiet life in Georgetown. They met when he was alternating between Yale's law faculty and the Department of Agriculture's legal staff. She was an economist at the department. After they married in 1935, he encouraged her to go to law school—so, of course, she went to Yale and graduated number two in a class of a hundred twenty-five. For many years she resisted joining her husband's firm, working instead in the Washington office of Adlai Stevenson's firm But when that office closed in 1960 after President Kennedy siphoned off Stevenson and several of his partners for government assignments, most of the staff moved over to Arnold, Fortas and Porter and she went along. Today she heads the firm's tax division.

The Fortases have broad cultural interests. He is a director of the Casals Festival in Puerto Rico and a trustee in the Carnegie Hall Corporation, the Washington Gallery of Modern Art and the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, the latter still in the planning stages. They generally shun the social circuit, however. Fortas explains that he developed a profound distaste for the standard Washington function back in his Interior Department days when he had to attend many as a stand-in for Secretary Ickes.

His greatest pleasure is his music. He plays the violin with near professional skill, and every week, without fail, he and three other musicians (two professionals and another amateur) devote an evening to playing string quartets. His cultural interests permit him to serve President Johnson as an occasional pipeline to the arts. Typically, he was chairman of the concert last inauguration eve which, with the help of his friend Isaac Stern, Van Cliburn and others, brought a touch of class to the somewhat garish inaugural festivities.

For a week or two each summer Fortas takes the other members of his string quartet to his summer home in Westport, Connecticut, where, he says, "I spend the mornings hauling manure for my wife's garden and the rest of the time playing chamber music." He and Mrs. Fortas usually manage at least one trip to Canada every winter for skiing and skating.

Fortas has a long-standing friendship with Pablo Casals, growing out of ties to Puerto Rico which began when he managed the island's affairs as part of his Interior Department job. He helped arrange the Casals Festivals and also engineered the cellist's White House appearance during the Kennedy administration.

As the first Casals Festival was about to open in San Juan in 1958, Fortas found himself entrusted with a mission as delicate as any he has performed for the President. A seam split in Casal's precious cello, and the maestro would not let anyone repair it but an expert in New York. Fortas was called in. He booked two first-class tickets on a plane for New York, took the window seat for himself and propped the cello in the other, holding it in place by the seat belt. A very moderate drinker, he recalls that he ordered two Martinis on that flight—one for himself and one for the cello—and drank both. "I was nervous," he explained. "Carrying a man's cello is like carrying his wife."

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. I commend the able leader for his remarks about Judge Thornberry. As the Representative in Congress of the district that he formerly represented, I am personally acquainted with this outstanding jurist. We do not have a finer man in America.

Judge Homer Thornberry has been a close personal friend for more than 30 years. I have known him as a young attorney, as a city council member in Austin, Tex., as a U.S. Representative, as a Federal judge, and as a steadfast friend.

During these years our families have been closely associated in many political, civic, and personal endeavors and I have always looked to Judge Thornberry with respect and admiration for the principles and actions he exemplifies.

With a spirit of self-confidence and diplomacy, Homer Thornberry served the people of the 10th Congressional District of Texas as their U.S. Representative for some 15 years. As a member of this body he gave bold and courageous leadership just as he has done in the Federal court system. He was an extraordinarily able lawmaker and during my freshman days as a Congressman I was often referred to as the man who took Homer Thornberry's place—a tribute to the dedication and devotion of former Representative Thornberry.

Judge Thornberry has been noted as a jurist who is able and impartial, and his decisions have been marked with commonsense and good judgment.

There is no man in America today more interested in principles of our democratic way of life than Homer Thornberry, who, I predict, will be a kindly knight for the public interest and a stern taskmaster of the law.

So far as I know, Judge Thornberry is the only person who served in this congressional body to be appointed to the Supreme Court since the appointment of Justice Hugo Black. And I believe he is the only Texan, except the distinguished and lovable Justice Tom Clark, to be appointed to this august body. Naturally, all Texans are extremely proud to have this public servant recognized by this appointment. The Federal judiciary will be in strong hands with the presence of this good and reasonable man on the Supreme Court. He and his beautiful, lovely wife, Eloise, and their children, Molly, David, and Kate, will be welcomed again in this city where they already have a large number of friends. Judge Thornberry has a world of friends here—and elsewhere—because he knows how to be a friend.

I am proud of the President's recommendation of Judge Thornberry and I commend him for his nomination.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I wish to associate myself with what the gentleman from Oklahoma said about Homer Thornberry. When he first came to Congress, we served on committees together and I know of his sterling work.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I have not been one who has always seen eye to eye with the Supreme Court decisions or been entirely satisfied with some of the appointments to the Supreme Court, but I think that with the appointment of Homer Thornberry to the Supreme Court we have established a splendid trend. It was a good appointment. I congratulate the President.

There is no better man than Homer Thornberry, and I am certain that he will make a great and outstanding judge. I wish him well and commend the gentleman from Oklahoma for bringing this appointment to the attention of the House.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the gentlemen in the well in their commendation of the recently announced nominations for the Supreme Court, but I must say that I do not share the views of the gentleman from Texas when he suggests that with the appointment of Homer Thornberry a splendid trend has been established in the Court. I hope that I am not misunderstanding the gentleman from Texas, but I do not believe that the appointment of Judge Thornberry to the Court will bring forth decisions that will turn back the clock. I

am sure that the Court will continue down its present road of protecting individual rights and will give full meaning to the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to go on record in support of President Johnson's excellent nominations to the Court in the persons of Justice Abe Fortas to be Chief Justice, and Judge Homer Thornberry to be Associate Justice.

Justice Fortas has served the court with distinction. He is a brilliant and dedicated jurist—fair, compassionate, careful and committed to a rule of law in our democratic society.

Judge Thornberry is an experienced and wise jurist, who exemplifies the kind of wise, commonsense approach to law that is fundamental to our American tradition.

The Court has been ably served by these two nominations. I believe that all Americans who value strong courts and wise laws will applaud the President's nominations. The Court will be in good hands.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the nomination of Abe Fortas to fill the No. 1 spot of the Judicial oligarchy comes as a great disappointment.

For years now, the only satisfaction of a respectable Democrat was to remind the Republicans that Earl Warren was of their party.

L. B. J., in leaving, wanted to give us something to remember him by. And certainly Abe is qualified for that—he's been the illumination since the infamous box 13 "burn-out" which launched the Great Society into orbit. For sure, L. B. J. is obligated to Abe, but why take it out on the people?

Abe Fortas may be just the man for restoration of law and order. The only problem is we'll have to follow Abe's rules—militancy and in the streets. See my remarks, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 1, 1968, page 11380, "Abe Fortas Goes Militant."

Certainly, our brethren on the Senate side will not confirm a lame duck's political debt.

Mr. Speaker, an interesting fact sheet on Mr. Fortas appeared in Mr. Frank Capell's August 13, 1965, issue of Herald of Freedom, Box 3, Zarephath, N.J. I include the Herald of Freedom and account from the Evening Star for June 26, along with other pertinent articles, as follows:

[From the Herald of Freedom, Aug. 13, 1965]

ABE FORTAS

Selection of Abe Fortas as Supreme Court Justice caused a debate in Congress as to his fitness. Mr. Fortas's background follows.

Abe Fortas was born in Memphis, Tennessee, June 19, 1910, the son of William Fortas and the former Ray Berson. He graduated from Southwestern College, Memphis, receiving his A. B. in 1930; he received his L. L. B. from Yale in 1933. He married Carolyn Eugenia Agger on July 9, 1935 and they have no children. William Fortas, his father, came to the United States from England in the early 1900's. He was a cabinetmaker by trade. He and his wife had five children of whom Abe was the youngest.

Abe persuaded his wife to go to law school. She went to Yale and graduated with honors. For a number of years, up to 1960, Mrs. Fortas worked in the Washington, D.C. law firm of Adlai Stevenson. She now heads the Tax Division of her husband's law firm, Arnold, Fortas and Porter of Washington, D.C. The present Commissioner of Internal Revenue Sheldon Cohen, came from this same division of this same law firm.

Mrs. Fortas formerly worked for the National Labor Relations Board and the Department of Justice under the New Deal. She was described by the New York "Times" (7/29/65) as being a "tiny dynamic woman who has smoked cigars for years." The Social List of Washington, D.C. shows that Mr. and Mrs. Fortas reside at 3025 N. Street, Washington, D.C. and at Minuteman Hill, Westport, Conn. However, newspaper reports indicate that they have recently purchased a new home on R Street, Washington, D.C. for approximately $250,000.00.

In 1933–4 Abe Fortas was Assistant Chief of the Legal Division of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration (A.A.A.). Concerning this period we read in "The Coming of the New Deal," the second volume of Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.'s trilogy on the New Deal, "'What we need,' he (Jerome Frank) told Peek, 'are brilliant young men with keen legal minds and imagination.' In a short time he brought together a remarkable group—among them, Thurman Arnold" (later to become Fortas's law partner) "and Abe Fortas from the Yale Law School; Adlai Stevenson of Chicago; and, from the Harvard Law School, Alger Hiss, Lee Pressman, John Abt, and Nathan Witt." The last four have been identified in sworn testimony before Congressional Committees as communists.

In the U.S. Government, in addition to the A.A.A., Mr. Fortas held the following posts: Assistant Director and consultant, Corporate Reorganization Study, Securities and Exchange Commission, 1934–38; General Counsel, Public Works Administration, 1939–40; Bituminous Coal Division, 1939–41; Director, Division of Power, Dept. of the Interior, 1941–42; Under Secretary of the Interior, 1942–46. He has also been Acting General Counsel of the National Power Policy Committee, a member of the Board of Legal Examiners of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, and a member of the President's Committee to Study Changes in Laws in Puerto Rico. In 1945 Abe Fortas was appointed as Adviser to the United States Delegation to the United Nations at San Francisco and in 1946 at London.

Frank L. Kluckhohn, a foreign, Washington and White House correspondent for the N.Y. "Times" for over twenty years, states on page 96 of his book, "Lyndon's Legacy," (Abe Fortas) "is a Washington attorney with a dizzying record of defending in court and at Congressional investigations, men who have been under attack as Communists. One of Abe Fortas' famous clients was Owen Lattimore, who was indicted by a Washington grand jury on six specific counts of perjury for lying about his espionage acts, while testifying under oath to the Senate Internal Security Sub-committee. Lattimore's attorney during these Senate hearings was none other than Abe Fortas. Other luminaries whom Abe Fortas has assisted are Soviet agents Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White, to name only two. Abe Fortas helped Hiss and White to draft the U.N. Charter."

The Chicago "Tribune" stated on July 30, 1965, "Abe Fortas Nominated to High Court. New Dealer Was Friend of Hiss." In an editorial they pointed out that Mr. Fortas had "helped Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White, Soviet agents, to draft the United Nations Charter."

In the academic field, Abe Fortas has been an Assistant Professor of Law at Yale Law School, 1933–34, and Visiting Lecturer on Law (with professor status) at Yale University, 1946–47. He has been an Associate Editor of the Journal of Psychiatry and a trustee in the William A. White Psychiatric Foundation, both of these asosciations resulting from his deep interest in mental health.

In the "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications" (Revised December 1, 1961), Page 88, is listed the International Juridical Association. Concerning it we read there, "1. Cited as 'a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense.'" . . . "2. Cited as an organization which 'actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line.'"

In the report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (Appendix IX) 1944, P. 795, we find Abe Fortas listed among the officers and national committeemen of the International Juridical Association along with Walter Gellhorn, Robert W. Kenny, Carol King, Thurgood Marshall, Carey McWilliams, David K. Niles, Lee Pressman, Ray Wilkins, A. L. Wirin, Nathan Witt and others. On Page 801 of this same report is stated, "it is appropriate at this point to call attention to an unparalleled phenomenon in the International Juridical Association. That phenomenon consists of the fact that the national committee of the International Juridical Association numbers among its members a larger percentage of high-ranking Federal Government officials than is or ever has been the case with any other Communist-front organization in this country." Among these officials it lists "Abe Fortas, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, at a salary of $9,000."

On Page 1093 of this same report, in a section devoted to "miscellaneous Communist and Communist-Front Organizations" we find the American Law Student's Association. On its "Faculty Advisory Board" are listed Prof. Abe Fortas from Yale Law School, Prof. Walter Gellhorn and Prof. Philip Jessup from Columbia University among others.

In "Human Events," August 7, 1965 edition, we read, "In the early 1940's Fortas joined the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, later listed as subversive by Atty. Gen. Tom Clark. In the 1930's Fortas was affiliated with the National Lawyers Guild, subsequently found subversive by Congress.

"He was also a supporter of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare in 1947, three years after it was listed as a Red front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities; a Senate subcommittee found it a Marxist operation 'serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist party in the United States.'"

The Senate Internal Security Sub-Committee, after an exhaustive investigation and hearings entitled "Strategy and Tactics of World Communism," found that a book called "False Witness" is a "confection of falsehoods which was prepared under the direction of Nathan Witt and Albert E. Kahn, each of whom invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to testify regarding his Communist Party membership." (Page 88) "Its immediate goal was to secure new trials in the cases of Communist leaders who had been convicted. Its broader and long-range goals were to discredit Government witnesses, the Department of Justice, the courts, the FBI, and congressional investigating committees, and thus to immobilize the prosecution and investigation of the Communist conspiracy." (Pages 88–89) Albert E. Kahn, testifying on March 8, 1955, stated that he sent copies of this book, "False Witness," supposedly written by Harvey Matusow, to Abe Fortas's law firm, the York (Pa.) Gazette, Drew Pearson, "The Nation," and others.

Abe Fortas was one of the seven men selected in 1962 for the President's Committee on Equal Opportunities in the Armed Forces. This is the committee which wrote the Civil Rights "Gesell Report."

This report recommended that more Negroes should be recruited into the U.S. Armed Forces, more Negroes should be placed on Promotion Boards, Negro soldiers should be prohibited from gravitating to one military base service club and white soldiers to another; more Negro hostesses should be hired for service clubs, more Negro girls should be

secured for dances, unintegrated business establishments should be placed off limits to all military personnel, homes should be leased in the name of the Federal Government and Negroes moved into them. Segregated busses should be boycotted, ROTC Units in segregated schools should be cancelled, local civic clubs should not be joined if they do not admit Negroes, special officers with bi-racial staffs should be appointed on every military base to handle all complaints of Negro servicemen, base commanders should appoint joint Negro-white committees to break down local segregation practices. The base commander should be encouraged to lead the way to racial homogenization. The Gesell Report recommended political adviser liaisons directly between Negro servicemen and the Defense Department. Negro servicemen who believe they have been discriminated against should report their complaints directly to the visiting personnel from the Defense Department. The Gesell Report stipulates that the identity of the accuser remain anonymous and that the accused not be allowed to confront his accuser. (Gesell Report data taken from "Lyndon's Legacy," Pages 93–94.)

According to the New York "Times," (7/29/65) Abe Fortas is a friend of Pablo Casals and helped bring him to the White House during the Kennedy Administration. From "Un-American Activities In California" (Senate Fact Finding Committee of California) Year 1948, Page 311, we read, "Among other Communist fronts organized for musicians was the Musicians' Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy. . . . Pablo Casals was honorary chairman."

Abe Fortas is a partner in the law firm of Arnold, Fortas and Porter, 1229 Nineteenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C. This is a very substantial law firm with a total of about thirty lawyers, including partners and associates. Fortas's personal income, according to the N.Y. "Times," is in excess of $150,000.00 per year. Thurman Arnold, one of the partners, was formerly Assistant U.S. Attorney General in the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice, as was John Abt. Paul A. Porter, the other partner in the law firm, was Counsel to the Administrator of the A.A.A., was U.S. Representative to the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine and held many important posts in the New Deal.

In the book, "For the Skeptic," edited by Lyle H. Munson, former U.S. Intelligence official, beginning on page 109, we read, "For some undisclosed reason White's (Harry Dexter White) office arranged gatherings of a number of selected, high-ranking, policy-making officials from various departments of the Government. . . . With White as the initiator and activist, such a gathering could result in far-reaching changes in our Government. The gatherings included: . . . Benjamin Cohen, General Counsel, Office of War Mobilization . . . Lauchlin B. Currie, Administrative Assistant to the President . . . Abe Fortas, Under Secretary of the Interior . . . David Niles, Administrative Assistant to the President . . . Paul Porter, Associate Director, Office of Economic Stabilization . . Aubrey Williams, Executive Director, National Youth Administration and director of organization, National Farmers Union."

"A detailed study and analysis by the subcommittee staff of the documents obtained at Concord through Attorney General Wyman have revealed striking new phases in the life and career of Harry Dexter White. They also emphasize the importance of White's part in the conspiracy of strategically placed individuals in government to subordinate the interests of the United States to the imperialistic designs of the Soviet Union. (quoted from 'Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments,' August 30, 1955)"

Poor's Register shows Abe Fortas as a Director of the American Molasses Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N.Y., doing 50 to 75 million dollars in sales per year. The Chairman of the Board is shown as Adolf A. Berle, Jr. (In 1939 Whittaker Chambers had supplied Mr. Berle with information naming twenty-seven members of the American Communist underground.) Mr. Berle is also listed as being a member of the 20th Century Fund of Boston and New York which has financed much of the Fabian Socialist activities in the United States.

Other directorships held by Abe Fortas are Su-Crest Corporation (1946), Federated Department Stores (1960), Carnegie Hall Corporation (1961), Greatamerica Corporation (1963) and Madison National Bank (1963).

The scandal regarding Robert G. (Bobby) Baker originated to some extent through a law suit instituted against Baker by the Capitol Vending Machine Company. Representing Mr. Baker was Abe Fortas. The N.Y. "Times" stated (7/29/65) that Fortas withdrew later as counsel "because of his advisory role in the Administration." The N.Y. "Times" also revealed that the night following the assassination of the late President Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson summoned Abe Fortas to the White House and Fortas went to work to plan what was later to become the Warren Commission.

"U.S. News and World Report" stated on October 26, 1964, "The so-called 'Bobby Baker case' is said to involve not only widespread 'influence peddling' but 'wild' parties for high officials in a cozy 'town house' near the U.S. Capitol, in which pretty girls reportedly figured.

"The Senate Rules Committee developed evidence that Bobby Baker, by using his position as secretary to the Democratic majority, was able to build a personal fortune while receiving a salary of $19,600 a year."

In 1948 in the fight for the U.S. Senate seat with Coke Stevenson in the Texas Primary Election, Candidate Lyndon Johnson had been declared the loser by a Federal Court judge. Abe Fortas, acting as attorney for Candidate Lyndon Johnson, took the case to U.S. Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black who set aside the lower court order. Fortas has been a close associate of Johnson for the past thirty years. It was Fortas who arranged the trust set-up for the TV holdings of the Johnson family. (From N.Y. "Times" articles)

On January 15, 1959, when Walter Wilson Jenkins was arrested at 10:20 p.m. (Case No. 168287) by the Morals Division of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police at the YMCA, 1636 "G" St., N.W., Washington, D.C. on a charge of disorderly conduct (pervert), he elected to forfeit the bail. On October 7, 1964, he was arrested again by members of the same police unit (Case No. 2208) at 8:35 p.m. at the same YMCA on a charge of disorderly (indecent gestures). Jenkins had just been at a cocktail party at "Newsweek," 1750 Pennsylvania Ave. Hostess of the party was Mrs. Katherine Graham, president of the Washington "Post." Present were many high U.S. Government officials, including Dean Rusk, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, William Wirtz, Robert McNamara, C. Douglas Dillon, and also diplomats from the Embassy of the Soviet Union.

Several days later when the story broke in the newspapers, it was learned that Clark Clifford and Abe Fortas had contacted the three Washington newspapers in an effort to either "kill" or soft-pedal the story. Arthur Krock, writing in the N.Y. "Times," October 17, 1964, stated "Although these advisers, Abe Fortas and Clark M. Clifford, are not members of the Administration, Mr. Johnson has deputized them for so many important personal and political missions that in Texas they would be described as wearing the brand of LBJ."

While there is no question of doubt that Abe Fortas is a very competent and successful lawyer and as far back as 1945 was selected as one of America's "outstanding young men," information from a number of sources raises questions as to the advisability of his confirmation as Supreme Court Justice.

Sen. John J. Williams of Delaware stated, "It is with regret that I must announce that I am not able to support the President in this instance." He said, "In my opinion the President could have made a far wiser choice" and that "contrary to the President's claim that he had looked all over America to find the best qualified man for the job, it is quite obvious that he did not look far beyond his inner circle of friends." Rep. Durward G. Hall of Missouri told the House of Representatives, "There is a serious question whether Mr. Fortas will be able to exercise independence because of his intimate ties with the President and because he has been a participant in some of the more dubious transactions involving the Johnson Administration."

The N.Y. "Times" (7/29/65) stated, "Mr. Fortas' appointment, in the view of students of the Court, means that there probably will be no appreciable change in the liberal course charted by the Court since 1962, when Mr. Goldberg replaced Justice Felix Frankfurter.

"It also keeps alive the tradition of a Jewish seat on the Court."

Many authorities believe that no one should be appointed a Supreme Court Justice without ever having been a judge. A pending bill, S-980, would require five years judicial experience as a qualification. Abe Fortas has had none.

[From the New York Daily News, June 27, 1968]

FORTAS NAMED CHIEF JUSTICE—L. B. J. NOMINATES A TEXAS CRONY TO FILL ABE'S SUPREME COURT SEAT

WASHINGTON, June 26.—President Johnson has nominated Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas, a long-time friend, to succeed retiring Chief Justice Earl Warren, and chosen Federal Judge Homer Thornberry, a Texas protege, to fill the vacancy created by Fortas' elevation.

If confirmed by the Senate, Fortas, 58, would become the first Jew to serve as chief justice and the third member of the Supreme Court to be promoted to its chief.

Thornberry, 59, is the third Supreme Court nomination made by Johnson in his four and a half years in the White House. His previous appointments were Fortas and Thurgood Marshall.

Johnson called a press conference today to read Warren's letter of retirement and announce the Fortas and Thornberry appointments.

The President said he had discussed the nominations with the Senate Democratic and Republican leaders, "several members of the Senate," and the leadership of the Senate Judiciary Committee. He said he believed the Senate would approve them.

DIRKSEN DOUBTS FIGHT

Senate GOP Leader Everett Dirksen told newsmen he foresaw little Republican opposition to the nominations. Dirksen called Fortas a "very able lawyer" whose philosophy is "quite sound." He termed Thornberry, a former Congressman, a "very solid citizen.

Three Republican senators, however, have already gone on record against the appointment of a chief justice by a "lame duck" President, one who is leaving office. They were Robert P. Griffin (Mich.), Strom Thurmond (S.C.) and John Tower (Tex.).

NIXON CALLS FOR DELAY

Griffin said today he would fight the nomination because he felt "very strongly that such appointments should be made by the next President." He said he would be joined by at least four or five other GOP senators, including Dirksen's son-in-law, Howard H. Baker (Tenn.), and Hiram Fong (Hawaii), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Shortly before Johnson's press conference,

Richard Nixon, the front-runner for the Republican presidential nomination, told newsmen he believed the President should ask Warren to stay on until after the election in November. Otherwise, Nixon said, there would be Democratic as well as GOP opposition to the appointment and the new chief justice would "go in under a cloud and his prestige would be impaired."

Senate Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield (Mont.), praising Fortas and Thornberry, said he hoped the nomination would be acted on this year. Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman James O. Eastland (D-Miss.) said no hearing on the nominations has been scheduled and that the normal procedure was to give a week's notice.

BOTH ARE DEMOCRATS

Fortas and Thornberry are Democrats. The retirement of Warren thus reduces the Republican members of the high court to three—Justices John M. Harlan, William J. Brennan Jr. and Potter Stewart.

At his press conference, Johnson read to reporters the letter from Warren disclosing his retirement, which was reported last week. The nation's 14th chief justice said he wanted to leave, not for reasons of health or because of any "associational problems," but "solely because of age." He is 77.

The former California governor said the problem of age "is one that no man can combat and, therefore, eventually must bow to it." He noted that he has been continuously in public sevice for 50 years.

"I therefore conceive it my duty to give way to someone who will have more years ahead of him to cope with the problems which come to the court," Warren said. He added that he had enjoyed every day of his 15 years on the bench and was grateful for his opportunity for public service.

In his reply to Warren, Johnson said he would accept his retirement "effective at such time as a successor is qualified."

"You have won for yourself the esteem of your fellow citizens," the President told the chief justice. "You have served your nation with exceptional distinction and deserves the nation's gratitude . . . Your wisdom and strength will inspire generations of Americans for many decades to come."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 26, 1968]

FORTAS PICKED FOR CHIEF JUSTICE, THORNBERRY IS NAMED TO COURT

President Johnson today nominated Associate Justice Abe Fortas to succeed Earl Warren as chief justice.

Judge Homer Thornberry of Texas was nominated as an associate justice to fill the vacancy caused by Warren's retirement—which the White House hadn't acknowledged until today.

At an impromtu news conference in his White House office, Johnson confirmed his receipt of Warren's resignation and disclosed the nomination of two of his oldest friends.

Fortas, a long-time Washington lawyer and very close adviser to Johnson, was named to the highest court of the land in 1965.

Thornberry, a former Texas lawyer and for 14 years a congressman from Texas, was named by Johnson in 1963 as a U.S. district court judge from the western district of Texas and from July 1, 1965, has been serving on the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals.

Fortas' nomination was widely speculated on ever since Warren's resignation became known on Friday.

FIGHT IS POSSIBLE

There is a possibility that some senators will oppose the nomination of Fortas on the ground that Johnson as a "lame duck president" should not name a chief justice.

Warren is 77. Fortas is 58.

Johnson read to newsmen Warren's letter to him of June 13, saying he had decided to retire "solely because of age."

Warren said: "I want you to know that it is not because of reasons of health or on account of any personal or associational problems, but solely because of age.

"I have been advised that I am in as good physical condition as a person of my age has any right to expect. My associations on the court have been cordial and satisfying in every respect and I have enjoyed each day of the 15 years I have been here.

"MUST BOW"

"The problem of age, however, is one that no man can combat and that, therefore, must eventually bow to it," Warren said.

Johnson wrote back today, saying:

"You have won for yourself the esteem of your fellow citizens. You have served your nation with exceptional distinction and deserve the nation's gratitude.

"Under your leadership, the Supreme Court of the United States has once again demonstrated the vitality of this nation's institutions and their capacity to meet with vigor and strength the challenge of changing times. The court has acted to achieve justice, fairness and equality before the law for all people."

Johnson told reporters he had discussed the nominations with the leadership of both the Republican and Democratic parties in the Senate, including James O. Eastland, D-Miss., chairman of the Judiciary Committee to which the nomination will go.

A number of senators, mostly Republicans, were moving today to build up support for challenging any court nominations by Johnson.

It now appears that the GOP leader, Sen. Everett M. Dirksen of Illinois, will not support the demand that Johnson leave to his successor any choice of new justices.

But an apparently growing number of his colleagues, believing—as one of them said—that Dirksen "is dragging his feet on this," are making their own move.

They may begin circulating, perhaps later today, a paper—something like a petition—to get signatures of other GOP members who will side with them in a demand that the seat left vacant by Warren's retirement, be kept open until January.

Another move the challengers are considering is a request, presumably directed to Dirksen, for a meeting of GOP senators to go over the issue in full.

FIVE FAVOR FIGHT

At a closed luncheon meeting yesterday, at least five senators spoke up in favor of a fight against Senate confirmation of any Johnson appointee to the tribunal, according to several senators who attended.

Among senators reportedly in this group were three moderates—Howard Baker of Tennessee, Hiram Fong of Hawaii and Robert Griffin of Michigan—and two conservatives—George Murphy of California and Paul Fannin of Arizona.

Baker is Dirksen's son-in-law, but he and the minority leader have differed on other issues.

Among senators who said they do not want to make a flat challenge on the appointment issue were two liberals, Edward Brooke of Massachusetts and Charles Percy of Illinois.

Some of the challengers were disturbed that yesterday's meeting was interrupted several times by roll-call votes on the Senate floor.

"That is not usually done, if Dirksen has something important he wants to discuss," said one man who had been at the meeting.

Dirksen himself would tell newsmen only that his GOP ranks were "divided" and that at this point the issue was not being treated as a "matter of minority policy."

HINT HE'S AGAINST FEUD

While refusing to say outright what his own view is, the GOP chief made a series of roundabout comments which—in sum—seemed to hint strongly that he is against a feud with Johnson on the matter.

He said he had talked about Warren's retirement with Johnson.

The minority leader told reporters that GOP senators "may have to just discuss it further."

But those who want to make a fight were worried that next Tuesday—the next regular day for a Senate GOP meeting—might be too late.

Sen. Griffin put it this way: "If we're not going to take a stand right away, the issue can be lost. As soon as the President makes an appointment, then we will be talking about a person rather than a principle."

Griffin and some of those on his side insist that they are not making just a partisan political fight. They do not dispute that the President has the power, under the Constitution, to replace Warren when his retirement becomes official.

But they are talking about the "desirability" of this.

FAVORS DELAY

As Baker put his position yesterday: "As sensitive as the Supreme Court has become in American life, a change in the government offers a unique opportunity. The appointment of the chief justice really ought to be a prerogative of the new administration."

Baker contended that he and others were not trying to hold up the appointment just because they believe Richard M. Nixon will be the next president, and the appointment should be his to make.

The Tennessean said some polls show now that Vice President Hubert Humphrey will win over Nixon in November. "That is not the issue," Baker said.

Others said they had no doubt the President has the power to make the appointment. But one GOP senator added: "But the Senate also has the power to confirm. The question is whether it is wise policy for the Senate to confirm a new chief justice when the people are in the midst of choosing a new government."

DIRKSEN'S VIEWS

The power argument and the role of historic precedent were cited by Sen. Dirksen in his discussion of the issue with newsmen. The minority leader made these points:

He referred to a Senate vote in 1960 which touched on presidential power to fill the court in the final months of an administration. That vote might be embarrassing to GOP senators this year, since all 33 Republicans in the Senate at that time favored letting the president fill court vacancies late in his term.

Dirksen cited what he considered something of a "precedent" in which Sen. Robert Taft of Ohio, when Republican leader, defended GOP support for the controversial Dean Acheson for Democratic secretary of state.

Illinoisan turned aside, as not a precedent, the Senate refusal—under Democratic control—to confirm Lewis Strauss as Republican secretary of commerce. Dirksen's comment on this suggested that mere "personal feuds" did not count on the question of Senate "intrusions" on presidential appointment power.

The GOP leader also discussed recent Senate investigations into the general question of whether one branch of government was "intruding" on another's prerogatives. In the context of the court discussion, this implied that out-and-out Senate resistance to a Johnson appointee might be just such an intrusion.

NO POLITICAL REQUIREMENT

[He told] reporters that there is no requirement in the law that Supreme Court justices be of any particular political affiliation. He contrasted this with the partisan division required on federal regulatory agencies.

And, finally, the minority chief said there was no question of the President's power to make the appointment.

He summed up his views by asking this question, which he did not directly answer:

"If it is admitted that the President has a clear constitutional power, wouldn't it be regarded as a bit of an intrusion—in the absence of anything derogatory about an appointee—to take a political viewpoint and say it shouldn't be done?"

[From the New York Daily News, June 27, 1968]

COURT KEPT IN LINE FOR GREAT SOCIETY

(By Jerry Greene)

WASHINGTON, June 26.—President Johnson defiantly ignored protests against lame duck action today to name Justice Abe Fortas chief justice of the United States and guarantee that the Great Society will be free of judicial curtailment for the next decade, or more.

Fortas, a pragmatic liberal and an activist, is a man not only friendly to the Great Society concepts. He, as a Johnson consultant and adviser, is one of the principal architects.

The choice of Judge Homer Thornberry to fill the Fortas vacancy will be an assist. Thornberry, for years a very ordinary Texas politician and an old pal of LBJ, has yet to make his mark in judicial circles but he has been a lifelong liberal.

Both appointments, undoubtedly, will be approved by the Senate despite vigorous objections from some Republicans. The promotion of Fortas was not unexpected.

LONG A BEHIND-THE-SCENES FORCE

The twin nominations will give the Supreme Court a lopsided liberal appearance. Only Justices Potter Stewart and John Harlan are generally regarded as conservative. They got more than an occasional touch of support from Justice Byron White and Justice Hugo Black, but the new lineup couldn't ordinarily be counted as less than 6–3 for the liberal views.

Where Chief Justice Warren has appeared blunt and forceful, Fortas will seem suave and mild of manner. But he is a very tough-minded lawyer. He is a perfectionist and a legal craftsman. He is persuasive and can be expected to swing heavy weight in influencing decisions.

The Fortas appointment is full notice that the Supreme Court will not deviate from the course pursued under Warren as an instrument for making law and policy, not merely for the interpretation of actions taken by Congress. Fortas has behind him a lifetime as an activist. His labors in government have been largely advisory. But behind scenes they have been forceful and effective. He won't stop now.

SYMPATHY WITH BIG BUSINESS AS WELL

Fortas was a young lawyer at the Interior Department when he met the then Rep. Lyndon Johnson to begin a personal and political friendship and alliance closer than is commonly understood. Fortas, the quiet one, complemented Johnson's brassy, talkative personality, soon the two found total agreement in the aims and objectives of FDR's New Deal.

It was Fortas who won a Supreme Court ruling for Johnson in 1948 to have him designated as the Democratic nominee for senator from Texas with that victory by 87 votes out of 988,295 cast in the primary.

It was Fortas, going great as a high-priced lawyer in private practice during the 1950s, who with James Rowe and Clark Clifford formed a team of advisers to help Johnson's rise to prominence in the Senate. Rowe is now helping Vice President Hubert Humphrey run his White House campaign. Clifford is defense secretary.

Fortas, Clifford and Rowe were always close at hand, watching and helping the wheels turn. There are few who know the operations of government and politics better. And none have had more influence with the President since 1963.

Yet with their liberal leanings, the three lawyers developed an understanding for and a sympathy with big business. Their clients were the nation's leading corporations. A year after he had been appointed to the court, Fortas broke with the Warren majority to register a strong dissent in an antitrust case.

Fortas has taken the position consistently that bigness in business is not necessarily bad. In his brief period on the court he has been increasingly involved in antitrust cases.

But apart from the feeling for business, as expressed in one opinion that "some mergers are distinctly beneficial to the achievement of a competitive economy," Fortas has remained firm in his Great Society liberalism.

Fortas has taken particular interest in civil rights litigation. He recently wrote the majority opinion in two New York cases which held that a policeman and 15 sanitation employes were illegally fired because they took refuge in the Fifth Amendment while under investigation.

DISSENTED FROM INTOXICATION RULING

A week later, Fortas wrote a long dissent where the majority ruled that a person can be jailed for public intoxication. The court left the way open for future consideration of this issue, but Fortas was emphatic in protesting that there is ample medical evidence that chronic alcoholism is an illness and should be treated as such.

The chief justice-designate went along with the majority in favoring punishment for draft card burners, and approving public aid for parochial school students. He voted for revival of the 1866 law for open housing.

Underlying all of the Fortas thinking is a lifetime of dedication to the FDR New Deal, the Harry Truman Fair Deal, the JFK New Frontier—through Johnson as vice president—and to the Great Society.

He is known to be very high on the protection of individual liberties, a factor which could be of substantial importance when the court considers, as it inevitably will, tests of the new crime control law, and whatever gun control laws that may be passed.

Johnson objected to the provisions of the crime bill authorizing wiretapping, and to sections which would override Supreme Court rulings on the use of confessions of criminals. Word was passed from the White House that these were believed to be unconstitutional.

A Fortas-led court judgment could be predicted.

[From the New York Times, June 27, 1968]

LIBERAL NOMINEES FOR SUPREME COURT POSTS: ABE FORTAS

WASHINGTON, June 26.—Abe Fortas, who was nominated today to succeed Chief Justice Earl Warren as the nation's highest judicial officer, is very much like Mr. Warren in outlook and almost totally unlike him in personality. During Mr. Fortas's three years on the Court the two men have usually been on the same liberal side of the issues, and a "Fortas Court" would be expected to be much like the "Warren Court"—liberal, venturesome and creative.

But while Mr. Warren is an amiable, grandfatherly type whose idealism seems almost naive, Mr. Fortas is a tough, sophisticated advocate who has built a solid reputation as a good Justice by hard work and intelligence. In the process he has rubbed a few Justices the wrong way.

"Abe Fortas has all the qualities of a good Associate Justice—scholarship, commitment and a feeling for the times," a Washington lawyer said. "But the great Chief Justices have also been healers."

PERSUASIVE DISSENT

An example of Justice Fortas's judicial prowess came a week ago Monday, the last day of the current Supreme Court term.

He wrote a persuasive dissent in a 5-to-4 decision saying that to punish chronic alcoholics for being drunk in public was "cruel and unusual" punishment and therefore unconstitutional under the Eighth Amendment. Many informed lawyers predicted that this minority view would eventually become the law.

Justice Byron R. White, while agreeing with the conclusion of the majority, wrote a concurring opinion sympathetic to the Fortas view, thus preserving the prospect of changes another day.

If the challenge to Mr. Fortas is to moderate the stern qualities that brought him success as a lawyer and Associate Justice, and to develop a Chief Justice's vital trait, the ability to "marshal the Court," his past history would suggest that this will be smoothly and efficiently done.

Mr. Fortas was born on June 19, 1910, the last of five children of a Jewish cabinetmaker who had immigrated to Memphis early in this century. By the time he was 13 years old he had begun earning money by playing the violin at social events.

NEW DEAL POSTS

After being graduated from Southwestern College in Memphis and the Yale Law School, he taught briefly at Yale and then entered the hurly-burly of the early New Deal. He served in about a dozen administrative positions, relished the bureaucratic infighting between the new agencies, and at the age of 32 became Under Secretary of the Interior to Harold L. Ickes.

In the late nineteen-thirties Mr. Fortas met Representative Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas and impressed him as a valuable counselor. Mr. Fortas has since tended to be at Mr. Johnson's side when important events required a trusted friend and confidant.

One of these occasions in 1948, proved to be a turning point in Mr. Johnson's career. Mr. Johnson had come out 87 votes ahead in the Democratic Senatorial primary, but his opponent had won a court order to keep Mr. Johnson's name off the ballot for the general election.

Mr. Fortas took the matter to Justice Hugo L. Black and obtained a reversal of the order. Mr. Johnson won the election, and Mr. Fortas, the lifelong appreciation of a future President.

Mr. Johnson has continued to call upon Mr. Fortas, for advice, legal and otherwise.

On the bench, Mr. Fortas invariably seems well-prepared, and he has a knack for asking the questions that reveal the pivotal issues in a case. He is said to be persuasive in presenting his views when the justices discuss cases in private before voting.

His most important opinions have been in the area of juvenile law, where he has insisted that youngsters be given many of the constitutional protections that adults must be granted in court.

Mrs. Fortas is a leading tax lawyer and remains a member of his former Washington law firm, Arnold & Porter. She practices under her maiden name, Carolyn Agger. There are no children.

An amusing after-dinner speaker who often pokes gentle fun at himself as well as at jurists and the legal profession in general, Mr. Fortas acknowledges occasional verbosity.

"My problem," he says, describing some of his lengthy opinions, "is that I like to begin each opinion with the invention of money."

WILLIAM HOMER THORNBERRY

Not long ago, Federal Judge William Homer Thornberry, looking back on his experience in the House of Representatives, said that his most agonizing moments were

in voting against bills that his friends had asked him to support and backing measures that his friends had opposed. "Finally," he said, "you make up your mind and do what you think is right as well as what is right for your constituents."

The 59-year-old member of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, who was nominated yesterday by President Johnson to the Supreme Court, has long indicated his independence and his beliefs.

His decisions as a district judge, to which he was named in 1963 by President Kennedy, and as a member of the Appeals Court, a Johnson appointment in 1965, have stressed his liberalism on civil rights, desegregation and freedom of speech.

Blunt-spoken advocate

A friend in Austin, Tex., where Judge Thornberry lives, who has known this stocky, gray-haired legislator and jurist for years, describes him as follows:

"He is blunt-spoken. He does not make a big fuss about what he believes, but he makes pretty clear what he means."

For example, more than 20 years ago, a community bordering on Austin wanted to become part of the city. Quietly, Mr. Thornberry, then a member of the City Council, learned that the area did not allow Jews. He said nothing until the community applied for inclusion in the city.

Then, without mincing words, he began a fight against the community unless it changed its charter to allow the sale of lots to Jews. His aggressive campaign blocked admission of the community, which refused to change its charter and is still not part of the city.

In recent years Judge Thornberry has argued off and on the bench for equal rights for Negroes.

During much of the Kennedy Administration as a member of the House Rules Committee, he was the only Southerner who voted on the liberal side, often giving the President a one-vote margin until the committee was expanded.

Childhood influences

Part of Judge Thornberry's ability to make up his mind quietly and then adhere to a decision despite pressure stems from his childhood experiences. He was born Jan. 9, 1909, and both his parents were deaf mutes. He communicated with them through sign language. His father died when he was a boy. He worked his way through the University of Texas and its law school.

Many years later, a publication at the University of Texas said of its eminent alumnus:

"He grew up in a silent household with little money."

Though like many Texans in public life, Judge Thornberry is a competent spinner of tales, he has the capacity for understatement. Once, when recalling how he ran for the Texas Legislature in 1936—he has never lost an election—with a campaign fund of $100, he added:

"Politics didn't cost as much then."

Part of the judge's success is undoubtedly due to his friendship with President Johnson, who used to refer to him as "my Congressman." Mr. Thronberry represented the 10th Congressional District in Texas, where he succeeded Mr. Johnson in 1948 and from which the President votes.

When Mr. Johnson was hospitalized with a heart attack, Mr. Thornberry visited him and played dominoes with him, a favorite pastime of Mr. Thornberry's. He was sworn in as circuit judge on the lawn of the L.B.J. Ranch.

Mr. Thornberry met his wife, the former Eloise Engle, during World War II, while he was stationed at Corpus Christi, where she was a civilian employee. They have three children—Molly, David Homer and Kate.

As excitement swept through Austin yesterday, Mrs. Thornberry, remarked to an acquaintance, who phoned congratulations:

"Homer's on his way home. I'm busy fixing him a steak dinner now."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, June 27, 1968]

BLOCK THIS RUSH ACT

President Lyndon B. Johnson dropped the other shoe yesterday, with a thud heard 'round the world.

He announced that he had accepted Earl Warren's resignation as Supreme Court chief justice and nominated Associate Justice Abe Fortas to succeed Warren and U.S. Circuit Judge Homer Thornberry of LBJ's home state of Texas to succeed Fortas.

It is a political rush act, in the end months of the L. B. Johnson presidency—an effort to prolong "liberal" control of the high court. Fortas is to the left even of Warren, which makes him a long way leftward and then some.

There is a swing toward conservatism in the United States, especially as regards official tenderness toward crooks, criminals and Communists.

Apparently the President has fallen victim to the professional-liberal conviction that professional liberals always are in the right and everybody else is wrong, and any means to gain professional-liberal ends are justified.

We think it is the U.S. Senate's patriotic duty to turn down the Fortas nomination and hold the chief justiceship open until the nation has a new President. We hope the Senate will on no account shirk that duty.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News June 27, 1968]

IT ALL BEGAN WITH THE NEW DEAL

(By Alton Slagle)

Abe Fortas descended on Washington in 1932, in the earliest days of Franklin Roosevent's New Deal, and quickly made friends with another young man named Lyndon Baines Johnson, then youth administrator for Texas. They met at the home of Arthur Goldschmidt, who later became deputy director of technical assistance for the United Nations.

Some years later—in 1948—Johnson made use of Fortas' legal abilities. His Senate victory in Texas was challenged by rightwing Democrat Coke Stevenson, who had lost to LBJ in the all-determining primary by 87 votes, and had filed suit to invalidate the election. Fortas filed countersuit and won. From that day until his appointment by President Johnson to the 1965 Supreme Court vacancy left by Arthur Goldberg, he remained Johnson's personal attorney.

NATIVE OF MEMPHIS

Fortas was born in Memphis, Tenn., in 1910, the fifth child of a Jewish cabinetmaker.

Fortas worked his way through high school and college—Southwestern College and the Yale Law School—by playing violin in a dance band. Music still is one of his passions. He has listed among his friends cellist Pablo Casals, violinist Isaac Stern and pianist Van Cliburn.

Fortas taught at Yale Law School from 1933 to 1937 commuting to Washington to work for various New Deal agencies. He was named undersecretary of the interior in 1942 when he was 32, serving until 1946, then formed a Washington law firm, Arnold, Fortas and Porter. He became one of the nation's most brilliant appeals lawyers.

In his firm was a cigar-smoking woman lawyer, an authority on tax law, who shared another tie with him: marriage. Fortas and the former Carolyn Eugenia Agger were married on July 1, 1935. They rode to work together in a Rolls Royce. They have no children.

While serving as attorney for Johnson before his Supreme Court appointment, Fortas also had dealings with Johnson aides.

THE JENKINS CASE

At one time, Fortas' firm was retained by former Senate Democratic Secretary Robert G. (Bobby) Baker, who was involved in a $300,000 vending machine contract suit that touched off a scandal. Fortas withdrew when it appeared his services to Baker might embarrass Johnson. He called it "a conflict of interest due to certain assignments I have undertaken for the new administration."

Trouble involving another Johnson aide, Walter Jenkins, propelled Fortas into one of his most embarrassing moments. Hours before Johnson heard of Jenkins' arrest on a morals charge in 1964, Fortas had been summoned by Jenkins, who told him: "Abe, I've got to see you. I'm in terrible trouble."

Fortas tried to get the story squelched in Washington newspapers. He was successful with two of them, then a wire service broke the news. Fortas obtained Jenkins' resignation.

The lawyer was always frank about the roles he played for the President. He made no boasts, but neither did he pretend that he and Johnson were just casual acquaintances.

APPROVAL WAS QUICK

When Goldberg resigned from the Supreme Court to succeed the late Adlai Stevenson at the United Nations, Johnson quickly nominated Fortas to replace him, and the Senate was quick to agree.

On the high bench Fortas established himself as a liberal and a champion of civil and individual liberties, a believer in psychiatry and the law, a believer in aid for oppressed nations and a believer in opening doors for the underdog.

He voted most like Chief Justice Earl Warren and other liberals—Justices William J. Brennan, Jr., William O. Douglas, Hugo Black.

In one recent decision, however, he disagreed with Warren, dissenting vigorously in a 6–3 decision upholding the constitutionality of New York's 1965 law requiring school systems to lend textbooks to pupils of parochial schools.

Fortas was the winning, and liberal, side when the court upheld the 1965 federal voting rights law, killed off payment of a poll tax as a condition to voting in state and local elections, and held unconstitutional a requirement that members of the Communist Party register with the federal government.

On several occasions, Fortas' vote has been decisive in producing liberal decisions.

FOR SUSPECT'S RIGHTS

He was with the majority when the court voted 5–4 to rule out all incriminating statements made in court by a suspect whose constitutional rights in regard to possible self-incrimination were not safeguarded by police.

Before his court appointment, Fortas set up the design of the Warren Commission, which investigated the assassination of John F. Kennedy, and before that, he had served as liaison between Johnson and the Kennedy family at the time of the President's funeral.

While not the first Jew to serve on the high court, he is the first to be appointed chief justice.

[From Americans for Constitutional Action]

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 26.—Americans for Constitutional Action (ACA) announced today, in response to inquiries from the Press, that the new nominee for Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Homer Thornberry, received a 5 percent rating for his final two years in Congress, 1961–1962, as a Representative from Texas.

ACA, national non-partisan, political ac-

tion organization, headquartered in Washington, added that Mr. Thornberry received a 16 percent cumulative ACA rating for the years 1957–62. The ratings are based on the voting records of the Members of Congress on major national and international issues.

The 5 percent 1961–62 rating and the 16 percent cumulating 1957–62 rating classify Mr. Thornberry, according to ACA, as an "extreme Left-wing Liberal."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 27, 1968]

HIGH COURT CYNICALLY MANIPULATED

(By David Lawrence)

Once again the membership of the Supreme Court of the United States has been cynically made an instrument of personal and political manipulation. The audacity of presidents in giving judicial appointments to political cronies was pointed out by this correspondent in what he wrote at the time when the two men now being named to fill vacancies on the nation's highest court—Abe Fortas and Homer Thornberry—were first nominated to serve on the federal bench.

Back in July 1963, President Kennedy announced that he was naming to the federal district court Rep. Thornberry, a Texas Democrat and for many years a political ally of Lyndon Johnson, then vice president. On July 11, 1963, this correspondent wrote:

"It is reported on Capitol Hill that the administration plans to defer action in the Senate on the Thornberry nomination until some time toward the end of the present session in order to assure his vote for administration policies in the closely divided Rules Committee of the House while important legislation is being considered by the committee in the next few months. . . .

"But why should Rep. Thornberry be rewarded with a federal judgeship? He has never served on the bench in any court. Why should the president of the United States give anyone a lifetime post in the judicial system on the basis of favors done of a political nature? How can there be confidence in the federal judiciary if judgeships become a matter of political patronage? Were there no lawyers or state judges in West Texas better qualified for the judgeship in question? . . .

"Does the system of using judgeships as a reward for past political favors mean that judges already on the bench can expect promotions to the United States Court of Appeals only if they 'play ball' with the administration in power?"

President Johnson in 1965 advanced Thornberry to the Court of Appeals and now has named him an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Also, when Arthur Goldberg was persuaded to leave the high court to become U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, President Johnson promptly appointed his long-time personal adviser, Abe Fortas, as associate justice. This correspondent wrote then, on July 25, 1965:

"Small wonder that the Supreme Court of the United States has steadily fallen into disrepute in recent years as it has developed into an oligarchy of politically rather than judicially minded individuals. Now President Johnson has selected Abe Fortas—his personal friend of long standing who has never had a day's experience on the bench—to be one of the nine justices of the Supreme Court of the United States. This is in line with the unfortunate trend of the past several years.

"Other presidents besides Johnson, Republican as well as Democratic, have appointed to the Supreme Court political associates or partisan supporters with a controversial background. . . .

"It is surprising that spokesmen for the bar associations, who often stress the need for a 'rule of law,' are willing to sit by without protest as political rather than judicial training becomes the major qualification for appointment to the highest court of the land."

What redress do the American people have when there is such blatant politics in appointments to the nation's highest court? The voters cannot express themselves on this issue directly at the polls, but they can hold responsible the members of the Senate who may soon vote to confirm the appointments. One third of the senators will be seeking reelection in November, and the people will have a chance to reject those candidates who go along with the "packing" of the Supreme Court with lifetime appointments of political cronies by a "lame-duck" president.

Other senators of both parties who will be voting on whether or not to confirm and who happen not to be up for re-election this year will hardly be indifferent, moreover, to the way public opinion reacts to this strange episode. For when a president with just a few months left in office undertakes to deprive the next president of an opportunity to appoint a chief justice of the United States—a position vitally affecting the operation of the American Constitutional system—it is hardly likely that the American people will approve what appears to them to be a case of political manipulation. There may even be a filibuster in the Senate to prevent action until the convening of the newly elected Congress in January.

[From the New York Times, June 27, 1968]

WARREN-JOHNSON LETTERS

WASHINGTON, June 26.—Following are the texts of a letter of retirement and a letter of explanation sent June 13 by Chief Justice Earl Warren to President Johnson and the text of the President's.

CHIEF JUSTICE'S LETTERS

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C., Section 371(B), I hereby advise you of my intention to retire as Chief Justice of the United States effective at your pleasure.

Respectfully yours,

EARL WARREN.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In connection with my retirement letter of today, I desire to state my reason for doing so at this time.

I want you to know that it is not because of reasons of health or on account of any personal or associational problems, but solely because of age. I have been advised that I am in as good physical condition as a person of my age has any right to expect. My associations on the court have been cordial and satisfying in every respect, and I have enjoyed each day of the fifteen years I have been here.

The problem of age, however, is one that no man can combat and, therefore, eventually must bow to it. I have been continuously in the public service for more than 50 years. When I entered the public service, 150 million of our 200 million people were not yet born. I, therefore, conceive it to be my duty to give way to someone who will have more years ahead of him to cope with the problems which will come to the Court.

I believe there are few people who have enjoyed serving the public or who are more grateful for the opportunity to have done so than I. I take leave of the Court with the warmest of feelings for every member on it and for the institution which we have jointly served in the years I have been privileged to be part of it.

With my very best wishes for your continued good health and happiness, I am

Sincerely,

EARL WARREN.

THE PRESIDENT'S LETTER

MY DEAR MR. CHIEF JUSTICE: It is with the deepest regret that I learn of your desire to retire, knowing how much the nation has benefited from your service as Chief Justice. However, in deference to your wishes, I will seek a replacement to fill the vacancy in the office of Chief Justice that will be occasioned when you depart. With your agreement, I will accept your decision to retire effective at such time as a successor is qualified.

You have won for yourself the esteem of your fellow citizens. You have served your nation with exceptional distinction and deserve the nation's gratitude.

Under your leadership, the Supreme Court of the United States has once again demonstrated the vitality of this nation's institutions and their capacity to meet with vigor and strength the challenge of changing times. The Court has acted to achieve justice, fairness, and equality before the law for all people.

Your wisdom and strength will inspire generations of Americans for many decades to come.

Fortunately, retirement does not mean that you will withdraw from service to your nation and to the institutions of the law. I am sure that you will continue, although retired from active service as Chief Justice, to respond to the calls which will be made upon you to furnish continued inspiration and guidance to the development of the rule of law both internationally and in our own nation. Nothing is more important than this work which you undertook so willingly and have so well advanced.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson is to be commended for his nomination of Associate Justice Abe Fortas to be Chief Justice of the United States and Judge Homer Thornberry to a member of the Supreme Court.

These two appointments by the President continue his record of nominating the best people for the most important public offices in the land.

Justice Fortas has already demonstrated his high competence during the 3 years in which he has served on the Supreme Court.

Judge Thornberry has had wide judicial experience in Federal courts as well as experience in the private practice of law and as a county attorney in Texas.

I had the pleasure of serving with Homer Thornberry in the House of Representatives where I came to know and admire his total dedication to the public interest.

The Supreme Court is one of the foundation stones of the American Government as set forth in the Constitution. The two nominations by President Johnson will help assure the strength and stability of that foundation.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the President's appointments of a new Chief Justice and a new Associate Justice of the Supreme Court offer dramatic justification for the approval of my proposal, House Joint Resolution 1279, for the election of all Federal judges.

The President, in making these lame-duck appointments, has brought two questions to the surface regarding the highest court of justice in our land. First, what general political motivations lie at the bottom of this action? And second, to what extent should any President go to his closest personal friends for making lifetime appointments of this kind?

By all rightful considerations of the public interest the President should have

left these appointments to his successor. The new President to take office in January will carry with him a mandate of the people which, by any reasonable standard, should be reflected in the lifetime appointments of men whose Supreme Court service will virtually be beginning at the same time the new President enters the White House.

House Joint Resolution 1279, providing for the election of Federal judges, is designed to avert exactly this kind of situation. Many Americans will wish that President Johnson, instead of making these lameduck appointments yesterday, would have expressed his support for the election of Federal judges as a means of making our Government more responsive to the people of the country.

Some would say that this would put the court in politics. But I ask you—what, other than politics, could have been the President's motive in making these appointments?

What we need on the Supreme Court today is not a group of personal friends of the President or of anyone else. Rather, we need a court made up of judges trained in the law and trained in writing decisions. We need a court made of men sensitive to the constitutional safeguards which have too often been laid by the wayside in recent years.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard much recently about "the establishment" and about how young people and others of fresh imagination and energy bitterly resent their difficulty in making an imprint on the course of public events. We see today in America a forceful challenge to the established ways of government of the past years. The President's appointments are a crude effort to defy that challenge and to perpetuate a system that has already been discredited. I urge our colleagues in the other body to consider these appointments carefully for the good of our Nation.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, is there now anyone so bold in this land who would step forward and say that the appointment of Supreme Court Justices for life to the bench removes that branch of government from politics? If so, then yesterday's appointment of Mr. Justice Fortas as Chief Justice and of yet another who shares Great Society beliefs, supposedly in its waning hours, should once and for all put that illusion to rest.

And should there still be those who in their naivety point to any proposal that the Congress review these Justices periodically and call it "radical and dangerous," then, this too, serves only to confound and perplex those who have seen the protection of the "separation of powers" principle become nonexistent.

I feel the urgent necessity to introduce this resolution because the Supreme Court has established itself as "a second legislative branch" completely frustrating the will of the people as it is supposed to be expressed through the Congress of the United States.

Never in the history of our democracy has the citizenry of this land confronted a crisis as grave as that which now exists. I am speaking not of the riots in our streets; not of the continuation of what is already the longest war in which our Nation has been involved; not of the great debt incurred by our Government which has placed heavy tax burdens upon every citizen; not of the regrettable and incomprehensible failure of our law-enforcement bodies to protect lives and property; and not of the myriad of other tragedies spread across the headlines of daily newspapers and uttered from the lips of radio and television newscasters. I am most fervently speaking of the undeniable and sweeping change in the form of government which we have learned to hold so dear and for which Americans have lived and died. I earnestly believe there can be no lasting solution to any of the problems we are frantically attempting to resolve until a more fundamental issue is decided, that of whether the system of government we have known is to be permitted survival.

The resolution which I am introducing is an essential first step toward maintaining that government which was conceived by those who drafted our Constitution. Citizens of this country are now living in a national welfare state, the evolution of which is largely attributable to decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. Had these decisions been limited to an interpretation of the law, as was intended by the Founding Fathers, we would not now be experiencing the trauma of crushed ideals and shattered freedoms. It is imperative for us to understand what the Supreme Court is doing. Stated simply, it is legislating under the guise of interpreting the Constitution. It has assumed powers never intended for its use and has plunged this Nation into bold and frightening sociological experiments.

Our Founding Fathers carefully and purposefully included in the Constitution of 1787 an intricate system of checks and balances. It was their purpose to establish an effective government without bestowing absolute power upon any segment thereof. The House of Representatives was established and given the power to make laws; but the Senate was given the power to reject those laws. Likewise, the Senate was created and given power to enact laws; but the House of Representatives can reject those laws. Even when the Senate and House of Representatives concur in the passage of a law, the Chief Executive has the power to approve or reject the same; but if the law is rejected by the President, his rejection can be overruled by two-thirds of the Senate and House. Through this "balance of powers" the will of the American people could be expressed, legislation suggested, hearings held at which expert testimony could be obtained, and a thorough analysis of the need for new laws could be arrived at.

A judiciary was established and given the power to interpret laws; but the power to make law was expressly reserved for the people through their representatives in Congress. Today, we are witnessing a usurpation of power by the judiciary. That which was most feared by the framers of the Constitution has come to pass; namely, resignation of the policy of our Government into the hands of a few. Decisions are being handed down by the Supreme Court which are tantamount to laws; and the judiciary has become an effective legislative branch of the Government. The tragedy of this occurrence is the total and complete removal of the people from an eminent part of the lawmaking process.

Although I am not in accord with many of the laws of this land which have achieved that status through Supreme Court decisions, it is not my intention to discuss the merits of those laws. It is very definitely my intention to depict their impact upon this Nation and the fact that the Founding Fathers never, not in their wildest dreams, conceived of the Judiciary having the ability to make such laws.

The impact upon this country of laws enacted by the Supreme Court is oftentimes greater than laws enacted by the Congress.

It is equally true that many of the decisions of the Court have been rendered with noble purposes and without question there has been instances where many individuals have benefited, however, the broad question of the impact of far-ranging and novel experiments by the Court upon our total society has been ignored. The members of the Court, being shielded by life tenure from the will of the people and, apparently insulated by their station in life from the realities of the world in which we live, have, on occasion, thrown prudence to the wind. Can anyone make a pretence of loyalty to this country and justify a decision which protects the employment of an admitted Communist in a factory devoted to the production of armaments for national defense? Their release of admittedly guilty persons who have returned to society to wreak havoc upon it, is a black mark in the history of the Court.

Only yesterday, I read that Danny Escobedo was arrested once again on a narcotics charge. You will remember, the Escobedo case established by the Supreme Court the principle that his interrogation by police without a lawyer present was grounds for reversing a conviction, where by his own admission, Escobedo had confessed to the crime. And who can forget the case of Andrew Mallory whose conviction for rape in Washington, D.C., was reversed by the Supreme Court on the grounds that Mallory was held too long between his arrest and arraignment. In this case, there were three suspects arrested together, each agreed to a lie detector test, and following these tests interrogation by police brought a confession from Andrew Mallory that he was the one who perpetrated the crime. After his release, Mallory committed another personal assault in Philadelphia for which he was convicted and sentenced from 11½ to 23 years imprisonment. This second victim—and probably others we do not know about—would have been spared the ravages of this criminal if justice had not miscarried—if the courts had not seized upon a dubious technicality to set him free. Probably, the most notorious of these decisions in the area of criminal law is the Miranda case, whereby the Court threw out a written confession by Ernesto Miranda convicted by a lower court of kidnaping and rape. Because Mr. Miranda was not fore-

warned, his signed confession was held invalid and his conviction overturned.

The far-reaching scope of Supreme Court decisions in criminal cases has usurped the prerogatives of the legislatures of the various States and one would do well to observe with fear the restraints which these decisions have placed upon local law-enforcement institutions.

In the name of protecting individual rights, the Supreme Court has made law which, if not checked, will ultimately cause the destruction of society. On its face, the results of these actions don't seem too bad, however, in their application, there is not a hardened criminal in the United States who does not take full advantage of the benefits bestowed upon him by the Supreme Court. Most respectable citizens do not even know of the intricate web which the policeman must weave if he is to comply with the "laws of the Supreme Court." He may, however, ask any criminal and receive a complete explanation.

Let us look more closely at the Court's decision in Miranda. The case turns upon the question of when counsel was appointed for an accused indigent. The Court held that counsel must be appointed, not only for the trial, but as soon as the accused is charged with a crime. This rule was derived by virtue of the Supreme Court's interpretation of the meaning of the sixth amendment of the Constitution. I want to read that amendment in its entirety.

It says:

> In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right of a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defense. [sic]

The language of the amendment is plain and lends no support whatsoever to the Court's "interpretation." Even if one feels the rules which have evolved from these decisions of the Supreme Court which are under discussion are good rules, he must admit there is no authority in the judiciary to make the same. If he then asks where the authority rests, he need only read the 10th amendment of the Constitution which states:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

The Supreme Court has so busily created laws which diminish the protections States have established for their citizens that soon one's only refuge will be to turn to the Almighty. Yet, even prayer has not escaped the dominating hand of the Court. "Interpreting" the first amendment to the Constitution, the Supreme Court declared it unconstitutional for children in the New York public school system to participate in a recitation of these words:

> Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country.

This decision of the Court may be found in the case of *Engel* v. *Vitale* (370 U.S. 421 (1962)); and it should be noted that the portion of the first amendment to the Constitution involved in the case says no more than:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

I do not dispute the applicability of the first amendment to States by virtue of the due process clause of the 14th amendment. That is another subject. I do dispute and shall continue to dispute the holding that the simple prayer I have quoted is an "establishment of religion". Writing a dissenting opinion, Mr. Justice Stewart said the Court had "misapplied a great constitutional principle." He said the issue involved was whether "those pupils who wish to do so may join in a brief prayer at the beginning of each school day"; and he said, further, he was unable to see how an official religion could be established thereby.

There are many cases which have been concluded in the lower Federal Courts, holding in accord with Engel against Vitale; and it may be safely said that the Supreme Court has successfully banned prayer and Bible readings from public schools. To give only one example among many, the case of *Stein* v. *Oshinsky* (224 F. Supp. 757 (1963); 348 F. 2d 999 (1964); Cert. denied, 382 U.S. 957) holds that children cannot even voluntarily say, before having milk and cookies:

> God is great, God is Good
> And we thank Him for our food.
> Amen

Or

> Thank you for the World so Sweet,
> Thank you for the food we eat,
> Thank you for the birds that sing,
> Thank you God for everything.

That same Supreme Court which decided Engle against Vitale and which begins each session following the Court Crier's supplication, "God save the United States and this Honorable Court", refused to hear the case of Stein against Oshinsky. The Supreme Court has itself violated the first amendment, but not quite so vaguely. It has clearly created law which prohibits the free exercise of religion. Is there no sanction against the judiciary?

No one can deny that many persons have benefited from some of the decisions of the Supreme Court. I would be the last to state that the "one-man, one-vote" rule, arrived at by the Court in *Baker* v. *Carr* (369 U.S. 186 (1962)) did not greatly benefit the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia. But, I cannot use the desirability of this action to defend the obvious extension of the Court's jurisdiction into legislative areas in arriving at that decision.

I am not alone in questioning the scope of this decision. Mr. Justice Harlan, joined by Mr. Justice Frankfurter wrote:

> I can find nothing in the Equal Protection Clause or elsewhere in the Federal Constitution which expressly or impliedly supports the view that state legislatures must be so structured as to reflect with approximate equality the voice to every voter. Not only is that proposition refuted by history * * * but it strikes deep into the heart of our federal system. Its acceptance would require us to turn our backs on the regard which this Court has always shown for the judgment of state legislatures and courts on matters of basically local concern.

And, Mr. Justice Frankfurter, joined by Mr. Justice Harlan said:

> To find such a political conception legally enforceable in the broad and unspecific guarantee of equal protection is to rewrite the Constitution.

The case of *Wesberry* v. *Sanders* (376 U.S. 1 (1964)) is the Georgia sequel to Baker against Carr; and the Supreme Court held that congressional districts must be composed of substantially equal numbers of people. Again, I do not argue here today that the law of the land imposed by this decision is necessarily bad law; but I heartily agree with that portion of Mr. Justice Harlan's vigorous dissent which reads:

> Today's decision has portents for our society and the Court itself which should be recognized. This is not a case in which the Court vindicates the kind of individual rights that are assured by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment * * * The Claim for judicial relief in this case strikes at one of the fundamental doctrines of our system of government, the separation of power. In upholding that claim the Court attempts to effect reforms in a field which the Constitution, as plainly as can be, has committed exclusively to the political process * * * this Court, no less than all other branches of the Government, is bound by the Constitution. The Constitution does not confer upon the Court blanket authority to step into every situation where the political branch may be thought to have fallen short. The stability of this institution ultimately depends not only upon its being alert to keep the other branches of government within constitutional bounds, but equally upon recognition of the limitations on the Court's own functions in the constitutional systems.

Certainly, in the field of civil rights, beginning with *Brown* v. *Board of Education* (347 U.S. 483 (1954)), the Supreme Court has led and continues to lead the Congress. This school segregation decision was much more than simply a move to end segregation in schools, it was the beginning of a trend—marking the entry of the Supreme Court into areas heavily weighted with political overtones.

The importance of Brown against Board of Education is not whether segregation is right or wrong. Rather, its importance rests in whether the Court had the power to render such an unprecedented decision. Until this case, the Court had, through many decisions, recognized its limitations. In numerous decisions, the Court had stated there was no constitutional prohibition against legislation providing for separation of the races; and in the case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163 U.S. 537 (1896)), the Court said that such legislation was "no more than an official recognition of prevailing social custom."

When the Court decided Brown against Board of Education it rejected all legal precedent and donned the robes of society's social conscience.

In the years since the Brown case, the Court has moved from its position of creator of civil rights to a position of

taskmaster for the advancement of social and economic goals. Tragically, but understandably, society has been unable to meet the demand of this second legislative branch of the Government; and the result has been the violence which is so prevalent in the streets of these United States.

Today we are looking back upon a nation which once stood for individual freedom. We are looking ahead to an egalitarian society, the type of society which, history has proven, will destroy itself. Much of the responsibility for this change in the structure of the American Government rests upon the U.S. Supreme Court.

Until 1900, the War Between the States constituted the major, if not the only real national emergency in this country; and, therefore, the Government did not find it necessary to assert broad powers. Every such attempt was squelched by the Supreme Court. And later in the cases of *Hammer* v. *Dagenhart* (247 U.S. 251 (1918)), *Carter* v. *Carter Coal Co.* (298 U.S. 238 (1936)), and *Bailey* v. *Drexel Furniture Co.* (259 U.S. 20 (1922)), the Supreme Court correctly held that Congress was attempting to assert control over local matters which control was reserved to the States. But, following President Franklin Roosevelt's appeal that the national emergency warranted different constitutional decisions, the Court began to take a complete about face; and now that it has turned completely around, it is moving posthaste in the other direction. It is incumbent upon the citizens of this Nation to do something in the interest of self-preservation; and I am suggesting that which must be done.

Judicial life tenure was granted to Supreme Court Justices in order to shield the Court from political pressures. The shield has been used, however, to respond to political pressures through legislating without fear of reprisal. Thus, the balance of power, so carefully created by the framers of our Constitution, is in a state of imbalance; and it must be restored.

The resolution which I am introducing proposes a constitutional amendment providing for confirmation of the appointment of Supreme Court Justices by two-thirds of the House and Senate. It provides, further, that the House and Senate shall reconfirm a number of the Justices during each third year. This does not destroy the intent of the Constitution. On the contrary, it is a means by which the meaning of the Constitution can be restored and the powers of this Government rebalanced. It is not required by reason that a Justice of the Supreme Court, who holds in his hands the power to destroy our system of government, be answerable to someone?

Finally, Mr. Justice Hugo L. Black, the senior member of the Supreme Court and long considered one of its most effective liberal voices, was quoted in the April 1, 1968, issue of U.S. News & World Report. In the Carpentier Lectures at Columbia University Law School, delivered March 20, 21, and 23 of this year, he said:

> The courts are given power to interpret the Constitution and laws, which means to explain and expound, not to alter, amend or remake. Judges take an oath to support the Constitution as it is, not as they think it should be. I cannot subscribe to the doctrine that, consistent with that oath, a judge can arrogate to himself a power to "adapt the Constitution to new times."
>
> But adherence to the Constitution as written does not mean we are controlled by the dead. It means we are controlled by the Constitution, truly a living document. For it contains within itself a lasting recognition that it should be changed to meet new demands, new conditions, new times.
>
> It provides the means to achieve these changes through the amendment process in Article V.

Mr. Justice Black has eloquently stated the problem which exists and the method of solving it. I urge my colleagues to take this first step which I am proposing.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and my honor to have as a classmate, as a fellow freshman in the 81st Congress, the Honorable William Homer Thornberry, whom President Johnson has nominated to the Supreme Court of the United States.

During his service in the House there was not a Member on either side of the aisle who did not hold him in the highest respect. Of such as Homer Thornberry are great judges made, and to that appraisal there will not be a single dissenting voice among the hundreds of his colleagues in his years of service in the House.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of the appointments of Mr. Justice Fortas and Homer Thornberry.

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

There was no objection.

SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT DESIGN MUST MEET ACCEPTABLE STANDARDS OF NOISE AND SONIC BOOMS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Appropriations today struck out a $223 million item for the development of supersonic transport until such time as industry comes up with an acceptable design.

The committee has also recommended that the $30 million heretofore advanced for this project be returned to the Treasury.

I want to congratulate the committee for its wisdom and good judgment. The committee has instructed the appropriate agencies to first come up with an acceptable design that will meet the standards of noise and supersonic booms in this country before any money is spent on this project.

Mr. Speaker, I am not at all disturbed with the fact that the British and the French are now developing a supersonic transport known as the Concord. That aircraft will produce a supersonic boom of such gravity that I am sure it will be barred from operating over the United States at supersonic speeds. I am certain that Congress sooner or later will approve legislation which I have introduced which would require that no supersonic flight can be made over the continental United States which produces supersonic booms of more than 1.5 pounds of pressure per square foot at ground level.

This is a serious problem. It is one confronting this Nation, and the world, and I believe the Committee on Appropriations today showed extremely good judgment in not funding any more money until the designers of these aircraft are prepared to come before Congress and to come before the people and say that they have designed an airfoil and a powerplant that will give us the thrust and the lift, and the speed that we need to fly at supersonic speeds which will not produce devastating supersonic booms in their wake.

We know the damage that supersonic booms can do. We had the example just recently at the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs where a supersonic flight broke some 300 windows and seriously injured a number of soldiers, including one colonel who had a piece of glass shattered through his neck. I do not know how he is doing at this moment, but that example just gives us a preview of things to come in this country if we do not insist upon research to counteract this problem of sonic booms before billions of dollars are spent on the development of a supersonic transport. I do not believe we should spend any more on supersonic planes until we have one designed that will not produce sonic booms in excess of tolerable limits. If the engineers say they have not reached that state of science where they can guarantee against sonic booms, then I say, Mr. Speaker, society just is not ready for supersonic flights. I do not believe that we have to jeopardize millions of people in the name of so-called progress. The aircraft industry has a responsibility to our people and until they break through the sonic boom problem, there just will not be any supersonic flights over the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, I congratulate the House Committee on Appropriations for its good judgment.

THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE CRIME PROBLEM IN AMERICA TODAY

Mr. ABBITT. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, All of us are keenly aware of the seriousness of the crime problem in America today. We are confronted with it on every hand, and the news media constantly report evidence that crime is on the increase in all parts of the country.

The recent statistics released by the Federal Bureau of Investigation are further evidence of the fact that we need to take some tangible and forceful action in order to deter those who are bent on breaking the law. It is abundantly obvious that much of the increase in crime in recent years has been brought about by the attitude of the top echelon of our law-enforcement authorities as well as the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. These decisions have given the criminal encouragement, protection and almost a license to commit crime at will. In addition, many of our courts have a growing tendency to release vicious criminals, to probation and turn them loose to prey further upon the innocent.

Something must be done by the Congress to change the present procedure and atmosphere if lawlessness and violence are to be wiped out in our Nation. If some of our national leaders who are now crying out against the crime wave would help the Congress enact the necessary laws to put a curb on the Supreme Court in its all-out effort to protect the criminal elements and to strengthen the hands of law-enforcement officials, we would then be in a much better position to combat crime throughout the Nation. In an endeavor to stop the coddling of prisoners and to in a small way increase the protection to society as a whole, several necessary changes in the law must be made. Action should be taken immediately and forthrightly.

The omnibus crime control bill, which the Congress recently approved, and which has now been signed into law, will, I believe, provide some remedial steps in restoring the proper perspective in dealing with crime in America. This law actually is only a first step toward that which is badly needed in order to overcome court decisions of recent years. The omnibus crime control bill reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee contained several sections which were later deleted by the Senate when it passed the bill. I have, therefore, introduced a bill which incorporates these important sections. It is my hope that immediate consideration can be given to enactment of these provisions. The purpose of my bill is to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Federal courts to review certain rulings in State criminal cases, and it provides that section 3502 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to deny jurisdiction to Federal courts to reverse convictions in State courts involving admissions and confessions admitted as voluntarily given where the highest court of the State has affirmed such convictions. The bill also contains section 3503, which would provide that eye-witness testimony is admissible in evidence and limits the appellate jurisdiction of the Federal courts in both Federal and State cases admitting this testimony into evidence. The language of the bill is clear and simple, and its purpose is to further insure that society as a whole will be adequately protected.

The bill also sets forth procedures in obtaining writs of habeas corpus, as follows:

The judgment of a court of a state upon a plea or verdict of guilty in a criminal action shall be conclusive with respect to all questions of law or fact which were determined, or which could have been determined, in that action until such judgment is reversed, vacated, or modified by a court having jurisdiction to review by appeal or certiorari such judgment; and neither the Supreme Court nor any inferior court ordained and established by Congress under Article III of the Constitution of the United States shall have jurisdiction to reverse, vacate, or modify any such judgment of a state court except upon appeal from, or writ of certiorari granted to review, a determination made with respect to such judgment upon review thereof by the highest court of that state having jurisdiction to review such judgment.

I firmly believe that legislation of this type is necessary if we are to adequately protect the public interest against the rise in crime which is gaining momentum all over America.

Those who continually assert that we need to go all out to protect the rights and privileges of the accused regardless of the effect on society as a whole were strongly opposed to the provisions added to the omnibus crime control bill relating to Federal courts. They apparently have no interest in protecting society but only in the coddling and pampering of the criminal element. These same people in the judiciary and out have nearly wrecked crime enforcement in America. They have so shackled our police and handcuffed enforcement officials that justice has been a mockery of in numerous trials of self-confessed vicious criminals. They will likewise be opposed to the provisions of this bill. I believe, however, that the time has come when we need to keep in mind that society as a whole needs to be protected against those who willfully and deliberately violate our laws. Nor can we sit back and let those who have little concern for our national well-being trample down the great constitutional principles which we have so long and painstakingly established.

The dogooders, leftwingers, and others who are constantly bending over backward to extend rights to the accused at the expense of society as a whole are never around to assume any responsibility for the results of their endeavors.

The No. 1 step facing us today is the curbing of the majority of the members of a Supreme Court which majority has done so much to wreck law enforcement in America and to bring about violence and lawlessness on every hand. We need the help of every law-abiding citizen in this effort to restore peace and tranquility in America. This is merely one step but it is an important one.

PRESENTATION OF AIR FORCE COMMENDATION MEDAL TO COL. CLOYCE TIPPETT, U.S. AIR FORCE, RETIRED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, on June 19 it was my great pleasure to attend the presentation of the Air Force Commendation Medal to Col. Cloyce Tippett, U.S. Air Force, retired. Colonel Tippett is an outstanding American who has rendered great service to his country and was most deserving of the tribute accorded him in this presentation. Remarks detailing Colonel Tippett's contribution to the Air Force were made by Brig. Gen. Jammie M. Philpott, U.S. Air Force. I include these remarks in the RECORD for the recognition of all Members of Congress:

REMARKS BY BRIG. GEN. JAMMIE M. PHILPOTT, DEPUTY ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF, INTELLIGENCE, AT THE PRESENTATION OF THE AIR FORCE COMMENDATION MEDAL TO COL. CLOYCE TIPPETT, U.S. AIR FORCE, RETIRED, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19, 1968

Ladies and gentlemen, I wish to express to you General Wheless' regrets for not being able to be here for this occasion and especially to Colonel Tippett whom he has known for a number of years. General Wheless anticipated being here this afternoon to preside at this ceremony; however, he has not been returned to duty and he has asked me to represent him.

On this occasion I believe it appropriate to briefly review some of the highlights of Colonel Tippett's career which started at Randolph and Kelly Fields, Texas in 1936.

Following the war, he was accredited to all Central and South American countries as a representative of the International Civil Aviation Organization. Because of his extensive knowledge of Latin American affairs Colonel Tippett has served his active duty periods with the United States Air Force Foreign Liaison Division from 1960 to the present.

Colonel Tippett's retirement from the Air Force Reserves culminates a long and active association with the United States Air Force which he has carried out with both loyalty and distinction.

Because of this it is fitting that Colonel Tippett's service be recognized with the awarding of the Air Force Commendation Medal.

Colonel Shertzer will you please read the citation.

CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE AWARD OF THE AIR FORCE COMMENDATION MEDAL TO CLOYCE J. TIPPETT

Colonel Cloyce J. Tippett distinguished himself by meritorious service while assigned to the Foreign Liaison Division, Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence, Headquarters United States Air Force, from 25 July 1961 to 17 April 1968. During his active duty periods, Colonel Tippett's highly professional skill, knowledge of Latin American affairs, and dedication to the United States Air Force, assisted to a marked degree in the development and maintenance of cordial and mutually beneficial relationships with the accredited Air Attaches, representatives of foreign missions, and other representatives of foreign Air Forces in the Washington area. The distinctive accomplishments of Colonel Tippett culminate a distinguished career in the service of his country, and reflect credit upon himself and the United States Air Force.

ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF AMERICANS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ACTION

Mr. BLACKBURN. 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. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today is the 10th anniversary of the founding of the Americans for Constitutional Action. This group has for the past 10 years been providing the American people with a comprehensive analysis of the voting records of the Members of Congress.

The ACA is a nonpartisan, nonprofit, nationwide political action organization which is dedicated to preserving our constitutional government as envisioned by our Founding Fathers. The main purpose of this organization is to protect American's social and economic freedoms and to combat trends toward socialism and a regimented society. In the true American tradition, the ACA has supported candidates for Congress who will protect these basic constitutional freedoms.

The board of directors and trustees of the Americans for Constitutional Action are a group of distinguished Americans. Among the trustees are patriotic Americans from the fields of business, government, law, and medicine. One of these trustees, Mr. John Wayne, celebrated Hollywood actor, has actively supported and campaigned for the cause of constitutional government. Over July Fourth, John Wayne will act as grand marshal of Atlanta's annual Fourth of July parade, and I have the honor of participating in that event. Mr. Wayne has always supported the goals of the ACA, and I consider him one of the outstanding members of this organization.

For the information of my colleagues, there are eight basic principles which the ACA adheres to. They are the following:

First. Man has the right to life, liberty, and possessing, utilizing, and disposing of his honestly acquired property.

Second. When any individual, group, or government deprives a person of his God-given rights, it is done in violation of natural law.

Third. No man can deprive posterity of their God-given rights or he cannot vote away or give away their economic and political freedom.

Fourth. All powers of government should be obtained by delegation of the individual. The government does not have the right to forcibly seize power or obtain power by voluntary delegation by individual citizens.

Fifth. Safeguards must be erected against an expanding government to insure that the instruments forged to protect the rights of the people will not be used to destroy those rights.

Sixth. To insure economic freedom, we must strive to preserve the free market system into which government can only intrude to protect individual rights and to prevent predatory action.

Seventh. The prevention of onerous or punitive taxation, including inflation, which tends to destroy economic freedom must be ameliorated. A slave is a person to whom economic freedom is denied.

Eighth. For every right there is a collateral responsibility. Unless there is a general prevailing individual self-discipline, which stems from devotion to the moral code, it is impossible to achieve that balance between public order and individual freedom which is essential for spiritual growth and material prosperity.

As we approach the Fourth of July, I hope each of you will join in rededicating yourselves to strengthening the principles of constitutional government and extend your best wishes to members of ACA as they celebrate their 10th anniversary.

AMERICANS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ACTION

Mr. SNYDER. 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 Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, today Americans for Constitutional Action completes a decade of service to the American electorate and also to numerous Members of Congress. For 10 years their efforts have played a vital and often decisive part in congressional elections; their winning percentages have been consistently high during their years of participation. This fact was dramatically pointed out by the nonpartisan, authoritative Congressional Quarterly when they reviewed the 1964 elections and found that out of 121 House contests where ACA and the AFL–CIO's COPE endorsed competing candidates, ACA endorsees won 68 races while 52 were won by COPE candidates.

ACA's published ratings—ACA Index—on the voting records of all legislators at the close of each session, provide an invaluable measure for the voting public to see for themselves how they are truly being represented. The news media also use the Index widely as a reliable gage of voting trends and varying individual patterns.

Conservative candidates who receive ACA's support are provided with a variety of services ranging from the counseling of new candidates to professional campaign assistance in areas where needed. Along with additional services such as in-depth research, speech material, art layouts, news releases, and use of ACA publications. However, regardless of ACA's involvement, a firm policy of never making endorsements without a prior request from the candidate, is maintained.

When manpower is needed in a given area, it is recruited if possible from the candidate's own district or State and takes direction directly from the candidate in an assigned capacity. This may include organizing the campaign, speechwriting, statistical research, fundraising, organizing committees, and election-day workers, or whatever needed.

ACA has organized citizens groups in some areas on a statewide or district level. They were organized to support conservative incumbents or to seek out new candidates where necessary. By their nonpartisan stature they have often been a tremendous asset to officeseekers on not only the congressional level but to State and local candidates.

After observing the many facets of ACA through the past 7 years I have developed a deep respect for their capacities and the leadership that makes them possible. And I want to say, "Thank you, ACA," for what you have done for so many of us in this Congress and in the past—I hope that you will continue and ever expand your efforts for good government through your voter education programs, campaign assistance, and in future ways that may not yet be on your planning boards.

PATRIOTISM TODAY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared recently in the June 21 issue of the Lauderdale County Enterprise of Ripley, Tenn., one of the outstanding weekly newspapers in the Nation, an article that was so outstanding from PFC Danny Ray Falkner, who is presently in the armed services in Korea, that I felt it should be brought to the attention of the Congress.

I know that many of us are getting letters from time to time from these hippies and draft-card burners not wanting to go to the service, but this young man is a true American in every respect. The letter speaks for itself:

EDITOR:

I am PFC Danny Ray Falkner. I have been a life-long resident of Lauderdale County. I graduated from Ripley High School in May of 1967. I'm presently a member of the United States Army Security Agency, which is stationed in Korea along the demilitarized zone.

Recently, I have been deeply touched over the matter of patriotism in our young people of today.

I hope you will publish this statement in order that it may help our young people, not only of Lauderdale County, but of the whole United States, in the way of patriotism.

Recently, there have been many riots and numerous people burning their draft cards, in protest against the Viet Nam war, and against the draft. From seeing all of this, a very serious question has arisen: "Patriotism, is it dead?"

As a member of the United States Army, I have been deeply touched by the fact that our American young people of today are doing such foolish stuff. These young people don't seem to realize what they are doing.

Ever since 1775, we Americans have been fighting for our freedom. We were fighting for the right to do as we wish, fighting to have the privilege of free vote, and the right to free speech. Our fore-fathers fought for such freedom, in order that generations to come might enjoy this privilege. Our men in Viet Nam today are fighting in order to help a country to rid itself of Communist aggression.

The young people also don't seem to realize that unless we continue to resist Communism, we will soon be under Communist rule, where we wouldn't have the right to do as we wish, nor have the right to express ourselves freely.

As for myself, I don't like war any more than anyone else does, but I realize the fact that we must fight in order to keep our freedom. Such stuff as burning draft cards and rioting in protest goes to prove that patriotism in our young people of today is at an all-time low, and something must be done about it, and quickly.

I agree a person has the right to express

himself, but when it comes down to where he burns his draft card and causes riots that endanger the lives of innocent people, it's absolutely foolish.

A person should want to serve his country. A person should have so much pride and respect that he would be willing to lay down his life in its defense.

We should remember the words of one of the famous patriots of the American Revolutionary War, Nathan Hale.

Nathan Hale was a school teacher before the war. He quit his job when the war broke out and joined the army. As you and I know, Nathan Hale was caught and hung as a spy. But his last words were not of protest and hate; they were of love and devotion to his country, and these words were, of course, "I have but one life to give to my country." Nathan Hale thought so much of his country that he was willing to lay down his life in its defense. Our young people of today should remember his words.

I enlisted in the army for one reason, and one reason only. The reason was because I was proud of my country and I was proud of those who fought and died before me for my country in order that I might enjoy the freedom that I now enjoy.

I was willing at least to give up a few years of my life for my country. And now if needed, I will give my life in its defense, because, as I've said, I'm proud of my country.

A person should be proud and be willing to serve if he is called to do so. He shouldn't go with hate or go rebelliously in his heart. There are many people all over the world who would love to have this freedom that we enjoy.

If a person goes with pride and honor in his heart, there will be no need to burn draft cards or cause riots, and above all there will be no need for people to wonder, "Patriotism, is it dead?"

DANNY R. FALKNER,
Co. B, 508th ASA Gp, Korea,
APO San Francisco, Calif. 96207.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT REQUIRES EXEMPTION FROM PERSONNEL CUTBACK TO AVOID MAIL SERVICE CHAOS

Mr. DULSKI. 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. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation to exempt the Post Office Department from the personnel cutback requirements provided in the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968, now awaiting President Johnson's signature.

I have been studying carefully the potential effect of the order on the Department, which already is grappling with a massive increase in mail volume. Clearly, the need will be for added manpower, not less.

The mail volume has increased sharply and postal employment practices have been changed in the Department during the past 2 years, so that the proposed cutback can result in chaos in our mail service.

I have discussed this matter already with our colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, to which committee my bill is being referred. He has assured me that his committee will give early consideration to my bill.

The mail volume in fiscal year 1969 will be 11 percent greater than it was in fiscal year 1966, which is the base year to be used by departments in establishing new employment ceilings.

What is more, there was an important change in the work schedule of postal employees in 1967, requiring more employees because of an expansion of the 5-day workweek, a change in overtime practices, and virtual elimination of split shifts.

The Post Office Department, unlike any other business, has no control over its workload. It has to handle whatever mail is dropped in the mail chutes or piled on the post office platforms.

Here are some of the key factors which are changing between fiscal year 1966, the base year, and fiscal year 1969:

There is a population increase of 7 million, an increase of 4 million in the number of homes in the United States receiving city delivery of mail, an additional 666,377 rural homes, a total of over 358,000 new businesses, and a per capita increase in volume of mail of 8.8 percent.

Even with that big increase in demand for postal service, and the changes in employment practices in the Department, the increase in personnel has been held in check.

In June 1966, the Department employed 489,898 permanent and 188,000 nonpermanent workers. By June 1969, it is now estimated that the Department—with the ordered cutback—will be employing 566,437 permanent and about 195,000 nonpermanent workers.

Unless we give consideration to the special demands of the postal service, I do not see how the Department will be able to handle the mail load while undergoing a big reduction in personnel.

Of course, the effect of the manpower reduction ordered in the tax bill will not be overnight. It will be gradual—by attrition—over a period of months.

During that time, however, the prospect is for the mail volume to keep increasing.

The only alternative is to cut back on postal service. If my mail is any indication, the American public is in no mood to accept anything less than the mail service which it is now receiving.

My bill simply exempts the Post Office Department from the employment limitations in the tax measure. It does not change sections in the bill dealing with reduction in expenditures in fiscal 1969.

THE SILENT DEATH

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate the ease with which one can purchase murder weapons, I recently purchased, in the Times Square area of New York City, a switchblade, a 5-inch gravity knife and other gruesome weapons. These so-called hunting knives are, in reality, only used to hunt people.

Now, while the public is rightly demanding and I am supporting strong gun control legislation, I call for a parallel effort to control these vicious knives. I call upon the Department of Justice, as well as State and local law-enforcement agencies, to crack down by enforcing existing laws. And to tighten existing law, I shall introduce legislation to effectively prohibit the manufacture of these weapons and to prevent the distribution of knives already produced.

Mr. Speaker, in all parts of the country, especially in those areas with effective gun control laws, the number of knife murders is steadily climbing. During 1965 and 1966 there were approximately 20,000 homicides in the United States. Of those 4,700 were committed with knives—that is just under 25 percent. And a national magazine recently reported that in some communities knife murders exceed gun murders by as much as 5 to 1.

As I said, there are existing Federal, State, and local laws controlling the distribution of switchblades and similar weapons. However these laws are too weak and are rarely enforced. Under a 10-year-old Federal law designed to stop the spread of these knives there have been only 17 convictions—that is in 10 years, Mr. Speaker.

Because these knives are a dreadful extension of violence in our society; because they are readily available, even to minors; because existing laws are ineffectual; and because these knives have no constructive purpose whatsoever—for all these reasons I shall introduce legislation to block the manufacture, distribution, and availability of switchblades, gravity knives and similar weapons.

The following points will be included in this legislation:

First. Clearly and specifically prohibit any individual, transporter or common carrier from carrying such knives in interstate travel;

Second. Prohibit the sale of surplus military switchblades;

Third. Prohibit the sale of such knives to an individual who is not a resident of the State in which the knife is sold;

Fourth. Prohibit the ordering of such knives by telephone;

Fifth. Prohibit any distributor or shipper dealing in interstate commerce from selling, transporting, or distributing such knives in any instance; and

Sixth. Prohibit any manufacturer dealing in interstate commerce from manufacturing such knives.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to the Members' attention an excellent article on the problem of switchblade knives This article, written by Jack Harrison Pollack, appeared in the May 26 issue of Parade magazine and, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include it in the RECORD at this point:

WE MUST STOP THE SALE OF SWITCHBLADE KNIVES

(By Jack Harrison Pollack)

It could happen to you or any member of your family, any time, anywhere—on a crowded subway or a lonely suburban street. The motive could be robbery, rape or senseless slaughter. Tempers flare. Suddenly a hand streaks toward a pocket. There is a swift click. A hidden, daggger-tipped blade darts out like a snake's tongue. Clutched in a fist is a murderous "switchblade" or

"gravity" type knife which in close quarters, police say, is as lethal as a loaded revolver.

Millions of words have been written and spoken in and out of Congress about the menace of guns; civic organizations press for legislation to curtail their sale. Too little has been said about concealed knives. Yet crime statistics show that knives cause far more trouble than guns. They accounted for 23 percent of U.S. murders in 1966, and the rate is probably higher today. In many communities, the ratio of knife crimes to gun crimes is as high as five to one. When newspapers report these crimes, they usually say "knife stabbings." But police records often reveal that switchblade or gravity knives were the weapons used.

Isn't it against the law to possess these dangerous knives? Most states have a law against carrying concealed weapons. And in at least 12 states these knives are specifically prohibited—and federal law prohibits their interstate shipment. But the laws are often so vaguely written that they are rarely enforced, and as a result are cynically flouted.

KNIVES AND SCHOOL

Parade learned in a nationwide survey that these switchblade and gravity knives (also called "springblade," "swingback" and "snap" knives)—*which are designed exclusively for violence*—are frequently as easy to buy in many parts of the U.S. as a package of gum or cigarettes. In many fair-sized cities, they are prominently displayed in store windows, and are sold openly, even to teenagers—no questions asked. Some cautious storekeepers, though, sell them from under the counter or cache them in the rear of the shop.

In New York City, the knives are advertised in seedy Times Square store windows with the come-on price—"from 88 cents up." On Chicago's South Side, they are for sale not far from a public school, and they have indeed been bought by thrill-seeking juveniles, who take them up as a fad, and take them to classes and school dances. In some California cities, where a state law prohibits the carrying of any knife with a blade of over two inches, knives and daggers with blades up to nine inches are illegally acquired by hoodlums and others.

In these and other communities, I recently purchased some of these knives. I saw them being sold to scores of minors and grownups, in flagrant violation of local and state laws, often with policemen passively patrolling outside the stores or in the vicinity. You can even charge these illegal purchases to your credit card service!

The knives are mainly manufactured in Japan, Germany and Italy and are smuggled into the U.S. Many have gaudy handles and are labeled "007." Others, also to attract the unhealthy fascination of teenagers and sophomoric adults, are emblazoned with such words as "Lion," "Tiger" and "Eagle." These knives cost from $3.98 to $25 for the more elegant Italian models.

What is the difference between these and conventional knives? First, they have a daggerpoint tip. Second, unlike ordinary pocketknives, they can be operated with one hand. To open a switchblade, you merely press a button, and the blade flies out instantly and locks into position. A gravity knife opens when held firmly by the fingers and quickly snapped with the arm and wrist. The blade leaps forward, automatically locked into place. In states where there is a specific prohibition against switchblades, gravity knives are now coming into greater circulation. These one-handed weapons may not be as multi-purpose as a Boy Scout's jackknife but they are infinitely swifter to open, and thus are favorites with street fighters, muggers and strongarm robbers. "I never even saw the knife," said one victim of a switchblade attack, "I only *felt* it."

I asked merchants why they sold these deadly knives. Here are some of their cynical, if whimsical replies: "People want them for protection." "You don't break your fingernail opening them." "They're easy to peel potatoes with." "You couldn't get a kid a nicer present." "Girls like to use them instead of hatpins."

Salesmen and manufacturers also have an ever-ready alibi: "If people can't get these knives, they'll find other weapons to commit crimes with—guns, icepicks, baseball bats and what-have-you." But countless crimes would never have been committed if switchblade and gravity knives were not so readily available. Police, judges, teachers, social workers and other responsible citizens are increasingly disturbed by the growing use of these weapons. A Midwestern police officer admits: "Nearly three out of four of our stabbing cases this year involved these knives. We sure need a tough law against them."

In 1958, Congress did pass a law to ban the interstate shipment of switchblade knives. Penalties for violation are up to five years in prison and a $2,000 fine. The bill was introduced by Sen. Warren G. Magnuson (D., Wash.) in response to urging the police chiefs across the nation, who were trying to cut down street warfare by youthful gangs. But the Justice Department admits there have been only eight convictions in the past five years. People who were vitally interested in the legislation at the time of its passage seem almost to have forgotten its existence. Senator Magnuson said he hasn't followed the progress of the law, but he has the impression it has "gone a long way toward correcting the situation." However, when asked whether the law had been effective, Attorney General Ramsey Clark declined to comment.

Knives are also on the list of forbidden imports. Customs men say they have seized 2,500 knives from persons returning from Europe in the past 12 months, but only one commercial shipment was confiscated, a consignment of Japanese knives seized in Los Angeles.

MORE THAN A MILLION

A decade ago, switchblade production in the U.S. was reported at 1 million knives a year. This was supplemented by the importation of another 200,000 knives. The federal law exempts from its provisions members of the armed forces when engaged in the pursuit of their duties, and one-armed persons, who may carry switchblades of less than three inches in interstate travel. When I told a storekeeper that I wanted a switchblade for a one-armed friend, he said: "Here's a gravity knife that's just as good. I'll show you how to open it." Another merchant hesitated to sell me a switchblade, but he produced a knife with the usual pushbutton removed, and then told me that I could replace the mechanism in a hardware store!

Most state and local laws are weasel-worded on the subject of the knives, and are often contradictory. Some do not make clear that it is a crime to buy and sell them, but only to "possess" or "carry" them.

Laws have also been handicapped by poor enforcement. Last month in New York City a detective saw a man pull a switchblade on the doorman of my apartment house. The detective seized the knife and told the man to move on. "Why didn't you lock him up?" asked the doorman. "Maybe I should have," said the detective, "but I'd have to go to court to testify against him—and so would you."

A few localities have taken effective action against knives. Philadelphia has passed an ordinance which carries penalties of up to 90 days in prison and a $300 fine for any seller or carrier of switchblade and gravity knives. When storekeepers display the weapons, police crack down. "This law has virtually dried up knives at the source," Ephraim R. Gomberg, executive vice-president of the Philadelphia Crime Commission, says.

How can you protect yourself and your family from this threat? Here are three things you can do immediately:

1. Find out if any of your local storekeepers display or sell switchblade or gravity knives. If they do—and are violating local or state law—notify the police and help prosecute them. Preferably, this can be done through your civic, religious, fraternal or PTA organizations.

2. If your local or state law needs clarifying, or if your state and town has no law against these knives, you can work for the passage of new laws. And add your voice to others demanding strict enforcement.

3. Make certain that your children and their friends do not buy or carry the knives.

Not long ago, a decorated young war hero—who had survived several overseas battle wounds—was getting off a bus with his girl friend. Suddenly, without warning or provocation, a drunken stranger pulled a four-inch switchblade from his pocket and plunged it into the veteran's heart, killing him almost instantly. Who was the murderer? A mentally ill man with a long police record of assault. He couldn't carry a gun without a permit. If needed laws were enacted and enforced, he wouldn't have found it so easy to roam the streets and ride the buses with an equally murderous weapon.

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

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

Mr. PASSMAN. Could you not also do the same thing with reference to a kitchen knife or a common steak knife that you use for cutting meat?

Mr. WOLFF. The kitchen knife is made for the purpose of cutting meat for human consumption, but these knives are made for the purpose of inflicting injury upon individual persons.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, approximately 10 years ago it was my pleasure to participate in the sponsoring of legislation, legislation which Congress passed, prohibiting the interstate shipment and sale of switchblade knives as well as the gravity knife.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the matter to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] has referred will receive the attention of the producers of such weapons and that the appropriate committees of the Congress will take action thereon.

Mr. PASSMAN. This will mean that I will have to head for the use of chopsticks.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON—AGE SHOULD BE NO BARRIER TO THE VOTE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support of President Johnson's proposal for a constitutional amendment to permit 18-year-olds to vote.

Today young people are among the best informed in all history. We need

their fresh ideas to help meet the needs of today's changing world. I do not mean to imply by this that this is an issue that will divide liberals from conservatives. It is a proposal worthy of their accord regardless of party.

The requirement of 21 as the voting age in 46 of our States derives from medieval England. It is illogical to suppose that the age of 21 is a relevant test of majority today. The quality and scope of our education have made such a test obsolete.

The President's proposal has already met with popular support.

In both the 89th and 90th Congresses I introduced a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that citizens 18 years old or members of the Armed Forces of the United States should not be prevented from voting in certain elections on grounds of their age.

It is my opinion that 18-year-olds, fresh from the study of politics and American Government in our high schools, are better versed in public affairs than were the 21-year-olds of 50 or even 25 years ago, and that this segment of our society would make a notable contribution to our political progress. It is time to give them the opportunity for direct participation in the political life of the country.

PROTEST OF PRESIDENT'S NOMINATIONS TO THE SUPREME COURT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to protest with all the vigor at my command the installation of justice by crony as exemplified by "lameduck" President Lyndon Johnson's nominations to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Abe Fortas, Johnson's nominee as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, is a glorified fixer. He demonstrated this beyond doubt in the infamous case of Walter Jenkins, a Johnson White House intimate, who was arrested in the basement of a Washington, D.C., YMCA and forfeited bond on a morals charge.

The nomination of Homer Thornberry, another close friend of the lameduck President, as an Associate Justice, brings into sharp focus the immediate need for Congress to establish qualifications for members of the Supreme Court. There are literally hundreds of members of the bar in this country with far more legal and judicial experience than Thornberry.

Mr. Speaker, this Government as ordained by the Founding Fathers cannot survive if its High Court is to continue to be used as a tool of politics and a dumping ground for cronies.

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman realize that Homer Thornberry goes to the Supreme Court with more Federal judicial experience than any other Member now sitting on the court, with the exception of one Member?

Mr. GROSS. That is no testimonial to the court now sitting, I would say.

Mr. ALBERT. But it is a testimonial to Homer Thornberry.

Of course, the gentleman has made charges about the distinguished nominee for the position of Chief Justice, whose credentials will be gone into by the other body and will be subject to open debate. I think it is admitted the gentleman nominated is one of the most brilliant men in America. I doubt that my friend can substantiate the very serious charges he has made about one of the brightest minds in our country today. I do not think the gentleman wants to be unfair.

Mr. GROSS. I have only 1 minute this evening, but I will be glad at some later date to take more time and to read into the record what happened on the occasion of the Walter Jenkins episode to prove my point. I will be glad at any time, with the gentleman on the floor, to ask questions or to comment, to take some time to do that, if the gentleman insists upon it.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT E. BAUMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GALLAGHER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to pay tribute to a young man with whom most of us have been well acquainted. His service to the Congress began in 1953, as a Page in the House, and has continued to the present day where he serves as manager of the Republican telephones in the House cloakroom. I pay tribute to this young man, Robert Bauman, because at the end of this week he will retire from his position in the House, to begin his career in the practice of law.

Like many young men of ability and determination, Bob completed his education by working his way through school. He has asked for no handouts from the Government, be it State or Federal. He had no stipends or other financial help. Putting himself through undergraduate and law school has only been accomplished by the hard, long efforts of working by day and going to class by night. This very morning in Annapolis, he, along with other young men entering the legal profession, was sworn into the bar of the State of Maryland.

I congratulate Bob on this achievement. He has worked long and hard and the reward is well deserved. As he leaves his tenure as a Republican assistant in the House of Representatives, I and all of my colleagues wish him well. Bob will leave a lot of friends when he leaves the employ of the House. His absence will be noted, I am sure, by many of those who have depended upon him for legislative information, and much more by those who have enjoyed knowing him personally. His reputation as a wit—sometimes it can be a particularly cutting wit—is well known around the cloakroom. He possesses a sense of humor that sometimes is woefully lacking in some men in politics. That sense of humor has often relieved the tension of long and arduous sessions of the Congress. It, coupled with his dedication to the Republican Party, will cause him to be sorely missed by all of us.

I would like to say a few words now about my own personal association with Bob Bauman, which began as long ago as 1957, when I was serving as national chairman of the Young Republicans. At that time, Bob was still in college, and was active in the College Young Republicans. I knew him then as a particularly competent, bright, and aggressive politician, with a distinct leaning to the political right in the GOP. As the years went by, I became associated with him in Young Republican conventions, in national Republican conventions, and in other conservative activities. At the same time, he continued to be active in the Republican Party in his own State of Maryland, while pursuing his law studies at Georgetown University at night.

I once attended a testimonial dinner in his honor. It may seem strange for one so young to have had a testimonial dinner—but Bob, at that time only 27—was retiring as national chairman of Young Americans for Freedom. Some of his friends thought he should be so honored, and I was proud to attend and add my tribute to the many others that were given that night. During his tenure as national chairman of Young Americans for Freedom, which was more than 3 years, YAF became a nationally known name, one which commands more respect from Members of Congress than almost any other youth group. When he retired from that post, he of course did not retire from politics, but went on to become a founding member of the board of directors of the American Conservative Union. I have had the honor of being chairman of the ACU since 1966, and Bob has served well as secretary to the board. I have also worked with him during that time when he, as a member of the national executive board of the Young Republicans, continued to be active in that group.

My greatest admiration for Bob is because of his profound dedication to the same great principles of constitutional government and just administration of the law which I hold so important. Were it not for my belief that these principles are threatened today by sinister forces both from without and within this Nation, I would not undertake the time-consuming and arduous political responsibilities that I now have. Those of us who have worked for these conservative principles of government sometimes become discouraged at the slow pace of our progress—and I do think we have made progress in recent years—but our greatest comfort is in knowing that young men like Bob are moving up to take their places in the struggle.

His concept of the law, and of the place of this Nation in the world, have been well manifested by his many speeches, writings, and efforts on behalf of conservative candidates for office. He has been a delegate to three Maryland State Republican conventions, and was a delegate to the Republican National Convention in 1964. In all of these endeavors,

he has sought to advance the conservative principles in which he believes.

It may seem strange that a young man, just past 30, could have amassed 15 years of service in the Congress. But Bob was truly a fortunate young man to have been appointed a page in the House at the age of 15. Even at that age, Bob was a dedicated Republican, and he found in serving Members of Congress a thrill which most boys of that age have never known. His awe of the Capitol, the Congress, and the legislative processes, has never diminished since that time. I once heard the story of how Bob came to be named as a page. I think other Members will find it amusing and instructive.

While a freshman in Easton High School, Easton, Md., Bob was an avid reader of the New York Times, oddly enough. He laboriously clipped newspaper items about the Republican campaign of 1952, and in so doing, came across an item about the number of Republican page jobs that would be opening up after the beginning of the Eisenhower administration and the convening of the Republican 83d Congress. Although Bob's parents were not active politically—I believe at that time they were not even registered Republicans—Bob had been doing his part in local campaigns in Maryland's First District in the 1952 campaign. He had marched in parades, passed Republican literature, worked at headquarters, and done everything that a novice politician is advised to do. So, when he learned about the opportunity for Republican pages, he simply presented himself to the Congressman from his district, the late Edward T. (Ted) Miller. Ted Miller remembered the boy, and although he said he did not have much influence on patronage appointments at that time, he would see what he could do. Bob's request might have seemed presumptuous to some who are familiar with the manner in which most page appointments are made, but to those who know Bob, it seemed the most natural way for him to approach the subject.

Mr. Miller did succeed in getting the page appointment, and Bob never forgot that favor. He worked for Mr. Miller in every election in which he ran including his Senate campaign in 1962. In his last campaign, Bob managed Mr. Miller's winning campaign for delegate to the State constitutional convention last year in Maryland. When Mr. Miller died in January of this year, Bob was one of the pallbearers. Those who remember Ted Miller's service in Congress will realize what a fine, honest, and dedicated political mentor he was to Bob Bauman.

In his time in the House of Representatives, Bob has seen hundreds of Congressmen come and go. At present, he has had longer service in the Congress than 366 of those in office.

May I say in closing that I am proud of Bob and his achievements. I will miss seeing him daily on the House floor. But the Republican Party and the State of Maryland will surely benefit from the years he will now dedicate to further service. At this point, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a biography of Bob Bauman which appears in the 1967–68 edition of "Who's Who in American Politics":

[From "Who's Who in American Politics" 1967–68 edition]

ROBERT EDMUND BAUMAN

Born, April 4, 1937, son of John Carl and Florence House Bauman.

Married, November 19, 1960 to Carol Gene Dawson of Indianapolis, Indiana.

Children: Edward Carroll (Teddy) (b. 1962), Eugenie Marie (b. 1965) and Victoria Ann (b. 1967).

Education: Capitol Page School, Library of Congress, 1955; Georgetown University School of Foreign Service, B.S. in International Affairs, 1959; Georgetown University Law Center, Juris Doctor, 1964.

Political Positions: Secretary and Member of the Board of Directors, American Conservative Union, 1964 to present; Member, Board of Directors and past National Chairman, Young Americans for Freedom, Inc., 1960–1966; Member, National Advisory Board, Young Americans for Freedom, 1966 to present; Program Committee Chairman and Member of the National Executive Committee of the Young Republican National Federation, 1965–1967.

Delegate from the First Congressional District of Maryland to the Republican National Convention in 1964; Delegate to three State Republican Conventions in Maryland representing Talbot County; Asst. Doorkeeper and Assist. Sgt. at Arms, Maryland Delegation, 1956 and 1960 Republican National Conventions. Delegate, Young Republican National Convention, 1959.

National Chairman, Youth for Nixon, 1960; President, Georgetown University Young Republican Club, 1959–1960.

Government Positions: Manager, House Republican Cloakroom, 1965–1968, by appointment of Hon. Gerald R. Ford, Minority Leader; Asst. Manager, House Republican Cloakroom, 1959–1965, by appointment of Hon. Charles A. Halleck, Minority Leader; Minority Staff, House Judiciary Committee, 1955–1959; Page, United States Senate, Special Session, 1954, by appointment by Senator John Marshall Butler of Maryland; Page, U.S. House of Representatives, January 22, 1953–1955, by appointment of late Hon. Edward T. Miller, Representative from the First District of Maryland.

Publications: Articles and reviews; *National Review*, The *New Guard*, *Republican Battle Line*, *Easton Star-Democrat* and other Maryland newspapers.

Legal Residence: 10 Sycamore Avenue, Easton, Md. 21601.

Mailing Address: 328 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003; Phone: 546-6555.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority leader at this point.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentleman from Ohio for yielding. I want to join him in congratulating Bob Bauman for his long, faithful, constructive, helpful service to those of us on our side of the aisle. It has been a privilege to know him personally, and I believe it is a great tribute to his ability and conscientiousness that he has held this job, or other jobs, and at the same time has continued his education.

I certainly wish him well in his new career, which I am certain will be successful. We will miss him badly on our side of the aisle, every one of us.

I am confident that he will do extremely well as an attorney in the State of Maryland. We welcome him back when he does have the time to come and see us in the future. Bob Bauman has been a good friend, a most helpful employee on the Republican side, and will be missed badly. We hope and trust that he will have the best of good fortune in the future.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished minority leader for those kind words. I am certain, with the work of Bob and others this fall, we might just have a few more openings for pages on our side.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman from Ohio and our distinguished minority leader in commending Robert Bauman, our Bob. One of the finest customs of the House is occasionally, like this one this evening, when Members take the floor and say what is in their hearts concerning those who have labored for and with us for so long. I commend the gentleman from Ohio, JOHN ASHBROOK, for being so thoughtful as to do this and give us a résumé and a letter concerning Bob Bauman, because he truly represents a Horatio Alger story in American history. He has done for himself what others in this day and age fail to try, by lifting on their own bootstraps. His work as a night student has resulted in his being sworn into the Maryland bar in his chosen profession as an attorney at law today. We are very proud of him.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to take 1 minute also to commend his lovely wife Carol Jean and the three children who must have been good backing for this young man who has studied at night so that he could help the leadership of tomorrow see daylight around the corner. This corner, which many of us have been trying to turn for so long, will be further assisted by young men like Bob Bauman and by the fine family that stood with and behind him all this time. I am very impressed by the gentleman's statement that Bob has served here longer than 366 Members have served in the Congress; in numbers of Members, 434 of us, more than there are days in the year. With the history that the gentleman is inserting in the RECORD I am sure many people will be impressed. We have a number of employees around here who have started as pages and who have served as counsels to committees and become attorneys at law in their own rights and are making their mark in the history of our Republic. He is known to all of us as an outstanding young Republican and now as a Republican in his own right and an attorney at law and, as the gentleman has said so well, the founder and instigator and expander, if I may use that term, which is a good medical term, wherein we expand plasma, if need be, at times of deficit through the YAF.

I congratulate Bob and congratulate the gentleman for taking this time. He must be just as proud today of being sworn into the bar as other people are when they hang up a shingle or maybe when they are first elected. Congratulations. I hope he has fair winds and following seas in his practice.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

I would certainly add, as a member of the bar myself, that the law profession can certainly use some honest and direct people like Bob Bauman. Quite

often we are inclined to think that lawyers are not as proper and honest as they should be. I know we are getting a good, honest member of the bar in Bob Bauman.

I am reminded of the story of the woman who was walking through the cemetery looking at the tombstones and one of them said, "Here lies a lawyer, an honest man." She said to her husband, "When did they start burying two people in the same grave?"

Well, I am afraid that many people just think that way about members of the bar. I know Bob will work hard to elevate the reputation of the bar just as he had to alleviate the problems of the Republican Party and to make it as viable an instrument in our political processes with a conservative philosophy within the Republican Party as he possibly could.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield for insertion in the RECORD to his own Congressman, ROGERS C. B. MORTON, and to CHARLEY HALLECK, who appointed Bob some 15 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that various statements may be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most dedicated employees of the House of Representatives has decided to leave Capitol Hill. Bob Bauman, whom I am pleased to claim as a resident of my district, plans to enter law practice in Easton, Md.

Bob came to the Hill as a page in the House of Representatives in January of 1953, while Dwight Eisenhower was in the White House and Edward T. Miller represented Maryland's First Congressional District. He is a familiar figure in the Capitol, where he has been of great service to the minority Members of this body for so many years.

I know I speak for all of us in saying, "We hate to see you leave." But, at the same time, we can be proud of the accomplishments he has made here, and in no way do we want to hold him back. Our best wishes go with Bob, and our heartfelt thanks for a job well done.

Mr. Speaker, it would be remiss of me not to add a very personal note concerning Bob Bauman. He has been a very loyal supporter of mine; he has spent a great deal of his vacation time working in my behalf throughout the First District of Maryland. In addition to the services he has rendered to me as a Member of Congress, I must express my gratitude and the gratitude of Republicans throughout our State for the services he has performed in behalf of my candidacy and for the Republican Party in Maryland.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as one who had a little something to do with Bob Bauman's progress from page boy to manager of the House Republican telephones, I want to express my satisfaction with the fine job he has done for all of us through the years. He has certainly justified the confidence we placed in him with succeeding promotions to positions of greater responsibility.

As far as I am concerned, he has been a minority staff member who has brought credit to that operation. He has been most accommodating to our membership and very efficient in the discharge of his duties. And certainly Bob deserves a lot of credit for the diligence with which he pursued his education. He got it the hard way, but he got it, and more power to him for that.

You know, if I could not find anything else good to say about Bob, I would have to admire his judgment in one respect: he married an Indiana girl.

While we shall all miss him around here, in my opinion he is moving in the right direction, and I wish him every success in his new career as a member of the bar.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to Bob Bauman, a capable and congenial young man who has demonstrated exceptional ability to serve and cooperate with House and Senate Members and employees since he first worked on Capitol Hill as a Capitol page more than 15 years ago.

Since serving as both a House and Senate page, Bob has served as a minority staff member on the House Judiciary Committee, assistant manager of the House Republican cloakroom and most recently and competently as manager of the Republican cloakroom. During those same 15 years, Bob has been associated with such organizations as the American Conservative Union, the Young Americans for Freedom, the Young Republican National Federation, and the Georgetown University Young Republican Club, serving each in various leadership capacities. In 1960 he was national chairman of Youth for Nixon. He has also represented the State of Maryland as a delegate to the Young Republican National Convention, three State Republican conventions and in 1964 as a delegate to the Republican National Convention.

His enthusiasm and ability as a leader have been recognized consistently by his coworkers. I am certain that he will be as successful and as well respected as a practicing lawyer in Maryland as he has been in all his other endeavors.

Bob will be missed by his many friends on Capitol Hill. However, I have no doubt that his interest, concern and participation in government operations and political affairs will continue and perhaps one day bring him back to the Hill and the many friends he has here.

I and my colleagues thank Bob for his years of service in government and I extend my sincere best wishes for success in his career as an attorney.

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice to the many, many others today in praise of an outstanding young man. Seven years ago, before I was active in politics or was even a member of the Republican Party, a young man raised in integrity and American heritage, dedicated to hard work and intellectual exercise found himself a political philosophy and a code of life which reflected honor and praised enterprise. This attitude reflected on everyone and everything with which Bob Bauman came in contact, including me. Bob Bauman helped develop a sense of purpose and direction for me and for many other young people in our blessed country through his participation in the Young Republicans and the Young Americans for Freedom. His service to this House and our country has been notable and important and his career of success is just starting. To the Baumans, one and all, but especially to Bob, may I say "Congratulations, and God bless you, yours, and your future."

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in acknowledging the fine service performed by Robert E. Bauman for members of the minority. His courtesy, helpfulness, and consistent good humor under stress have been much appreciated.

His very conservative views on legislation have been forthright and presented with intelligence with no attempt to impose.

I wish Bob Bauman well in his future career in law and in Government.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I know I express the sentiment of all Republican Members of the House of Representatives when I say we are sorry that Bob Bauman is leaving his position as manager of the House Republican cloakroom.

We are, however, grateful that he has seen fit to train Ronnie Lasch to succeed him.

Bob Bauman came from a humble background but his parents were great Americans. They were not ashamed to work.

Bob's record is well known to all. A page school graduate, and now a full-fledged barrister.

Although Bob Bauman is a Republican through and through he has always placed his country ahead of his party, even as a member of the National Advisory Board of the Young Americans for Freedom.

I wish Bob and his lovely wife, Carol, and little Teddy, Eugenie and Victoria, the best of everything in the years ahead.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this salute today to Bob Bauman, Manager of the Republican telephone, who is leaving our scene to engage in the practice of law in the State of Maryland.

Bob Bauman's recognition of the significance of congressional business—and the fact that much of it must be handled by telephone during periods of active House debate—has contributed immensely to our own reputation as lawmakers and as Representatives of the people of America.

Bob Bauman's fine example has served to influence many younger men who have come to the House of Representatives as pages and in other capacities of service.

It is not my intention to review Bob Bauman's career or experience. I do wish, however, to voice this expression of respect and affection and to extend to Bob Bauman this wish for success as a lawyer and as a distinguished and active citizen of the Nation.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that Bob Bauman is leaving as manager of the House Republican cloakroom. I am exceedingly happy that he will no longer be among us, handling his various duties with good humor and dis-

patch. I am filled with joy at the prospect that come next Monday Bob will not be waiting in the cloakroom with the latest news about the American Conservative Union, Young Americans for Freedom, the intricacies of Maryland politics or perhaps the inside story on what Ronald Reagan really told Nelson Rockefeller in New Orleans.

I am a happy man, Mr. Speaker, because Bob's departure means that a brilliant, perceptive, dedicated young American has begun his career as a lawyer and that he has begun walking down a road, which may be long and hard and filled with twists and turns—but one which I am confident will lead him back to the House of Representatives as one of its Members. On that day, Mr. Speaker, I will be an even happier man than I am today.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the truly deserved tribute being paid today to Robert E. Bauman, the diligent manager of the House Republican cloakroom.

While I am a newcomer to the House, Bob Bauman and I enjoy a long-time friendship dating back to undergraduate days, when Bob and his talented, attractive wife—then Miss Carol Gene Dawson—were leaders of the college youth for Nixon. Bob was managing an important role in youth politics, while simultaneously carrying a full course of study and energetically serving Members of the House. In early 1959, at age 21, Bob was already in his sixth year with the House of Representatives. Those of us who were his fellow undergraduates felt, appropriately, I think, that it was a unique privilege to know a peer who was already an institution within an institution.

It is a double loss that we feel now that Bob Bauman is leaving his 15-year service in the House. It is very secure that I am in the conviction, nevertheless, that it will be only a matter of months before Congress hears from him again.

To an unusually able couple, the Bob Baumans, go my warmest and best wishes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, we sure will miss Bob Bauman. I have great respect for Bob; for his knowledge of the operations of the House of Representatives; for the impartiality and fair play he has consistently demonstrated in dealing with all the Members.

I wish Bob Bauman well in his practice, and I thank the gentleman from Ohio for taking this special order to honor this deserving individual who has been so helpful to all of us.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Robert E. Bauman as he concludes his tour of duty as manager of the Republican telephones, to begin the practice of law in his native Maryland. We regret his departure, but we are very proud of his accomplishments and appreciate greatly his splendid efforts.

Although he is a young man, he has already compiled an enviable record of service to his country and his party. In addition to his duties here in the House, he has been active in State and National Republican affairs, while, at the same time, continuing his education. Ambition and hard work have paid great dividends and I know he will bring to the practice of law the same high qualities he has displayed in his position here.

During my years in the House, I have relied greatly upon Bob and have found him always helpful and courteous. His future clients will profit from the same dedicated effort.

Bob Bauman represents the type of young, dynamic leadership we covet for our party and I am sure we will find him in places of increased responsibility. He has our deep appreciation and we wish for him, and his good wife Carol, every happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, Robert Bauman's "retirement" as manager of the House Republican telephones is indeed a loss to those of us who have worked with him and who have come to rely on his effective and dedicated service.

Bob Bauman is in many ways representative of the many thousands of young men and women who today are contributing enormously to the political and governmental life of our Nation. Beginning with his appointment by the late Edward T. Miller, Representative in Congress from the First District of Maryland, as a page in the U.S. House of Representatives, Bob Bauman has achieved a most impressive record of service in a short period of time. In addition, he has found the time to continue his education in both international affairs and law. Today he will be sworn in as an attorney before the Maryland Court of Appeals.

As Bob Bauman launches his new career, I wish him well and express the hope that his many talents will not be lost to his party and to his country. Our Nation needs young men of ability, ideals, and dedication to make our democracy a continuing success; men like Bob Bauman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was sorry to hear that Bob Bauman is leaving us after 15 years of service to the Congress.

Bob has been a fine and efficient manager of House Republican telephones, following a number of years of faithful and friendly service in managing the Republican cloakroom. We will miss him on the Republican side.

I want to join in wishing Bob the best of everything in his new career.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my distinguished colleagues in marking the end of Robert E. Bauman's 15 years on the Hill. Mr. Bauman is ending one distinguished career for another in the law in which I am sure he will contain and maintain his success. Mr. Bauman came to the Hill as a page at the age of 16, and leaves it at the age of 31 as manager of the House Republican telephones. Yet, in spite of the hard work of his official duties, he has found time and energy for an active extracurricular life in politics. An assistant doorkeeper and an assistant sergeant at arms of the Maryland delegation to the Republican National Convention in 1956 and 1960, he graduated to full membership of the delegation at the famous convention of 1964. His career has culminated in selection to the national executive committee of the Young Republican National Federation, and to directing positions in several other political organizations.

I am sure we will miss him in the House Republican cloakroom, but our loss will be the gain of others. I join my distinguished brethren in wishing Mr. Bauman a career to equal the one he has left.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure to join with my colleagues today in honoring the work of Robert E. Bauman, manager of the House Republican telephones. Bob has discharged his responsibilities in a diligent manner. I want to congratulate him upon admission to the Maryland bar. We shall miss him in the House—where his services have been so helpful—but wish him every success in his new endeavors.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my good friend and colleague, JOHN ASHBROOK, of Ohio, in paying tribute to a very fine and dedicated young man who is leaving his responsibilities here in the House in order to enter the private practice of law. Bob Bauman is an outstanding citizen. He has been a loyal employee whose efforts have been concentrated on doing the best job he is capable of doing for not only House Members, but for these United States. He has measured up to all that has been expected of him, and it has been a sincere pleasure to have worked with him.

As manager of the Republican cloakroom, Bob's absence will be regretted. I know that his successor will carry on in Bob's tradition, but I shall miss his presence. I know that I speak for all of us when I wish him godspeed in his new endeavors.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I regret to learn that Bob Bauman is leaving his work in the House of Representatives.

Bob has been most courteous, efficient, and faithful in his work on the Republican side of the aisle, and he will be missed by all of us.

It is my understanding that he will soon start the practice of law, having been admitted to the bar only recently. I wish him every success and attend this with every good wish to Mrs. Bauman and their children.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I join with my fellow Republican colleagues in a special tribute to Mr. Robert E. Bauman on the occasion of his retirement from more than 15 years of dedicated service on Capitol Hill. During his tenure as manager of the Republican Cloakroom, he has earned admiration, friendship, and appreciation of the Members he has served with outstanding efficiency and dedication. Bob kept the wheels running smoothly in a most intricate and exacting position. His special skills, know-how, and his astute judgment helped our Members to legislate with ease and coordination of efforts. Losing Bob is like losing a good right arm. He was a great public servant, and we will be ever grateful for the excellence of his services to us.

Let me take this opportunity to wish Bob Bauman every measure of success in

the future, and to extend an invitation to revisit his old haunts on Capitol Hill—he will be always welcome.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, every one of us regrets to see Bob Bauman leave his post as manager of the telephones in the cloakroom on our side of the aisle. All of us, however, rejoice that the opportunity has come for him to apply his many talents in a more challenging and more rewarding field of endeavor.

There is great significance in Bob's leaving here to enter into the practice of law in Maryland. He is a self-made man. This opportunity to enter upon a professional career for himself is of his own making. Bob is an example of what a young man can do if he has the determination and willingness to make the sacrifices to realize an ambition. We are proud of him.

Bob began his career on Capitol Hill as a page. He graduated from Page School and then went to Georgetown University School of Foreign Service and received a bachelor of science degree in international affairs and subsequently graduated from Georgetown University Law Center in 1964.

While doing all this he served in various capacities with the Congress. From 1955 to 1959 he was on the minority staff of the Judiciary Committee and served there until appointed by Minority Leader CHARLIE HALLECK to be assistant manager of the House Republican cloakroom. Our present minority leader, JERRY FORD, promoted him to manager of the cloakroom in 1965.

Bob Bauman is an example of a young man determined to get his education and a law degree. It required a tremendous amount of sacrifice. It is not easy to devote one's days working and one's nights attending school. This in itself bespeaks of the caliber of man and it also portends a great future for him in the legal profession.

As it would say in the vernacular, "he has what it takes." He has not only a winning personality and ability. He has a capacity for sacrifice and hard work. I predict for him a great future and wish for him the very best.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a special pleasure to join with many of our colleagues in expressing appreciation for the long and valuable service rendered to minority Members—and I am sure those majority Members who wandered to our side of the aisle received the same courtesies—by our young and able manager of the House Republican Cloakroom, Robert E. Bauman.

Since Bob Bauman is resigning, effective the end of this month, to enter the private practice of law, it is especially fitting that we pay him this tribute. For he has been of immense help to all of us—available when needed, informed, loyal, alert, and on his toes at every moment. In the midst of the confusion that often reigns on the House floor, his has been a cool head and a ready hand. We could not ask for better service.

But I have an additional reason, Mr. Speaker, for expressing gratitude to Bob Bauman. In an arena where partisan politics and political philosophies come in all shades of the rainbow, he has never allowed his personal preferences to interfere with the effective carrying out of his responsibilities. Bob Bauman is a convinced and forthright conservative in a party which has its liberals and moderates as well as conservatives. To my knowledge, however, he has always submerged his own feelings in the greater interest of serving all our colleagues—with equal attention, courtesy, and respect.

I consider this fact, in the kind of job Bob Bauman has been called on to fill, an attribute of the highest significance. Combined with his obvious abilities and the warmth of his personality, it foreshadows a long and successful career in the law and in whatever area of public service he may enter. Together with our colleagues, I wish him the great success he deserves.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND THE HUNGARIAN MINORITY IN SLOVAKIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GALLAGHER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks 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. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, since January, all of us have followed with great interest the changes taking place and the new measures promised by the new government in Czechoslovakia. Following the fall of the Stalinist-type Novotny regime, it seemed that liberalizing efforts would be made both with regard to personal and group freedom and with regard to the problem of relationships between Czechs and Slovaks living in the state.

The limited restoration of certain democratic rights, such as press and religious freedom, are favorable signs. However, a Czechoslovak delegation returning from Moscow recently has reported Russian doubts about this liberalism, and we still do not know for certain whether Moscow will continue to allow even this limited restoration of personal freedom.

Beyond the personal freedom issues, the problems of nationalities living in Czechoslovakia are now in the center of discussion and debate. Throughout its 50-year history Czechoslovakia was plagued by nationality problems. The German nationality problem led to Nazi occupation following the Munich Pact. The Allied victory in World War II resulted in the expulsion of the German minority. At this juncture the Slovaks were, on paper at least, admitted to a position of equality, but the assymetric solution failed to achieve equality.

Therefore, it is of great significance that at the present moment both the Czechs and the Slovaks are now willing to settle the problem by creating a Federal state based on national equality. It is my hope that this willingness will find its expression in constitutional settlement, and that liberalization will proceed in spite of anticipated Soviet and East German reaction.

Simultaneously, the fate of the Hungarian minority in Slovakia has emerged. The approximately 1 million people of Hungarian origin in southern Slovakia have been the stepchildren of first the Republic and then the Communist Czechoslovak state.

After the Munich Pact, the first Vienna award attached the southern Slovak region, with its overwhelming Hungarian population, to Hungary, a nation regarded by the exile Czechoslovak government as its arch enemy. A Hungarian population, to Hungary, a writing in the Bratislava paper Uj Szo—New Word—Joseph Gyonyor, recounts the events as follows:

> The decree No. 12 issued June 21, 1945, belongs to the most important ones. Under this decree, persons of Hungarian nationality were deprived without any compensation and effective immediately of their land holdings and real estate, regardless of their financial status.
>
> A series of atrocities was carried out against these unfortunate people . . . where it was not possible to remove them immediately from the country, hundreds of Hungarians were dragged to the (Hungarian) frontier and left without food or drink.
>
> The Government declared in June, 1946, the so-called re-Slovakization. The purpose was clear. The Hungarian minority could not remain in this country. In promoting this purpose, the "Magyarized" part of the population was permitted to return to their original nationality. The fact was, however, that these people . . . could have safely declared themselves Slovak during the time of the First Republic. It is no secret that this measure was coupled with the matter of citizenship. I ask you, who would have been willing to leave the place of his birth under insecure conditions? It was thus that 410,820 Hungarians were forced to deny their nationality in writing.

So much about the immediate postwar period. The thaw in Czechoslovakia now permits a partial description of the situation at the height of the Communist terror, 1949–54. Coming on the decision of the Presidum of the Czechoslovak Communist Party that persons tried unjustly in the years 1949–54 should be rehabilitated, Gyonyor continues:

> It is likewise natural that not only those persons must be rehabilitated who were sentenced in a political trial. Who knows the number of workers who were victims of illegal administrative measures? Neither is the number of these people known who spent months and years in forced-labor camps . . . Neither can we collect the names of all those who were dismissed without reason and who remained together with their families without a job.

As to the equality of treatment of Hungarian nationality citizens, another writer, Charles Patho, writes in the same paper:

> Equality of status is still a paper equality. For 20 years not a single politician of Hungarian nationality has been considered worthy to become a member of parliament. We find them only rarely in the lower echelons of civil service, and only now and then can we find Hungarian experts in leading positions in any enterprise or plant in the country. The diplomatic service does not even know we exist.

The critical articles appear with regularity in the sole Hungarian-language

daily, Uj Szo, as the air of press freedom infiltrates over the barriers of censorship in Czechoslovakia.

However, the Hungarian minority is now hopeful of obtaining some of its rights. The concept involved is that there must be complete equality between the nations and nationalities in Czechoslovakia if peace and stability are to prevail and nationality persecution cease. This equality must be constitutionally defined, and supported both by adequate school and cultural institutions run by members of the minority, and by sufficient budgetary resources from the state, regional, and local authorities. The economic discrimination against the Hungarian-inhabited area has been patently documented by many of the writers in Uj Szo. A new concept is represented by them: self-administration. This is less than the self-determination which ended the existence of the First Czechoslovak Republic, but more than the autonomy which means very limited self-government. They call for the creation of smaller counties, which are more or less ethnically homogenous, and where local government would guarantee equal rights of both the Czech and Slovak minorities. It also calls for equalizing the economic burdens and for state aid to equalize educational and economic opportunities.

Party Secretary Dubcek's recent visit to Budapest showed, through remarks he made there, that no decision has yet been made about accepting the minority demands, but we know that strong opposition to the Hungarian minority demands has come from the Slovaks and Czech Stalinists. David Binder, writing in the New York Times on June 23, 1968, describes the situation as follows:

> In May and early June, Hungarians returning from visits to Bratislava . . . and other Slovak communities, reported that the minority had come under intensive pressure from Slovak Chauvinists.
>
> A recent visitor to Slovakia said that "in some villages the Hungarians feel it is better not to go out at night" and then went on to speak of beating and scuffles. . . .
>
> A Slovak cultural official, Ondrej Kulik, told the Hungarian minority newspaper in Bratislava, Uj Szo, "If the Hungarians want to destroy our state then nothing remains for us but to drive them out with weapons.

Despite these sorry occurrences hope is still high that the federalization of Czechoslovakia will increase the rights of the Hungarian minority, and that Czechs, Slovaks, and Hungarians will find a peaceful coexistence.

It is important, in conclusion, that we all recognize the twofold struggle going on in Czechoslovakia today. The first is the struggle for personal and ethnic freedom. The second is the struggle for independence from Russia so that the peoples of the state may solve their own problems in a democratic, evolutionary process.

I include the following pertinent material:

TEXT OF THE RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CULTURAL FEDERATION OF HUNGARIAN WORKERS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA—CSEMADOK—PRINTED IN UJ SZO, BRATISLAVA, MARCH 15, 1968

Nations and nationalities are living together in our country. A solution of the nationality question cannot be restricted to a settlement of the relationship of the (two) nations but must include the question of the nationalities on the basis of full equality of rights.

Unfortunately, deficiencies existing in this regard could not be solved even by positive resolutions of the Central Committee of the Slovak Communist Party in the last few years. Implementation of these resolutions was made near impossible as they were not within the jurisdiction of the Slovak National Council, and the central authorities of the state simply failed to act on them. Thus the odd situation arose that on the one hand, the Slovak National Council was charged with their implementation but on the other it was not granted sufficient jurisdiction to do so. Therefore, it is the opinion of the Central Committee of the CSEMADOK that the only truly equitable solution would be a reform along federal lines including a settlement of the constitutional position of the Hungarian and other nationalities on the basis of the principle of self-administration.

By presenting proposals for solving these problems, the Central Committee of CSEMADOK wants not only to demonstrate its enthusiasm and full consensus toward the resolutions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic (CSR) and Slovakia and the changes occurring therefrom since January but also its fullest support of these resolutions.

In regard to the question of nationalities we have accomplished much but have also committed grave errors. The errors have originated basically as follows:

The nationalities are not recognized in the Constitution and other basic statutes in addition to the two nations as equal societal factors;

The legal position of the nationalities is not regulated by statute;

The nationalities have no constitutionally elected nationality organs or constitutionally guaranteed nationality institutions;

As a result the nationalities do not enjoy complete equality of rights.

The full and complete equality of nations and nationalities must be constitutionally guaranteed.

Statutes of constitutional character must define the legal position of the nationalities.

It must be stated clearly that the nationalities form an organic, undetachable part of the CSR. Not only as individuals but also as social groups the nationalities are citizens of equal status in our land. The CSR consists of nations and nationalities and nations and nationalities must possess equal rights.

The constitutional position of the nationalities must be clearly and concretely determined by a constitutional statute.

1. Nationality organs and institutions must be created participating in the work of the political, administrative, economic and state security authorities as part of the national organs and expressing their will on the basis of self-administration principles in order to solve problems of the nationalities.

In order to do so at the earliest possible date:

(a) We propose the creation of the following organs and institutions as integral parts in the structure of legislative and executive organs:

A Nationality Committee in the Slovak Council to be composed of the deputies of the nationalities and experts as members; and in the Representative Assembly an office of representatives (poverenictvo) of the Slovak National Council.

Likewise nationality committees should be created in the national committee of every district to be composed of nationality deputies and experts in order to form a nationalities office in the committees.

In order to satisfy special economic and financial needs of the nationalities the National Assembly and the Slovak National Council shall act within the framework of the debate and approval of the State, territorial and regional budgets. Similar jurisdiction should be granted to the Nationalities Secretariat of the Government of the CSR and the Representatives' Secretariat of the Slovak National Council and the various ministries and offices in order to equalize national living standards.

(b) We propose the territorial organization of areas inhabited by different nationalities—

The new counties created in the 1960 Territorial Reorganization hinder the good neighborly relations and friendly coexistence of the various nationalities. They retard the practical realization of nationality policies defined by Party and Government resolutions. Practice has shown that districts inhabited overwhelmingly by one nationality progress both economically and politically faster and more efficiently.

The need both for a further improvement of the economy and the solution of the nationality question securing full equality of rights necessitates the creation of territorial units integrated from the standpoint of nationality. This can be accomplished by a territorial reorganization of the districts, a measure also favored by geographic considerations.

Simultaneously full equality of rights for the members of the nations and nationalities forming the minority in any given district must also be constitutionally guaranteed.

(c) We propose that members of the nationalities (experts) should be called in as members in addition to the deputies of the committee of the Slovak National Council:

In order to facilitate a more active participation of the nationalities in public affairs;

That everywhere members of the nationalities be granted proportional representation in selecting the deputies to be elected to the governing bodies and that the representation of the nationalities consist of experts and activists who can adequately represent their interests at each level of government;

Great care shall be exercised in the Slovak Trade Union Council and the Slovak Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Youth Federation by the creation of a Hungarian nationality section and also by establishing Hungarian advisory sections in the Slovak committees of the mass organizations.

In order to facilitate these measures and in order to contribute to the preparations of the 14th Congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party and to the planned changes of the Constitution, we propose the following:

To anchor constitutionally those principles which guarantee the national existence, position and free cultural development and reenforced self-reliance of the nationalities.

To elaborate these principles with political and professional expertise defining the legal position of the nationalities and helping to create institutions in order to realize the rights and guaranteeing a most efficient solution of societal and national equality on the basis of self-administration.

To review all laws and decrees which were passed in regard to citizens of Hungarian nationality and the deletion of discriminatory legislation.

2. Substantial differences exist in the school and educational level between the nations and nationalities. In order to fulfill with efficiency the tasks resulting out of the scientific-technological revolution, an expansion of the democratization process demands the approximate, but clear, levelling of the differences in the political, economic and cultural living standards between nations and nationalities. The present school structure secures "the availability of equal learning opportunities of each child" in their mother tongue only on a grade school level. Youth participation in mother-tongue instruction on secondary school level fails to respond to the requirements of our age and

hinders the necessary process of economic and political equality. Lack of the necessary network of secondary schools further increases existing unhealthy differences in educational level between secondary school and college graduates.

One of the basic requirements of progress in the Hungarian-inhabited areas of our country lies in the further development of nationality schools. Only educational-informational instruction in the mother tongue can promote the harmonious, open-minded development of the individual toward a deeper understanding of Socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism. Prevailing practices in nationality school administration ignoring national considerations have only created an atmosphere of mistrust and educational obsolescence. Therefore, it must be made possible that Hungarian schools should be led and guided by Hungarian educational institutions. This alone offers a guarantee that they will keep peace efficiently with the achievement needed to fulfill educational-informational purposes common to the entire country.

In order to solve existing problems of the Hungarian school question and promote its further development, we propose:

Creation of conditions facilitating equal opportunities for the nationality in regard to employment and higher education and adequate admission ratios at college levels by a proportionate admission of Hungarians to the universities and professional schools;

Creation of legal requirements enabling an independent solution of the problems unique to the administration and leadership of nationality schools and the establishment of the needed scientific and research institutions.

An increase in the number of Hungarian university and college students especially in the sciences and regulation of their possible study in Hungary at university level.

3. The most unique expression of the existence of nationalities is their culture. Its independent development lies in the most basic interest of each nationality. Nationality cultures occupy an important niche in the Czechoslovak cultural context, but they also relate organically and inseparably to the culture and tradition of their own nation—in our case to the general Hungarian culture and tradition. Great care must be exercised in guaranteeing further cultural development, for men are most sensitive in this regard. Cultural development of the societal life of nationalities requires, however, the presence of scientific institutions and laboratories.

Therefore, we propose:

To apply successfully the same principles toward nationality culture which are used toward a democratization of Czech and Slovak cultural life. Nationality culture must be regarded as a culture *sui generis* and not as a translation of Czech and Slovak culture into Hungarian language. While nationality culture forms a part of Czechoslovak culture, it is also a part of the general national (Hungarian) culture to which it is tied by unseparable bonds. Its development must be secured both financially and personnelwise;

Establishment of scientific cultural institutions and laboratories which form the requirement for the maintenance of their national existence;

Intense participation by pertinent national institutions and national committees in regard to the care and financial security of the culture of the nationalities. They alone can solve these problems in cooperation with the cultural associations of the nationalities.

II

We are convinced that without the measures outlined in Chapter I the solution of the nationalities' problem will stagnate in a state of half-solution and will continue to be dependent on individual goodwill and subjective decisions, a state intolerable in a democracy.

We are also convinced that the implementation of these measures and the realization of these principles will result in a most efficient strengthening of the national consensus and would substantially reenforce patriotism. These measures will immediately and considerably promote the building of socialism, strengthen confidence in the Czechoslovak Communist Party, enhance the rapprochement of nations and nationalities and forge a more perfect unity among the peoples of our country.

The Central Committee of the CSEMADOK suggests to the political representatives of the CSR that they should clearly explain the constitutional position of the Hungarian nationality in Czechoslovakia in the action program of the Central Committee of the Czech and Slovak Communist Parties and that the Czechoslovak CP should appoint a working group composed of Hungarian and Ukrainian nationality members of the Party and delegate to them the task of working out the part of the action program dealing with the nationalities.

III

The National Front and the social organizations united in the National Front are important organs of our national life. The democratization process that has begun with the January meeting of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party provides ample space for an active work by social organizations enabling them to harmonize their work with real life and the views and interests of their membership thereby fulfilling the purposes, needs and claims of society and social life. Thus they can become the mobilizers of the broadest strata of society.

We know that overcoming the mistakes of the past will require hard work, cool analysis, patience and unity. We will work honestly for the good of socialism united in close cooperation with the nations of Czechoslovakia.

[From Uj Szo (Bratislava), March 20, 1968, Radio Free Europe translation]

SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY AND THE NATIONALITY QUESTION

(By Karoly Patho)

The conservative forces which slow down the development of our socialist society are being pushed into the background. The period of unlimited personal power is over. Our society is proceeding toward a real democracy which will guarantee maximum opportunity for all citizens of our country to fight, to take a stand—in line with the interests of the working people—against the harmful factors and symptoms which stand in the way of our political, economic, and cultural development.

* * * * *

The democratization of our social life is linked with a complete and just solution of the nationality question. This was indicated in the resolution of the plenary meeting of the Central Committee of our Party and the Slovak National Council, which considers a confederation, based on the brotherhood of the two nations and the nationalities, as the solution of the nationality question. Certainly the legal and political conditions for complete equality of status, for the economic and cultural development of workers of Hungarian and Ukrainian nationality, will also be established within this confederation.

The Central Committee of Csemadok has published proposals for a reasonable solution of the Hungarian question, and has presented this as a suggestion to the CC of our Party. Thus, we can confidently state that never before have we been so close to a just solution of the nationality question. But we must state, for the sake of the truth, that good and reasonable proposals can become a practical reality only if they are accepted by the broad masses of the workers, who must not only demand the implementation of the ideas expressed in the proposals, but also take part in the effort to strengthen socialist democracy and work out a just solution of the nationality question.

Not even in cities and villages with Hungarian populations, can development of democracy and the solution of the nationality question be merely an internal affair of Party organizations and national committees. It is their moral duty to lead the struggle to strengthen democracy, to develop the activities of the broad masses of workers, to ask the opinion of the population concerning the solution of the above-mentioned social questions, and to present them to the highest organs of Party and state power.

I would like to point out that if in the past we felt it necessary to ask the opinion of the workers concerning the solution of social questions, then today, when we are trying to create a new atmosphere in which to establish the fraternal coexistence—based on complete equality of status—of the nations and nationalities of our country, this necessity becomes increasingly pressing.

Those leading personalities who are unable to shed their conservative ideas and harmful methods of operation—in other words, who are unable to cooperate in the revival of democracy and the just solution of the nationality question—would do well to stand aside, and to yield their positions to qualified persons who—not for personal advantages but because they may have a sense of responsibility for our socialist society, for our people and nation—will lead the public movement for real socialists democracy and a just solution of the nationality question.

In the course of development of socialist democracy we shall certainly reach the point where the regulation of the affairs of Hungarian workers in Czechoslovakia will no longer depend only on the views of one or two "established" persons, but when the competent agencies will take into consideration the opinions of the broad masses of Hungarian workers (participatory democracy).

To achieve practical implementation of complete equality of status for Hungarian workers in Czechoslovakia—in other words, to enable them to solve their specific nationality problems themselves—it will be necessary in addition to other important factors that workers of Hungarian nationality establish Hungarian districts. Therefore, I consider the establishment of Hungarian national districts a key issue in the solution of the nationality question. But, if we want such radical changes, then the question arises, have the May 19 national committee elections lost their timeliness?

In my opinion, the right thing for the competent agencies to do is to establish the confederation as soon as possible and, within it, district and central state organs of workers of Hungarian origin in Czechoslovakia; then these organs—through competent management and in close cooperation with the elected organs of the population of Hungarian nationality—could establish Hungarian districts and then, together with the new district organs and institutions, schedule the national committee elections at a later date.

The establishment of districts with Hungarian majorities will require that the continuous chain of Hungarian villages—even though it is interrupted by one or two Slovak villages—be organized into districts that are Hungarian in character. The best solution, in my opinion, would be the reestablishment of small districts, like those that existed prior to the regional arrangement. This would mean that there would be about 15 districts with a Hungarian majority.

But it is quite possible that the competent agencies will stick to the idea of larger districts, because they consider an increase in the number of offices inexpedient. Certainly, in this case, the Hungarian districts will be larger as well.

And while considering the possibility of establishment of larger districts, we should also consider which south Slovakian towns should be the capitals of the Hungarian districts.

Practical experience reminds us that the national composition of the population of district capitals influences the development of the nationality character of the district as a whole. Thus, if we were to choose a town with a Slovak majority as the district capital, this would inevitably have an effect on the character of the district. Because of this, it is my opinion that the capitals of the Hungarian districts should be south Slovakian cities that are Hungarian in character. These are: Dunaszerdahely, Komarom, Galanta, Parkany, Ipolysag, Zseliz, Tornalja, Szepsi, and Kiralyhelmec.

If we consider these cities as the capitals of the Hungarian districts then we must see to it that the villages near the mixed-population district capitals but belonging to the chain of Hungarian villages are included in the new districts. This solution would make it possible for the great majority of Hungarian workers in Czechoslovakia to belong to Hungarian districts and enjoy the advantages of administrative autonomy.

Unfortunately, it is impossible to arrive at a solution that would enable all workers of Hungarian nationality to belong to Hungarian districts. One reason for this is that a number of Hungarian villages are located in areas where the majority of the villages are populated by Slovak workers. The other reason is that in a number of south Slovak cities—as, for example, Ersekujvar, Leva, Losonc, Rimaszombat, Rozsnyo, and Kassa—which are at present district capitals, a large number and, in some cases the majority, of the population are Slovak workers. Thus, even with the best will, besides the nine or ten Hungarian districts there will be another eight districts with a minority of workers of Hungarian nationality. (The list could be completed with the Bratislava and Nyitra districts.)

In the districts with Hungarian minorities the principles of equality of status and bilingualism for Hungarian workers should be implemented just as it is for minorities of Slovak nationality living in Hungarian districts.

It is also quite logical that the interests and equal status of Hungarian workers be protected by nationality offices and institutions to be established on the district and central level, regardless of whether the citizens in question are of Hungarian nationality living in Hungarian districts or minorities in districts of mixed population.

In my opinion, it would be a grave mistake to establish the national composition of the south Slovak cities and villages on the basis of the results of the latest census. A number of actual instances have proved that the results of this census—from the point of view of national composition—do not agree with the facts. I know, for example, not only of individual families but of a number of villages where, according to the census, the majority of the population is of Slovak nationality, but at the same time no one—except the teachers and one or two officials—speaks the Slovak language. These distortions call attention to the fact that the national composition of the population can be correctly established only on the basis of the language spoken in families and in everyday life.

Finally, I would like to point out again that we cannot remain indifferent to the complicated problems involved in the transformation of our society. Because indifference and submissiveness will retard the development of socialist democracy and the solution of the nationality question, and thus will slow down the development of our socialist society.

[From Uj Szo (Bratislava), March 24, 1968, Radio Free Europe translation]

STANDPOINT OF THE LEADERSHIP OF THE HUNGARIAN SECTION OF THE SLOVAK UNION OF WRITERS

The great majority of the Czechoslovak people, and among them the members of the Hungarian minority, are tensely watching the rebirth developing in the wake of the resolutions passed at the December and January conferences of the Czechoslovak CC. This involves complete liquidation of the social, political, and economic distortions that are paralyzing our socialist development and hindering the development of the specific requisites for socialist construction and the consistent reorganization of state functions in a spirit of equal national rights. The resolutions passed at the CP district conferences, the attitude of social organizations, and the spontaneous demonstrations of the broad masses of the populace prove that the people have identified themselves with these revolutionary targets, and fully support the progressive forces grouping themselves around Comrade Dubcek.

In this historic hour, we Hungarian writers in Czechoslovakia side with the Party and the people, and wish to participate actively in the process of renewal which our socialist society is undergoing. With regard to the solution of the nationality question, we agree with the proposal worked out by the Central Csemadok (Cultural Association of Hungarian Writers in Czechoslovakia) and submitted to the highest state and Party bodies. We think it essential that this proposal become an integral part of the programs under debate.

In recent years the Hungarian writers in Czechoslovakia have repeatedly stated their opinions on the vital problems of the Hungarians living here. We have stood up for our rights in the name of humanism and in the interest of socialism, we have asked that our human dignity be respected. We did this at a time when it meant taking a risk, when it meant taking a stand which could result in the sacrifice of one's private and public existence. Our initiatives were known only to a small group of people, and in most cases it was utterly impossible to state our targets to a wider public. Socio-political conditions were unfavorable, and we were also handicapped by the demagogic or opportunistic attitude adopted by the majority of Hungarian functionaries. We do not wish to give the impression that we were the only ones who know the truth. We have no more right to claim this than other people have. On the other hand, the responsibility inherent in our mission obliges us to lay before the public the problems of the Hungarian nationalities that we consider important.

We shall now stress those elements of the nationality question which relate to cultural problems, the foundation of our national cultural life, which should be reorganized in a spirit of autonomy. In addition, we shall also mention those elements which were not emphasized by the Csemadok proposal.

1. We suggest the development and promulgation of a cultural policy in accordance with the principle of self-administration. We consider the following points necessary.

a. The establishment of a central independent managerial body for Hungarian school affairs.

b. Under the guarantee of instruction in our mother tongue, the setting up of a network of Hungarian-language kindergartens, apprentice schools, elementary, and specialized secondary schools; the reorganization into an independent high school of the Hungarian section of the pedagogic faculty of Nyitra; the opening of a Hungarian section in the Nyitra agricultural high school or at the Pozsony and Kassa medical faculties; that training of secondary school teachers in our mother tongue be considered.

c. Rescinding of the measures concerning joint administration of Hungarian and Slovak schools.

d. Supervision of the teaching of history in the secondary schools, and introduction of the teaching of the history of the Hungarian people in line with the new situation.

e. In specific cases and in a suitable ratio permission for and financial support of study in Hungary.

2. In the interest of developing our intellectual life and our national culture, we consider the establishment of the following institutions necessary in addition to a guarantee of their financial maintenance.

a. A National Hungarian Scientific Institute—with departments of philology, literary science, history, and ethnology.

b. A National Hungarian Library.

c. A permanent Hungarian Theater in Pozsony.

d. A professional Hungarian Folklore Ensemble.

e. An independent Hungarian book and newspaper publishing house.

f. A new Hungarian daily in addition to *Uj Szo*.

g. A cultural-political weekly.

h. The transformation of *Termeszet es Tarsaladom;* which is now a transmutation of *Priroda a Spolocnost*, into an independent review.

i. Introduction of Hungarian television programs.

3. Federation of the nation will make necessary the reorganization and enlargement of social organizations. We suggest, in the interest of greater activity on the part of the Hungarian minority in Czechoslovakia:

a. The foundation of a independent Hungarian pioneer and youth association functioning along the lines of the Slovak Youth Association.

b. The establishment of a Union of Hungarian Teachers in Czechoslovakia.

c. The reassessment of the status of the Hungarian sections of the Union of Journalists and the Union of Writers, and consideration of their being transformed into independent associations.

4. At the time of the first republic, the elite among the Hungarians in Czechoslovakia—Communists, non-Party members, workers, peasants, and intellectuals alike—played an active and progressive role in the life of the country. In spite of this—and as a reaction to the events of 1938—the Hungarians in this country were summarily and collectively held responsible for the dismemberment of the republic, and this collective charge was made in such basic documents as the Kassa government program. We demand revision of this indictment, considered official to this very day and never properly and publicly corrected; and we demand the rehabilitation of innocent people persecuted under the collective charge; and we further demand a review of the trials of those who protested against the deprivation of their rights between 1945 and 1948, and reimbursement of financial losses suffered because of the illegal decrees enacted between 1945 and 1949. We demand an official and public annulment of re-Slovakization, and the renaming of villages in Hungarian-language territory whose names were changed. And now a word about the unjustified charge that Hungarians are bourgeois nationalists. In the course of socialist construction Hungarians have given repeated evidence of their political maturity, and have fulfilled their civic duties in an exemplary manner. On these grounds, they request rights equal to those due to the peoples of the republic.

5. The forthcoming elections are an extremely important event in the lives of Czechoslovak Hungarians too. We consider it necessary, from the viewpoint of the democratization of our society, to play an active

role in the preparations for the election. In view of the fact that the process of renascence has begun comparatively late, postponement of the elections is especially important for us.

We must put an end to the political practice, so far as Hungarians are concerned, of disregarding the necessary rotation of functions and favoring those who hold conservative views. It is not true that, aside from those who presently hold office or positions of authority, the Hungarians have no personalities capable of playing a political and public role. Because of this false attitude, it frequently occurs that people of other nationalities, whose only qualification is that they speak Hungarian, are appointed to public office.

We deem it necessary, from the viewpoint of the democratic renewal of our public life, that all public figures who, either out of passivity or opportunism, are politically and morally unfit for their posts, be excluded from public life.

We request that a sufficient number of Hungarians be included at every level on the committees set up to prepare for and manage the elections.

The Slovak nation has, in the course of its history, repeatedly experienced what it is to be oppressed, subordinate, and cheated. Now, when it has arrived at a stage of fully developed-independent national existence, we trust that it will know its job, and that it will deal with the state-political position of the nationalities under its jurisdicton on a basis of full equality of rights and self-administration. The principle expressed by Budovit Stur more than a hundred years ago is still valid ". . . It does not make for happiness if we raise our standard at the expense of other people, and by oppressing them; happiness is achieved when we live with people who are as cultured, as happy, and as satisfied as we are."

[From Uj Szo (Bratislava), Apr. 12, 1968, Radio Free Europe translation]

IN THE DEFENSE OF INNOCENTS

(By Jozsef Gyonyor)

"We suggest the reconsideration of all those articles of law which were passed after 1945 which concern the citizens of Hungarian nationality and we also suggest the annulment of discriminatory laws." (From the resolution of the Csemadok Central Committee.)

One shivers when one reads about the arrest of innocent people and the tortures of the condemned. The question arises: were these monsters born by mothers? Who can tell the number of those people who in the last quarter of a century were illegally arrested, how many people lost their health or life on the grounds of unjust court sentences?

I was reading recently that the presidium of the Supreme Court urges the rehabilitation of persons tried injustly in the years between 1949–1954. However, before we start to deal with this subject, we must know the meaning of this Latin word, now a topic of priority all the country over. According to the dictionary "rehabilitation" means the restoration of one's honor and good reputation, a compensation, an exoneration of the detrimental legal consequences due to arrest. People who are rehabilitated will be reinstated in their rights. Putting it plainly, the illegal sentence must be quashed, and the rehabilitated compensated for the damage done by illegal detention and the execution of the punishment. All this, however, is not enough. A complete rehabilitation demands that the innocently condemned be reinstated—if possible—in their original position. And naturally, that at least as much publicity should be given to this as to the reflections cast on their good reputation at the time.

It is likewise natural that not only those persons must be rehabilitated who were sentenced in a political trial. Who knows the number of workers who were victims of illegal administrative measures? Neither is the number of those people known who spent months and long years in forced-labor camps or had to do forced labor. Neither can we collect the names of all those who were dismissed without reason and who remained with their families without a job. The infringement of the law, however, did not begin in 1949, but earlier. There is no sufficient explanation for the fact that the Supreme Court counts the illegalities from 1949, because the series of illegal actions began with the decrees discriminating against the Hungarian citizens. For the sake of historical authenticity, however, we shall give an account at least of the most flagrant ones.

They were opened by the decree No. Four issued by the Slovak National Council on 27 February 1945. This was followed by the decree issued April 7 (No. 26.) and by the one issued May 15. (No. 33.)

After this, came the era of President Benes. Perhaps there has never been in the course of history a king by the grace of God who ruled his subjects with such inhuman decrees. The decree No. 12 issued 21 June 1945 belongs to the most important ones. Under this decree persons of Hungarian nationality were deprived without any compensation, and effective immediately, of their agricultural real estate, rich and poor alike. Assets which were not confiscated on the grounds of this decree were taken away on the grounds of decree No. 108 of October 5, which the executive bodies were ordered to carry out, and which did not even exempt the movable property of the Hungarians.

We shall look now into the events themselves and find out who were those people who carried out every presidential decree? They were first of all those persons who were afraid to have to account for having been fascists during the war, who moved speedily away from the northern districts and became rulers over life and death in Hungarian towns and villages. The teachers and employees of the former Hlinka party were transferred—mostly as a punishment—to South Slovakia. These politically corrupt elements, former Guardists, left-overs from the estate owners, and other "experts" flooded the Hungarian villages and towns. It was rumored that they were forgiven all their sins because they were good enough to beat the Hungarians. Unfortunately, they really beat up and hit the Hungarians in the true sense of the word. Notices were on display in offices with the text "Na Slovensku po slovensky" (Speak Slovak in Slovakia). And how many mothers were hit because they talked Hungarian with their sons on the streets.

A series of atrocities were carried out on these unfortunate people, from whom they wanted to take away their houses, land, shops, or their honor. Where it was not immediately possible to put them out of the country, hundreds of Hungarians were dragged to the frontier and left there without food or drink.

The "peoples tribunal" began its activities and Hungarians were convicted chiefly on account of their nationality. They were resettled without compensation, and even those persons were taken to court who only had "earth" in their flower pots.

In the resettlement office work was started on a "scientific" basis. Lists were drawn up containing the names of those Hungarians whom they wanted to resettle in Hungary. They were divided into two categories on the grounds of articles No. 5 and 8 of the Agreement. What was the difference? Persons belonging to the first category could take with them all their movable assets, while those included in the second category could only hope for the chance to take 50 kilograms of luggage per person with them.

Of the 105,047 persons qualified for resettlement, only 68,407 left the country, and an additional 60,000, afraid of the hopeless future, left of their own free will. On the other hand, those persons whom they wanted to get rid of—the "criminals"—on the grounds of paragraph No. 8 stayed on in the country on account of the new circumstances.

The exchange scheme did not and could not attain its goal. It was a great mistake of the time that the number of Slovaks in Hungary was wrongly estimated and the Hungarians in Czechoslovakia, whose number amounted to three-quarters of a million, were left out of consideration.

The Czechoslovak Resettlement Commission, working in Hungary, distributed in vain between the fourth of March 1946 and 25 June 1946, 790,000 newspaper copies, 490,000 propaganda booklets and 540,000 leaflets, but results did not come up to expectations. Neither were the 266 lectures on the Budapest radio of much help. The magic of the spoken word also had no effect. Neither did the 277 meetings, organized in 133 villages and towns in Hungary, attain the results anticipated. It was in vain to flood the villages with thousands of books, to organize 60 concerts; there were only 59,774 who registered for resettlement within the framework of the exchange action, while 13,499 persons were taken to Czechoslovakia arbitrarily outside the scheme. After the unsuccessful action, the question arises: what sort of data were the point of departure of the Prague Foreign Ministry and the Slovak offices in charge, how did the "experts" work? As far as I know, the number of Slovaks in Hungary was estimated at 540,000, but most of the Hungarians living in Slovakia were considered Hungarianized Slovaks.

It was on the grounds of this false theory that the government decreed in June 1946 the so-called re-Slovakization. The purpose was clear. The Hungarian minority could not remain in this country. In the interest of this purpose the "magyarized" part of the population was permitted to return to their original nationality. The fact, however, that those people who on account of the one-time class oppression had actually become magyarized, and who at the time of the first republic could have safely declared themselves Slovak, were not taken into consideration. The scheme was carried through in the same year, in the period between 17 June—and July first. It is no secret that this action was coupled with the matter of citizenship. I ask you, who would have been willing to leave his place of birth under insecure conditions? It was thus that 410,820 Hungarians were forced to deny their nationality in writing.

As regards those people with whom they could not reckon in the course of the resettlement of their Slovakization, their fate was settled by "providence" so that they were scattered in Bohemia. Decisions were reached on the grounds of further registers of the resettlement office and in accordance with the decree No. 88 issued 19 November 1945, and forwarded to 9,610 heads of families, with the signature of the chiefs of the district labor offices. Only 2,154 Hungarian families changed their residence of their own free will and moved to some farms in Bohemia, where they were hired as farm hands. The remaining 41,640 persons were put on cattle-trucks on a cold winter day and moved with military assistance to the historical parts of the country. But with this, their tragedy has not yet ended. The part of their property which was not confiscated by official bodies was looted by unknown culprits. Many of them could return to their abandoned homes only after long years. They were treated as war criminals, though most of them were the sons of workers and of poor peasants. However, their guilt was never established by any court or administrative body. They were merely taken to the market

and carried off as slaves. Was that recruitment? No, there is another expression for it: forced expulsion.

People who were not broken by so much suffering and slander, were granted, after the coming to power of the working class, citizenship under decree 245/1948. But according to sub-section three of section one of this law, around 300 persons were not happy about it. The list of names of these persons was forwarded accompanied by a circular letter of the Ministry of the Interior dated 16 December 1948 (No. 190/1948) to the districts. There is no need for us to say that many innocent Hungarians were also included on the list, who could live and work in the country even ten years later only with a residence permit.

In order to make the series of illegalities complete every Hungarian language school was closed down, although under the decree issued by the Slovak National Council on the Sixth September 1944, the elementary schools set up prior to the Sixth November 1938 could have continued to function. After this, the teachers were sacked and the children were not even permitted to learn the alphabet in their own language for almost half a decade.

There are only brief facts and only a small fragment of what really took place.

How often did we put the question to ourselves in the course of the past two decades; what did we do, that for the sins of a few bourgeois politicians hundreds of thousands of ordinary men were totally outlawed? Perhaps it was our generation which had to answer for those historical offenses the Hungarian great landowners inflicted on the Slovak people? Whatever the reason, we must establish for the sake of historical objectivity, that South Slovakia and its people have changed hands several times during the last quarter of a century. After World War I, it was annexed to Czechoslovakia. On the grounds of the Vienna treaty, part of the territory and inhabitants were returned to Hungary, while in 1945, the exile government liberated it as a Czechoslovak area. Our fathers were not asked in 1918, where they wished to belong. The representatives or our national minority did not give their signature to the documents of the Vienna treaty. From the class point of view, the totalitarian measures, also affecting the working people, even if they were Communists, are inconceivable.

Thus far, it was rumored in Hungarian nationality groups, that the atrocities were started by "Husak, Novomesky and Okali." It was even stated in the resolution passed on the 16 January 1959 by the Central Committee of the Slovak National Council, that it was only after the denunciation of the bourgeois nationalist activities of "Husak and his associates," that the Leninist nationality policy could be implemented by the Czech CP among the Hungarian language population. The first chapter of the report was also written in a similar spirit.

In the meantime, the "bourgeois nationalists" mentioned earlier were rehabilitated. I suggest therefore, that Dr. Gustav Husak, Ladislav Novomesky and Danial Okali should take a stand in Uj Szo in the matter of the charges raised against them.

It is well known that people of Hungarian nationality had a share in the construction of socialism in our country, though they had few political rights. For all this however, they were not appreciated. Thus far, neither the Supreme Court nor the state agencies, took steps for the calling to account of the people guilty of the cruelties committed against the inhabitants of Hungarian nationality. It is strange, but it seems, that statesmen and the press alike, have forgotten the events of 20 years ago. Nothing was mentioned even when the radio and television spoke about the necessity that Hungarians illegally arrested and persecuted, must also be rehabilitated. Neither did the papers, that some parliamentary commission has dealt with the rehabilitation of the whole Hungarian national minority. And yet, there is no question that everybody suffering under the collective charge, the whole of the Hungarian minority, must be rehabilitated.

This year has been declared by the UN, as the international year of human rights. I am certain that before long, the parliament and government of the Czechoslovak socialist republic will take count of the inhumanities committed against the Hungarian minority. On the grounds of this, the government resolution stipulating re-Slovakization must be revoked and invalidated fully, because we still have villages whose inhabitants are afraid to declare themselves Hungarian. Further, the list issued by the interior minister on the grounds of the provision of law No. 245/1943, must be revised, and every discriminatory law and decree invalidated, as a disgrace to the Czechoslovak statute books.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today we are discussing another minority issue that of the almost 1 million Hungarians living in Czechoslovakia close to the Czechoslovak-Hungarian border.

Reading the material appearing in the only daily paper of the minority—Uj Szo—which exposes courageously the abuses of the Communist regime in the past, we have both praise for the valiant struggle these people lead for a restoration of their human rights both as individuals and as an ethnic group in a multi-national state and compassion for their past sufferings on the hand of Communist dictatorship.

We feel that their demands submitted to the Government for self-administration of the Hungarian-inhabited areas, expansion of Hungarian-language secondary schools, scientific establishments and cultural events and institutions are fair and that their support of the reforms demonstrate their ardent wish that totalitarianism should disappear from their state. Their demands on a personal and group level freedom is consonant with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations and the best principles of our Nation and all freedom-loving nations.

We are listening carefully to their voices and to the policies which by federalization and expansion of individual freedoms are trying to make life more humane and bearable in totalitarian Czechoslovakia and hope that the voices of freedom, humanism, and democracy will win out over the forces of Russian imperialism, totalitarian communism and oppression. The events in Czechoslovakia again demonstrate that freedom cannot be erased off the minds of people even by Communist indoctrination and police terror and that peace and stability require both a restoration of individual freedom and just treatment of minorities as well.

In this regard we are wishing success to those efforts which would bring peace between the nations and nationalities of Czechoslovakia rather than exacerbate existing differences and which would help unite them in the quest for peace and human dignity and freedom for the individual instead of living in a totalitarian Communist dictatorship.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join today the distinguished gentleman from New York and my other colleagues in discussing the fate of the almost 1 million Hungarians in Czechoslovakia.

The events of the last 6 months in Czechoslovakia restore our hope that the indomitable human desire for freedom and a democratic form of government cannot be destroyed by oppression, terror, and indoctrination, but will pervade even the circles of those who for a time were ardent adherents of a totalitarian ideology. Of course, the potentials open to the Czechoslovak people are still limited to a degree. The Soviet Union continues to exercise an imperialist protectorate over the region and attempts through economic and political means to stop the force of change that the people of Czechoslovakia desire to implement in order to regain their national identity and their reputation for democracy.

This is the first time in the last 22 years that the Hungarian minority in Slovakia can express its hopes and desires within the framework of the present political structure of the country. A veritable flood of articles have appeared in the only Hungarian-language daily Uj Szo—New World—in Bratislava, denouncing the grievous deeds against the minority after World War II and during the Novotny era, and demanding new solutions based on the principle of equality that has been promised. We ought to follow their struggle with great attention since either a solution or stagnation of the question of Slovaks and Hungarians in Czechoslovakia will constitute the supreme test regarding the sincerity of the reform, and its capability to bring peace and stability. Their demands for self-administration, near proportional representation in state and public agencies and institutions, and a more equitable educational institutional framework in their mother tongue, are certainly justified. They contribute to the implementation of those human and minority rights which were so eloquently and resolutely expressed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the U.N. in 1948, and which also form a historical tradition for the spirit of both Masaryk and Kossuth.

Presently there are some surface tensions between Slovaks and Hungarians in the area. But these are due, to a large extent, to misinformation and unfounded rumors, and encouraged to a degree by the Soviet Union which hopes to use the divide et impera approach to Czechoslovak events. It is our earnest hope and desire that Slovaks and Hungarians will find a way of accommodating each other and solve the nationality issues, since both were, until very recently, the victims of the same political, ideological and ethnic discrimination.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I am joining today with my distinguished colleague from New York in discussing the developments in Czechoslovakia relating to the almost 1 million citizens of Hungarian nationality in that country.

We are witnessing interesting and very important events in that country. The popular resentment against Communist totalitarianism finally found its expression even among the more sensible elements within the party and is resulting now in concessions to the people in the field of personal rights and press freedoms. As the dam of oppression has been

broken, the flood of the desire for democracy and human and group rights is now emerging in world and script all over that country despite the rear-guard actions of the Novotny wing and their mentors, Moscow and East Berlin.

The liberalization process also embraced the members and leaders of the Hungarian minority. They support fully the liberalization measures and hope that they will result in improving their legal and economic situation and do away with the conscious discrimination that has been practiced against them for decades.

The difficulties are now centering on making the Slovaks, themselves victims of discrimination until now to understand that if they are able to secure equality for themselves, they must grant equality to the minority in the midst, the Hungarians.

Hungarian demands include an agglomeration of the Hungarian-inhabited areas into counties with local autonomy, more educational institutions, recognition of their group rights in the constitution, certainly demands which are compatible with democracy and the unity of the state. These rights are identical with the ones given to individuals and minorities in the U.N. Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and would form the basis of a peace between nations and nationalities in the area which is the prerequisite for stability in the Danubian area. We hope that Soviet obstructionism and Communist diehards will not succeed in reversing the trend for more freedom and equality in Czechoslovakia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with pleasure my distinguished colleague from New York in discussing the fate of the Hungarians in Czechoslovakia.

Today the overwhelming desire for human rights and a nontotalitarian existence has pervaded Czechoslovak society so much that even the Communist Party leadership must take these desires into consideration and try to head off a revolt by offering concession in the sphere of personal and group freedoms.

As a result the grievances of the unjustly oppressed and sentenced and the nationalities who were gravely discriminated against are raising their voices and ask for a recognition of their rights and a partial remedying for the wrongs of the past. Whether they will succeed is not clear yet as Moscow and its East German minion, Ulbricht, is trying to sabotage the liberalization attempts both economically, politically, and to a limited degree even militarily through the phony maneuvers at the time when major decisions on reform are taken in Czechoslovakia.

The Hungarian minority was probably the most oppressed minority in the last few decades. While the Slovaks had also their share of discrimination, Hungarians were in 1945 deprived of their citizenship, many of them were expelled or forced to declare themselves Slovaks in order to remain in their homes, and 76,000 of them were deported to the Sudeten region to do forced work in 1946–47. They also suffered after the Communist takeover and lost many of their elite to forced labor camps and prisons during the Novotny era.

Today their leadership must react to the ever-increasing demands for human and minority rights evinced by the masses of the Hungarians and some of them are spearheading a movement for reform that would not only include a restoration of the general human and civil rights of the citizen but also a proportional representation of the nationalities in public bodies and professions and self-administration of the Hungarian-inhabited areas which should be constituted as counties.

Finally, they point out the inadequacy of Hungarian-language institutions on the secondary and college level in Czechoslovakia and the absence of any research institutions, TV programs, radio programs, and adequate press products for almost 1 million people. Last but not least they want official recognition of their group rights in the Constitution and the annulment of all the discriminatory legislation against them even though they are no longer enforced.

We hope that the intrigue of Moscow and Pankow will not succeed in stopping the reforms in Czechoslovakia and that the Hungarians and Slovaks will both achieve their aims and will find a modus vivendi among themselves and with the Czechs in the state of Czechoslovakia.

For a description of the tensions present I insert an article by David Binder, from the New York Times, June 23, 1968, which elaborates on the fears of the Hungarian minority because of the lack of understanding on the part of the Slovaks:

HUNGARIAN MINORITY TENSIONS WITH SLOVAKS WORRY BUDAPEST

(By David Binder)

BUDAPEST, June 21.—Tension between the Hungarian minority in Slovakia and the Slovaks has caused worry here this month.

Hungarians also complain about discrimination against the Hungarian minority in Rumania.

It is understood that both Alexander Dubcek, the new Czechoslovak Communist party chief, and Janos Kadar, the Hungarian leader, have intervened personally to calm tensions between Hungarians and Slovaks.

They conferred on the matter at a meeting in Budapest last week and agreed to continue working closely together to resolve the nationalist conflicts.

In May and early June, Hungarians returning from visits to Bratislava, the Slovak capital, and other Slovak communities reported that the minority had come under intense pressure from Slovak chauvinists.

A recent visitor to Slovakia said that "in some villages the Hungarians feel it is better not to go out at night," and then went on to speak of beatings and scuffles.

REUNION AVOIDED

A woman who went to Bratislava to attend an alumni reunion of her Hungarian school there, said many of her former classmates stayed away from the festivities because they feared trouble with their Slovak neighbors.

There are believed to be almost one million of Hungarian origin in Slovakia, although fewer than 700,000 openly declare themselves to be members of the minority. Under the Austro-Hungarian Empire, which was dissolved in 1918, all Slovakia belonged to the Hungarian crown.

Between the wars, Bratislava was officially a trinational and trilingual city—with Austrians, Hungarians and Slovaks enjoying equal rights.

Czechs, though a tiny minority in Bratislava, soon took over most of the leading political and economic posts, acting as agents of the Prague Government. From the Slovak viewpoint, this exchange of Hungarian-Austrian masters for Czech masters served to their nationalism all the more during the period between the wars.

Meanwhile, some of the Hungarians of Slovakia, remembering the days when Bratislava was Pozsonyl—and the capital of a truncated Hungary—still hold it to be "theirs" and they have occasionally provoked the Slovak majority. After World War II about 120,000 Hungarians were resettled from Slovakia to Hungary.

Since 1945, Bratislava has become an almost exclusively Slovak city and has lost virtually all its cosmopolitan aura.

According to reliable information available here, groups of Slovak nationalists marched in May through villages where the Hungarian minority predominates, shouting: "Hungarians to the Danube." The Danube forms part of the border between Hungary and Slovakia.

Gyula Lörincz, a Stalinist who was appointed chief of the minority in 1946 by the Hungarian premier, Matyas Rakosi, inflamed Slovak resentment further last month by declaring that Hungarians "had not asked" to be included in Czechoslovakia in 1918.

Retorting to this sally, a Slovak cultural official, Ondrej Kulik, told the Hungarian minority newspaper in Bratislava, Uj Szo: "If the Hungarians want to destroy our state then nothing remains for us but to drive them out with weapons."

The hope in political and intellectual circles here is that the Czechoslovak democratization process will eventually slake Slovak nationalist demands for federal rights and then will permit the Hungarian minority to gain greater group liberties.

The Hungarians in Slovakia are hoping to obtain more schools and higher educational institutions as well as a theater.

SITUATION IN RUMANIA

The situation of the Magyar minority of 1,500,000 people in Rumania remains a sharper thorn in the Hungarian side. While Budapest intellectuals acknowledge that there is slightly greater travel freedom and that there have been economic improvements for the Hungarians in Rumania, they complain of other forms of discrimination.

They note that Hungarian textbooks are often printed in editions of under 5,000 copies, which a writer said, "is far too small for a minority that size." Imports of most Hungarian writings are barred by the Bucharest authorities. The intellectuals also excoriate the resettlement measures that have driven thousands of Hungarians out of their traditional homes in the Transylvania region of Rumania.

Earlier this year, the Rumanian regime abolished the Transylvanian territory known as the Magyar Autonomous Region, redrawing the administrative lines along the prewar county system. The reaction here was a shrug of the shoulders. "That region soon became neither Magyar nor autonomous." said an intellectual "so what is the difference?" What counts are personal liberties and equality.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject matter at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

VOTING AT 18

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is a red letter day in the Congress. In a special message, the President earlier today urged adoption of a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18.

Every year since I have served in the House of Representatives—commencing in 1959—I have introduced a joint resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to enable all citizens to vote at the age of 18. As long ago as 1937, when I was a young instructor at Columbia University, I began agitating for the lowering of the voting age. In the ensuing 31 years, the reasons for the 18-year-old vote have changed as the nature of youth has changed, and the President has set forth eloquently and persuasively the compelling arguments to support adoption of what will be the 26th amendment to the Constitution.

IMPORTANCE IN AN ELECTION YEAR

I am hopeful that the President's message will furnish the impetus that will see this proposal through to final approval and ratification. I believe it is fitting that we consider such a proposal now, during an election year, at a time when we can witness the active participation of young people in the political campaigns of all the candidates.

Our political system can benefit greatly from the genuine idealism of young people. Many young people are more highly motivated toward political action than their elders. It is interesting that a great deal of this zeal for activity has occurred very recently, as many young people are beginning to appreciate the fact that in a democracy their interest and activity really counts and does make a difference.

YOUNG PEOPLE TODAY AS CONTRASTED WITH 1950

I am impressed by the fact that this generation of young people is on the whole more serious minded, thoughtful, and activist in spirit than their counterparts among the students of the 1950's. They are searching for the meaning of life, and their role in society. Their participation in belligerent demonstrations of a destructive nature, such as what occurred at Columbia University, is an inexcusable breach of discipline which cannot be condoned. Yet I sometimes wonder whether the senseless violence, animal energy, and nihilistic attacks on the "Establishment" would not be tempered and directed into useful channels if opportunities for expression were afforded at the ballot box.

It is argued by some that the modern generation of young people lacks the maturity to vote at the age of 18, and to lower the voting age will simply corrupt elections with those who lack a sense of balance. It is also argued that our Nation should not reward those prone to riot with a share of choosing our governing officials. It is further argued that the hippies and the yippies will lower the level of intelligence in the electorate, resulting in big votes for weird candidates, and votes being cast for superficial personal characteristics rather than meaningful policies.

YOUNG PEOPLE CAN ENRICH DEMOCRACY

Mr. Speaker, I do not see any overnight transformation in intelligence which occurs on the very day a young adult reaches the magic age of 21. And I would concur with the assessment of the President who expressed it this way in his message earlier today:

> The young people of America in this decade are far more ready, far better qualified, far more able to discharge the highest duty of citizenship than any generations of the past.

It is self-evident that confidence placed in young people will awaken them to a new sense of responsibility toward our Nation, and direct their energies and interests toward the constructive task of making democracy work.

I therefore trust that early action will be taken by the Congress and the States in the passage and ratification of this important constitutional amendment.

GRANTING PERMITS TO USE PUBLIC PROPERTY—NO MORE RESURRECTION CITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two bills of similar content which will require hereafter that no permit shall be issued for any demonstrations, encampment, or assemblage without first obtaining approval for such permit from the two Interior Committees of the Congress, as to one bill, and the two District of Columbia Committees of the Congress, as to the other bill.

As you are all aware, H.R. 16981, has been reported and may be acted upon by the Congress in the near future. This measure prohibits any officer or employee of the U.S. Government or the District of Columbia from issuing a permit for the use of land owned or under the control of the United States or the District of Columbia for camping, sleeping, or other overnight occupancy or for contructing or erecting any temporary buildings.

While we hope that there may be control over the use of Government lands in the future, an outright prohibition would prevent any overnight occupancy of public lands. Such a bill would even prevent a Boy Scout jamboree or any other proven organization overnight use of public lands. We might find ourselves in an awkward position if we had to deny completely and entirely worthwhile uses.

It is my opinion that the type of bill which I have introduced will serve for the Congress as the stewards of the people's property, the responsibility and say over who may or may not be given the right to obtain occupancy of public lands and for how long and under what terms. It is true there is a section of H.R. 16981 that orders the posting of bonds before using public lands for purposes other than overnight occupancy. But under the type of bills which I have introduced, the Congress could consider as a condition for the granting of a permit the amount and the terms of such a bond, rather than delegate to an appointed individual in the executive branch of the Government or in the District of Columbia government, the authority to require a bond or the amount of bond.

There could be a simple committee resolution which could be acted upon by a simple quorum of the committees involved and action by the full House or Senate would not be required. A committee could disapprove an application simply by taking no action.

I submit that under my bill the Congress, being directly responsible to the people, would have control over the use of land belonging to all the people. In addition there would be no risk of the challenge that some appointed official would inhibit the constitutional rights to lawfully assemble and petition the Congress. The very application to the Congress for a permit would constitute part of the petition.

If I may respectfully point out, any other type of bill might be challenged summarily particularly those which call for a complex prohibition against the granting of a permit as denial of the right to petition. In any event there should be some latitude allowed rather than an outright prohibition.

I am sure that the great majority of the Members of this House want to see no more Resurrection Cities. The bills which I have introduced today will give us all assurances there will be no more permits granted by the Interior Department or by the District of Columbia government. The method which I have proposed in my bills is a much more logical treatment of the procedure to require the committees of the Congress to consider such permits than to delegate this authority to appointed officials. Certainly the Members of the Congress, elected Representatives of the people, and their decisions should better express the will of the people.

WHY THE ATOMIC ENERGY PROGRAM MUST BE INVESTIGATED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GALLAGHER). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on June 5, Dr. H. Beecher Charmbury, secretary of the Pennsylvania Department of Mines and Mineral Industries, delivered an address in which he recommended a study involving all implications of the nuclear power industry.

Dr. Charmbury charged that environmental problems coming from the mining and burning of coal are infinitesimal compared with dangers that could arise from atomic reactors. He also asserted that the Federal Government has not disclosed actual costs of atomic power. His analysis reviews in depth the awful damage that could come from an accident in a reactor or in the transportation of nuclear materials.

I ask that the entire statement appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, along with an editorial on the Charmbury remarks from the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat of June 17.

The material supports my resolution for a top-to-bottom study of the civilian

reactor program. I have warned that air and water pollution from atomic reactors could be catastrophic, that a shortage of uranium could bring unnecessarily high prices for electricity, and that a full disclosure of the Atomic Energy Commission's civilian reactor program is essential both to the public safety and to the public purse.

Another factor involved in the projected study of the AEC program is the plan to detonate a nuclear device underground in Pennsylvania for the purpose of creating a natural gas storage reservoir. This week, opponents of the project presented a petition containing 9,500 signatures to a State official in Harrisburg. In all, almost 15,000 citizens of the Commonwealth have signed petitions asking that the idea be rejected.

AEC is already making the decisions on whether reactors may be built on sites selected by utilities, regardless of the desires of residents who may reject the idea of living next door to the atom. If this Federal agency can also decide to blast in an area despite opposition of local citizens, Heaven help the Nation.

The Charmbury address and the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat editorial follow:

A PLEA FOR THOUGHT AND ACTION BY H. B. CHARMBURY, SECRETARY, PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND MINERAL INDUSTRIES

During the past five years, we have been living in a very air-land-and-water conservation-minded society. Hundreds, yes even thousands, of articles have been prepared for the public by the news media of Pennsylvania and the rest of the country severely criticizing the coal industry for the scars left as a result of more than 100 years of uncontrolled and unregulated coal mining to protect the general public.

Today, we have these controls, and the coal mining industry in Pennsylvania is to be commended for the job it is doing in working with government, conservationists, and others to protect, for future generations, our air, land, and water. The change in the coal industry's entire philosophy and attitude is almost simply unbelievable. From a slow start, we have built up to a point where there has never been greater cooperation between all groups concerned to have a healthy bituminous coal-producing industry in Pennsylvania with mining operations being conducted to protect the people now living in Pennsylvania, and those who live in and enjoy Pennsylvania in many, many years to come.

Now, however, government must turn its attention to other problems that might make our current problems from previous coal mining seem infinitesimal. These problems would be concerned with the life and death of our population as well as the preservation of our natural resources. I am referring to the radiation problems from the utilization of nuclear power plants.

In 1966, twenty-one new plants were licensed by the Atomic Energy Commission. In 1967, thirty additional plants were also licensed and in 1968 to date, an additional eleven plants have been announced by the Atomic Energy Commission. The total number of operating, licensed, under construction and in final phases of startup are ninety-nine plants. These plants are scheduled to be in operation by the end of 1975. The current forecast of the Atomic Energy Commission is the installation of 150 million kilowatts of nuclear power generating plants by the year 1980 representing approximately 30 per cent of the installed capacity in this country.

During the past decade, the general public has been fed a constant stream of information, principally from United States government agencies, on the desirable features of the application of nuclear energy. Science fiction has pointed out the theoretical tremendous levels of energy available from the splitting of the uranium atom. Frequent stories have been released to the public that one pound of uranium-235 is equivalent in heat energy to 3 million pounds of coal and, therefore, the coal mining industry was doomed.

In contrast, the undesirable, and in fact, dangerous features with respect to pollution from such plants and the production of deadly radiation to all living things created by the operation of these nuclear power plants have not been widely discussed with the public. What are the true facts.

1. The fundamental principal of the splitting of the nucleus of the uranium-235 atom by a "slow" neutron results in two fragments of the nucleus that are new and different chemical elements. Each of these two fragments without exception, is radioactive and in turn begins to disintegrate to a stable and different chemical element. Additional neutrons are released to maintain the "chain" reaction. Heat is released. Dangerous gamma rays are given off of this "chain" reaction. The truth is, for every pound of uranium-235 atoms "burned" in a nuclear reaction, there is created approximately an equal pound of radioactive fission fragments.

2. The public is not informed of, first, the volume and, second, the basic time required to control these radioactive materials.

3. The point is the radiation from these fission fragments cannot be seen or detected in any manner by the other senses of humans. Everyone is familiar with the effects of x-rays on human tissue. The same danger is present from the radiation constantly produced by the radioactive fission fragments.

Strontium-90 for example, a product of a nuclear power plant, is one of the most deadly radioactive fission fragments to all living things. This radioactive material is a solid and gives off beta rays and if present within the human body is a bone seeking material directly causing bone cancer. Worst of all, this material slowly disintegrates to a new and stable chemical element. It has a half life of 28 years. This term half life means that if you started with one pound of strontium-90, in 28 years the radioactive decay would reduce the weight to ½ pound and in another 28 years you would have ¼ pound and so on.

In fact, it would require 600 years to reduce the radiation danger of strontium-90 created in one year of operation of a single 1,000,000 kilowatt nuclear plant to a level acceptable to the public.

Other examples of very dangerous radioactive fission fragments such as cesium-137, iodine-131, cerium-144, and krypton-85, could be cited. The radioactive fission products accordingly exist in gaseous, liquid and solid forms and without exception, all give off deadly radiation to human beings and in fact all living things in our environment.

Mr. W. R. Harper in his book, "Basic Principles of Fission Reactors" states: "It may be calculated that a worker who stood ten yards from one gram of fresh unshielded fission products would receive a deadly dose of radiation in one or two minutes."

The commercial nuclear plants by 1980 will create a volume of radioactive elements that is almost beyond comprehension. There will be approximately a ton per day.

Recently actual operating data has been released concerning the practical facts of several of the operating commercial nuclear power plants in the United States. Here again two basic conclusions are evident.

First, not over 2 per cent of the uranium-235 actually present in the nuclear core can be fissioned without poisoning the core. The result is approximately ⅓ of the fuel assemblies per year must be removed, stored in the utility plant under water for 90 days, loaded in special casks, and transported by rail or truck to commercial processing plants to remove the valuable uranium materials. Subsequently, the recovered uranium is refabricated into new fuel assemblies and shipped back to the private utility plant.

Second, the regulations issued by the Atomic Energy Commission in the code of Federal regulations with reference to the licensing and design of a shipping cask for the shipment of the extremely dangerous spent fuel elements have been constantly undergoing modifications to assure the safety of the general public.

The magnitude of this rapidly developing public problem has been thoroughly discussed in the past five years by both academic and government sources. In general it is agreed that by 1980 there will be approximately 4,600 tons per year of spent fuel elements representing thousands of shipments across the United States to and from the estimated 150 nuclear power plants to be in operation by that date.

The importance of the special shipping casks is well stated by the publication of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory of Atomic Energy Commission in April, 1965, by Mr. L. B. Shaford of the Basic Problems of Heat Transfer, Shielding, Contamination, Pressure Build-up and Accident Analysis.

The Southern State Nuclear Board, a compact of seventeen southern states, published in 1966 a study "The International Traffic of Radioactive Materials". This document again points out the serious problems of safety, insurance and indemnity costs, legal factors and the numerous problems of the design and licensing by the Atomic Energy Commission of the large shipping casks required in the near future.

The staff at Johns Hopkins has thoroughly studied the density population of various cities in the United States to estimate the number of persons and the cost thereof to evacuate the public from the deadly gamma ray exposures in the event of a transportation accident by a truck or rail carrier. This report points out the very significant facts of what would happen to persons from a single spent fuel element exposure of the deadly radiation.

In view of this authentic information from Johns Hopkins University, it is necessary for each state to carefully control the use of its highways, railroads and airways for the transportation of highly dangerous radioactive materials required for the fuel cycle for commercial nuclear power plants.

Gentlemen, do we know all of the facts? What other key information has not been revealed to the public by government or by the press? What will be the total cost of this nuclear energy? What are the potential dangers?

Earlier this year I had a proposal submitted to the Department of Mineral Industries at my request to get some of the answers. In trying to get the proposal approved, I received the most fantastic government red tape treatment that I've had in six years in Harrisburg. I was told there was nothing for me to be concerned about. These things are all taken care of. Well, I am concerned. If people can be concerned with sulfur dioxide and fly ash from coal burning power plants, and if people can be concerned with mine drainage pollution coming from the mines which produce the coal, somebody better be concerned with the potential pollution from nuclear power plants.

Since I am not permitted to undertake this study, I am asking this Association to consider the possibility of making the study. I will be most happy to make the details available regarding what can and should be done so that the facts can be made known.

Eastern Europe doesn't have a monopoly

on "iron curtains", when it comes to the free flow of information.

Your association can help to lift the unseen iron curtain on information relating to the deleterious effects of uninhibited development of nuclear power plants. Not only are our natural resources, but humanity itself is directly involved.

The study I am asking this association to undertake would certainly help to lift that curtain, while, at the same time, prove invaluable to the States themselves when it comes to establishing regulatory legislation that could post guidelines on the orderly progression—not retrogression of mankind—in its headlong exploitation of such awesome power.

I am worried. I have seen results as to the cost of pollution from energy in the past. . . . I don't want to see the same mistakes with even greater costs take place in the future.

NUCLEAR ENERGY UNKNOWNS

Many are the uncertainties associated with peaceful uses of nuclear power.

Even when someone sets out to explain the beneficial aspects of the awesome power potential, what is heard often is only barely understood. And many questions, therefore, remain.

So it is understandable that there is much concern about the possible harmful aspects of widespread use of nuclear energy. And Pennsylvania's secretary of mines and mineral industries has put some of that concern into words as he issued a challenge to a soft-coal association to study the problems of producing electric power through atomic energy.

Dr. H. Beecher Charmbury told a group of coal producers that "the problems created by coal mining in the past are infinitesimal to what we could face through the massive use of nuclear power plants in the future."

That statement prefaced Dr. Charmbury's challenge. He said:

"For this reason I am asking your association (Keystone Coal Association) to undertake a full-fledged study of the problems connected with production of electric power through atomic energy. Such a study would not come under the scope of activities of the Department of Mines and Mineral Industries.

"I know that problems do exist, and the people of our nation must be made aware of the vast, deadly dangers constituted in the methods as well as by-products created in making electric power with atomic energy."

Dr. Charmbury noted that there has been an abundance of information about the positive aspects of nuclear power production but said that "an unseen iron curtain exists when it comes to information on the deleterious effects."

He went on in his talk to the coal producers as follows:

"I genuinely hope you will undertake this study because we are not just talking about the effects on our lands and waters but on humanity itself. Such a study could prove invaluable, too, in the ultimate creation of regulations—at the state level—if we are to progress, not retrogress, in exploitation of such an awesome power."

Dr. Charmbury noted the proliferation of nuclear power plants and said:

"The current forecast of the Atomic Energy Commission is the installation of 150 million kilowatts of nuclear power generating plants by the year 1980 and representing approximately 30 per cent of this nation's . . . capacity."

Without doubt, the American public must be fully—and in understandable language—informed about the still-young nuclear age. The people must be made aware of all the dangers that may arise as nuclear energy production facilities continue to sprout across the nation.

OUR YOUNG PEOPLE DESERVE TO VOTE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted with the President's message today recommending the reduction of the voting age to 18. This has been a long time objective of mine and I have introduced legislation toward this end ever since I came to this House in 1959. I have felt that one of the blatant inequities in our American society has been the denial of this franchise to our younger citizens.

The history of these United States describes a long but unbroken progress from the rule of a tiny minority in its earliest day to what is now an almost universal suffrage. In this same decade, in which voting discrimination based on poll taxes, on race or color, or on voting districts have all been outlawed, the discrimination which deprives over 10 million of our younger citizens of their rightful vote must be our next objective.

No time could be more appropriate. These young people are today being asked to acquire more education and assume more and heavier responsibilities, and at an earlier age, than ever before. There is no group with a larger stake in the long term consequences of our Government's policies than these people. At a time when the "generation gap" has become an issue, and when increasing numbers of responsible, serious young people are asking for a broader role and participation in society—what more appropriate measure can be taken than the extension to these people of our society's most fundamental means of participation—the right to vote?

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. ARMY CHEMICAL CORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, June 28, 1968, the 50th anniversary of the creation of the U.S. Army Chemical Corps, is a fit and proper occasion on which to honor the record, services, sacrifices, and accomplishments of this vitally important branch of the national military establishment. Equally—and perhaps more—importantly, the anniversary to which I refer affords a fit and proper opportunity to survey one of the major problems now confronting the American people and their national security policy—the deterrence and if necessary the waging of chemical and biological warfare.

It was a long time ago that the Spartans burned wet straw in smudge pots in order to conceal the movements of their troops against Hannibal's forces during the Carthaginian wars. And it was a considerable time ago—some of our younger citizens probably think shortly after the discovery of fire—that the German army released a cloud of chlorine gas over Allied lines near Ypres, Belgium, and caused confusion, gasping death, and thousands of maimed casualties. The launching of the gas attack on April 22, 1915, also launched what we have come to recognize as the modern era of chemical—more properly—chemical and biological warfare.

The first American troops that landed in France in 1917 had to depend on British and French equipment for protection against gas attacks. Within a short period of time the American Expeditionary Force not only had its own gas warfare equipment but its own gas and flame regiment. This regiment developed into the Chemical Warfare Service, which was organized as such on June 28, 1918. After the war—in 1920—the Chemical Warfare Service became a permanent branch of the Regular Army, a decision reflecting practical experiences gained in World War I—experiences including the simple, awesome fact that the some 6,000 German troops assigned to chemical warfare duties inflicted about 30 percent of the American casualties suffered during the entire war.

According to one historical summary:

Although chemical agents such as gas were not used in World War II, the contributions of Chemical Warfare Service units to combat operations were extensive. Chemical mortar battalions firing 4.2 inch high-explosives were famous in all theaters of war for their accurate fire in close support of Infantry. Flame throwers of the Chemical Warfare Service were one of the few weapons capable of driving fanatical Japanese defenders from their bunkers and caves in the Pacific, and were also a favorite weapon against the German pillboxes in Europe.

In 1946, the Chemical Warfare Service was reorganized as the Chemical Corps. During the Korean fighting the Corp's 4.2 inch chemical mortars firing high-explosive rounds in the same manner as in World War II once again demonstrated and proved the extent to which the vitality of the U.S. defenses and U.S. national security policy depended on the Army Chemical Corps.

To continue with the historical summary from which I quoted earlier:

In the Vietnam war, the Chemical Corps does not play the same role that it did in World War II or Korea. Smoke screens on a large scale are not needed because fighting there does not involve large units or troop movements, and the function of the 4.2 inch mortar battalions is being handled effectively by conventional artillery and mortars organic to infantry units. Nevertheless, the Chemical Corps has not let down its guard. Research and testing continue to prepare American forces for any eventuality and to provide a strong deterrent to any enemy contemplating the use of chemical agents on the battlefield.

Insofar as Vietnam is concerned, this report completely misses the boat. There has been considerable emphasis on the use of chemicals in Southeast Asia limited to tear gas and defoliants, and their value in the present conflict is increasingly obvious. In the case of defoliants, jungle areas with dense foliage provide perfect cover for enemy operations and defy efforts at detection. The use of defoliants has denied enemy units the use

of important areas and rendered allied operations correspondingly more effective. However, it is in the use of an improved tear gas that greatest benefits to allied forces have been realized. It has been impossible in many instances to route out stubborn enemy resistance in underground fortified bunkers with the use of conventional weapons. In these cases tear gas has been highly effective. There have been instances where tear gas could be used in lieu of more destructive devices where enemy forces were holding civilians captive. In each instance, a savings of lives has resulted. There is increasing use and growing demand for additional chemical weapons of the type described for the battlefields in Vietnam and this is coupled with an obvious need for improvement in weapons and delivery systems.

Research and testing, plus the Southeast Asia participation, is costing in the neighborhood of $300 million a year and absorbing the energies and capacities of some 7,000 scientists and technicians, constitute one of the contemporary hallmarks of the Army Chemical Corps. But such research and testing, which over the last quarter century or so have brought forth chemical and biological warfare—or "CBW"—agents including nerve gas and incapacitants, have also brought forth damning criticisms from usually well-intentioned but unfortunately misguided citizens of the United States and of other countries. For example, it was reported in the press on May 10, 1968, that the Federation of American Scientists had attacked U.S. development and production of CBW weapons and urged discontinuation of CBW programs. I understand that the Federation believes not only that the development, testing, and production of CBW weapons of mass destruction are pointless, dangerous, and provocative, but that all CBW weapons should be foresworn by the United States.

On the other hand, I believe it is instructive and imperative to mark well an editorial published by the New York Times in 1964, which stated, in part:

> Chemical and biological agents—repulsive though they may be—are, like nuclear weapons, here to stay and an understanding of them and of the defenses that can be erected against them are essential to the nation's security. 'Humane warfare' is far off, but the attempt to achieve it is worthwhile.

Using this New York Times editorial position as a background, I would like to submit for your consideration a few rules of thumb that I believe can guide the United States well as it reflects on and evaluates CBW military capabilities in relation to national security. The first rule of thumb is that the United States must develop and retain as many military options as are available to it in order to deter and if necessary mount military action against any conceivable aggressor or aggression. A second rule is that the fruits or payoffs of military research and development, and the resulting military capabilities, are hard to predict and can never be realized short of dedicated, sustained, and long-term efforts. A very recent issue of Newsweek reports:

> A chemical called BZ is the only dividend of the Army's oversold effort to develop psychochemicals and other incapacitants, beyond the riot-control arsenal, for a 'war without death."

Yet my reading—as a nonscientist—has led me to an almost equally recent issue of Ordnance, which presents a considerably more optimistic view of the possible effectiveness of incapacitating agents that might be used in close-combat situations in Vietnam. A third rule is that the fruits or payoffs of military research and development often have ramifications extending far beyond military capabilities. For example, several years ago the Army Chemical Corps found it possible to list no less than 11 areas, ranging from medicine, to health, to safety, to animal and crop research, in which the Chemical Corps had made valuable contributions to the welfare and better living of the American people.

I have not commented on the Russian capability for chemical and biological warfare. This is important enough to justify a paper devoted entirely to that subject. Suffice it to say at this time that the Russian effort is very much larger than ours. The Russians have developed a chemical and biological capability far greater than our own. The training program for Russian soldiers in this field is much more thorough and detailed than ours. It is an accepted fact that the Russians have developed production facilities and stocks of chemical and biological weapons far beyond the very limited capacity which exists in the United States. The Soviets take a highly realistic view of the importance of chemical and biological warfare, and they are much better prepared to wage war in these fields if it should ever serve their purpose to do so. This should be a cause for very considerable apprehension to the United States, where the emphasis has been in downgrading the significance of chemical and biological warfare and where constant attacks are being launched within our own country by those who seek to have our limited capability downgraded to an even greater extent.

In a word, then, on the basis of its past and present record of services rendered not only to the safety but to the general welfare of the Nation, and on the basis of truly well-founded expectations of invaluable services yet to be rendered, I am honored to play some small part in commemorating the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the U.S. Army Chemical Corps.

TEACHER CORPS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations has recommended a cutback in the Teacher Corps program.

In this period when the educational crisis continues to grow, I believe that the Teacher Corps should be expanded rather than reduced.

Educational surveys show that only 17 percent of the regular teachers want to teach in the innercity schools. Seventy-six percent prefer to teach in the suburbs.

Yet, we all know that the most serious problems in education today are in the poverty area schools in the cities and in the rural areas.

The Teacher Corps is directed at this very problem: Getting at the hardcore, poorly educated child.

The Corps recently graduated 657 teacher interns who have spent the past 2 years in some of the poorest sections of our big cities and rural areas.

A survey this month by the Teacher Corps showed that 72 percent of the graduates plan to teach on a regular basis in poverty area schools.

I know personally about the Teacher Corps program because it has been operating in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., for 2 years. It has done an excellent job of getting to children who really need help; reaching children who might otherwise be school dropouts of the future.

There have been 16 Teacher Corps interns teaching in three Buffalo schools. Their work is supervised competently by three team leaders who are veteran, experienced teachers.

The program is under the direction of the State University College at Buffalo in cooperation with the city school system.

Besides supplementing the Buffalo school system, the Teacher Corps interns have engaged in community activities.

They started a Boy Scout troop and are tutoring adults in an evening center. They also are making home visits to the parents of the pupils they teach.

Recently, the Buffalo Teacher Corps was responsible for bringing together about 150 representatives of 48 Buffalo civic organizations in an effort to get concerted action on a variety of community problems.

The corps in Buffalo recently helped to form an advisory council on education composed of school administrators in the Ellicott School District. This council seeks solutions to common educational problems.

As can be seen from the Buffalo work which I have cited, the Teacher Corps is serving a definite need in our major cities.

I hope sincerely that the House not only will reject the proposed reduction in the Teacher Corps budget, but also will make additional funds available for its work in fiscal 1969.

THE COMMEMORATION OF JAMES CHANEY, ANDREW GOODMAN, AND MICHAEL SCHWERNER, WHO SACRIFICED THEIR LIVES FOR LIBERTY

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, 4 years ago I rose in the well of the House to inform the Members that three young Americans were missing in the State of Mississippi in the vicinity of Philadelphia, Neshoba County.

Today I rise to pay tribute to those three civil rights workers—James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner—who sacrificed their lives for liberty.

It requires a little historical memory to understand the circumstances within which these young men undertook the work of promoting civil rights and equal opportunity. They were murdered on June 21, 1964. On June 21, 1964, Congress had not yet passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964—Negroes in Mississippi and in other Southern States were denied service in places of public accommodation; they were discriminated against in employment; they lacked the whole array of Federal rights created by that act, the enforcement of which has begun to change the thinking and racial perspectives of the South.

These three courageous young men faced the most bitter opposition and hostility. They knew this, and they proceeded to the task of promoting liberty and racial equality.

On the date of their deaths, there was no Federal law providing adequate penalties for violent interference with civil rights—it was only this year that Congress passed legislation providing punishment up to life imprisonment for violence and murder committed to prevent the victims and others from exercising civil rights. Hence, these three young men faced not only the most bitter opposition and hostility, but they faced the possibility of violence unrestrained by fear of Federal prosecution and of life imprisonment. They faced this danger with a courage to match their calling.

Andrew Goodman and Michael Schwerner went to Mississippi to conduct voter registration drives and to open freedom schools under the auspices of the Council of Federal Organizations, an alliance of several civil rights groups—the Congress of Racial Equality, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

They, together with other volunteers, were preparing to offer courses of study designed to make possible greater freedom for Negroes in Mississippi—courses in the humanities, in the liberal arts, in the mechanical arts, and in the rights and the duties of citizenship.

Michael Schwerner and his wife, Rita, had opened one of the first two freedom schools in Mississippi. They opened their school in a five-room space in the town of Meridian. They established a library with a collection of some 10,000 books which were available for everyone in that community.

These three—Michael Schwerner and Andrew Goodman, both white civil rights workers from the North, and James Chaney, a young Negro from Mississippi—dedicated themselves to advancing equal opportunity.

What did these young men do which brought about their brutal murder in Neshoba County?

They were assisting American citizens to become citizens in the real sense of the word.

They were assisting men and women to develop productive abilities of mind and hand so that they could make the world in which they live more their own.

They were assisting men and women to take responsibility for government and for a public order of things in which they would have more of a stake. They were assisting men and women to take an active part in the democratic process in order to make those in public office responsive to their rights and needs.

To those who were determined to prevent the Negro from becoming fully a citizen, these goals to which the three young civil rights workers dedicated themselves were reason enough to kill them.

The deaths of James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner demonstrated to Congress and to the country the need for Federal intervention in Mississippi and elsewhere in the South on behalf of the disadvantaged and disfranchised. By their deaths they hastened passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Where they and other civil rights workers led the way—into hostile country—Federal voter registrars have followed. Assumption by the Federal Government of direct responsibility for enforcement of the guarantee of the 15th amendment is bringing about profound change in the political life of the South.

On the date of enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, only a little more than one-fourth of adult Negroes were registered to vote in Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina. By June 30, 1967, more than half of the adult Negroes in these same States were registered to vote. There are today in these States more than 1¼ million Negro voters—and the percentage of Negroes in the South who register and who vote can be expected to keep on rising.

It is a tribute to the three men whom we remember and honor today that Negroes are being elected to public office in Mississippi and in other Southern States for the first time in this century. Robert Clark is a member of the Mississippi State Legislature representing Holmes County. Wesley Liddell is mayor of Mound Bayou. Constables in six Mississippi counties are Negroes, as are the supervisors in four counties. There is a Negro chancery clerk in Claiborne County, a Negro school board member in Jefferson County, a Negro coroner in Marshall County, Negro justices of the peace in seven counties. And in other Southern States also Negroes are entering elective offices—Alabama has two Negro mayors, for example; Georgia has two Negro State senators and nine Negro State representatives. These gains are few thus far, but they constitute a beginning.

And election of Negroes to public office by a growing black electorate should not be the only consequence of enfranchisement. White candidates for elective office and white persons in positions of authority should be compelled increasingly to recognize the rights and the needs of disadvantaged black people and of disadvantaged white people in their States, and should be compelled to devote more effort to safeguarding these rights and answering these needs.

Thanks to the heroism of the three young civil rights workers whom we commemorate today, thanks to the numbers of other civil rights workers who also faced the possibility of violence and death in order to conduct voter education campaigns, thanks to the Voting Rights Act and to the Federal officials registering voters in the South—Negroes can gain and exercise political power.

James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner were killed by racial prejudice and racial hostility. Nevertheless, we are beginning to move toward realization of certain of the goals for the sake of which they died—democratic political rights, equal opportunity in education, equal opportunity in employment.

Much remains to be done before every Negro can shape a part of the world into something that he can call his own. Much remains to be done before he can cast off economic dependence on those who have for generations used that economic dependence to deprive him of an effective participation in political affairs.

How much remains to be done has been accurately gaged by the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

The Negro seeks to gain the self-respect which comes from achievement which is a genuine expression of self.

The Negro seeks to gain the self-respect which comes from recognition on the part of others of one's value as a person.

The Negro seeks to gain the sense of belonging to the American community.

These great ends of public policy are deeply personal values. They are values for which James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner traded their lives.

In this current crisis of racial relations and of public order we must be well aware that the same prejudice and hostility which killed these three young men threaten to preclude the Negro's gaining such self-respect and sense of belonging.

The Commission's basic finding, which is that white racism is the primary cause of the violence which today disrupts our national life, has incurred the wrath of many white Americans. The Commission demonstrated depth and objectivity when they presented their findings. The Commission stated:

> The record before this Commission reveals that the causes of recent racial disorders are imbedded in a massive tangle of issues and circumstances—social, economic, political, and psychological—which arise out of the historical pattern of Negro-white relations in America.
>
> These factors are both complex and interacting; they vary significantly in their effect from city to city and from year to year; and the consequencies of one disorder, generating new grievances and new demands, become the causes of the next. It is this which creates the thicket of tension, conflicting evidence, and extreme opinions cited by the President.

Despite these complexities, certain fundamental matters are clear. Of these, the most fundamental is the racial attitude and behavior of white Americans toward black Americans. Race prejudice has shaped our history decisively in the past; it now threatens to do so again. White racism is essentially responsible for the explosive mixture which has been accumulating in our cities since the end of World War II.

If white Americans refuse to recognize the truth of this finding, we will never become the kind of people we ought to be. And if we never become the kind of people we ought to be, the Negro will continue to be rent by the despair and anger which have generated the violence in our cities.

Despair and anger in the black ghettos are facts of life which must be faced. For we shall either come to understand, or else we shall continue to move—in the words of the Commission—"toward two socities: one black, one white—separate and unequal."

John Oliver Killens, the well-known author, recently published a book called "Black Man's Burden." In a chapter of this book called "The Black Psyche," Mr. Killens spoke thus to white Americans:

But white Americans are great pretenders. Millions of you wish we were invisible, and so you make believe we are. You'd like to wish us out of existence so that the whole world would not see us, because our very life in this country, as black people, gives the lie before the world to your protestations of freedom and human brotherhood. The white man's juju is powerful stuff, but it cannot wish the Negro into invisibility. So you try the next best thing, pretending you can't tell one of us from another.

White Americans, Mr. Killens says, try to wish Negroes out of existence by not seeing them. But being recognized as a person is essential to everyone's psychological welfare. The experience of being wished out of existence by not being seen, or of being regarded as merely anonymous is bound to leave scars.

Bayard Rustin, a respected civil rights spokesman, talked to young people in Watts shortly after the 1965 riot. He reported what he found in an article entitled "The Watts Manifesto." Mr. Rustin said:

If we can't read their "manifesto" in the burnt buildings and the smashed store windows in Watts, if things don't change, these young people were saying they would do it again. They wanted more than anything to be heard, to be recognized, to be listened to.

Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, the renowned psychologist, had the following to say about the motivation behind the riots:

Beneath the random and clearly destructive and irrational behavior, there remains the pathetic logic of asserting self-esteem and searching for a positive identity by exposing oneself to danger and even inviting death.

This is the quest for self-esteem of the truly desperate human being. This is the way those who have absolutely nothing to lose seek a pathetic affirmation of self even if it is obtained moments before death. (New York Times, July 30, 1967, p. 49.)

Will white Americans understand the despair and anger of black Americans and will the racial attitudes of white Americans be changed by such understanding? Or will the racism which murdered James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner plunge us further into division and disorder?

In commemorating the anniversary of the sacrifice of these three courageous civil rights workers, let us hope that their example will lead our Nation to a new understanding and to the achievement of full equality for all Americans.

THE ROAD LESS TRAVELED

Mr. GIBBONS. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House the outstanding remarks made by Michael F. Stafford upon the occasion of his graduation from West Springfield High School. This young man compiled an outstanding high school career and was valedictorian of his class. In addition to being a fine student, he is a well-rounded individual. He is deeply motivated by love of his country and has chosen a career in the military service. His outstanding ability and his desire to serve his country have been recognized. Appropriately, he has received an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

The challenge that Michael Stafford makes in his speech is a challenge to which each of us should respond in an affirmative manner.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to read this challenging and inspiring address.

THE ROAD LESS TRAVELED

We are at the crossroads of life. Looking back, we see a past of hard work. The devoted efforts of our administration and faculty have ended in a finished product. For us, their job is done; our job has just begun. We are now ready to face a new challenge, a new decision, a new life. In doing so, we must look back to learn, and look forward to act. Be it pleasant or disagreeable, the past is finished. We cannot live in the past, and we must not exist on memories of it. It is our duty to advance on the road of life, prepared to meet and overcome any obstacle in our path.

As we turn to look forward, we encounter a new fork in the road. This is a truly important work, possibly the most important we will ever face. We must choose wisely, for it is here that the road splits into the two paths of life, paths which will probably never cross again. The first path is the one of passivity. It is well traveled, for it is an enticing trail. It is easy to be passive, to sit back and watch the world go by. It is easy to be satisfied with life and be resigned to its shortcomings. It is also easy to settle down in a daily routine, taking no chances and making no bold moves to avoid risk or agitation. Many students choose to be passive. They sit quietly through their daily classes, contributing nothing and getting very little in return. They do not get involved. Their philosophy is a simple one, shared by numerous Americans: "Don't get involved in the lives and problems of other people. Take no chances and you will keep out of trouble. Just live your own life and step on no one else's toes. So people have been publicly stabbed and beaten with their pleas for help unanswered because those around them didn't want to get involved.

The Bible says, "All that is necessary for evil to prevail, is for good men to do nothing." This is the folly of passivity. The hippie movement is an international cult which has ended up on the road of passivity. The hippie philosophy is beautiful, if not practical, for if the world could be rid of hatred, if brotherly love could abound, then this would be a truly wonderful place in which to live. The hippie goal of finding oneself is also fine, but there are few true hippies. Instead, the movement is riddled with parasites, using it as an excuse for their ways. Those ways are simply withdrawal, withdrawal from life as a protest against it. They make no attempt to change it, but simply depend on others to exist in their own individual world. This is the essence of passivity. Protest and criticism are invaluable to the improvement of a system when balanced with a suggested means for that improvement. But protest for the sake of protest, protest without a counter-solution, this is absurdity.

The second is the road less traveled, the one of activity. It may not be as inviting as the road of passivity, for it requires greater effort and resolution, but its rewards are much more gratifying. The person who chooses this path sets a goal for himself and works diligently for the achievement of this goal. The goal must be high, or it is useless. "Aim at the sun," says Joel Hawes, "and you may not reach it; but your arrow will fly far higher than if aimed at an object on a level with yourself."

In the last few months, a group of college students have shot their arrows at the sun, and they have made an impression that will not soon be forgotten. In New Hampshire, Wisconsin, and elsewhere, they dressed up, cut their hair, and otherwise conformed to the standards of the generation with which they were to deal. They then went out and ran one of the most inspired and exciting presidential primary campaigns in history. In so doing, they salvaged respect for the younger generation, a generation which had been labelled as hopelessly drifting, one of America's major crises. Their aim was to help carry to the Presidency a man who had captured their imagination and in the process they did much more than win a few votes. The Negro race, in particular the disciples of non-violence, established for themselves years ago a goal which seemed unattainable. Their dream was to generate a legal, nonviolent revolution in the United States, to create racial equality in a country tainted with prejudice and malevolence. Starting with their first victory in 1954 with school desegregation, they slowly and painfully integrated restaurants, public centers, and other bastions of bias. Met with force, they perservered in their non-violent methods, to such an extent that Dr. King was awarded a Nobel Prize for Peace. But racial unrest has intensified. The solution to this, America's greatest domestic problem, has not yet been found; it lies within our generation. With his increased educational and job opportunities, the Negro will, in the near future, be working and studying at the side of the white American more than ever before. By accepting him and his challenge, by judging him on his talents rather than his color, by setting an example of friendship and justice, we can do much to ease racial tension and eliminate bigotry. The Negro goal still seems far away, but it no longer seems unattainable. The possibility is ours to make great advances for the cause of human rights and give the moral equality of all men a large boost toward universal acceptance.

In setting his goal, one must look to the future, but in working toward achievement of this goal, he must act in the present. Existing on dreams of the future is no less erroneous than existing on memories of the past. One who sets a high goal for the future and works simply for the future will not succeed. He must work in the present to improve the present and then the future will

take care of itself. For when one works diligently, using every moral and legal means in his power, there is little that he cannot accomplish.

Now it is time for us to make the decision which we alone must make, to decide the course of our lives. Will we take the road of passivity or the road of activity? Will we be an indifferent or driving element in this changing world? Will we discuss the achievements of others, or will we make our own mark on society? To answer is imperative: act we must, drive we must, mark we must. I dare you to set a high goal and work for its accomplishment. I dare you to make a place for yourself in the advancing ranks of this country. I dare you to learn from the past, plan for the future, and act in the present. I dare you to take the road less traveled, and someday when you look back on your life, it won't be with regret. And so proceed, heeding the words of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow: "Look not mournfully to the past—it comes not back again; wisely improve the present—it is thine; go forth to meet the shadowy future without fear and with a manly heart."

A PRESCRIPTION FOR ENDING LAWLESSNESS AND VIOLENCE

Mr. PELLY. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, lawlessness and violence on the streets of America's cities and towns have increased in recent years to the point that today responsible citizens in many areas of the country hesitate to walk where they once took their safety for granted.

A look at the statistics on crime clearly shows that our people have reason for their fears. While it is said that statistics do not always tell the true story, Congress itself need look no farther than outside this Capitol Building to see large congregations of police; gathered because of the threat of what is loosely called "civil disobedience." Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleagues that the beginning of the tragic April rioting here in the Nation's Capital was labeled as a "civil disobedience," but it was crime and lawlessness by any man's standards or statistics.

Just consider the fact that busdrivers in Washington, D.C., refuse to carry money to make change at night because of the high incidence of crime; crime which cost the busdrivers the life of one of their coworkers and led to a scrip system after sunset so they would not invite holdups.

Taxicabs are scarce on the streets after dark because of the threat of crime. Fires, called "mysterious," continue to plague Washington, D.C., night after night. And, heavy amounts of tear gas were used just this week to disperse growing mobs police had reason to believe were intending to rekindle the April rioting.

And, around the Nation the lawlessness continues to increase. New names are added to the growing roster: Richmond, Calif., Durham, N.C.

But, here in the city which the President has continued to label as a "model" for American cities, felonies and misdemeanors more than doubled between 1960 and 1967. Felonies alone almost tripled in the same period of time.

Mr. Speaker, there is a solution to this lawlessness gripping our Nation. It was demonstrated here in Washington, D.C., when police force was ordered to firmly halt criminal force following the closing of Resurrection City. But, this was only a first step. It must be repeated and repeated until those with criminal design are made to understand that our society is based on order, not lawlessness. They must understand that their minority will not be tolerated by the majority.

But, equally important, the courts also must be made aware that the decent, law-abiding American has "had it." It was shocking to learn following the recent murders of five Washington, D.C., businessmen and the busdriver that 11 of the 13 suspects charged with the murders had been arrested previously, and that five were free on probation or personal bond from previous convictions or arrests. One of them was free on personal bond awaiting a robbery trial that had been delayed 15 months in the U.S. district court.

Only a broad front attack on crime from every branch of government, coupled with strong citizen support will return our Nation to law and order. The age of leniency must end. Permissiveness must halt.

Members of Congress are being swamped by letters and telegrams concerning gun legislation at the present time. We also heard in great numbers regarding similar legislation following the murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. But the passage of more laws on guns, no matter how much they may or may not be needed, will do little or nothing to halt the criminal. This is an attack that can come mainly from the law-abiding citizen himself; an attack by his voice saying emphatically that he will no longer stand for court coddling of criminals, that he is impatient with a President, a Congress, and a Supreme Court that permit permissiveness toward criminals at a time when anarchy is threatening the welfare and existence of our people.

Mr. Speaker, 130 years ago, in 1838, such a case was cited in these words:

> There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law. . . . Passion has helped us, but can do so no more. It will in future be our enemy. Reason, cold, calculating, unimpassioned reason must furnish all the materials for our future support and defense.

Abraham Lincoln, speaking in Springfield, Ill., undoubtedly would be moved to the same words again in 1968.

THE PRESIDENT'S TAX INCREASE

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion by some in the Congress concerning whether or not a Member voted correctly on the President's tax increase. I voted against the tax increase not because of my political future, but because I felt it best for the country. Many in my congressional district have written to express their agreement with my judgment since the House made its decision.

Others, including the Wall Street Journal in a recent article have commented on the President's tax-spending package by stating:

> Perhaps the greatest peculiarity about the newly enacted tax-spending law is the way it has been successfully oversold as an economic curative—by the Administration, by some in the Congress, and by many businessmen. It's not just a matter of academic interest; in the near future there could be bitter disappointment at the measures unfulfilled promises.

Some events which have occurred in the last few days cause these comments to be almost prophetic. Since passage of the legislation the White House has made two announcements. The first was that the President had just discovered that there would be an increase in the deficit of another $5 billion. This theoretically means that the $6 billion spending cutback which the President reluctantly agreed to has already been decimated to only $1 billion.

The second announcement, and the most fantastic, is that the White House was reported Tuesday as starting that it may be "months" before President Johnson reaches any "decision" as to what cuts he intends to make in fiscal year 1969 appropriations. This kind of irresponsibility on the part of an administration which already has its fiscal credibility in question is the main reason that I voted against the tax bill. The Congress passed the President's tax increase with the assurance from him that spending cuts would be made. However, it appears that it is business as usual in the White House.

Looking ahead, therefore, it appears that the action taken by the Congress will not be an effective counter to inflation. Instead, it raises the families cost of living by reducing the amount of money it can keep, in a period when purchasing power is already eroded by inflation and taxes of all sorts which are going up at a staggering rate locally. It raises a company's cost of doing business in a period when costs are already skyrocketing. Thus still higher prices are in the future for buyers of the company's products. For example, the major utilities announced that they plan a rate increase to offset declines as a result of the 10-percent tax surcharge.

The spending reduction side of the bill offered more hope for stopping inflation. Part of the trouble here is that $6 billion is a small cut out of a $186 billion budget. It is also going to be difficult to see it realized in light of the President's recent announcements.

In view of all this, it is difficult to understand the near naivete with which so many discuss the supposed wonders of the tax-spending scheme. I suspect it stems partly from a feeling of despera-

tion, and a sense that the whole government's financial structure is in fact so dangerously out of control that something, practically anything should be done.

I still believe that serious cuts must be made in the largest budget in the Nation's history before the dollar will be sound again. Unfortunately, from the President's statements, it appears that those who voted for the tax bill have just given the administration another $8 billion to spend. I am sure that some of my colleagues who supported this bill in the hope of reducing expenditures feel just as frustrated as do the people who must pay the new taxes in light of the President's recent announcements.

ROBERT BAUMAN RESIGNING

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, having learned that Mr. Robert Bauman is resigning from his position as manager of the House Republican cloakroom, I wish to express my sentiments concerning this fine young man.

Bob, as he is affectionately known by those of us on this side of the aisle, has not only been a faithful and competent employee, but also a good friend during the 15 years he has been employed in the U.S. House of Representatives.

He also has an Indiana background which is another reason that we Hoosiers in the House hold him is such high regard.

Married to the daughter of the late Gene Dawson, Bob and his wife Carol now have a fine family consisting of a son and two charming daughters. Incidentally, Gene Dawson was a prominent Indiana newspaperman and had served on the staff of Senator Homer Capehart before his tragic death in an automobile accident.

Bob will be missed after he leaves his position in the Republican cloakroom. I certainly wish him well as he ventures into the legal profession. As a lawyer he will be practicing in his home State of Maryland.

I know I speak for his many friends and my Republican colleagues when I say we have been delighted with his energetic devotion to his duties and the service and cooperation he has extended at all times. He has an excellent record of personal attention and in promptly assisting whenever called upon.

Finally, as a dedicated Republican with a sound conservative attitude, I am confident that we will hear from Bob in the future. He has my warm good wishes for his success in the years ahead.

ACA MARKS 10TH ANNIVERSARY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, since its founding on June 27, 1958, the Americans for Constitutional Action has performed an important and vital role in promoting sound principles of constitutional government.

These are times when it is often difficult to tell the players without a scorecard, but thanks to ACA, it is possible for the American voter to tell where his or her Representative and Senator stands on legislative issues. If he believes in preserving the Constitution, in restraining the heavy hand of big government, and if he believes in maximum freedom of the individual, commensurate with an orderly society, he will surely rate high on the score card which ACA keeps for every session of Congress. I have often said, the genius of our Constitution is the three ways of change from within.

If on the other hand, he votes to concentrate more and more power in the hands of fewer and fewer Government leaders; if he votes to spend tax dollars as though they were pennies from heaven; if he votes to make the separate States little more than administrative extension of the Central Government; and, if his vote on key issues is more closely attuned to pacifying special interest groups than to strengthening America, he is not likely to rate very high on the ACA scoresheet. I commend ACA, its board of directors, and staff, for an outstanding performance, and for their dedication to the cause of sound principled government. I hope the Americans who share the conservative philosophy and who wish to regain for America the greatness that has been dissipated through modern-day "liberalism" will support ACA and help make it a more effective voice in the mainstream of good government in the United States.

ACA

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, for 10 years I have followed the progress of the Americans for Constitutional Action in working for responsible, economical government. Its record of progress is impressive.

In my opinion, ACA performs a valuable service in clearly and sensibly reporting the voting records of Members of the Congress and evaluating the merits of their records on a nonpartisan, constitutional basis.

The ACA has faced and overcome several crucial trials since its founding 10 years ago. I recall in particular that in 1963 it was subjected to a barrage of attacks labeling the organization a rabid, rightwing extremist group. An unimpeachable record and intelligent leadership overcame these vicious attacks and ACA emerged stronger and more united than ever.

I have been proud to accept the organization's Distinguished Service Awards, for I consider ACA to be a model of responsible and effective constitutional conservatism.

All Americans owe the ACA a debt of gratitude for its untiring efforts to uphold constitutional government.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but express my keen disappointment at the rejection of an amendment to provide $5 million for the bilingual education program. I would like to urge my colleagues to reconsider and restore the modest appropriations request. The appropriation of at least $5 million for this new and imaginative program is not asking too much.

Mr. Speaker, if we cannot increase the funds for bilingual education let us at least not eliminate the program.

The new program would provide financial assistance to local educational agencies to develop and carry out new and imaginative elementary and secondary programs designed to meet these special educational needs.

These programs would be designed to impart to students a knowledge of the history and culture associated with their languages and will hopefully establish closer cooperation between the school and the home. Efforts would be made to improve the potential for profitable learning activities by children and also to provide adult education programs for their parents.

My congressional district consists of Riverside and Imperial Counties and a portion of San Bernardino County. A large number of residents of my district are Mexican American. The State of California has close historical and cultural ties with Mexico. There are over 1,500,000 Mexican Americans in California. Many lag seriously behind in education, jobs, and income. They have been displaced from their farming and laboring occupations of the past and are among the hard core unemployed in many areas. They are not adequately prepared, through no fault of their own, to move into new employment occupations. Automation and technological change is having a particularly severe effect on our Mexican-American population. Statistics show that over 50 percent have not gone beyond the eighth grade.

The bilingual education program will help to reduce the number of Mexican-American children who are actual or potential dropouts. The program will hopefully give children who speak a foreign language an equal opportunity for advancement.

The most promising method of insuring the economic and social progress of the Mexican-American community or any other group is adequate education. With education comes the hope of new and better opportunities for self-improvement. The bilingual education program would hasten the day when all Americans have an equal opportunity to help themselves.

Let us not eliminate the hope for a better future for Mexican American and other bilingual children.

CONSERVATIVES HAVE POINTED OUT THE INADEQUACY OF OUR PRESENT WELFARE SYSTEM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it was not too many years ago that any person, especially any public official, who might be classified as a conservative was considered to be some kind of "oddball"—a person still living in the 19th century and completely unable to comprehend the problems and difficulties confronting a modern 20th century society.

Fortunately, that image has been proven to be totally erroneous and misguided, and thus we see the adoption of conservative methods and approaches to problem solving being adopted by many in public life who have heretofore been strongly identified in the past with a so-called liberal philosophy. I am speaking of a growing trend, for example, toward the view that the Federal Government does not have all the answers and that we must return responsibility for problem solving to the local and State level. Conservatives for some time have pointed out the inadequacy of our present welfare system and how it only serves to trap families from one generation to another into the welfare pit, and now this same view is heard from the liberal platform by individuals who formerly ridiculed such proposals as not being responsive to the needs and wishes of our people.

There are many reasons for this improvement in the image of conservatives and not the least has been the tremendously effective contribution by the Americans for Constitutional Action, which today is celebrating its 10th anniversary. Through its literature and other educational materials it has consistently presented the conservative viewpoint in a responsible and effective fashion and the organization has come to be regarded as an important tool in promoting constitutional government by helping the American people to become more concerned and more aware of their duties and obligations to their country.

An outstanding group of Americans serves as the officers and trustees of the Americans for Constitutional Action and I would just like to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations and felicitations to the ACA on their 10th anniversary and also express my hope that they will continue to have success in their future efforts.

TEN YEARS OF VITAL SERVICE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 10th anniversary of an organization which has contributed greatly toward maintaining that form of government which our forefathers had bequeathed to us many years ago. That organization is Americans for Constitutional Action, a nonpartisan, nonprofit, nationwide, political action group whose first goal is to reelect Members of both the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives whose voting records reflect the original spirit and principles of the Constitution. To further the principles of constitutional government, ACA also assists in recruiting and electing other candidates who will strengthen the ranks of constitutional conservatives in Congress.

The founders of ACA fully realized that Congress is where the action is. They were aware that the legislative body is the keeper of the Federal purse strings, oversees the administration of the executive branch and has the powers to restrict the operation of the Supreme Court. To provide a guideline on which to judge the efforts of Members of Congress, ACA devised a system of analysis and statistical evaluation of the voting records of Members which is now known as the ACA index. The seven criteria of constitutional conservatism upon which the index evaluations are made are:

First. The ACA consistency index: For safeguarding the God-given rights of the individual and promoting sound economic growth by strengthening constitutional government; against group morality, a socialized economy, and centralization of Government power.

Second. For sound money and fiscal integrity; against inflation.

Third. For a private, competitive market and individual freedom of choice; against Government interference by price fixing and controls.

Fourth. For local self-government and the citizen's right to be let alone; against Central Government interferences in local government and private affairs.

Fifth. For private ownership and control of the means of production and distribution; against Government ownership and competition with private competitive enterprise.

Sixth. For individual liberty, rights and responsibilities; against coercion of individuals through Government regulation.

Seventh. For strengthening our national sovereignty; against surrendering control of our foreign or domestic affairs or our national security to any other nation or to any international organization.

In addition to the ACA index, ACA provides conservative candidates with statistical research, speech material, art layouts, personalized news releases, counseling of new candidates, news releases designed to refute "smears" and ACA published materials. Other assistance during the actual campaign includes professional manpower recruited, when possible, from within the candidate's own State or district and working directly under the supervision of the candidate.

At the grassroots level, ACA chapters, chartered by national headquarters for action in local, State and National elections, function in direct support of approved candidates while adhering strictly to the basic principles, policies, and code of conduct governing ACA.

On the ideological level ACA emphasizes the divinely motivated tenets of the Declaration of Independence. In the mundane world of politics, this reassertion of our moral and religious heritage returns the complex business of government to the foundation demanded by our forefathers in the conduct of governmental affairs. For instance, in this age of defiance of law, more emphasis must be placed on the balance between civil rights and civil responsibilities as enunciated in ACA's "A Credo for Concerned Americans":

> For every right there is a collateral responsibility. The rights with which an individual is endowed by the Creator impose on him a duty to use those rights in conformity with the moral law as derived from such statements as the Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount and the golden rule.

Thus it can be seen that ACA's contribution to the science of good government includes both the ideological and practical approaches. The members and officers of this organization can justly be proud of their efforts in the civic arena. May the next 10 years greet Americans for Constitutional Action with increased success in preserving, reemphasizing and expanding those principles and virtues first propounded by the founders of our Nation.

GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Washington Irving, one of our outstanding American authors, wrote:

> With every exertion the best of men can do but a moderate amount of good; but it seems in the power of the most contemptible individuals to do incalculable mischief.

In no area is this more obviously true than in the current controversy over gun legislation. Very few people violate the laws and commit violent acts with firearms but yet all that the "best of men can do," as Irving puts it, seems to hang in jeopardy.

My position on this matter is very clear and has been stated many times over the years. There are legitimate uses and le-

gitimate users of firearms and I strongly resist efforts to unduly hinder these legitimate uses in attempting to get at the abuses. I oppose registration of firearms.

The best example of the emotionalism which is currently being generated can be seen in a statement of Attorney General Ramsey Clark. After the slaying of Reverend King, a headline in the Associated Press wire stories proclaimed: "Clark Ties King Slaying to Gun Law." The article said:

Attorney General Ramsey Clark, urging strong laws to spike gun sales, said yesterday the sniper slayer of Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, might not have been able to buy the death weapon if Congress had acted in the past.

The Senate Judiciary Committee recently approved a measure to outlaw shipping hand guns across state lines after spurning a broader ban the day Dr. King was shot to death in Memphis, Tenn.

Clark told newsmen Dr. King's slayer "may not have been able to have bought that rifle at that time with impunity" if there had been strong Federal laws on the books controlling the interstate shipment of both rifles and pistols.

How ridiculous can you get? This kind of observation tends to cloud the issues in the gun-control debate and is nothing more than deceitful. Among the 20,000-odd laws on the books relating to criminal use of firearms and firearm control is title 15 of the United States Code, section 902(f). It states:

It shall be unlawful for any person who has been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year or is a fugitive from justice to receive any firearm or ammunition which has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce, and the possession of a firearm or ammunition by any such person shall be presumptive evidence that such firearm or ammunition was shipped or transported or received, as the case may be, by such person in violation of this chapter.

Now to tell the American people that Dr. King's slayer "may not have been able to have bought that rifle at that time with impunity" if there had been strong Federal laws on the books is either the height of naivete or grossly deceitful. It is currently thought that James Earl Ray is the slayer. This man is not only a fugitive from justice but has been convicted more than once of crimes punishable by imprisonment for terms exceeding more than 1 year. He violated the law, he should be prosecuted and I am certain that he had no feeling of "impunity," as Attorney General Clark put it when he acquired his firearm.

This is a typical example of the effort to create mass hysteria. A better reason for our difficulties comes in the climate of our society which currently condones criminal activities. Criminal statutes denied their proper enforcement give more impetus to crime, in my judgment, than any availability of guns.

An "expert" on guns and their acquisition recently wrote about the gun laws and how they would affect his circle of friends. Charles Lee Howard, No. 122-595 at Ohio State Penitentiary, comes up for parole hearing in May 1975. He does not plan to return to a life of crime and recently wrote that disarming the honest citizen will make it easier for criminals. He stated:

It's baffling that the people who want to prevent criminals like me from getting hold of guns expect to accomplish this by passing new laws. Do they forget that the criminal makes a business of breaking laws? No criminal would obey a gun law while committing a crime of equal or greater seriousness.

To illustrate the lack of law enforcement—note that well, law enforcement, for those statutes already on the books—it is startling to note that only recently did an U.S. attorney obtain a Federal grand jury indictment for violating the Federal Firearms Act of 1938. This would not be newsworthy except for that fact that this marked the first time that an indictment had ever been achieved in 30 years. Where has the Justice Department been all of these years?

RIOTING AND LOOTING

Mr. Speaker, the same Attorney General Clark looked the other way when mobs were ransacking stores in Washington earlier this year. Condoning looting, roiting, sniping, and blackmail has been commonplace in our big cities during these past few years. The liberal-oriented politician just cannot cope with this type of permissiveness in the permissive society he has worked so hard to build. He looks for excuses in society's deficencies rather than enforce the laws already on the statute books.

The continual socialistic assault on private property has run counter to our historic trend of respecting person and property. The main solution to our dilemma lies within the institutions, public and private, that can promote or tear down this respect for person and property. Attorney General Clark and other liberals simply scoff when rioting and looting occurs. "It is only property," they say. This attitude has produced many results.

The criminal is led to believe he can riot and pillage. The honest citizen, on the other hand, has sought the security he formerly knew by acquiring his own weapons to protect himself. A government that chooses not to govern, a government that looks the other way when rioting and looting occur, a government which does not protect the innocent has been the hallmark of the past few years. Our President now wants to blame all of this on guns. I, for one, will not fall for this phony emotionalism.

LAW BREAKING IS CONDONED

I have served on a committee investigating riots in our major cities. Aside from the conspiratorial element which has fanned these rebellions and the "hate the police" campaign which has been promoted for years, you have the very real problem of inadequate law enforcement. From the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, New York Times edition, you can see what I mean on page 339. It is stated:

In Detroit, 26 persons were charged with assault with intent to commit murder (those alleged to be snipers). Twenty-three of those charges were subsequently dismissed. As of September 30, 1967, one out of seven homicide arrests had resulted in a conviction; two were still pending. Of 253 assault arrests only 11 convictions were produced; 58 were still pending. Twenty-one out of 34 arson arrests, and 22 out of 28 inciting to riot arrests, had been dropped by the prosecution.[2]

DEMAGOGS WORSE THAN GUNS

Attorney General Clark's attitude on the incendiary statements of Stokely Carmichael and Rap Brown is indicative of his double standard. How can a law-abiding person with a firearm be the threat that these demagogs are? They go throughout the country exhorting to violence, threatening to burn this Nation down and urging young men to refuse to serve in the Armed Forces. This is illegal conduct and should be prosecuted. Instead, the Attorney General turns his attention in the opposite direction and wants to infringe on the rights of the peaceable American who is in no way a threat to his fellow citizen.

The whole sordid affair shows one elementary fact: Laws are not self-executing. They must be enforced and prosecutions must be advanced by the constituted legal authorities. Failures in this area probably pose more of a threat to domestic tranquility which is insured in the Constitution than the possession of any firearm, even possession by a criminal. General amnesty granted as a matter of political expediency after rioting and looting can only serve to license arson, looting, and rioting. In these areas our leaders should offer some leadership, not in emotional pleas to legislate against firearms.

It is vitally important that the distinction between the gun and the user be observed in all gun proposals. The gun enthusiast, the sportsman, or the person who wants a gun for his self-defense should not be placed in the same class as the criminal. Much of the legislation we see before the Congress makes the gun the target instead of the unlawful use of the weapon.

MANDATORY PRISON SENTENCE

In 1965, I introduced H.R. 9574 which provided for 25-year sentences for use of a firearm in the commission of any robbery, assault, murder, rape, burglary, kidnaping, or homicide. I now have introduced a more stringent measure which should be an even more formidable deterrent to crime. My H.R. 18159 calls for a mandatory 1-year sentence for any conviction of a felony in which the accused was armed with a firearm or destructive device. I added the words "destructive device" because our hearings have made it crystal clear that many extremists in our country are advocating the use of Molotov cocktails and dynamite in their terrorist activities. Certainly these destructive devices are more dangerous than any ordinary gun.

In Ohio, it cannot be argued that the mandatory 3-day jail sentence for con-

[2] In the 1965 Watts riot, of seven persons arrested on homicide charges, five were subsequently released. None has yet been convicted. A total of 120 adult arrests for assault produced only 60 convictions; 27 adult arson arrests; seven convictions. In Newark, one homicide indictment and 22 assault indictments (none for sniping) have been returned.

viction for drunken driving has not served as a deterrent. To use the mandatory prison sentence for felonious use of firearms or destructive devices will serve as a strong deterrent if enforced.

My legislation provides additional prison sentences for up to life for use of a firearm or destructive device in the commission of a felony. This is the type of legislation we need, not registration of firearms. The word must go out to every hood and punk as well as every hardened criminal that using a firearm in the commission of a crime means a mandatory 1 year sentence with no possibility of probation or suspension. More than that, the possibility of life imprisonment is also there.

I believe in and have voted for firearm controls. I will not, however, support oppressive or vindictive legislation such as the President is now suggesting. Increasing the penalties for misuse of firearms seems to be the preferable action.

NO REGISTRATION OF FIREARMS

I categorically oppose registration of firearms. Proposals which provide for orderly regulation of sale of firearms and prohibitions against acquisition by criminals or mental deficients will receive my support. I read into the current legislative drive the effort to reject self-defense as a legitimate use of firearms. This is totally improper, particularly in light of the tendency of Attorney General Clark and other high administration officials to condone rioting, looting, and lawlessness when perpetrated by minority or so-called disadvantaged groups.

It is said that Switzerland, England, and other countries do not have the problem with firearms which supposedly exists in this Nation. Maybe the general public apathy, the liberal trend toward a permissive society, the condoning of Reverend King's lawlessness guised as civil disobedience from thousands of pulpits in America, the Supreme Court's tendency to coddle criminals and the "anything goes" nature of our society have something to do with it. I am inclined to think that these reasons are closer to the mark than the absence of restrictive gun laws.

No one knows all there is to know about the phenomenon of crime. I would venture to say, however, that any community that will support its police and law-enforcement officers, insist on punishment that fits the crime, become indignant at corruption and practice brotherly love in its everyday activities will have a minimum of crime. The Federal Government is not going to abate the crime wave by passing a strict gun law. In fact, exactly the opposite might happen.

Before responding to the demands to impose unnecessary restrictions on the sale of firearms, America needs to return to the type of justice that dissuades lawbreaking through adequate prosecution and proper punishment. Lawlessness has abounded in the Great Society because it has been pampered.

Ben Franklin once said:

Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety.

In this case, we need to preserve both liberty and safety and it can be done by generating public opinion against lawlessess not against an inanimate object, the firearm, which is the wrong target, against the lawbreaker not the law-abiding citizen and against the misuse not the proper use of firearms.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert the text of my bill, H.R. 18159 and urge its support by the Members of this body:

H.R. 18159

A bill to provide additional penalties for the use of firearms or destructive devices in the commission of certain crimes of violence

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately after chapter 115 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 116.—USE OF FIREARMS AND DESTRUCTIVE DEVICES IN THE COMMISSION OF CERTAIN CRIMES OF VIOLENCE

"Sec.
"2401. Use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence.
"2402. Definitions.

"§ 2401. Use of firearms and destructive devices in the commission of certain crimes of violence

"Whoever, while engaged in the commission of any offense which is a crime of violence punishable under this title, is armed with any firearm or destructive device, may in addition to the punishment provided for the crime be punished by imprisonment for an indeterminate number of years up to life, as determined by the court. Upon a conviction under this section, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the court shall not suspend the first year of the sentence of such person or give him a probationary sentence but shall impose, as a minimum, a mandatory one-year sentence.

"§ 2402. Definitions

"As used in this chapter—

" 'Crime of violence' means any of the following crimes or an attempt to commit any of the following crimes: murder; voluntary manslaughter; Presidential assassination, kidnaping, and assault; killing certain officers and employees of the United States; rape; kidnaping; assault with intent to kill, rob, rape, or poison; assault with a dangerous weapon; robbery; burglary; theft or looting; racketeering; extortion; and arson.

" 'Firearm' means any weapon (including a starter gun) which will or is designed to or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive; the frame or receiver of any such weapon; or any firearm muffler or firearm silencer; or any destructive device.

" 'Destructive device' means any explosive, incendiary, or poison gas bomb, grenade, mine, rocket, missile, 'molotov cocktail' or similar device; and includes any type of weapon which will or is designed to or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of any explosive and having any barrel with a bore of one-half inch or more in diameter."

(b) The analysis of part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately before the last item the following:

"116. Use of firearms and destructive devices in the commission of certain crimes of violence ---------- 2401".

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of the President's message with reference to 18-year-old voters.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be granted 5 days' leave of absence in order to attend to certain problems which exist in my congressional district, for the period of July 1 to July 5, inclusive.

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

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MINISH (at the request of Mr. DENT), for Monday, July 1, through Tuesday, July 9.

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. SAYLOR, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. REUSS, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. SIKES, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RANDALL, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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

Mr. HALL and to include extraneous material.

Mr. YATES during general debate on H.R. 18038 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama (at the request of Mr. STEED) to revise and extend his remarks on H.R. 18038 and include extraneous matter and tables.

Mr. HUNGATE following the President's message on the 18-year-old voter and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include an editorial.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona.
Mr. GURNEY.
Mr. ROUDEBUSH.
Mr. DUNCAN in three instances.
Mr. TALCOTT.
Mr. BUCHANAN in three instances.
Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.
Mr. BERRY.
Mr. GARDNER.
Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. ZWACH in two instances.
Mr. HUNT.
Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.
Mr. UTT.
Mr. BROCK.
Mr. LUKENS in two instances.
Mr. SCHERLE in two instances.
Mr. SMITH of California.
Mr. HOSMER in two instances.
Mr. PRICE of Texas.
Mr. DOLE.
Mr. WYMAN in three instances.
Mr. CLEVELAND in three instances.
Mr. MICHEL in two instances.
Mr. BOB WILSON in two instances.
Mr. DEL CLAWSON.
Mr. SCHADEBERG.
Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts.
Mr. MCDADE in three instances.
Mr. BRAY in two instances.
Mr. KUPFERMAN in five instances.
Mr. BUSH.
Mr. DERWINSKI.
Mr. GERALD R. FORD.
Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.

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

Mr. OTTINGER in two instances.
Mr. EDWARDS of California in five instances.
Mr. RESNICK.
Mr. BRINKLEY.
Mr. PODELL in two instances.
Mr. FULTON of Tennessee in two instances.
Mr. RARICK in six instances.
Mr. CORMAN.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. PICKLE in two instances.
Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in two instances.
Mr. JONES of North Carolina in two instances.
Mr. ABBITT.
Mr. DE LA GARZA.
Mr. GALLAGHER.
Mr. PEPPER in three instances.
Mr. STEPHENS.
Mr. PATTEN.
Mr. HATHAWAY.
Mr. GATHINGS.
Mr. TENZER in five instances.
Mr. ASHMORE.
Mr. DINGELL in two instances.
Mr. HANNA in five instances.
Mr. CABELL.
Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.
Mr. PUCINSKI in 12 instances.
Mr. DANIELS in two instances.
Mr. PATMAN.
Mr. MCCARTHY in 10 instances.
Mr. ICHORD in two instances.
Mr. KYROS.
Mr. ROSENTHAL in three instances.
Mr. FEIGHAN in five instances.
Mr. WAGGONNER in two instances.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.
Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

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

S. 1514. An act relating to the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1628. An act to authorize suits in the courts of the District of Columbia for collection of taxes owed to States, territories, or possessions, or political subdivisions thereof, when the reciprocal right is accorded to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3931. An act to amend the act of April 3, 1952;

H.R. 8581. An act to amend section 11-341 (b) of the District of Columbia Code which relates to the sales price for the reports of the opinions of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit; and

H.R. 13373. An act for the relief of Richard C. Mockler.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5783. An act to amend titles 10, 14, and 37, United States Code, to provide for confinement and treatment of offenders against the Uniform Code of Military Justice;

H.R. 10480 to prohibit desecration of the flag, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13050 to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize an increase in the numbers of officers of the Navy designated for engineering duty, aeronautical engineering duty, and special duty;

H.R. 13593 to amend title 10, United States Code, to increase the number of congressional alternates authorized to be nominated for each vacancy at the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies;

H.R. 15789 to amend section 2306 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize certain contracts for services and related supplies to extend beyond 1 year;

H.R. 16819 to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend the authorization of grants to States for rehabilitation services, to broaden the scope of goods and services available under that act for the handicapped, and for other purposes;

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 to collections under the postal embezzlement statute, section 1711 of title 18, United States Code; and

H.R. 17320 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant an easement over certain lands to the St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 1, 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:

1979. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 30, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study and an interim hurricane survey of Dade County, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented, and authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 335); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1980. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 7, 1968, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Alhambra Creek, Calif., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 1, 1958 (H. Doc. No. 336); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1981. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 4, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on Licking River and tributaries, Ohio, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 3, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 337); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1982. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 3, 1968, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of the report on Detroit River, Trenton Channel, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 29, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 338); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

1983. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 11, 1968, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the report on St. Francis River, Mo., and Ark., with reference to flood control on Belle Fountain ditch and tributaries, Missouri, and within drainage district No. 17 of Mississippi County, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 7, 1961 (H. Doc. No. 339); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1984. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 26, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the report on southwestern Jefferson County, Ky., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted May 18, 1964, and June 23, 1964 (H. Doc. No. 340); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1985. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the elective franchise of citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 1196. Resolution providing for further expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 179; with amendment (Rept. No. 1591). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 1198. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on Agriculture; with amendment (Rept. No. 1592). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 11233. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1593). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ZABLOCKI: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 970. Resolution to extend the greetings of the U.S. House of Representatives to the Congress of the Philippines in commemoration of the arrival of the Thomasite teachers (Rept. No. 1594). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 15045. A bill to extend certain expiring provisions under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 1595). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLAND: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 18188. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1596). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 163. A bill to prevent vessels built or rebuilt outside the United States or documented under foreign registry from carrying cargoes restricted to vessels of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1597). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 18188. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.R. 18189. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations and volunteer rescue squads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H.R. 18190. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 18191. A bill to amend section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 18192. A bill to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 18193. A bill to clarify the application of section 1073 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 18194. A bill to provide for U.S. participation in a free trade association and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 18195. A bill to disarm lawless persons and assist State and Federal enforcement agencies in preventing and solving gun crimes by requiring registration of all firearms and licenses for purchase and possession of firearms and ammunition and to encourage responsible State firearms laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 18196. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to make aliens admitted for permanent residence eligible for appointment as commissioned officers in the service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 18197. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect the people of the United States against the lawless and irresponsible use of firearms, and to assist in the prevention and solution of crime by requiring a national registration of firearms, establishing minimum licensing standards for the possession of firearms, and encouraging the enactment of effective State and local firearms laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H.R. 18198. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to establish certain qualifications for persons appointed as judges or justices of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma:

H.R. 18199. A bill to authorize the use of funds from a judgment in favor of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 18200. A bill to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 18201. A bill to authorize a study for a waterway connecting the Savannah and Tennessee Rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 18202. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to release restrictions on the use of certain real property conveyed to the city of Redmond, Oreg., for airport purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAREY (for himself, Mr. DANIELS, and Mr. SCHERLE):

H.R. 18203. A bill to increase the size of the board of directors of Gallaudet College, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 18204. A bill to permit the administrative adjustment of certain wheat acreage allotment reductions resulting from action taken by farmers prior to 1965 in good faith reliance upon representations or advice of authorized representatives of the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 18205. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 18206. A bill to promote the economic development of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GETTYS:

H.R. 18207. 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.

By Mr. MARSH (for himself and Mr. ABBITT):

H.R. 18208. A bill to provide specific and additional penalties for the use or carrying of firearms in the commission of crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 18209. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to provide for loans to supplement farm income and to provide for additional recreation loans, extend the period for water and sewer grants prior to completion of a comprehensive plan, increase the amount of unsold insured loans that may be made out of the fund, raise the aggregate annual limits on grants, remove the annual ceiling on insured loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 18210. A bill to regulate the granting of permits for private use of publicly owned lands within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 18211. A bill to regulate the granting of permits for private use of public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 18212. A bill to amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, to authorize a study of essential railroad passenger service by the Secretary of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEED (for himself, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. BURLESON, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. HENDERSON):

H.R. 18213. A bill to provide continuing authority for maintaining farm income, stabilization of prices and assuring adequate supplies of peanuts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 18214. A bill to disarm lawless persons and assist State and Federal enforcement agencies in preventing and solving gun crimes by requiring registration of all firearms and licenses for purchase and possession of firearms and ammunition, and to encourage responsible State firearms laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for himself, Mr. KUYKENDALL, and Mr. COWGER):

H.J. Res. 1370. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the confirmation and reconfirmation of Justices of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. DENT, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. CAREY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. AYRES, Mr. QUIE, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. BELL, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, and Mr. ASHBROOK):

H.J. Res. 1371. A 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 1971, to be planned and conducted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DORN:

H.J. Res. 1372. Joint resolution proposing

an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.J. Res. 1373. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to terms of Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.J. Res. 1374. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution requiring that Justices of the Supreme Court be reconfirmed by the Senate every 6 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE (for himself and Mr. FINDLEY):

H.J. Res. 1375. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States making citizens who have attained 18 years of age eligible to vote in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.J. Res. 1376. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Robert Francis Kennedy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. Res. 1230. 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.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H. Res. 1231. Resolution to amend rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives to require the yeas and nays in the case of final action by the House of Representatives on general appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 1232. Resolution amending the rules of the House to prohibit a single appropriation bill from carrying appropriations for more than one executive department; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H Res. 1233. 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 deliver, 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. 18215. A bill for the relief of Dominico Fodera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 18216. A bill for the relief of Elie Louis Charalabopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18217. A bill for the relief of Bartolome A. Federico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18218. A bill for the relief of Caterina Grimaldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 18219. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ena Mocega; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18220. A bill for the relief of Miss Esther Mocega; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 18221. A bill for the relief of Ludovic But and his wife, Leontina But; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 18222. A bill for the relief of Naim Nissem Ben-Zur, Elana Ben-Zur, Liora Ben-Zur, Orna Ben-Zur, and Mayer Ben-Zur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18223. A bill for the relief of Odilia Kwang Wook Han; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18224. A bill for the relief of Hagop Dikran Krakozian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 18225. A bill for the relief of Dr. Arturo de Jesus de Leon and Dr. Rose Mary de Leon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 18226. A bill for the relief of Yock Shan Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18227. A bill for the relief of Pasqua Porzia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 18228. A bill for the relief of Juliet G. Mudzinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 18229. A bill for the relief of Domenico Mammana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 18230. A bill for the relief of Gennaro Lita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 18231. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Nelson C. Mah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18232. A bill for the relief of Norma M. Sasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 18233. A bill for the relief of Anna Di Lauro and her minor daughters, Maria and Vincenza Di Lauro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 18234. A bill for the relief of Rubenstein D. Landreth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18235. A bill for the relief of Eric Richard Scotte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 18236. A bill for the relief of Baij Nath Verma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18237. A bill for the relief of Chu Ying Yeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 18238. A bill for the relief of Olivera Milivojevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 18239. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sing San Yang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 18240. A bill for the relief of Fotios George and Evangelia Metaxas; 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:

357. By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia: Petition of Mrs. R. H. Ligon, Mechanicsville, Va., and others, concerning aid to Communist countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

358. By Mr. FISHER: Petition of B. L. Bradford, Houston, Tex., and others, to have this administration stop, promptly and completely, giving aid in any form, directly or indirectly, to our Communist enemies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

359. By Mr. LONG of Louisiana: Petition of Delia B. Harris, Martinville, La., and others, relative to trading with the enemy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

360. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Josephine Scarminaci, Brooklyn, N.Y., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CORREGIDOR MEMORIAL SHRINE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from an approximately 20,000-mile round trip to the Philippine Islands, where, with other distinguished Americans, I was privileged, indeed honored, to witness the turnover ceremony whereby the Corregidor Memorial Shrine is now the official function of the Philippine Government.

This shrine commemorates, for all time, the memory of those who gave their lives in the South Pacific during World War II; and particularly those Americans who gave their lives during the gallant fight on Bataan and Corregidor 26 years ago.

It would be fitting, then, that we examine only one portion of that now infamous death march of Bataan with a firsthand report from one of its survivors, Dr. David Brown, of Bellaire, Ohio.

The report follows:

SUNSET AT CAMP O'DONNELL

Ours was the first group to arrive at Camp O'Donnell. We had been picked up by a convoy near Cabcaben in the late afternoon of April 10, 1942. The narrow road was jammed with heavy traffic. The Japanese were taking advantage of the silence of Corregidor's guns (to allow the removal of the Filipino—American prisoners from Bataan) to move in their own men and equipment for the final assault against the island fortress. Tanks, artillery, grim-faced veterans of the Singapore campaign, truckloads of American food "requisitioned" in Manila moved into Bataan, while in the opposite direction, lines of haggard Filipinos and Americans stumbled heavily toward their destiny.

The road out of Bataan led through towns and villages that had been devastated early in the war. Abucay, Hermosa—leveled by repeated bombing and shelling—were now a mass, a rubble. The sweet sickening smell of burnt flesh still emanated from the charred ruins. Groups of Japanese soldiers, naked

save for their G-strings, stared at the passing columns.

In the succeeding days and weeks the survivors of Bataan, 55,000 Filipinos and 8,000 Americans, arrived at Camp O'Donnell, many having walked from 80 to 100 miles without food or water. To the men who had undergone disease and hunger during January, February, and March, the added ordeal of the march out of Bataan in April was more than flesh and blood could bear.

The greatness of a nation, or of an individual, is not measured in terms of material wealth or achievement, but in terms of morality. Here was a chance for Japan to prove to a doubting world her claims to equality among the civilized nations. The withholding of food and water, the deliberate marching during the extreme heat of the day, the cramping of men in small enclosures at night so that they could not sleep, above all the senseless bayonetting of those who, crazed with thirst or bent over with the agonizing pangs of dysentery, sought refuge in a ditch at the side of the road—all this could have been avoided without undue effort on the part of the captors, and would have enhanced their prestige in the eyes of the world and in the hearts of the captured. But Japan chose to apply the lash. Her attitude was tersely expressed to one by a Japanese interpreter, educated in the United States, when they refused transportation for a sick man. "You have made us suffer—now we will make you suffer."

Unwashed, unshaven, all suffering from hunger and thirst, and many from heat exhaustion and dysentery, the remnants of a once-great fighting force crept into Camp O'Donnell. It was heart-rending to see those pitiful shadows seek out a building designated as a hospital. They would stumble to the door or fall on the ground outside. Here at last they hoped to find a haven of mercy, and rest for their weary bodies. Alas, all there was to give them were small sips of water and the hard floors of the barracks called a "hospital." Of medicines there were only the meager amounts some of the medical officers had managed to bring out of Bataan.

The first meal and every meal thereafter for a month consisted of one-half mess kit of rice. The month's "rice treatment" was accorded all prisoners of war by the Japanese, and was designed to get the prisoners down to a level of weakness where they could be easily disciplined and would not have the strength for organized resistance. Water, too, was insufficient. Long queues would form for filling canteens from the few faucets which were turned on at specified hours. No water was available for bathing or washing of clothing.

O'Donnell had been built before the war for the 71st Philippine Division (about 12,000 men). In an area less than a mile square were now concentrated 55,000 Filipino and 8,000 American prisoners of war.

By the end of April 1942, dysentery had reached epidemic proportions. Many men had contracted the disease on the march to O'Donnell by drinking polluted water out of ditches. The overcrowding, lack of soap and water, flies, the open filthy latrines made the camp a perfect breeding ground for dysentery. Bodies already weakened by privation did not have the resistance to withstand the new enemy. The terrific knife-like pains in the abdomen, the uncontrollable diarrhea, and the loss of sleep sapped the strength quickly; a boy in fairly good shape could become an emaciated skeleton within a few days. The effort of going to and from the latrines was too much, and many of the sufferers would remain on the ground near the latrines continuously.

The "hospital" was soon filled with dysentery patients. No change of clothing was available, nor was there sufficient water to bathe the patients or wash the floors. The terrific stench from the hospital pervaded the entire camp. Of all the afflictions that "flesh is heir to," dysentery in a Japanese prison camp was the most wretched. The emaciated sufferers lay on hard boards or on the ground, covered with vermin and excreta, their bodies seized by uncontrollable spasms of retching and diarrhea. They stared vacantly at the misery around them until death mercifully supervened.

The tropics exact heavy penalties upon the trespassing white race. Diseases which affect the native mildly assume a virulent character when attacking the foreigner. Bataan is one of the world's worst malaria-infested areas. During the war, the disease had been held in check with prophylactic doses of quinine, but when the drug became exhausted, more than one-half of the men were stricken. At O'Donnell, the disease recurred in malignant form. The febrile peroxysem would be followed by delirium, coma, and death within 24 to 36 hours.

The cachectic prisoners were plagued by tropical ulcers. Abrasions of the skin would become ugly festering sores, often progressing to amputation or death. The foul odor of rotting flesh vied with the stench of dysentery for supremacy.

The first dietary-deficiency disease to make its appearance was beriberi. To the macabre nightmare were now added new specters. The wasting away of extremities, the unsteady gait, the swollen bodies, reduce the victims to a state neither dead nor alive. These pitiful specimens of humanity, for whom there was no room in the hospital now overflowing with dead and dying would attempt to carry on. Unable to control the movements of their legs due to loss of coordination, they would stumble and fall, and crawl on their hands and knees, but there was no hand to raise them. The mental torpor that comes with starvation had deadened the sense to everything but the most primitive of instincts—hunger. Long-continued association with suffering breeds calloused indifference.

The most terrifying actor in this drama of death was the fulminating type of beriberi. An apparently normal individual would suddenly swell up from head to foot, and as suddenly die of heart failure. Their bloated bodies contrasted weirdly with the gaunt forms of the men who had dysentery.

The greatest sufferers under the starvation regime were those below the age of 21. Still in the growing age, their basic food requirement were greater than those who had already matured. I remember one pink-cheeked boy of 18 who had run to help whenever he was needed when those around him were falling from weakness. We found him one day while extracting the men pinned underneath a fallen barracks during a storm. These barracks, built of bamboo, nipa, and straw would sway in a high wind and often collapse like a house of cards. The driving rain was beating down upon his upturned face. He was already in that coma which precedes death and had lain there, unnoticed and uncared for, for several days.

We ordinarily think of a tropical rain as a relief from the enervating heat, but the sudden drop in temperature can be fatal to a weakened body. Persons with terminal dysentery or beriberi, who would ordinarily linger on for a week or ten days, would die within a few hours after a rain.

As more and more men become incapacitated, the problem of getting enough men for burial details became serious. Bodies would lie unburied for days as the grave diggers could not keep up with the mounting death rate.

Whether the Japanese authorities were perturbed by the conditions at O'Donnell is doubtful, as the same conditions were repeated at Cabanatuan and the prison camps in Japan. Appeals for medicine, food, and soap were met with bland explanations that all transportation was occupied in supplying their troops in Bataan, but that soon more food and medicine would be available. "Soon," we came to know, to the Japanese might mean tomorrow, next month, or next year. After the fall of Corregidor, the rice diet was supplemented with insignificant amounts of salt, sugar, oil, and vegetables, with rarely one carabao to season the soup for 5,000 men after the Japanese had taken the best portions of the meat.

A Japanese medical group visited the hospital and observed that it was dirty but did not say how we were to get soap and water to clean it up. However, they sent us some quinine and sulfa drugs out of which the Japanese took a cut, leaving us without enough medicine to meet the daily increasing sick rate.

The Japanese effort, there as elsewhere, was to be too little and too late. It was too late to save the lives that could have been saved a few weeks earlier with a minimum of effort. Daily the funeral processions became longer, the bamboo catafalques more numerous. The seeds sown in Bataan had borne fruit. The Bataan death march was the prelude to the grand march of death at O'Donnell. By the end of May 1942, the deaths averaged 300 to 400 Filipinos and 40 to 50 Americans daily. In all, 23,000 Filipinos and 1,500 Americans died here.

The burial at first was inside the camp, and each body was consigned to a separate grave, but lack of space necessitated using the ground outside the camp, where the bodies were dumped en masse into common, shallow graves. During a rain, the cadavers would wash out of their position and gaunt limbs would protrude from the mud to greet the new arrivals.

In every clime the elements produce some distinctive form of beauty. In the Philippines the sun and air combine at the end of the day to create a panorama of color unequalled in the world. We have seen the famed Philippine sunsets before in San Bernardino straits, at Baguio, and Manila Bay. But it was at O'Donnell that we first beheld them in their full splendor. The peculiarly undulating soil of Tarlac province covered over with coarse brown grass, and the sharp contours of the distant mountain peaks silhouetted in the clear air blend together to form a natural setting for the ethereal display. Here, amid the solitude of death, nature sought to compensate for the material craving by nourishing the spiritual. And the pangs of hunger were temporarily dulled as the sense fed on the grandeur of the celestial spectacle.

As the sun sinks below the horizon, the western sky is ablaze in a fiery red. Every color of the spectrum, in seemingly endless combination, plays upon the central theme of red. The gleaming shades of gold and crimson fade into infinitely brilliant green and blue, and finally, a curtain of purple merges with the darkness of night, creating an aura of another world.

The unreality of the scene in the skies was matched by that on the earth. Above, a silent symphony of light; below, the staggering gait and the bloated bodies of the beriberis, the gaunt skeletons and the fixed, staring eyes of the dysenteries, and over all the stench from the hospital and latrines intermingled with penetrating odor of the unburied dead.

Good and evil rarely travel the same paths, but here they had met. There was the ultimate in beauty together with the ultimate in ugliness—a union of heaven and hell, a scene that might have been conjured up by Satan.

O'Donnell is no more. The buildings were burned by the retreating Japanese. The coarse cogon now covers the common graves of 23,000 Filipino and 1,500 American men. But O'Donnell still lives in the memories of those who survived, and they beg the American people to heed the lessons that were learned so bitterly.

NO TIME FOR APATHY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Hickory Hills News, a publication serving a number of communities in southwest Cook County, in its June 19 edition featured an editorial commentary by Ken Maurin which I feel is extremely penetrating and obviously of very timely nature.

This column carries commentary on a number of vital issues and is, I believe, solid expression of grassroot American thinking.

Therefore, in view of its interesting and thought provoking nature, I insert it into the RECORD:

NO TIME FOR APATHY

(By Ken Maurin)

During the past decade it has been my unpleasant lot to witness this country decaying from the increasing disruption of orderly processes within our society. The onus of blame for this disasterous progression is difficult to access, however, it does appear clear that the fault does not lie entirely with the dissident factions, but the burden of guilt must be apportioned in significant measure to those who have sought to assume positions of responsibility and leadership. From the local politician who overlooks certain vices, rackets, etc. in his sphere of influence in order to ease his quest of an elected position, to the personages of national prominence who can prostitute their consciences to the point where they make the appropriate statement to a given audience provided it will yield their support. Several such cases in point can be made, from the assurances by Vice President Humphrey informing the appropriate audience that if he lived under such conditions he too would lead a "mighty good revolt". This, . . . in the face of the crucial situation of today with regard to racial tensions. Another equally detrimental statement by another figure of national prominence assuring a sympathetic audience that the sending of blood and medical aid to the Viet Cong was among the highest principles of the American people.

Compounding the problems we face is a tendency on the part of the news media, i.e., radio, press, and T.V. to permeate their large impressionable audiences with every bit of social poison that can be derived by the machinations of every disturbed mind capble of disrupting the social tranquillity. This, and we wonder out loud why the cycle increases its intensity.

We believe it to be in order also to examine the permissiveness of the Supreme Court in its decisions regarding human rights, the Constitution of the United States, and last, but not least, human dignity. It is also inexcusable that the Supreme Court in its quest for the unattainable theoretical perfection in the application of the law to make legal such infectious organizations as the Communist Party.

Today it is vogue to ignore the logical approaches to a problem in preference for the convenient, superficial, and popularly acceptable explanations. For instance, according to some in responsible positions the panacea for the prevention of crime and violence is the "simple" elimination of any and all kinds of firearms. The rather fundamental fact completely ignored is that it takes someone criminally motivated to commit the deed, the tool being relatively unimportant. It isn't the society which is sick, but rather it is the society which absorbs the blame for the unreasoned action of a few deranged individuals. Senator Dodd who is the most vociferous of the current proponents of this type of misdirected legislation is being heard and supported by many persons. This comes from a man whose personal conduct and integrity is sufficiently in question for his fellow Senators to recently reprimand him by official censure.

Prohibition, which was enacted into law by similar misguided legislation, led to a festering ulcer in the vitals of our society—i.e., the crime syndicate. Removal of firearms from honest, God fearing citizens is giving open license to such organizations, as well as weakening the inherent strength of our Nation.

This is our country that is being so grievously damaged by current policies. This is the only country in which there are still some vestiges of personal freedom, the only country in which minority groups even have a chance to improve their lot. We should not stand idly by and let this be destroyed.

SOLIDARITY DAY

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, all of us have been quite aware of the Poor People's Campaign and Resurrection City.

A highlight of the Poor People's Campaign was to be Solidarity Day. But many of us realized there was something missing that day. The editorial in the Evening Star on June 20, poignantly told us what it was.

The editorial follows:

SOLIDARITY DAY

From time to time the cameras focused on the massive, brooding figure in the background. And one felt that he would have understood it—all of it.

Poverty? Very few among the many thousands massed around the Memorial have known poverty as Abraham Lincoln knew it.

Housing? The only home he knew in his formative years was a log cabin in the wilderness.

Hunger? There were many days when young Abe felt its pangs.

War? It may be doubted that any man has known greater anguish than that which was Lincoln's constant companion from 1861 to 1865.

So Abraham Lincoln would have understood the demonstration—all of it.

He would have abided the demagogues, for he knew an abundance of them in his day. He would have understood and applauded the statesman-like remarks from such men as Roy Wilkins and Senator Brooke, for Lincoln also bore the stamp of statesmanship.

He would have listened with compassion as Mrs. Martin Luther King, a remarkable woman, cried out for an end to the war in Vietnam. Abraham Lincoln paced the floor on many a sleepless night searching in heart and mind for a way to end the agony of our Civil War. He would have been deeply moved as he listened to Mrs. Mary Gurley, of Atlanta, sing "My Heavenly Father Watches Over Me."

He would even have understood the threatful, even belligerent tone of the speech by the Rev. Ralph David Abernathy, and he would have hoped, as all must hope, that reflection and wiser counsel will overrule the announced intent to stay indefinitely in Resurrection City, permit or no permit.

Yes, this man who spoke of government of the people, by the people, for the people would have fully understood and appreciated the peaceful demonstration put together in Washington yesterday under the direction of Sterling Tucker. The right of the people to petition their government was close to the heart of Abraham Lincoln, who also died of an assassin's bullet—although, strangely, there was little or no mention of the fact by the speakers who addressed the throng from the steps of his Memorial.

HILL SECTION'S 4-H CLUB

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House an article by columnist John Chamberlain which appeared in the New Haven Register, describing the activities of the 4-H Club in the largest city in my district. This organization, operating on a minimal budget, is conducting a wide variety of programs designed to improve the occupational abilities of ghetto children and to provide them with better recreational opportunities. I think that we are all pleased to see that meaningful progress can take place in underprivileged areas without large expenditures of funds. In addition, I would like to assure Mr. Chamberlain that I did not have the Hill Section's 4-H Club in mind when I had occasion to criticize some of the operations of New Haven's Community Action Agency.

The article follows:

HILL SECTION'S 4-H CLUB

(By John Chamberlain)

Maybe country America has something to teach the city. For years the boys and girls of the farmlands have been 4-H Club ("Head, Heart, Hands, Health") members between the ages of nine and 19. The 4-H Clubs have had the blessing and the aid of the Department of Agriculture extension services, and have done wonders to spread the gospel of better land care, better stock breeding, better community living, and a more responsible attitude about individual behavior. While no surveys have been made, it is doubtful that 4-H kids ever become hippies or yippies.

With virtually no publicity, and with little money, the 4-H Clubs have recently started to move into a few American cities. There is a big 4-H movement of 40,000 enrolled youngsters in Nassau County, the big semi-urban bedroom adjunct to New York City. And there are 4-H Clubs in Rochester, Syracuse, Providence, Milwaukee, Chicago, Cleveland and Hartford.

The one I happened to hit upon through a concerned friend was started in the slums of the so-called Hill District of New Haven in 1964. When Cong. Robert Giaimo recently denounced the waste and the bureaucratic inefficiencies of the lavishly funded Community Progress, Inc. projects which, supposedly, were making New Haven the "model city" in race relations, he couldn't have had the local inner city 4-H Youth Program in mind. The program runs on a tiny budget of $2,500 a year, half of which goes for rent, the rest for supplies and tools. This is in addition to the $70-a-week salary that goes to a dedicated 4-H agent supervisor, and whatever it takes to maintain liaison with

the Co-operative Extension Service of the University of Connecticut's College of Agriculture, which started it all.

The "rus in urbe," or country in city, flavor of the New Haven 4-H Club slum project is preserved in a Green Thumb Club, which, when I visited the area, was nurturing its tomato plants and eggplants in pots and waiting hopefully for somebody with a rototiller to dig up the space behind the local public library so it could transplant them. (The city of New Haven, incidentally, does nothing to pick up around this library, which stands in a sea of easily preventable squalor that hardly accords with Model City pretensions.) If the Green Thumb Club demonstrably works under difficulties imposed by its surroundings, the Hill 4-H Bike Club program does better. This is a revelation of how much can be done both for and by slum kids with a little imagination and ingenuity.

Using old discarded bikes that have cadged from all over the place with the help of the police department, the bike program is an elaborate experiment in cannibalization of parts to make new, and even glistening, wholes. The 4-H agent provides the tools, which must be kept in good order, and the boy must make his bike from old parts and put it in good running order before he can take title to it. Bike rodeos and weekly trips are part of the program. And there is "business experience" for a limited number of boys: who are allowed to repair and and sell bikes, borrowing money from the 4-H Fund for the parts, and keeping the profits after their creditors have been satisfied. One look at the bike club repair shop in operation is enough to convince even the most skeptical visitor that here is something that slum kids will take to with enthusiasm; mobility in a slum means that it is not a ghetto any more within the technical meaning of the term.

The 4-H program for the New Haven Hill district includes woodworking and sewing clubs, cooking clubs, sports, swimming and camping activities, and gas engines. It's all done on a shoestring, with dues and token payments from parents adding to the funds wherever lean." The 4-H-ers seemed to be doing a lot better than the supposed beneficiaries of far more expensive projects. You can go elsewhere in slum areas and see things that cost four times as much and produce nothing of permanent value for anybody.

The 4-H Clubs have had 50 years of experience with youth in rural America. Since many of the Negro and Puerto Rican migrants to the inner city come from the country, the 4-H Club that moves into town may be just following its own.

WARREN: A LAME DUCK MOVE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of comment and discussion in recent days regarding the resignation of Chief Justice Warren. An editorial appearing in the June 24 edition of the Peoria Journal Star says it all as far as I am concerned, and I place the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

WARREN: A LAME DUCK MOVE

The resignation of Chief Justice Earl Warren finally settles the long argument that has raged in this country about him—and demonstrates that, after all, he does not come up to the standard on honor, integrity, and "above politics" attitude expected in the U.S. Supreme Court.

We have disagreed violently with Justice Warren's notions of usurping the lawmaking powers and inflicting his own social philosophies on this nation through manipulating "Constitutional decisions" instead of by the processes at law provided in the Constitution, itself, which he was sworn to uphold and defend.

But we always regarded him as sincere, honorable, and a man of great integrity, and disagreed just as violently with those who regarded him as malevolent in purpose.

His resignation at this time, however, while it does not make him malevolent vastly cheapens his position and his life career, and caps it with an act befitting a ward-heeling city hall hack in one of our seedier cities.

After all these years, at aged 77, after waiting to see the lay of the land in the primary elections and the shape of politics in 1968—he now chooses his timing so as to jump in and permit a Lame Duck President to name the next member of the court, and deny to the "new President" to be elected by the people of the United States his proper right to make that appointment.

Others may follow suit on the Supreme Court, and make this cheap, rankly political, anti-public political manipulation—and thereby certify to the political nature of the trick, and the level of dignity, integrity and honor they have actually represented on the court all these years.

ABE FORTAS

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, wisdom is a rare quality; it is found only in men who are secure within themselves and honest with themselves. Justice Abe Fortas is a wise and gentle man. It is to the entire country's benefit that he has been named by President Johnson to succeed Chief Justice Earl Warren.

Justice Fortas is a man of many achievements and distinctions. He was recognized nationally as one of our foremost corporate lawyers; he is admired as a near-professional violinist; and he is a highly respected academician.

Abe Fortas will bring increased vitality to the Supreme Court, for he is a man who keeps himself constantly young by associating with the questioning minds of the young and their ideas. Justice Fortas, as Chief Justice, will perpetuate the very best of the Supreme Court's purposes and ideals.

The versatile Justice is also a philosopher, one whose contacts with every level of society are kept continually fresh.

In the year before he was appointed to the Supreme Court, Mr. Fortas wrote:

For a Justice of this ultimate tribunal, the opportunities for self-discovery and the occasion for self-revelation are usually great. Judging is a lonely job in which a man is, as near as may be, an island entire. The moment is likely to come when he realizes that he is, in essential fact, answerable only to himself.

The job of Chief Justice is difficult and lonely; the challenge is ceaseless and ever-growing. It is to the good of our Nation that the talents and devotion of a wise and gentle man will continue to serve the public interest.

HOUSING FOR THE POOR

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the July 4 recess, we will consider the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. This proposed legislation will go far toward achieving the goal set by Congress in 1949 of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American." It will take us 3 years down the road toward President Johnson's goal, stated in his message on the cities last February, of abolishing substandard housing in the United States within the next 10 years.

Realizing the pressures on us to pursue a responsible fiscal policy, the Des Moines Register recently endorsed this legislation stating:

Congress should recognize the urgency of the housing need and decline to cut back in this area.

I join the Register in support of this legislation and with permission I place the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

HOUSING FOR THE POOR

The National Housing Act of 1949 promised "a decent home and suitable environment for every American family." Twenty years later, more than 20 million Americans still occupy nearly 6 million substandard housing units. The number of non-whites living in substandard housing has actually increased. In many cities, more low-cost housing has been eliminated by freeway and urban renewal development than has been built.

The housing bill approved by the Senate last week represents an effort to fulfill the 1949 promise. The measure authorizes $5.2 billion for federal housing programs over the next three years. The bill provides for 300,000 low and moderate income housing units in the next fiscal year as part of the Administration's plan to produce six million such units in the next 10 years. The 300,000 target is triple the production rate this year and is more than half the number of low and moderate income housing units built over the last decade.

Most of this housing is to be furnished through stepped-up support for the now-familiar public housing and rent supplement programs and housing constructed by non-profit and limited-dividend groups with market and below-market rate loans. The Senate bill adds to this mix a promising new program of government mortgage subsidies to enable low-income families to become home owners.

The Senate bill, however, is merely an authorization. It represents a ceiling, or goal, rather than a go-ahead to reach the goal. The bill is subject to authorization cuts in the House and appropriation cuts in both houses. The determination to cut federal spending by $6 billion next year could make the goal of 300,000 low and moderate income housing units nothing but a fond hope.

Congress should recognize the urgency of the housing need and decline to cut back in this area. The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders found poor housing to be a major source of tension and dissatis-

faction in the nation's cities. The commission recommended a program to produce 600,000 low and moderate income units next year and six million units over the next five years. The Administration's program, reflected in the Senate bill, calls for a much slower rate of housing production.

The country has been unconscionably slow in responding to the housing needs of the poor. Only about 800,000 low-income units have been produced in the 31-year history of federal housing programs compared to more than 10 million middle and upper-income units produced with federal insurance guarantees in roughly the same period. The country cannot afford much longer to fail to deliver on its 1949 promise.

THE MAJOR OF ST. LO

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, this July marks the 24th anniversary of the American campaign to take St. Lo during World War II. Leading the attack on St. Lo was Maj. Thomas D. Howie, who commanded the 2d Battalion, 116th Infantry, 29th Division, which, prior to Federal activation, had been a National Guard unit. Major Howie was killed just prior to the final attack on St. Lo.

The armory in Staunton, Va., is named the Thomas D. Howie Memorial Armory in tribute to him. In the foyer of that armory hangs the portrait of this heroic major who earned the sobriquet, "The Major of St. Lo." Beneath that portrait is a framed legend telling the story of his death, which reads as follows:

The German stronghold of St. Lo, France was the key objective of the Allied Forces breaking out of the Normandy beachhead in July 1944, and lay in the zone of advance of the 29th Division and its Virginia Regiment, the 116th Infantry. Major Howie led his battalion to the relief of the 2nd Battalion which had been cut off by Germans outside of St. Lo for three days. In one of the few bayonet attacks in the European Theatre in World War II, he routed in a night attack the Germans who had hemmed in the 2nd Battalion.

After a briefing on orders for the final attack on the important communications center of St. Lo, Major Howie was killed by a shell fragment as he completed issuing his battalion attack order, remaining exposed to a mortar barrage to make sure his command group had taken cover. "I'll see you in St. Lo," he had told his company commanders.

His body was draped with the national color, carried into St. Lo in an ambulance, and placed on the rubble of the town church, where the victorious American troops marched past for pursuit of the Germans.

Tom Howie was one of the finest of the young men that Virginia and the Nation lost in the war. He was an able, courageous officer who always looked out for his men. He was greatly admired and loved by them and by his fellow officers. He, like so many of them, and like the young men of ancient Athens, "gave their bodies to the Commonwealth, each for his own memory, praise that will never die, and with it the greatest of all sepulchers . . . a home in the minds of men."

This armory has been dedicated to the memory of the gallant Tom Howie as Staunton's expression of admiration and appreciation.

GALLANT POSTAL WORKERS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, every day postal workers labor to keep abreast of the ever-increasing flow of mail.

Last December, at the height of the Christmas mail rush, fire swept through one of the key mail stations in the Nation's largest city, the Morgan Station in New York City.

The postal employees did a yeoman job of trying to save the mail and then changing operations so as to avoid the fire-gutted area and keep the tremendous flood of mail moving to its destination.

The Post Office Department paid due honor this week to a large number of Morgan Station employees and others who performed heroically in connection with the fire.

Postmaster General W. Marvin Watson personally made the awards, according special recognition to Acting New York Postal Regional Director A. C. Hahn and New York Postmaster John R. Strachan for "their resourcefulness, their leadership, their untiring efforts at a time of major emergency."

Besides Mr. Hahn and Mr. Strachan, 111 other employees of the New York Post Office, and 26 other employees of the New York Postal Regional Office were cited for "distinguished performance in safeguarding the U.S. mails and restoring vital services during a time of great crisis."

Nine awards recognized the work of city services, utility companies, and other Federal agencies contributing to the post office's swift recovery in the wake of the most disastrous fire in postal history.

Ten New York Central Railroad employees were honored for moving three boxcars of mail from within the burning building.

Seven postal inspectors were cited, among other things, for heading salvage operations which saved more than 10.8 million pieces of mail.

In his remarks Postmaster General Watson said:

Today we honor those who proved that the human spirit is not crushed by disaster. These individuals have shown that the postal service is resilient enough to provide uninterrupted service even though a major facility is stricken and inoperative. This can only emphasize our debt to the devoted employees and others who helped us make such a swift—almost miraculous—recovery.

Following is the list of award recipients:

LIST OF AWARD RECIPIENTS

EMPLOYEES OF THE NEW YORK POST OFFICE

Gerard J. Frunzi, Edward Wetzel, Dominick Riccardi, Michael Pesce, John T. O'Neill. Milton Kirschner, Ironclad E. Oliver, Samuel J. Verello, Luther Joyner, Fred Williams, Edward L. Keepler, James R. Williams, Louis L. Friscella, George Hernandez, David H. Anthony, Luke B. Bassett, Traver J. Brown, Edmund M. Connelly.

Rafael Espina, Joseph D. Gattie, John R. Hedlund, Edward J. Malenczak, Rudolph J. Maikis, James J. McCarthy, John J. O'Hara, Allen J. O'Neill, Robert Kussick, Benjamin Goodman, George E. Hirsch, Herbert L. Johnston, Joseph H. Pascal, William J. Long, Samuel Pollack, John J. Lever, Stephen Panzara, Peter J. Pinto, Charles Goldstein.

Andrew Alongi, Martin Driller, Alphonso Eppolito, James Siclari, Joseph Evak, Thomas Hicks, Peter R. Byrne, Jose Diaz, Joseph Powell, Mike Andrews, Jr., Kevin P. Fegan, Robert Gardner, Ira Greinsky, Eldridge W. Fowler, John R. Blanchard, Marshall Humphries, Everett H. Anderson, Willie L. Robinson.

Talton E. Arrington, William S. Nelson, Alexander Mazur, John Kelly, James J. Dwyer, William O'Malley, Carlton L. Bain, Hyman Gershonson, Charles S. James, James Clark, Alfred M. Storch, Theresa McCarney, William H. Shostak, Samuel L. Popper, Harold Payne, Joseph V. Celentano, Joseph Wilkowski, Matthew Leonard, Thomas P. McCormick.

Max Klapholz, Anthony Buonamano, John Casali, Fabio Necco, Oscar Mingeram, Charles D'Errico, Thomas J. McCullough, Santo Viola, Morris Portnoy, Albert Rawley, Frank D'Alessio, Harold J. Bruno, Louis M. Charles, Carlos Cuadrado, Alton A. Duconge, Mario Diaz, Santo Emma, Charles C. Giglia.

Miguel A. Hernandez, Albert N. Hicks, Owen J. McCabe, Robert Orellano, Ernest Perine, Konrad Rantanen, Carlos Teyidore, Jose Torres, Gwilym T. Richards, Francisco Aponte-Viera, Cristostomo Torres, Walter Bell, Santo A. Bracco, Harry Pappas, Human Blank, Irving Bicofsky, Thomas V. Flanagan, John F. Ward, George Hass.

EMPLOYEES IN NEW YORK REGIONAL OFFICE

William A. Carroll, William H. Mills, Peter P. Nash, Emory L. Russell, Joseph Romanelli, Joseph Napoli, John D. Mills, Frank A. Cirillo, Chester C. Suske.

John F. Kirk, Albert Razzetti, John J. Doyle, Joseph Bierbauer, Henry Platt, Benjamin Budd, Henry Pauly, John Dribnack, G. William Delamar.

Frank Alaburda, Henry Knetter, Frank G. Lawther, Frank Daido, Henry Levitt, George Archer, Ralph R. Franzese, David Zuckerman.

POSTAL INSPECTORS

Lester B. Battles, James G. Brogan, John T. Herrmann, James J. McFadden, Frederick R. Mollo, George C. Ross, Jr., James R. Stephens.

NONPOSTAL UNITS

New York City Fire Department.

Second Division, New York City Police Department.

Ventilation and Drainage Section, New York City Transit Authority.

ORTUPS (O) 03-82207, U.S. Third Coast Guard District.

Public Building Service, General Services Administration.

Eastern Area, Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service, Brooklyn Army Terminal.

New York Board of Fire Underwriters.

Consolidated Edison Company.

Midtown Division, New York Telephone Company.

EMPLOYEES OF NEW YORK CENTRAL RAILROAD

John A. Farrell, Joseph J. Ford, Frank B. Huggins, John J. Madden, Philip J. Pignatelli, Buck D. Walker, Charles A. Wilson, Francis J. Lamb, Edward J. Keegan, John Kuyck.

DOMESTIC AID CAUGHT IN SPRAWLING CHAOS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the monumental effort of our colleague, the

gentleman from Delaware, should be commended by all who are interested in streamlining Federal aid programs.

Many of us over the years have pointed out the duplication, waste and overlapping but never, I think, as successfully as was done in this package.

This research not only points up the critical need for a cataloging of Federal programs but the need for thorough investigation of what they do, what they are supposed to do, their relation to other projects and methods and steps which should be taken to decentralize what has become the inverted pyramid of the Federal Government.

As fine an effort as this was, there must be a continuing review of Federal programs, not only into the cataloging and explaining of programs but into the effects of them. And this should be directed at the programs themselves.

One of the essential points which the gentleman demonstrates is stated in a column from the Philadelphia Enquirer by Roscoe Drummond. He states:

The need is to decentralize, not just a little bit, but radically, functions, funds and authority so that state and local Government—near to the people—can begin to do the job on a scale which is manageable.

The Roth study is an excellent beginning. Congress and the Executive must now carry on.

For further interest, I include the Drummond column:

DOMESTIC AID CAUGHT IN SPRAWLING CHAOS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGON.—Federal Administration of billion of dollars in aid to millions of Americans is so tangled today nobody knows how bad things are.

The need is urgent to rescue from itself the sprawling, chaotic, inefficient, overburdened, overcostly maze of Federal assistance programs.

Democratic liberals like the late Robert Kennedy, J. F. K. aides Daniel Moynihan and Richard Goodwin and Republican conservatives like Congressman Melvin Laird, Gerald Ford and Charles Goodell have for some time been suggesting that the Federal complex has become so big, so cumbersome, so overlapping that it simply can't any longer do its job.

The need is to decentralize, not just a little bit but radically, functions, funds and authority so that State and local Government—near to the people—can begin to do the job on a scale which is manageable.

New facts which reveal how bad the situation is come from a heroic effort of a lone first-term Congressman, William V. Roth, Jr. (R., Del.), who set out four months ago to survey the entire Federal establishment to find out just how many programs of Federal assistance there are, what they do, how and where they are administered.

His findings justify virtually everything that has been said about the labyrinth of overgrown national Government. He found:

That nobody knows how many Federal programs there are and that there is no place to go in the whole Federal system to find out.

That Congress simply does not have the information to judge which programs should be kept and which should be stopped.

That the executive branch does not have the information to find overlapping and duplication and thereby to unify and streamline the operation.

That at the very least the Federal Government is attempting to administer 1050 assistance programs designed to dispense more than $20 billion a year.

That as many as 10 Cabinet-level departments and 15 or more agencies operate programs devoted essentially to the same purpose.

No wonder Democrats and Republicans alike, conservatives and liberals alike and many who used to think let-Washington-do-it was the answer to every social ill are beginning to see and to say that functions, funds and initiative need to be turned back to state and local government.

This is why Moynihan, Assistant Secretary of Labor under President Kennedy and now head of the Harvard-M.I.T. Urban Affairs Center, bluntly asserts that while the Federal Government has proved itself massively efficient at collecting taxes, it has shown itself massively inefficient at dispensing Federal services.

Representative Roth's titanic study of administrative dishevelment ought to stir Congress and the White House to action. His immediate proposal is modest—that the Government be directed to put into a single catalogue a lucid report on all Federal assistance programs and what the citizen needs to know to use them.

It would be a beginning to get at the facts. But far more needs to be done—and soon. A special Congressional-Presidential commission, like the Hoover Commission, ought to be put to work at once to study how best to decentralize Federal assistance programs and to report to the new Congress early enough so that action could be forthcoming next year.

There is little doubt that decentralization of the unwieldy Federal sprawl is coming. It ought to be brought about in an orderly, well planned manner. This is why Congress ought to put it in motion now.

TRIPLE TRAILERS THWART TRAVEL

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the House Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, has been holding hearings on legislation which would permit longer and heavier trucks to travel the Nation's highways. It appears that some trucking interests would like to turn our interstate highways into freightways by making trucks longer, heavier, and adding caravans of trucks to the existent hazards faced by motorists on interstate highways. I note with interest that a trailer combine dispatched from Buffalo to New York City by the Red Star Express Lines was halted in Auburn, N.Y. due to "some concern that it might have trouble" if it had completed its journey. The Buffalo Courier Express on June 6 published an excellent editorial on this question of trailer combines on the highways and I completely agree with the position taken by the editorial. The editorial follows:

TRIPLE TRAILER'S THWART TRAVEL

In approving the use of three-trailer combines on the New York State Thruway, the Thruway Authority appears to be more interested in moving freight over the billion dollar highway than in protecting the safety and convenience of the millions of motorists who use it. So far, only one company has equipment that meets the authority's specifications but there can be little doubt that before the year is out, other companies will meet the requirements. When that happens, three-trailer combines will become a common sight.

The news release states that approval was granted after eight years of research and testing carried out jointly by the company concerned and the Thruway Authority. We do not question the accuracy or the truthfulness of the statement but we cannot help observe that the testing must have been conducted with about the same degree of public knowledge and observance as is the country's nuclear-testing program.

Just how much public information about the new regulation has been released might be judged from the Buffalo Automobile Club's monthly publication which features a front-page story opposing the testing of the vehicles. Based on the information it has received, the auto club states that the overall length of the three-trailer combine is 108 feet, bumper to bumper. The club estimates that it would require one half mile of clear road to pass the vehicle without violating legal speed limits.

It is difficult to determine just how this factor alone will contribute to keeping the New York State Thruway the safest highway in the country. Add to this the fact that heavy vehicles create their own storms as they whip up surface slush in winter and water during rainfalls, thereby reducing visibility for other motorists. This greatly increases the normal hazards of driving.

Aside from the questionable safety factors, it appears that the Thruway Authority is more interested in converting an excellent highway—paid for and maintained through the tolls paid by all motorists—into a subsidized freight route. "Certainly if the operation meets the specifications of the authority, there is no reason to believe that four section or five-section rigs will not be permitted eventually. It was relatively only a short time ago that tandem hauling was approved. To date, that operation has met anything but public acclaim.

Could it be that the Thruway Authority plans to convert the Thruway into a rapid-transit, freight-hauling highway and relegate automobile traffic to other roads? Approval of the triple-trailer "freight train" seems to indicate that such a move may not fall into the realm of fantastic speculation. The Thruway Authority's slogan appears to be: "Billboards, no, freight trains, yes."

A GREAT ASSOCIATE JUSTICE WILL BE A GREAT CHIEF JUSTICE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I have had a special opportunity and responsibility to observe and study the workings of our constitutional form of government, and particularly, the operations of the Federal judiciary.

From that vantage point, President Johnson's latest appointments to the Supreme Court, in my view, only can be described as excellent.

Both Judge Homer Thornberry and Justice Abe Fortas have compiled outstanding records in the past, and their intelligence and character offer the promise of even greater service to the Nation in the future.

I am gratified personally at the nomination of Justice Fortas. As a member of the Jewish faith myself, I cannot help but take pride from the thought of an-

other American Jew, Abe Fortas, becoming Chief Justice of the United States.

The notion of a so-called Jewish seat on the Supreme Court is, fortunately, completely outdated in modern America. Justice Fortas came to his present position of eminence through intelligence, hard work, human compassion, and a deep commitment to public service.

And these are the characteristics which will assure his confirmation for the highest judicial post in the Nation.

I salute the President on his choice and I congratulate these two fine men.

HEMISFAIR

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, last week a group of our colleagues visited the attractive and colorful HemisFair in San Antonio, Tex. There they were hosted by the city of San Antonio and were extended many courtesies by that city, as well as by our inimitable colleague, HENRY B. GONZALEZ.

During their stay, they visited the exhibits of some 30 nations and enjoyed the friendly hospitality that exists at this confluence of civilizations.

In a relaxed moment they witnessed the "highest milking contest in the world"—an actual milking contest between Darrell Royal, the University of Texas head football coach and athletic director, Congressman HENRY B. GONZALEZ, and the Honorable Edward Clark, Commissioner of the U.S. Pavilion and former U.S. Ambassador to Australia.

During this time, HemisFair's Ambassador Edward Clark made some timely remarks on the occasion in which he not only saluted HemisFair and the city of San Antonio but also reminded us of the accomplishments of HENRY B. GONZALEZ and the affection in which he is held.

I submit for the RECORD the remarks of Ambassador Clark:

HEMISFAIR

Governor Connally, Distinguished Congressmen, who have traveled so far to honor our local Member of Congress; Members of the Executive Committee of HemisFair, Commissioners of the International Pavilions at HemisFair, Roy Barrera, Mayor McAllister:

My friends, you know my old friend and our distinguished Congressman, Henry B. Gonzalez's record for his action and concern for air safety, legislation to protect the interests of the consumer, the several million dollars in Federal grants and loans he has obtained for San Antonio for housing, hospitals, urban renewal, channel improvements for the San Antonio River, the economic opportunity programs of the President's War on Poverty which has meant so many new jobs for the poor, and a new Veterans' Administration Hospital complex.

You also know his role and participation in HemisFair. He was a leader in getting a $30 million bond election passed in San Antonio for the Fair and in 1965 he successfully got through a resolution calling for Federal sanction and participation.

You know and love the man we honor today, the man who received the unbelieveable total on ninety per cent of the votes cast in November, 1966, Congressional election. This man has served as a teacher, a politician, as a progressive, a writer, an engineer, a probation officer and as a debater.

When I say debater, I should say I understand one of the ways to commemorate this day and perhaps to keep you all here through out the speechmaking, is to have a drawing at 11:30 a.m. for some lucky fairgoers who will receive a free lunch with the Congressman and his lovely wife. Now, I would just like to let that lucky couple know that Congressman Gonzalez spoke, in Austin, for 36 hours and 2 minutes in 1956 along with another State Senator, alone in 1957 for twenty consecutive hours for causes he devoutly believed in and fought for; and all his running for Congress since then has not hurt his vocal talents and endurance. And so, whoever that couple is that wins the drawing may be, I would just like you to know that when the Congressman and my good friend, Henry B. Gonzalez, asks you, "How are you?", you had better have ready all the facts and questions because you may not have another chance to speak! Henry B. Gonzalez is a man of a few million words!

I did not come to talk about his speaking qualities. What I wanted to tell you about are his cow-milking talents, not his public ones. You see, yesterday in the high Tower of the Americas over there, we had a milking contest. Not just a milking contest, *but the highest milking contest in the world*, at least as far as anyone knows. There was one cow and three contestants. Darrell Royal, the University of Texas Head Football Coach and Athletic Director, Congressman Henry B. Gonzalez and myself. Now I won't say that Congressman Gonzalez lost, but the wonderful and distinguished Mayor McAllister, the judge, had to take three good long looks at the milk in the measuring cups before he ruled there was enough milk to cover the bottom. Henry B. Gonzalez is a good city boy—born under an arc light—who knows more abount urban renewal than cows.

Now, to make a long story short, the cow kicked over the bucket of Coach Royal, who didn't have a chance anyway, which left me the winner of the blue ribbon and undisputed world-wide, high milking champion. And so, as the world's tallest champion milker, from Texas, I would like to congratulate Congressman Gonzalez on his first milking performance and recommend that he not do any more milking until after the November elections!

Welcome home Henry B. Gonzalez, you are a great Congressman and a friend of all the people—God bless you and your dear family. Viva Henry B. Gonzalez, Viva San Antonio, Viva U.S.A.

SUPREME COURT

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of pleasure that I learned that the President nominated Associate Justice Abe Fortas to succeed the Honorable Earl Warren as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. Justice Fortas has had 35 years of experience in all phases of the legal profession and in every instance has proved to be devoted to law, justice, and the high ethics of the legal profession.

In 1965 he brought to the Supreme Court wide experience in private practice, the academic field, and public service. In the course of his career he has defended the rights of many people and organizations, from large corporations to the poorest, most ignored of all, our Nation's citizens.

He was chosen by the Supreme Court itself to argue Gideon against Wainwright, involving right to counsel, in what became a landmark decision that has influenced the entire sphere of rights in criminal proceedings.

His decisions on the Court have been praised for their logic and clarity. Mr. Justice Fortas always goes to the heart of the matter and rules on the question involved. He has shown concern for the discrepancies between the letter and the spirit of the law, the purpose and effects of statutes. He has brought to the Court great intellectual capacity, broad legal experience, and deep devotion to the cause of liberty and justice.

I hope the Senate will soon confirm the nomination of this able and dedicated public servant. I know that no finer gentleman could be found for this awesome responsibility and I laud the President's nomination.

THE NEW CHIEF JUSTICE

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Judiciary Committee, I would like to express my personal satisfaction with the President's nomination of the Honorable Abe Fortas to be Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Justice Fortas' background and experience make him well qualified to assume this most important position and I hope that the Members of the other body will act quickly to confirm his nomination.

I had the pleasure of meeting Justice Fortas for the first time in the early 1930's when I came to Washington as general counsel to the Code Authority for the Wholesale Confectionery Industry under the NRA. At that time Justice Fortas was on the staff of the Securities and Exchange Commission and later with the Interior Department.

Since his appointment to the Supreme Court in August 1965, Justice Fortas has amply proved his high qualifications as a Justice and his ability to work with his colleagues.

The recent attacks on the Supreme Court have been emotional but irrational, loud but from a minority, and above all dangerous to our system of an independent judiciary free from political threats. Much of the progress we have made in the past 15 years in the area of human rights and social progress can be attributed to the Supreme Court and its willingness to lead us on the path of social change and to protect the individual rights of every American citizen. Chief Justice Earl Warren has made his mark in history for his leadership during these years and I am confident that Justice Fortas will carry on the tradition of the great Chief Justices of the Court and prove his ability as a spokesman for all Americans.

HAMPTON COUNTY'S 26TH ANNUAL WATERMELON FESTIVAL

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therewith an address by the distinguished Governor of Tennessee, the Honorable Buford Ellington. The speech by this great American was preceded by a prayer by the dean of the entire clergy representing the Hampton area, the Reverend Dr. W. J. Swindell. Reverend Swindell has preached, taught, and healed with his ministry in the Hampton area for over 50 years. No one is more beloved than the Reverend Swindell. Recently he celebrated his 50th anniversary in Hampton County. Reverend Swindell has preached love of God and love of country. It was appropriate, therefore, that his invocation preceded the magnificent speech by the distinguished Governor of Tennessee. I want every American to read the entire proceedings of this memorable occasion as well as the incomparable address by that great and peerless Governor Ellington.

Governor Ellington's address extolled, as few men can, respect for law, love of country, and the sacrifice our men are making in Vietnam and everywhere else in the world. He called to the attention of all Americans the need of service above self both at home and on the field of battle. His eloquent speech excelled all others which had gone before him at this historic event. His address will motivate Americans yet unborn and those after them to dedicate their efforts for the preservation of the greatest nation on earth.

I had the privilege of attending this event and sharing the rare opportunity of listening to this great American impart his philosophy to similarly dedicated Americans.

The material follows:

PRAYER BY W. J. SWINDELL FOR 1968 WATERMELON FESTIVAL

Great Jehovah God, our Creator, we are Happy that Thou hast Revealed Thyself unto us as our Loving Father who Art in Heaven. We are glad that we have Learned of Thy Love for us and Thine Interest in our Welfare through Thy Beloved Son Jesus Christ, His Loyal Followers and through the Sacred Scriptures, Thy Holy Word.

We Thank Thee for Blessing us to be Citizens of our Beloved Country, the United States of America, the Child of Providence, the Queen of Nations, the Land of Liberty, Freedom and Opportunity.

We Thank Thee for our most Wonderful, enlightened, Progressive Country with Its Broad Plains, Fertile Valleys, Majestic Mountains, Happy Homes, Sacred Places of Worship, Modern Institutions of Learning and Facilities for Ministering unto the Afflicted, the Sick and the Underprivileged.

We Thank Thee, our Father, for the Faith, the Dreams, the Visions and the Courage of Thy Worthy Servants who Founded, Built and Made Great our Nation and Made It Like unto Ancient Canaan of the Holy Land that Flowed with Milk and Honey.

We Thank Thee for our Present Unselfish Statesmen, our Capable and Worthy Leaders in Government, Business, Labor and Religion.

We Especially Thank Thee, our God, for our Community Leaders and their Cooperative Supporters that Made Possible this Happy Occasion, this Assembly and this Inspiring Fellowship in this Splendid Town this Glad Day.

We Humbly Pray, Dear Father, for Thy Presence, Guidance and Wisdom that our Lives may be So Enriched, Gladdened and Sweetened that we may Become More Appreciative of our Country and be Challenged to Give More of our Time, Talents and Material Possessions to Make More Room for Christ and His Reign of Righteousness, Justice and Peace for all People Everywhere.

May that which we may Hear, See and Experience Here Today Help us to Love Mercy, Do Justly, to Walk Humbly with our God and to be Challenged to Let Flow through our Lives the Milk of Human Kindness for the Saving, the Gladdening and the Sweetening of Life of our More Unfortunate Fellowmen. In our Master's Name, we Thank Thee and Pray. Amen.

REMARKS OF GOV. BUFORD ELLINGTON AT THE WATERMELON FESTIVAL, HAMPTON, S.C., JUNE 22, 1968

I would like to express my personal thanks to the Jaycees and to my friend and colleague Governor Bob McNair for giving me this opportunity to visit your festival for the first time and to share a most pleasant day with you.

I can assure you that Governor McNair is recognized by his fellow Governors as a man who gets things done . . . both on the State and national level.

Governor McNair and I share a dream for our respective States and for this region and our citizens share a common bond of understanding.

Our people understand the need for fulfilling the development of physical and human resources through education, agriculture, and industry . . . and they have come to recognize this winning combination of resources as a key to our future.

This magnificent festival is certainly tangible evidence of the hard work you folks have been doing in this area.

It is evidence also of the fact that the people of South Carolina . . . as the people of Tennessee . . . prefer dealing with problems and meeting challenges with "action" rather than just "words".

This Nation faces many perils today as it has in the past . . . and as in the past . . . they must and will be solved by those who are willing to *do something* rather than those who merely talk . . . and scream . . . and protest . . .

I think it is most appropriate that this festival has been dedicated to our Armed Forces in Vietnam . . . to those men who have served there in the past . . . to those men who are serving now . . . and especially to those men who have paid the supreme sacrifice.

The people of Tennessee join you in paying tribute to those gallant men.

As a matter of record a young Tennessee boy by the name of Tom Davis was the first American serviceman to give his life in Vietnam.

And when I think of this, I must constantly remind myself that one of the things that Tom Davis and thousands of other boys like him died for in Vietnam, was a freedom that included the right to dissent.

But I must also admit that it is totally repelling to me when that dissent erupts into acts of degrading the very flag that waves as a symbol for this freedom.

And I must also admit that when a person burns a flag or burns a draft card or sends aid to the enemy, then I think that person has moved beyond the limits of dissent and is committing acts that border on treason . . . and if it isn't treason, it is at least gross cowardice.

We have another conflict here at home that disturbs our boys in Vietnam just as it disturbs you and me and that is, the crises in our cities across the nation.

We must face these crises in a sound and sensible manner.

We must provide equal and ever increasing educational opportunities . . . job opportunities . . . housing . . . and many other services for all your citizens . . . and I truly mean all of our citizens.

But this must be done within the framework of law and order.

Without law and order there can be no democratic society.

In the final analysis without law and order there can be no free America.

This is the stand we have taken in Tennessee and we have received overwhelming support from Tennesseans of all races and all walks of life.

We are too near the twenty-first century . . . just 33 years away . . . with all its brilliant promise and hope to have it blighted in its beginning by a breakdown in the twentieth century of the moral fiber that has made America great.

I sincerely believe we are at a point in our Nation's history when we must get a strong grip on basic principles . . . the same principles which have always been the cornerstones of our democracy.

We must cast aside the idea, far too prevalent in present day thinking, that we can get something for nothing . . . that society owes us a living . . . that responsibility always rests with the "other fellow" or with Government but never with us.

We must realize that the freedoms and the prosperity that we enjoy are the results of dedicated thinking and years and years of work and toil.

We must realize that our present day freedoms and prosperity did not come quickly and easily . . . but could be quickly and easily diminished or lost entirely.

I don't intend to be pessimistic . . . but I do intend to be *realistic*.

And I think any realistic appraisal of America today dictates the realization that the current massive assaults on our basic principles of government must be challenged . . . and must be dealt with . . . in a frank and honest manner.

Leaders at every level of government must exercise their responsibility . . . and Americans from all walks of life must accept their responsibilities of citizenship.

Development and responsibility go hand-in-hand in a partnership that has been a key to America's past.

This same partnership of development and responsibility holds the key to America's future . . . a future that shines bright with promise and hope if we will but follow those basic principles of government that continue to light the way.

I guess you might say I am doing a little flag waving today.

If this is true, then let it wave.

I couldn't think of a better flag to wave, a better place to wave it, a better time or a better group to be waving it with.

And if being patriotic is square, then let them bring out the chisel to sharpen up the four corners . . . because I am very proud and very thankful that I have the privilege of being an *American*.

Thank you.

LONG ISLAND COMPANY FIGHTS POVERTY

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my feeling that we need original

and increased initiative from the private sector to solve our pressing problems of poverty and joblessness.

Thus, it is that I am proud that Kollsman Instrument Corp., located in my congressional district, has launched an effort to train hard-core unemployed persons for skilled jobs.

Since this effort could well serve as a model for similar projects throughout the country I wish to call it to the attention of the House and place in the RECORD an article describing the program. This article, which follows, appeared in the Long Island Press on Thursday, June 20:

LONG ISLAND FIRM FIGHTS POVERTY—KOLLSMAN TO TRAIN NEGRO YOUTHS

In the first program of its kind, a Long Island instrument company will start training hard-core unemployed Negroes for skilled jobs Monday in Syosset.

The new project was announced jointly yesterday by spokesmen for the Kollsman Instrument Corp. and Long Island Congress of Racial Equality in the offices of Nassau Labor Commissioner Robert W. MacGregor.

"This is the first time that a Long Island company has set up a training program of this type," said Lamar Cox, CORE chairman.

"We feel a responsibility to the Long Island community," said Kollsman president David B. Nichinson, "to find a positive way to help the hard-core unemployed and perhaps point the way for other interested companies."

Yesterday's announcement came after about eight months of talking, planning and negotiating between Kollsman and CORE. The civil rights organization approached the company last year after the handful of Negroes employed by the firm reported to CORE that there was discrimination in the plant.

"I feel that industry has an obligation to hire hard-core unemployed," said Cox, "to break the vicious cycle that black people find themselves in. Kollsman has taken this first step. CORE hopes it is not just a response to our recommendations, but is a realization of a very real need."

Cox said he assumes that discrimination is widespread in Long Island plants and said CORE will press for other training programs.

Nichinson said that 10 to 12 youths enrolled at the outset will be paid $2.03 an hour and upon graduation will start as machinists at Kollsman at $2.35 an hour.

He said the training center at the company's Syosset warehouse was a permanent fixture and that other Negroes would follow the first group.

Cox said CORE is seeking to obtain bus transportation for the workers from another firm in the area which buses employes from Hempstead and Westbury to Syosset.

Since November, CORE and Kollsman have been discussing with each other and MacGregor such subjects as guidelines for fair employment as well as plans for expanded opportunities for members of minority groups, they told newsmen yesterday.

CORE and Kollsman officials have been recruiting youths for the program, which will produce machinists for Kollsman's two plants—one in Syosset and one in Elmhurst. The course will take three to six months, depending upon individual capabilities.

Instruction, combining classroom and shop work, will take eight hours a day on a five-day week. The youths will learn blueprint reading, basic mathematics and the operation of bench, watch and polishing lathes, drill presses and milling machines.

Kollsman deals in complex instrumentation and optical systems, Nichinson pointed out, and therefore needs virtually no unskilled workers for the poverty areas.

CREATIVE CONGRESSMAN PRAISED BY DISTINGUISHED COLUMNIST

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the House yesterday was presented with an achievement of great significance: the results of a mammoth study of Federal assistance programs and legislation which will help us take a major step forward in understanding, controlling, and improving the administration of programs in which we now invest more than $20 billion annually.

This achievement belongs to one of our ablest first-term Members, the distinguished gentleman from Delaware [Mr. ROTH], who has devoted many months of tireless and imaginative effort to this back-breaking task.

It was a source of great pleasure to me and to all our colleagues, I am sure—at least 60 of whom from both political parties joined with Congressman ROTH in sponsoring his "Program Information Act" yesterday—that one of the country's outstanding newspaper columnists, Mr. Roscoe Drummond, devoted his column in this morning's Washington Post to a discussion of the gentleman's work and the critical problems it is designed to help solve.

Whether our individual objective be the greater economy and efficiency of Federal operations or the more effective delivery of help to areas and people who need it most, Congressman ROTH's study and proposal merit our gratitude and wholehearted support.

Unless we make a determined beginning now, as Mr. Drummond notes, "to rescue from itself the sprawling, chaotic, inefficient, overburdened, overcostly maze of Federal assistance programs," then we shall be wasting even more of our limited resources and denying help to those who look to us for justice and the opportunity to live more fruitful and productive lives.

Mr. Drummond's column follows:

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS NEED DECENTRALIZATION BADLY

Federal administration of billions of dollars in aid to millions of Americans is so tangled today nobody knows how bad things are.

The need is urgent to rescue from itself the sprawling, chaotic, inefficient, overburdened, overcostly maze of Federal assistance programs.

Democratic liberals like the late Robert Kennedy, JFK aides Daniel Moynihan and Richard Goodwin, and Republican conservatives like Congressmen Melvin Laird, Gerald Ford and Charles Goodell have for some time been suggesting that the Federal complex has become so big, so cumbersome, so overlapping that it simply can't any longer do its job.

The need is to decentralize not just a little bit, but radically, functions, funds, and authority so that state and local government—near to the people—can begin to do the job on a scale which is manageable.

New facts which reveal how bad the situation is come from a heroic effort of a lone first-term Congressman, William V. Roth Jr. (R-Del.) who set out four months ago to survey the entire Federal establishment to find out just how many programs of Federal assistance there are, what they do, how and where they are administered.

His findings justify virtually everything that has been said about the labyrinth of overgrown national Government. He found:

That nobody knows how many Federal programs there are and that there is no place to go in the whole Federal system to find out.

That Congress simply does not have the information to judge which programs should be kept and which should be stopped.

That the Executive Branch does not have the information to find overlapping and duplication and thereby to unify and streamline the operation.

That at the very least the Federal Government is attempting to administer 1050 assistance programs designed to dispense more than 20 billion dollars a year.

That as many as ten Cabinet-level departments and 15 or more agencies operate programs devoted essentially to the same purpose.

No wonder Democrats and Republicans alike, conservatives and liberals alike, and many who used to think let-Washington-do-it was the answer to every social ill are beginning to see and to say that functions, funds, and initiative needs to be turned back to state and local government.

This is why Moynihan, Assistant Secretary of Labor under President Kennedy and now head of the Harvard-MIT Urban Affairs Center, bluntly asserts that, while the Federal Government has proved itself massively efficient at collecting taxes, it has shown itself massively inefficient at dispensing Federal services.

Rep. Roth's titanic study of Administrative dishevelment ought to stir Congress and the White House to action. His immediate proposal is modest—that the Government be directed to put into a single catalogue a lucid report on all Federal assistance programs and what the citizen needs to know to use them.

It would be a beginning just to get at the facts. But far more needs to be done—and soon. A special congressional presidential Commission, like the Hoover Commission, ought to be put to work at once to study how best to decentralize Federal assistance programs and to report to the new Congress early enough so that action could be forthcoming next year.

There is little doubt that decentralization of the unwieldy Federal sprawl is coming. It ought to be brought about in an orderly well-planned manner. This is why Congress ought to put it in motion now.

H.R. 15414: REVENUE-EXPENDITURE CONTROL ACT

HON. JAMES C. GARDNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, my vote against H.R. 15414, the bill providing for a 10-percent surtax and a $6 billion reduction in Federal expenditures, was based on the conviction that the American taxpayer should not be saddled with the responsibility of improving our current economic crisis, which was brought about by mismanagement and overspending by the Johnson administration. A combination of events has brought us today to a dangerously critical financial position. However, the blame for this rests squarely upon the administration and not the individual taxpayer.

It is clear what has basically thrown our financial picture out of order—the costs of the Vietnam war combined with the failure of the Johnson administration to take significant steps to adjust our economic conditions to meet this demand. For the period from July 1, 1965, to July 1, 1968, we will have spent well over $50 billion on the costs of this war alone. An additional $26 billion is budgeted for fiscal 1969—without meaningful fiscal adjustments to meet this increased burden.

We are presently facing budget deficits of close to $25 billion for both fiscal years 1968 and 1969. After eight successive budget deficits since 1961, the national debt has increased from $289.2 billion in 1960 to $335.4 billion, an increase of $46.2 billion.

Since 1960, budgeted expenditures of the Federal Government have risen 102 percent, while the population of the country grew only 10 percent. Contrary to common belief, most of this increase has occurred in domestic expenditures, not in defense spending.

We are in an extremely difficult balance-of-payments situation which threatens to get worse as increased prices reduce our trade surplus. The U.S. balance-of-payments deficit from 1961 to 1967 totals $16.4 billion.

We are experiencing significant inflation today with prices rising at a rate of some 4 percent a year. The cost of credit is also sky high, with interest rates in some cases reaching the highest in a century.

The strength of the dollar is being questioned all over the world. The diminishing confidence in the dollar has been most obviously expressed in the rapid purchasing of gold in foreign markets by foreigners. Our supply of gold has diminished to just over $10 billion.

It is evident that the policies of the Johnson administration have not adapted to these circumstances and situations and, in fact, are responsible for our current economic crisis.

The administration has been slow to face the fact that we cannot maintain a policy of guns and butter without suffering serious consequences. Our financial house should have been put in order several years ago, at the first signs of crisis. Instead, the Johnson administration insisted on conducting business at home as usual and completely disregarding the tens of billions of dollars that we are spending in Vietnam.

Not only do I believe the surtax places the expense and burden for our economic crisis on the wrong shoulders, but I also feel that it is entirely the incorrect way to attack and solve our problems. The only adequate solution is a reduction in Federal expenditures of at least $10 billion. However, this should be done through setting spending priorities and not through across-the-board cuts in all programs. As I have stated numerous times, sizable cuts could be made in foreign aid, the space program, public works, development of the supersonic transport plane, Government research and development, and highway beautification—all of which would have a selective impact on our economy. These cuts would involve, for the most part, postponement rather than cancellation of these programs. What is most important, they would have a less depressing effect on the economy than the across-the-board tax increase.

The sad fact is that the 10-percent tax increase will, in effect, cause inflation. Many businesses have already said they will have to raise prices to compensate for the additional tax. So again the American taxpayer is asked to pay not only a 10-percent surtax but more for the goods he is buying.

FLAG DAY

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, I had the honor and privilege to speak at the Flag Day celebration at Fort Washington in Cambridge, Mass.

Fort Washington goes back to the earliest period of history in the United States. In November 1775, Gen. George Washington ordered that this fort be built on the bank of the Charles River to protect the city of Cambridge where Revolutionary troops were stationed.

The fort lay abandoned for many years, but has recently been completely restored and returned to its original condition.

For many years Mr. and Mrs. Bernard Rudolph would come out to the fort where there was a makeshift flagpole. Daily they would raise and lower the flag. Neighbors and businesses in the area made a collection for a new flagpole to be erected at the fort. I had the honor of presenting them with the flag which was flown above the U.S. Capitol in their honor.

On Friday, the 14th of June, we dedicated the flagpole at Fort Washington.

Two young students who attend school in the area read essays that they had written on the American flag. Both writings illustrate hearty idealism and enormous patriotism. I would like to submit them now for the benefit of my colleagues and for all citizens.

Marcel Dubois of the Morse School wrote on "What My Flag Means to Me":

WHAT MY FLAG MEANS TO ME

When I look at the flag and think of the pledge that I am making, I feel the thrill of being an American. The flag means more to me than the red, white and blue cloth of which it is made. It is the symbol of the United States of America.

To me, our flag stands as the past, the present and the future of our country, for our way of life, our land and the freedom of all our people. I love our flag and when I look at it, and salute it, I think of how proud I will be when I am old enough to serve under it.

Our flag today has 13 stripes and 50 white stars on a field of blue. The stripes remind me of the 13 original colonies, whose citizens fought for our freedom, that we could have our flag. I am proud to be an American, and to love the flag of my country. When I think of our flag, what has gone into the making of it and preserving it for our people and their freedom, I find it difficult to express how I feel. I can only say that I truly love our flag and I am proud to be an American.

Leslie Whitney of the Blessed Sacrament School presented her essay: "Stars for Hope":

STARS FOR HOPE

If the people of America were asked what they thought of when they looked at the flag, most of them would go off with a starry-eyed impression of patriotism, parades, fire crackers, and a few choruses of "Yankee Doodle". When I look at the flag of the United States, I see, simply enough, the hope of millions of people to find democracy in its full glory. This is the hope which is given to them by the fact that they can believe what they think is right for the world and that they are allowed to set their principles to work.

The hope which is represented by the flag is reinforced by the fact that it is held together, not only by the ideals of one man, but by those of many, many men. These are men who are really trying to help the world. These are the men who go to war to preserve our flags true meaning.

Our flag represents the struggle of a certain society to obtain the perfect environment in order that man may live in the manner which God intended for humanity. Although this goal is not likely to be obtained, a great deal will be accomplished by the American attempt to reach for the stars.

HIDING FROM THE VOTERS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in the various primary elections which have taken place recently, one Republican presidential candidate, who chose not to actively participate, was Gov. Nelson Rockefeller. Golden opportunities were passed up by the Governor to convey to hundreds of thousands of Republicans his positions on various national issues. Now the Rockefeller blitz is on and we are being regaled with a public relations campaign to get his message across to the Nation. National Review, in its July 2 issue, summed up the strategy thus:

The Governor's strategy is to stamp his image so forcibly in the consciousness of the masses that the opinion polls will report, as feedback, a rising grassroots feeling for Rockefeller. Going into the convention hall with Gallup & Harris reporting that he's the only Man Who, Rockefeller may then expect to force the convention to see the light of reason and give him the Presidential nomination.

Although Richard Nixon faced the voters in the various primaries, the New York Times, of June 19, labels the former Vice President as a "negative campaigner." It seems that the Times is distressed because Nixon adheres to a "no confrontation" policy regarding Rockefeller. If he persists in this policy, this will, in the words of the Times editorial, be a "no confrontation with the American people—who will have the final say in November." Suddenly, the Times has remembered the American people, some of whom Rockefeller conveniently forgot during the primaries.

The Times editorial was adequately

answered by D. David Eisenhower II, the son of a President who never hid from the people, in a letter appearing in the Times today, June 26.

To put the issue in proper perspective, I include the Times editorial and Mr. Eisenhower's rebuttal in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times, June 19, 1968]

THE NEGATIVE CAMPAIGNERS

The front-runner for the Republican Presidential nomination, Richard M. Nixon, appears to be standing four-square on silence. Confident that he has a majority of the convention delegates under seal, Mr. Nixon has let it be known that his political strategy is to speak only in generalities and ignore Governor Rockefeller.

But if the former Vice President sticks to this policy of "no confrontation" with his chief rival from June into August's convention, the real meaning will be "no confrontation" with the American people—who will have the final say in November.

A candidate who goes into dead storage nearly two months before the delegates convene is downrating both the interest and intelligence of the electorate. He is relying on the "weighted opinions" of a few thousand polled persons and the stampeding effect that these secret surveys will have upon the professional politicians.

"The politician who sways with the polls is not worth his pay. . . . One of the reasons the Republican party is in trouble today is because we have allowed people to criticize our policies and we have not stood up and answered effectively. . . . I believe in vigorous sharp debate during a political campaign."

We agree unreservedly with these sentiments expressed by Mr. Nixon, in and out of office, in 1958 and 1962. That is precisely why we believe that the silence promised by the Nixon camp is not golden. His national campaign manager, John Mitchell, said the other day that Mr. Nixon would not "engage in an exchange of charge and countercharge with Rockefeller or in any of the other tactics of the old politics of divisiveness."

But keeping quiet before a party's platform and selection is really "old politics," for it assumes that the delegates will act as rubber stamps instead of representing the varying views and sections within the Republican party. Furthermore, it is callous "divisiveness" to ignore the issues that divide the country. Peace in Asia, the crisis of millions of Americans living in poverty and the nature of a Presidential administration itself call for statements and programs.

Up to this point the front-runner on the Democratic side, Vice President Humphrey, has shown little more disposition than Mr. Nixon to risk his theoretical mastery of the convention by setting forth any comprehensive independent program of his own. A good many people have been saying that Mr. Humphrey's long silence on this score—a silence not of words but of fresh ideas—is about to end. It is past time for forthrightness.

Governor Rockefeller and, even more, Senator McCarthy have been speaking out in writing and on the stump. They are visible and so are their ideas. Mr. Nixon and the Vice President must also recognize that issues and opponents cannot be swept under a national campaign rug. With primaries finished, outspokenness is the only means the electorate has of knowing what the candidates stand for.

"The general interest of a party frequently demands that members belonging to it should not speak on great questions which they understand imperfectly," de Tocqueville said of politicians in America over a century ago. "To keep silence is the most useful service that an indifferent spokesman can render."

Today's great questions before the conventions of 1968 demand the service of great spokesmen—now.

[From the New York Times, June 26, 1968]

MR. NIXON'S CAMPAIGN STATEMENTS

To the EDITOR.

I feel that in your June 19 editorial "The Negative Campaigners" you are guilty of either grave oversight or willful neglect in regard to Richard Nixon. The entire thrust of the editorial is that a Presidential candidate is obligated to present his views to the voting public. I agree. Likewise, the editorial infers that Mr. Nixon is failing to live up to his obligation, as candidate, by following the policy of "nonconfrontation," in view of Governor Rockefeller's belated and desperate effort to secure the Republican nomination.

Your contention is false. With the possible exception of Senator McCarthy, no candidate has gone to greater pains to present himself as an alternate to voters than has Richard Nixon. Beginning late last January, Mr. Nixon has stumped up and down every primary state, made numerous policy statements via nationwide broadcasts, and has circulated position papers on at least a dozen issues of import. Mr. Nixon's policy statements have not escaped your attention in the least, as I can cite numerous editorials written in this paper addressed to them.

On the other hand, Governor Rockefeller has carefully avoided the heat of the primary races, to diminish the possibility that his vulnerabilities be exposed. His absence from primary competition was conspicuous, and people can rightly assume there must have been good reasons for it.

It is ironic that both your editorial and James Reston's column of the same day implied that Mr. Nixon has resorted to the tactic of locking up delegate strength in a behind-the-scenes manner. The irony consists of the fact that the only conceivable method by which Governor Rockefeller can obtain the nomination is by performing a backstage miracle. By withholding his candidacy from the people of the primary states, Governor Rockefeller has left himself no alternative but to appeal directly to delegates, which excludes the voice of the people.

STATE'S MESSAGE

The voice of the people, incidentally, has come through loud and clear over the past few months. I recall Governor Chafee's remarks last March over an A.B.C. broadcast in which he firmly stated "I don't see how anyone could emerge from Oregon a loser, and hope to win the nomination." He spoke with William Lawrence with regard to a special tactical session held that day at the Rockefeller home.

Though Chafee would perhaps prefer to forget those words forever. I have not forgotten. The Oregon message was clear, as were the New Hampshire, the Wisconsin, the Nebraska, the Indiana, the South Dakota, the Pennsylvania and the New Jersey messages. Republican voters have chosen Mr. Nixon. In the event the convention does not, I feel Republicans, the primary election process and the people will have been cheated.

D. DAVID EISENHOWER II.

NEW YORK, *June 14, 1968.*

GEORGE A. LAMONDE, PHILADELPHIA PUBLISHER, CITED FOR SERVICE

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I need hardly tell my colleagues of the vitally important role played by community newspapers. Their contributions to a better life for the citizens of our Nation are well known but all too often not paid the recognition they deserve.

It is a distinct pleasure, therefore, for me to note that George A. Lamonde, general manager of the Times Newspapers in Philadelphia, was presented the "Man of the Year" award by the Half-Century Square Club for his outstanding service to the Northeast Community on May 26, 1968. I add to the many which Mr. Lamonde has already received, my personal congratulations for this recognition of his outstanding service.

LONG ISLAND DIOCESE ENDORSES KERNER COMMISSION REPORT

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, as one who has endorsed the recommendations of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders, I, of course, welcome public support for the Commission's report.

The Long Island diocese at its annual convention last week urged that implementation of the Commission's recommendations be undertaken at all levels of government. I welcome this resolution of the Long Island diocese and commend the diocese for exercising sound social judgment and demonstrating responsible concern.

Because this resolution so well sets forth the need for immediate action to help all Americans I wish to include it in the RECORD at this point:

RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON CIVIL DISORDERS

Whereas, The President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders stated in its report that "only a commitment to national action on an unprecedented scale can shape a future compatible with the historic ideals of American society," which future will alleviate the conditions of poverty, deprivation and disadvantage among large segments of our people; and

Whereas, The Commission has made recommendations to carry out this commitment, including the following:

(a) creation of two million new jobs over the next three years—550,000 within the first year, half in the public and half in the private sector;

(b) on-the-job training by both public and private employers "with reimbursement to private employers for the extra costs of training the hard-core employed";

(c) sharply increased efforts to eliminate the de facto segregation in our schools through substantial Federal aid;

(d) efforts to improve schools serving disadvantaged children through substantial Federal funding for year-round compensatory education programs;

(e) establishment of uniform national standards "at least as high as the annual poverty level" (now $3,335.00 for an urban family of four), with the government assuming "at least 90% of total payments";

(f) a national system of income supplements, in order to provide a minimum standard of decent living;

(g) steps to give low and moderate income families "within the next five years, six mil-

lion new and existing units of decent housing, beginning with 600,000 units in the next year"; and

Whereas, Federal, State and local revenue systems must be brought up to date in order to provide the resources to pay for these massive and vital needs; now, therefore,

Be it resolved, That this One Hundred and First Convention of The Diocese of Long Island, meeting in Garden City on the twenty-first day of May, nineteen hundred and sixty-eight, urges that:

(1) Federal, State and Local governments push ahead with existing programs and start new programs and implement the recommendations The President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, in the fields of jobs, education, health, welfare, housing and community response to the needs, and that such governmental actions be considered urgent;

(2) Concurrent with such actions, a complete review and coordinated reform of Federal, State and Local taxing systems should be undertaken in order to eliminate loopholes and inequities and otherwise create the modern machinery to pay for the nation's growing needs; and

Be it further resolved, That the Commission on Political and Social Issues of The Diocese of Long Island, urges every member of this Convention, Clergy and Lay people, to involve themselves in the promotion of action to bring all people within our Diocese, Church and non-Church, to a realization of the urgent need for personal involvement in the effort to overcome the deplorable conditions set forth in The President's report, and such involvement presupposes the utilization of the existing structure within and without the Diocesan community, and the creation of new structures, many of which will be ecumenical in nature, to implement the action of The President's report; and

Be it further resolved, That The Diocesan Council of The Diocese of Long Island follow up this Resolution of the Convention by keeping itself informed through its appropriate Departments or Committees, on the status of specific measures and programs to carry out the recommendations of The President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, and by endorsing such measures and programs and requesting the governmental officials or bodies concerned, to approve and act upon such measures; and

Be it further resolved, That copies of this Resolution be sent to The President of the United States, The Governor of the State of New York, The Mayor of New York City, the County Executives and Chairmen of the Board of Supervisors of Nassau and Suffolk Counties, and to Members of Congress and of the New York State Legislature from districts within The Diocese of Long Island.

A THANK YOU TO THE CONGRESS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Lintner, of Chilton, Wis., has been awarded an educational opportunity grant. Tom has asked me to pass on his thanks to the Members of this great body and for the information of my colleagues I include as part of my remarks his letter to me. I am proud of Tom Lintner's record of achievement and know he will use wisely this grant in his pursuit of knowledge.

CHILTON, WIS.

Congressman WILLIAM STEIGER,
Wisconsin Sixth Congressional District, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEIGER: I wish to thank the Federal Government for awarding me an Educational Opportunity Grant. This grant will allow me to go to the University of Wisconsin, Madison, this fall.

I hope you will convey my feeling of gratitude to your colleagues in the House and that the government will continue the policy of granting money to students in quest of higher education.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

THOMAS LINTNER.

JOHN SCOTT'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY AS A NEWSCASTER

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, John Scott, the outstanding newscaster in the New York metropolitan area, tomorrow celebrates his 25th anniversary with WOR radio and WOR-TV.

As a relatively young man, Mr. Scott started in broadcasting with WOR in my district and soon developed the top-rated news and talk program, which is the "talk" of New York in more ways than one.

A recent issue of the Browning School newspaper, the Grytte, in my district, has a concise biography of John Scott in connection with his speech at their 79th senior class commencement, which gives some of his background.

One aspect which ought to be emphasized is the large amount of community work in which he takes part, not the least being his appearance at the Browning School.

I am pleased to have the opportunity of joining many people in broadcasting and the listening public, of which I am one, acknowledging this important anniversary and a great record of public service.

The article from the Browning School newspaper follows:

SEVENTY-NINTH SENIOR CLASS TO GRADUATE TODAY; MR. JOHN SCOTT SPEAKER

John Scott, journalist, lecturer, and author, has for 25 years been a news caster for WOR Radio and WOR-TV. Scott, a native of Trenton, New Jersey, is a graduate in Journalism of Kent State University. For a time he was Professor of Reportage and Speech at the famous "School of Radio and Television Technique", Radio City, New York.

For many years, Scott followed his career wherever the news led him. He has covered the New York City beat from police stations and the morgue, to civil rights demonstrations, peace marches, graveyard and garbage strikes, to air crashes and ship sinkings. Scott has narrated, produced and directed network television and radio documentaries on crime, medicine, space, politics, and international affairs. Still active with his on-the-spot reports, Scott's lucid comments explained the complicated student demonstrations and police actions at the campus of Columbia University.

His work has even taken him overseas. Scott has reported on Berlin—the Divided City, international conferences at Geneva and Lausanne. His international datelines range from Paris and Rome to Rejkavik and Mexico City.

John Scott is the anchor-man of WOR's top-rated afternoon all-talk news program, "Radio New York," which is heard from 4:15 to 6 P.M., Monday thru Friday. He is also heard daily on the 2 P.M. "News of the World." Fascinated by politics, Scott moderates Channel 9's "New Jersey Report" program, seen each Sunday morning at 9:30.

He is the holder of the coveted "All America Award" for Journalism in the year 1960 and is the author of the best-selling anthology of poetry, "Treasured Volume."

Scott is highly regarded in philatelic circles and his nature studies have won him recognition in the photographic world. A member of the Overseas Press Club of New York, he is also a member of the Board of Trustees of Brotherhood-in-Action.

John Scott is active in religious and civic affairs in New York and lives as he works, in the heart of Manhattan. He is married to the former Edythe Gersten of New York and Simsbury, Connecticut and has two children: 18 year old Lawrence and 12 year old Amelia. He has one brother, who is Deputy Attorney-General of the State of New Jersey.

CHRYSLER AIDS GHETTO JOBLESS

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, the Chrysler Corp., of Detroit, Mich., has undertaken a program of training hard-core unemployed. It has discovered that training these people is more difficult than anticipated, but there have been successes.

In a recent talk in Detroit, Chrysler president, Virgil E. Boyd, said:

> We found that many of these people had no social security number and had never been counted in a census, had never registered to vote or belonged to an organization of any kind. In most of the accepted senses, they really didn't even exist.

He added:

> Yet, the first group was ready for work after eight weeks of training and, out of 44 placed on jobs, only one quit.

The corporation trained as "hard core" not those who were without steady jobs but those who were unemployable, that is, not equipped for any job.

The program has had some hits as well as errors. Results are difficult to achieve but the thing that is commendable and essential is that the effort is being made.

An interesting article on one small success appeared in the Sunday, June 16 issue of the Washington Post. Under leave to extend my remarks, the article follows:

CHRYSLER AIDS GHETTO JOBLESS

(By Robert C. Maynard)

DETROIT, June 15.—On the streets where they rioted here last summer, Alan Jackson is called a "tough dude." At the age of 37, he had spent nine years behind bars, mostly for armed robbery. One entire year was in isolation cells.

And Alan Jackson was not much for book learning. Raised in northwest Michigan's poverty-stricken Baldwin area, Jackson's reading and mathematics levels never reached second grade.

All indications were that Alan Jackson,

which is not his real name, was born a loser, would remain a loser and die a loser. It looked that way last summer and this winter.

COMPANIES OFFER JOBS

After the convulsive rioting here last July, the big auto companies went into the inner city and opened employment offices, offering a job to anyone who walked in and asked. Many came and some were employed.

But it soon became obvious to firms like Ford, General Motors and Chrysler that there was a man they could not reach, a man with too little intelligence to sign his name, to find his way to the factory gate, and even to know that it was time to go to work.

Chrysler President Virgil E. Boyd, in a talk here to a group of executives, put it this way:

". . . We found that many of them had no Social Security number or had never been counted in a census, or registered to vote or belonged to any organization of any kind. In most of the accepted senses, they really didn't even exist."

PROGRAM IS BEGUN

Chrysler, with $1.7 million from the Department of Labor, embarked on a program three months ago "to find out what was really wrong," as Boyd put it, with the so-called hard-core unemployed. They began with a group of 125.

What the company found, Boyd said, was that:

"These people had been pushed into the backwaters of our society and can't read simple words such as 'in' and 'out' signs on a door."

Once Chrysler became involved, Boyd said, "Our people began to re-examine the facts and they became as much learners as teachers."

Chuck Spieser, the former heavyweight boxer and a graduate of Michigan State University who is employed as a counselor in the Chrysler program, is one of those who became a learner and a teacher. He counseled Alan Jackson.

"It took a hell of a lot of time to break through," Spieser said. But he began to learn of some of the abuse with which Jackson had lived all of his life. Spieser pitched in to fight off the oppressive terms of a salary judgment against Jackson and in other ways began helping Jackson to make his way through the maze of the Chrysler plant.

Today, Alan Jackson earns $3.25 an hour in the Dodge Truck Division of Chrysler. He has responsibility for a small materials handling area and he is the pride of his bosses.

There are other stories here that parallel those of Alan Jackson, stories that are beginning to suggest to Chrysler and to other industries that the so-called hard core are not only trainable, but make able employes.

A point was reached, says Boyd, where "some of our established competent people began to revise those things they knew to be true. They changed their thinking because once those hard-core people knew how and why to come to work, their attendance and tardiness record was 500 per cent better than the average of all our our employees." In all, 750 persons will go through special training programs at Chrysler this year and the firm is about to embark on a new program that will bring in a pool of 2000 more.

ESTIMATE OF JOBLESS

Detroit Mayor Jerome P. Cavanagh, who estimated last July's level of unemployment among inner-city youths at 30 per cent, said he believes that programs such as the Chrysler one have reduced unemployment, but he said he had no figures.

Wayne E. Grimm, the director of Chrysler Institute, has moved 50 people from the starting group of 125 into jobs at Chrysler's in a little more than three months. So far, he has lost 14 people. Seven washed out for being unresponsive to training or discipline. Seven left Chrysler's training program and found other jobs.

The other big auto firms here are also moving into the hard-core program, under the National Alliance of Businessmen initiated by Henry Ford II.

There are indications in Detroit that big business in general is getting a message from the experience of the Chrysler program.

LOT OF HAND HOLDING

One executive of a competing auto firm, chatting off the record, said the Chrysler program demands "a lot of hand holding" of the poor.

He looked down into his drink for a long minute and then added, "But, maybe considering what we did in the past it's about time to hold hands."

The way in which Chrysler's program has "held hands" has included such basic classroom work with computers and a class ratio of 12 students to one teacher; counseling on everything from legal problems to where to find eye glasses and dentures and—most of all—what Boyd called a "commitment" on the part of Chrysler to make the program work.

Chrysler people are candid in admitting that all of the activity, all of this change of attitude at the management level, is a consequence of last July's costly and bloody Negro uprising. "If we can help it," one executive said, "the past is not going to prologue in Detroit."

HAMPTON COUNTY DEDICATES WATERMELON FESTIVAL TO U.S. FORCES IN VIETNAM

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday, June 22, the annual watermelon festival in Hampton, S.C., was dedicated to our forces in Vietnam. Mr. Speaker, this was an inspiring event. Gov. Buford Ellington of Tennessee delivered the main address. The largest crowd ever to attend the watermelon festival was present. The Jaycees of Hampton County, the sponsor of this event, by resolution dedicated this festival to our military forces in Southeast Asia.

As chairman of the Armed Services Committee, I was presented the resolution attesting to this dedication. I promised the assembled throng that I would not only call it to the attention of the Congress of the United States, but to the world, and assured them that it would be called to the attention of the highest echelons of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and also sending a copy to the commanding general of our forces in Vietnam, Gen. Creighton Abrams.

RESOLUTION, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, COUNTY OF HAMPTON

Whereas, The United States Armed Forces in Vietnam at the present time total over 500,000 persons; and are presently engaged in open conflict to arrest communist aggression and to promote and protect the rights of free people; and

Whereas, There are located in Vietnam numerous South Carolinians and Hampton Countians fighting on behalf of the United States and the Free World; and

Whereas, Thousands of Americans, hundreds of South Carolinians, and many citizens of Hampton County have died or were seriously wounded in Vietnam; and

Whereas, It is the wish and desire of the Hampton-Varnville Jaycees to express concern, support, and pay tribute to our fallen heroes and those who are still engaged in conflict in Vietnam,

Be it resolved, That the Hampton-Varnville Jaycees, as one means of expressing our admiration and gratitude to those who still fight, and to consecrate the memory of those who have given their lives and limbs on behalf of their country in Vietnam, do dedicate to the United States Armed Forces in Vietnam the 26th Annual Watermelon Festival, to be held June 22, 1968, at Hampton, South Carolina.

HOMER THORNBERRY, A DISTINGUISHED MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the President has made an outstanding appointment in naming Judge Homer Thornberry to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court. I had the pleasure of serving with Judge Thornberry in the House of Representatives and know him to be a man of high integrity and exceptional ability.

His background as a lawyer, Congressman, and Federal judge all combine to make him an excellent choice for this position. Am hopeful that the Senate will confirm his appointment without undue delay.

Judge Thornberry is a lifelong Texan who was born in Austin, January 9, 1909. After attending public schools and the University of Texas, he was graduated from the University of Texas School of Law at the age of 27. Later that year he was admitted to the Texas State bar and commenced the private practice of law with his office in Austin.

His very first venture into politics came when he successfully ran for the Texas House of Representatives in the year following his graduation from law school. He served in this capacity for the next 4 years. He was district attorney of the 53d Judiciary Circuit of Texas from 1941 to his resignation in 1942, to enlist in the U.S. Navy.

While serving with the Navy, on February 24, 1945, he married the lovely Eloise Engle. The following year he was discharged from the Navy as a lieutenant commander. He then returned to his home city of Austin where he was elected to the city council. In that office he served as mayor pro tem in 1947 and 1948.

In 1948, he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. He was sworn in as a Member of the 81st Congress on January 3, 1949. Judge Thornberry was subsequently elected to the six succeeding Congresses. During his time in the House of Representatives, he served most ably as a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and later of the Rules Committee. As a Member of Congress, he established a reputation of

dedication and outstanding service and enjoyed the highest respect of all his colleagues.

He was appointed by President John F. Kennedy as a U.S. district judge for the western district of Texas in 1963. President Lyndon Johnson, in 1965, chose him to serve as associate judge of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. He is a distinguished member of the Federal judiciary and has taken part in several landmark decisions during his tenure of office.

While a Member of Congress, he also served as director of the Gallaudet College in Washington, D.C., a national institution for the deaf. This renowned institution of higher learning presented him with an honorary degree of doctor of law. This was given in recognition of his and his family's years of service in the field of education for handicapped individuals.

Judge and Mrs. Thornberry presently reside in Austin and have three children, Molly, David, and Kate.

REDWOODS, OR WHEN IS A PARK NOT A PARK

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the mini may be in for skirt styles, but it certainly is not in for national park styles. And, rightfully, we may expect a large public outcry if the "mini" Redwood Park recommended by the House Interior Subcommittee is approved by the House of Representatives.

The people of this Nation, who ultimately are the protectors of our natural resources, have demanded the protection of virgin timber in a Redwood National Park worthy of its name.

They will not be fooled by the proposal of the House Interior Subcommittee, because calling that proposal a Redwood National Park is like calling a tricycle a motorcycle. It just does not meet the qualifications.

The House Interior Subcommittee recommended a park of only 25,300 acres. The Senate passed a bill last fall authorizing a park of 64,000 acres.

Even this does not tell the full story. Of the 25,300 acres in the House proposal, approximately 18,000 acres are currently in State parks, which must be donated by the State to complete the national park. Thus, only 7,000 additional acres would be protected.

Furthermore, it will be difficult to persuade the State to contribute its fine State parks to such a pathetic Federal effort. That would leave us with only a 7,000-acre national park.

The Senate bill, by way of comparison, authorized the acquisition of 33,000 additional acres, or over four times that recommended by the House subcommittee.

I hope the full Interior Committee will critically review this proposal and restore the Redwood National Park to at least the size authorized by the Senate. Lost Man Creek, Little Lost Man Creek, and Skunk Cabbage Creek drainages, included by the Senate but excluded by the House subcommittee rightfully belong in our Nation's heritage, not to the chain saw.

Already, two leading newspapers have urged the creation of a Redwood National Park larger than that recommended by the Interior Subcommittee. I wish to insert these in the RECORD at this time, and I hope that we will heed the recommendations made in them.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, June 25, 1968]

REDWOODS DECISION

The acquisition of a great national park in California's coastal redwoods may depend upon the voting in a House Interior subcommittee today. Meeting behind closed doors, the subcommittee is trying to agree on a bill that will be sent to the floor, it is hoped for action at this session. If it should approve an inadequate bill, or if its bill should vary too much from the measure passed by the Senate last November, the chance of completing legislative action before adjournment would be jeopardized.

Some rather alarming reports have come out of the subcommittee suggesting that the Senate bill is being stripped to disappointing proportions. This would be a critical error. The magnificent coastal redwoods provide some of the grandest scenery in the United States. The national park designed to save the finest of these trees should rank near the top in our outdoor recreational units. Nothing short of the Senate bill would satisfy the widespread demand for a major conservation effort in the redwoods.

The Senate bill itself was a rather painful compromise. It trimmed out about 17,000 acres of land from the park originally proposed by the Administration in the Mill Creek watershed, but it substantially enlarged the park area to be taken on the slope rising from Redwood and Lost Man Creeks. The combined segments, which would include the tallest known trees and three state parks, would be joined by an attractive strip along the Pacific Coast.

To minimize the impact of this measure on the timber industry, the Senate also voted to trade 14,567 acres of Forest Service land for park quality redwoods. This newspaper is loath to see any Federal forest land pass into private hands, but if this is necessary to secure a first-class Redwood National Park the price is not too high. The frightening thing about reports emerging from the House subcommittee is that they seem to indicate a disposition to abandon this proposed exchange and to trim the size of the proposed park accordingly.

Under the best of circumstances it would be difficult to maintain a small enclave of great trees in the large Redwood Creek area if the remainder of the watershed were stripped of its forest cover. If this segment of the park should be reduced to a mere token, moreover, the basis of the Senate compromise would be destroyed. The row among conservationists over the location of the park would break out again, and the whole project might be lost.

The House subcommittee may have reasons for not following the boundaries precisely as they were approved by the Senate. But it cannot retreat from the concept of a redwood park of truly national scope without grave risk of short-changing future generations.

[From the New York Times, June 26, 1968]

TRUNCATED REDWOODS

This year Congress has an opportunity to establish a minimum-sized Redwoods National Park in California or a mini-minimum park. The second course would be a national tragedy.

Last year the Senate passed a bill to create a 64,000-acre park in Humboldt and Del Norte Counties. It afforded protection to the magnificent redwoods in Mill Creek and Redwood Creek. Although it involved a compromise with the timber companies, the result was a park that would have provided at least a respectable measure of safety for a national treasure.

However, instead of insuring that even this small area would be protected, the Parks and Recreation subcommittee of the House Interior Committee has now chopped down the size of the proposed park to less than half of what the Senate approved. Its bill would authorize a park of only 25,300 acres. And even that is not a valid figure because 18,000 acres represents lands taken from two existing state parks. As against the Senate bill's acquisition of 33,000 acres of private land, the House subcommittee would provide for taking in just 7,300 private acres.

The Sierra Club has rightly branded this truncated park plan "shocking in its disregard for park values" and has warned that it "protects even less acreage than the lumber companies have offered to sell." There is no reason why the state should donate its two parks to complement such a sub-minimal Federal effort. The plain duty of the full House Interior Committee is to undo the damage by reporting out a Redwoods National Park as big, or bigger, than the Senate bill insures. Anything less is sabotage of the entire project, a craven capitulation to the lumber interests.

COMMUNITY LEADER SPEAKS ON URBAN CRISIS

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues and the American people the fine address, "The Urban Crisis—A Challenge to the Establishment," delivered at the 10th anniversary luncheon of the Health and Welfare Association of Allegheny County on June 7, 1968, in Pittsburgh, Pa., by Mr. Joseph G. Smith.

Mr. Smith is vice president for international purchases and traffic of the Pittsburgh Steel Co. He has long been active in community affairs, as well as many business organizations.

At present he serves as chairman of the board of directors of the Health and Welfare Association of Allegheny County and as chairman of the board of trustees of Mount Mercy College in Pittsburgh. He is a member of the board of directors of the Allegheny Conference on Community Development and also a member of the board of the Pittsburgh Hospital.

We in Allegheny County are certainly proud of his continued and active interest in social and civic affairs, and I am glad to insert his address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time:

THE URBAN CRISIS—A CHALLENGE TO THE ESTABLISHMENT

(By Joseph G. Smith, vice president, international purchases and traffic, Pittsburgh Steel Co., and chairman, board of directors, Health and Welfare Association of Allegheny County, at the 10th anniversary luncheon of the Health and Welfare Association, June 7, 1968)

There is a general malaise among peoples everywhere today. A crisis has erupted in widely divergent social systems. It's present

here and in the Soviet Union. It's in Britain and Poland, Czechoslovakia and Spain, Italy and Germany. It's in full bloom in France. It's in free and wealthy countries of the West and totalitarian and poor countries of the East.

Truly we are in the midst of an urban crisis, perhaps the most divisive internal problem that we have faced since the Civil War. It is a crisis which is being played out on the streets of our cities, and in many communities throughout the country. The consensus is that it will become worse before it gets better.

There are two facts which help pin-point the crisis as primarily urban. "The new medium of communication—television—is carrying the excesses of life, the violence and the disasters right into our living rooms. Visual presentation of events lives on motion and emotion much more than a written report which conveys both horror and reason. Vision highlights action—the printed word induces reflection. To catch the eye is something else than to catch the mind."

Secondly, life in a big city contributes to this malaise. Our cities are over-crowded—people live closer together than in times past, but in reality farther apart. The daily diet of tranquilizers testifies to strained nerves caused by noise, poor air, dense traffic, long commuting, and monotony of production. Even the campus is overcrowded and the relation between teacher and student has become anonymous.

These are general symptoms of the problems of the day. But when we reflect that the crisis is more deeply rooted in human welfare problems—poverty and economic insecurity, inadequate education and training, unemployment and underemployment, poor housing, poor health and discrimination against minorities—then you begin to get a feel of the reason for the rebellion in our cities. These problems all relate to one another and have more than casual relationships to his great crisis of our time. The impersonal character of the city adds to the crisis. For many people the Vietnam War is thousands of miles away; the riots and disorders are on the other side of the town. We know that both exist, but don't feel them.

"A demoralized people", Walter Lippmann wrote in 1932 at the height of the economic depression, "is one in which the individual has become isolated. He trusts in nobody and nothing, not even himself. He believes nothing, except the worst of everybody and everything. He sees only confusion in himself and conspiracies in other men. That is panic. That is disintegration. That is what comes when in some sudden emergency of their lives men find themselves unsupported by clear convictions that transcend their immediate and personal desires." Of the greatest importance today is the feeling that the political system for dealing with these problems has broken down. Some people are now asking themselves whether our system of government can or will survive. Their comments stem from a sense of forlornness in the face of overwhelming power of the established modes and institutions of society—in the mass society of the cities particularly. No one who really is honestly objective in an analysis of the situation dare deny the fact of an urban crisis.

For a moment now let's ask ourselves a question or two about the establishment and the challenge it faces. What is the establishment? In the general sense it can be society—that enduring moral union of two or more persons for a common good attainable through cooperative activity. Society may take many forms—the family is a society. The State is a society formed by man's consent because man has the natural qualities which fit him to live in bonds of union with other men and which morally necessitate him to cooperate with others for the attainment of some common good. Civil society has two essential purposes: the security of its members in the possession of their personal and family rights and liberties, and the affording in justice of opportunities socially necessary for the temporal prosperity of its members. Civil society must operate within the framework of certain minimal rules and regulations. Civil society must always have before it the goal of justice. The major burden of such a society must always be the preservation of an exact balance between power and liberty; an excess of power means tyranny and an excess of liberty means anarchy. To secure such conditions which make for man's best development we have government which in a broad sense can be called an "establishment." Without it society cannot operate.

These facts, however, are in jeopardy today. The rebels of society strongly motivated by nihilist and anarchistic tendencies, by ideas of absolute freedom, would seek his end by the destruction of the existing order. His constant cry is that the authority must be overthrown.

Ultimately the rebels must understand that what they seek to achieve cannot be gained by those methods and we at the same time cannot ignore the fact of the rebels and the reasons which motivate them. If their bizarre trappings are stripped off and their basic yearning is expressed in simple words it is the desire for more justice, more individual liberty and less central authority. This is the age-old cry of man in his struggle to achieve his own place in the sun; his own degree of freedom in the framework of orderly society. The big question of the day is whether these wishes can be filled in a modern industrial society that is loaded with heavy burdens of social and national security. Can diffusion of authority and freedom from obligations go along with the discipline and contribution required by mass society? When you add the very real question for many—is there really freedom of opportunity?—you have the dilemma which constitutes the challenge to the establishment if by that term we speak of the ruling organization in civil society chosen and preserved by its members.

Civil society does face a challenge. What are we to do about it? Part of the answer lies in remembering the philosophy which made this country and has sustained it. We ought to focus not only on the individual good nor on the collective good, but on a third good which we here in this country know as the *common* good. It's wider than that of the individual; warmer than that of the collectivity; it has richly personal elements but at the same time it's public in nature; it's more humane than the good of the State and more generous than the good of the mere individual. It's both personal and public, yet not merely individual or political. It is imperative that society in general relearn this philosophical principle and again apply its precepts to the solution of today's problems.

There is another "Establishment" which is challenged today. It's something much more local to a specific situation or problem. It's the people who execute things in a given locality such as Pittsburgh or Allegheny County. It's easier to define it by stating what it is not. It's not a monolithic structure controlled by a handful of people, nor is it some ill-defined "power structure" that is supposed to exist but actually doesn't. I believe that to talk of this kind of an "Establishment" is an intellectual temptation—as if there were a system—a single coherent, rigidly structured, deliberately contrived and rigorously directed system. This talk is a form of intellectual laziness which makes for infinite talk, but since it underestimates the complexities of the problem and the incoherence of the so-called system, cannot result in effective action.

We—you and I—all of us are the system—the establishment. It's people just as surely as society in general is people. It's all the people in a community, but at the same time it's specific people. It's those people who think in terms of the common good. It's the heritage of the past and the hope of the future. Like the common good itself, it's common to many and is therefore public; it's perfective of the individual and therefore personal. It's the individual who moves out of himself to share things with the general community and it's the general community itself putting it's resources at the service of the things closest to the personality of the individual. Even more specifically it is those persons in decision-making positions in the community; in business; industry; government; education; social services and in health and welfare. If there really is an "establishment" it is all the citizens of this society working toegther for the common good.

This "Establishment" faces the Urban crisis and its challenge because it is urban itself. Put another way the "Establishment" is labor *plus* management; tradesman *plus* intellectuals; government *plus* the citizen; black *plus* white rather than the opposition of each of these groups to each other. The "Establishment" then is the distillation at any given moment of man's judgments of the institutions he wants and the philosophy behind them and the structure and the rules by and through which they operate. The establishment gives to our society here today and for the future the stability which it needs to operate. Essentially the establishment is you and me individually but at the same time collectively exercising our own peculiar talent and personality on the needs of the community in the interest of the *common good.*

The establishment that will be the most viable is the one which can provide adaptability with stability. Can we avoid or oversimplify the violence in the streets or in the hearts of men? Can we ignore any longer the challenge to conscience which exists? Can we put off that confrontation with social and moral evil that calls for systematic and persevering action programs? From our own selfish point of view we can't. It's a history tested principle that those who obstruct peaceful revolution provoke violent revolution.

More particularly at this Tenth Anniversary Meeting of the Health and Welfare Association of Allegheny County, we concern ourselves with one aspect of the establishment, namely, its health and social welfare system. This is a large and complex system. In Allegheny County the annual expenditures amount to approximately $275,000,000 and nationally it is a multi-billion dollar enterprise. Despite these efforts, our country—our community—is troubled by massive and all but overwhelming social problems: Poverty, economic insecurity, poor housing, poor health, inadequate education and training, unemployment and underemployment, racial discrimination.

So, questions are raised about the role, relevancy, the effectiveness of the established institutions.

Why, has slum housing continued as a major problem in spite of housing codes, public housing and urban renewal programs?

Why, does public assistance appear to perpetuate and institutionalize poverty rather than relieve it?

Why are youth-serving agencies not meeting the needs of many of our young people?

Are we listening to the new voices being raised to the new demands being made? Are we aware that there are sharp differences of opinion on the effectiveness and validity of various types of welfare services?

This criticism and restiveness of the established institutions comes not only from the consumer but from friends and research scholars as well.

The National Assembly for Social Policy and Development observed that "Clearly our social inventiveness has failed to come to grips with the root causes of our problems."

The challenge then for the established health and social welfare institutions is how to stay relevant to changing needs, how to improve their impact and effectiveness, how to speed the pace of change.

What can the health and social welfare establishment do about it? I submit these few guidelines for charting a future course:

Increase the awareness—understanding—commitment toward welfare problems and goals.

Is the core of our urban crisis the attitude and behavior of all of us in relation to other human beings?

After all aren't attitudes and behavior based upon a true awareness and understanding of human welfare problems.

For some reason, past studies and reports, past publicity, past warning signals about human welfare needs and problems did not get through, did not have a sufficient impact. For example, previous riot reports alerted us to the problems. Studies by our own Health and Welfare Association have indicated our deficiencies.

William Graham, President of Baxter Laboratories, Inc., and President of the Chicago Community Fund, said: "Many business men were surprised and shocked to learn that despite the fact millions of dollars were spent annually, our communities still had such massive social problems."

William Day, President of Michigan Bell Telephone, after visiting the riot areas of Detroit, said, "Absolutely terrifying—no wonder people riot."

This is the opinion of an astute businessman who has been a civic leader for years and yet expresses surprise at the condition of urban life that has existed for years.

Therefore, the first business at hand is to become truly *aware* of the problem:

Aware of the discrimination and racism that exists.

Aware of the poverty and hostility that exists in the ghetto communities.

Aware of the inadequacy of income, housing, education, social services, unemployment and underemployment.

Aware of the indignities that every black man and especially the poor suffer in our community.

By awareness let me make it clear that I mean understanding—real understanding—not the knowledge we have slammed home by the fact of a riot.

Every individual in the community must listen not only to voices, but man's heart. Listening to a man's heart means understand much that is not contained in words. Listening to a man's heart means that we sense what he cannot voice—to be open to his ideas, his dreams and his aspirations.

With such an awareness and understanding, a commitment of resources—its leadership, energies and money—should follow, along with a deeper commitment by individuals who are concerned.

INVOLVE THE CONSUMER

Health and social welfare agencies have always placed emphasis on citizens participation and involvement. The story of welfare work has been the story of a group of citizens who saw some need that should be met or some injustice that should be corrected. They organized to do something about it. And it grew, developed, and exerted influence in proportion to the strength and vitality of its citizen leaders and participants.

This is still true. But today there is emphasis on a new dimension in citizen participation, namely, the involvement of the consumer in planning, policy-making and the administration of programs involving or affecting them.

This dimension needs attention and development. We need new styles for working with and involving consumers and neighborhood groups. We should develop greater trust in each other than currently exists; we must develop programs and services more relevant to the needs of people. These new styles must move away from social agency paternalism; must respond to the needs of the consumer rather than encouraging the consumer to respond to the agencies' programs.

INCREASE CONCERN FOR SOCIAL VALUES AND COMMUNITY SOCIAL POLICY

There must be more concern with the social values which ultimately determine the size and nature of our health and welfare programs.

The established institutions must not just be agencies through which therapy is provided. They should be the social conscience of the community. They should be concerned with our programs of public welfare. Juvenile Courts, County Child Welfare, Mental Health and Mental Retardation, Public Health, Discrimination, Housing, Public Recreation.

The agencies are working in this human welfare laboratory where they can observe what different social changes do to people and what services are needed. The Citizens on the Boards and Committees of the agencies are in a different position from many other citizens and, therefore, must be a vital force in the improvement of human welfare programs. They should be the informed and constructive critics bearing witness to needed changes in community social programs—setting social goals toward which the community should move; designing measures to cope with our social problems, mobilizing citizen involvement and support to reach those goals.

TRY NEW APPROACHES

The answer to meeting the challenges of the urban crisis is not just to provide more of the same services. Such an approach is based upon the assumption that all that is necessary is to extend more current services to more people in more places and it will solve our problems. Not all problems come under this heading for there are many good programs but others are justifiably under criticism because they have failed to demonstrate that what they are doing is adequately coping with our problems.

We need new approaches in providing public assistance to people with no income or inadequate income, in providing adequate housing, in meeting the needs of youth, in reaching those people who have not come to the established institutions for services, or whom the established institutions have been unsuccessful in holding.

Those fragmented, piece-meal, and uncoordinated approaches of the past must be replaced with programs that have cohesiveness, and are both comprehensive and have continuity. We need to think in terms of systems of service rather than in terms of individual agencies.

We need to work more with the new indigenous groups that are emerging in our neighborhoods.

We need new approaches in the use of our very short supply of professional manpower.

We need new approaches in our funding patterns to provide greater freedom in the use of voluntary dollars, more venture money to experiment and demonstrate with new ideas.

We must re-examine the use of the more limited voluntary funds in relation to the vast public funds and their use from the point of view of the common good as well as public acceptance.

Our voluntary funding philosophy must be approached more from the point of view of meeting community needs than just federating campaigns.

REASSESS PRIORITIES

All of us must reassess our priorities—all priorities in the health and welfare field.

We must give a higher priority to the difficult, pressing human welfare problems of concern to the urban community.

The chronic, complicated problems found in the deteriorated areas.

The problems of relocation and readjustment created or brought to light when the bulldozer knocks down the slum housing or makes way for a highway program.

The problems of furthering equal opportunity for people to obtain an adequate education, a job commensurate with their ability, a decent home. These are the problems that concern the city planners, the educators, the urban redevelopers, government officials, the business community (e.g. National Alliance of Businessmen) and most important, the neighborhoods and the people affected—the establishment.

More money alone will not do the job since available funds (and sometimes available manpower) will perhaps always fall short of our desires. It's basically a matter of allocating scarce resources. So, it becomes a matter of priorities, a matter of decision of what problems will receive our attention.

This is never an easy task. It might be facilitated, however, if the Board of every health and welfare organization undertook a continual reassessment of its own organization and the field of which it is a part.

Board members cannot look on their job as gentlemanly avocations which they can pursue quietly. The job is performed in a real world—a highly contentious world; a world where people take sides. It's a world not free of name-calling, but it's a world where tough problems can be solved when attacked cooperatively by intelligent and courageous men and women of integrity and good will who want to do more than just score points.

We need to look at the changes in our community and the problems they are creating or uncovering, and listen to the requests for help in coping with them and then decide what shifts in program emphasis, program priorities should be made.

Everyone in the community must examine his priorities. How much more time, effort and intelligent talent can we give if we are convinced that the health and welfare field is one which has top priority in relation to the urban crisis.

IMPROVED MANAGEMENT

The problem of allocation of scarce resources brings into focus the need to improve the management of the health and welfare system. The role of management has been underemphasized in community social planning. We accept much of what we are doing on faith; we do not have the profit control to help gauge and guide our program efforts. However, the rapid expansion of the health and welfare enterprise, the growth in the number of agencies, the questions being raised about the relevancy and effectiveness of the traditional agencies in relation to the urban crises—have all highlighted the need to improve the management aspect of the welfare system.

Roy R. Epperts, Chairman of the Board of Burroughs Corporation until 1968 and long active in health and welfare activities, stated: "The not-for-profit health system is going to be called to account and it must be able to respond promptly and adequately—so don't stand by idly and wait for developments, but take the initiative to determine what can be done better than we are doing now."

There must be increased concern with the developments of instruments and methods to improve operation, to measure our effectiveness, and to guide the allocation of our resources.

This is why it is essential for agencies to convert to a functional budgeting system, to develop more precise service accounting, to develop instruments and a system for the periodic review of their activities, and to evaluate their accomplishments, efficiency,

and effectiveness, to develop an information system or planning program and budgeting system which will help the health and welfare system better allocate its resources and set its priorities.

ENCOURAGE CHANGE

Perhaps all of the previous suggestions to become more responsive, more relevant to the urban crises, have as their basis a willingness to change. Change is difficult for the establishment because essentially the purpose of an established organization—be it business or welfare—is to maintain a degree of order and conformity in order to get a particular job done. An establishment creates a certain amount of inflexibility necessary to get a job done. Creativity, innovation, and change disturb the routine.

Yet an organization must change. The measure of its vitality today will be determined largely by its ability to change and how it handles change. Change is the order of the day and the pace of change is much more rapid and radical and revolutionary than ever before.

The timely and difficult question we must ask ourselves is how much have our established programs changed—and if they haven't—how much should they change?

A phrase one frequently hears which raises a question about our intention to change is: "If we only had more money and staff." This implies that we don't intend to carve the new out of the old.

The times require that the establishment be *future-oriented*; that it makes a conscious effort to anticipate and guide change.

Don't think in terms of the community of the past, but of the community of tomorrow and make certain that we are relevant to it.

CONCLUSION

The sobering developments of the past few months in this community clearly challenge all of us—the establishment and those who are critical of the establishment—all who live and work in the community—all of us—black, white, rich, poor, big, little, effective, ineffective are caught up in this urban crisis. If we be the establishment then let's face the challenge and solve it. We had better do so for I believe that riots and violence per se are not nearly the problem that the backlash to violence may become. The goal of containing riots must not take precedence over the goal of continuing progress.

We are challenged to build a sound economic and social structure which provides respect for differences and freedom of opportunity for all.

We are challenged to develop goals accepted by all and for which we can all work together to achieve.

We are challenged to bring reason again to a world where feeling and the "gut reaction" are more prized and more persuasive than analysis. If this challenge seems hard to handle, still it can be met and solved by the reflective, rational man, burning with passion and anger but applying his mind and rational soul to the problems of the community in which we live.

If this challenge seems too impractical, too idealistic—if it seems unachievable—let us remember that only 25 years ago Pittsburgh had a very bleak future. Some believed it was on the verge of collapse. Our industrial base had eroded away, skilled workmen were not available, each year the rivers took their million dollars in toll, the city was coated with grime and filth. The future seemed nonexistent.

But a few men of vision by working together, by laying aside their deep-rooted suspicion and distrust of one another, performed a miracle. We call it the Pittsburgh Renaissance. It was a *Physical Renaissance*.

Now we need a Social Renaissance. It must be equally well planned, equally extensive, equally tough, and equally followed through.

This is not the time for isolated unrelated competitive efforts. This is not the time for small factions of people to try to deal with the task.

Pittsburgh and Allegheny County need a total commitment, an unswerving priority, a *coalition* of all its forces if it is to succeed.

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH AMERICA

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, it is apparently quite popular in some circles to criticize and, in some instances, even disparage our country's accomplishments. Because of this heavy accent on the negative, foreign observers and, in fact, some of our own citizens—if they do not take the time to put these matters in the proper perspective—could well develop a harmful opinion on what the United States stands for, what it has done, and what it is attempting to do.

This Sunday, June 23, 1968, Roscoe Drummond, in his article entitled, "It's Time to Concentrate on the Good That Is Being Done in America," sets forth the case for what is right with our society. In this, he proves a most able advocate.

As he points out, "the record is impressive." He cites our many accomplishments in the field of education, racial justice, health, unemployment, domestic progress, and assistance to our less fortunate neighbors throughout the world.

I feel that his column would be worthwhile reading for all of my colleagues, both Democratic and Republican. While as a Democrat I take particular pride in the accomplishments of the Johnson and Kennedy administrations, the progress we have made in our country cannot be attributed solely to any one party or group of individuals. It is rather a credit to America and all Americans.

The text of the article follows:

IT'S TIME TO CONCENTRATE ON THE GOOD THAT'S BEING DONE IN AMERICA

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Hasn't the time come to speak up for what's right with America and not center so much on what's wrong?

We think so, and our purpose is not to stop reform but to accelerate it. Our purpose is to give those who are understandably frustrated the evidence of things to come and a will to utilize our democracy, not to destroy it in despair.

The record is impressive. It shows that our society and our way of governing is sufficiently animate, vital, and productive to warrant the conclusion: don't wreck it, use it.

Take the record on racial justice:

More wrongs have been righted and more things that are just have been achieved in the past decade and a half than were accomplished over the 90 years from the end of the Civil War to 1954. That was the year of the milestone Supreme Court decision which began to lay the legal basis in America for complete racial justice and equality of opportunity.

Since then every aim of the Federal government—the courts, the Congress, and three Presidents—have acted to see that the Constitutional writ of equality under the law runs to the boundaries of the nation.

Except for hard pockets of delay, public places are open on an equal basis, the vote is assured, and Negroes, with white help and white assent, are electing Negroes to posts of high governing authority.

In the last four years the Federal government has invested twice as much in education as it invested in the previous century.

The Federal government is devoting three times more resources to health programs this year than it did in 1964.

Job-training programs are being greatly expanded. The war on poverty is just beginning to pay significant dividends. Together business and government are committed to reducing hard-core unemployed by 500,000 by 1971.

The best tribute to the late Rev. Martin Luther King Jr., took only four words. "The ayes have it," said the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Civil Rights Act of 1968, striking down racial barriers in about 80 percent of the nation's housing and providing other protections, became law.

There is a Justice on the Supreme Court who is black. There is a member of the President's Cabinet who is black. Negroes are moving steadily into the middle classes and in rising numbers are going to college.

Howard K. Smith, the TV commentator, does not overstate it when he says: "The era of Martin Luther King has made ultimate triumph inevitable. Negro impatience may obscure it, but in fact tremendous forces are at work and cannot be stopped."

Not enough, many will cry. And they are right. But it provides the evidence of things to come. It proves that American democratic institutions have been productively at work to begin to remove the blight of racial discrimination.

We submit that it is dangerous to overlook what is going right because the first ingredient of success in dissolving the mood of violence in the nation and in accelerating racial justice is faith that it can be done.

If too many Americans do not believe that our society can serve its goal, if they don't see that American democratic institutions are productively at work removing the blight of social and racial ills, if they don't understand that revolution-by-ballot is the best and workable way to do what needs to be done, then we risk leaving the field to revolution-by-violence. The end of that road is calamity and the beginning of authoritarian government.

STUDENT POWER

The truth is that the American system is animate, vital, and responsive and one of the best ways of making it more so is to realize What's Right with America, not just what's wrong.

There are some doubters who suggest that the nation's youth has lost its way. There are signs that some have. Students are resorting to violence, trying to escape the draft and to elevate obscenity to a moral cult.

These things are happening, but the truth is that the students who are more interested in smelling flowers and smoking marijuana are a minute minority of American youth.

Are the young alienated over politics? Far from it. They are using the political process to give dedicated assistance to Senator McCarthy and Vice President Humphrey.

Alienated over the war? Far from it. The desertion rate of American GIs in South Vietnam is less than it was in Korea and 50 percent less than in World War II.

I believe we have today a most committed and compassionate younger generation. At one time in college the big deal was swallowing goldfish; today it is questioning moral values. That's good.

How good? One answer is that more than 300,000 college students are today voluntarily helping the disadvantaged throughout the United States

And what about the way the U.S. has managed its economy in recent years? Obviously all is not well with the dollar, with the imbalance of payments and inflation.

But on any comparative basis we have managed our economic affairs with skill and wisdom for the most part. None of the bleak predictions that large-scale unemployment would follow the end of World War II and that depression would be on us in the '40s, or the '50s, or '60s, have come true; all have proved wrong.

Today the American free-enterprise economy is the most productive in the world with the highest gross national product, the largest per capita income. We have the highest employment and the lowest percentage of unemployment in the nation's history. And the longest period of sustained economic growth.

One of the reasons is that under the advocacy of President Kennedy, the leadership of President Johnson, and the support of most business leaders, Congress had the wisdom to cut taxes despite an unbalanced budget in order to give impetus to the economy when it was needed.

And now, when it is vital to restrain an over-booming economy, Congress is finally enacting, however tardily, a 10 percent tax increase and trimming the Federal budget.

The way this democracy of our has dealt with the perilous issues of war and peace, there can be only one report: the record is one of outstanding and creative success.

WAR OR PEACE

In measuring What's Right with America in the role the U.S. has played from 1941 to 1968, we submit that so much has been right that there is no reason for defeatism or apology.

Too many people accept the idea these days that the U.S. bungles just about everything it attempts in foreign policy. It does not.

We are not suggesting that everything is well in this world. It isn't. But everything has not gone wrong by any means and we ought not to forget how much has gone right during all the years we have been acting to protect our own freedom by helping others to protect theirs.

Here are the facts:

1—More than anything else, the American Lend-Lease Act of 1941 wisely put needed weapons into the hands of Britain and enabled her to hold off Hitler until Russia and the U.S. entered the war.

2—Through military and economic aid the U.S. acted to save Greece and Turkey from being dragged behind the iron curtain. It succeeded.

3—Through the Marshall Plan the U.S. acted to save the entire continent of Western Europe from the threat of Communist takeover. It succeeded.

4—The American-British airlift moved in to rescue West Berlin from the Soviet attempt to starve its people into submission. It succeeded.

5—The U.S. and the U.N. acted to turn back the armed Communist aggression against South Korea. It succeeded.

6—President Eisenhower acted to defend the independence of Lebanon and Taiwan. He succeeded.

7—After the fiasco of the Bay of Pigs, which temporarily persuaded Nikita Khrushchev that we might not defend our vital interest, President Kennedy acted to force the Soviets to withdraw their nuclear missiles from Cuba and thus struck from Moscow's hands the instrument of nuclear blackmail. He succeeded.

8—Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy laid the foundation in policy and in action for the defense of South Vietnam against Communist expansion-by-force. President Johnson further implemented this policy. If divided opinion at home does not paralyze the United States, we believe the U.S. will succeed.

9—President Johnson and later the Organization of American States intervened to preserve democracy in the Dominican Republic. They succeeded.

Every harassed country cited above whose safety from oppression we have helped secure—because our own safety was at stake—is a free and independent nation today.

When we look at the role of the U.S. in today's world and its successful actions in the cause of human freedom, there is good reason to shed the myth of helplessness and frustration.

We have been discussing how well our society and our system of government have been functioning in recent years in the whole range of racial justice, economic reform, and foreign policy.

We have been telling the too-often untold story of What's Right with America, not because we should be either smug or satisfied but because the best way to turn the aggrieved and the impatient from resort to revolution-by-violence to revolution-by-ballot is to demonstrate that government by the peaceable consent of the governed is working and that any other course holds little prospect of doing anybody any good and every prospect of doing everybody terrible harm.

Today this precious democracy is awake as never before—sensitive, concerned, active.

The United States can do whatever it needs to do in order to be whatever it wants to be.

NIXON WARNS ON BUDGET CUTS

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call to the attention of my colleagues a recent warning by Dick Nixon. Nixon believes that in the proposed budget cuts expenditures for national security should not face any cutback.

Under unanimous consent I submit this article which appeared Monday, June 24, 1968, in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

NIXON WARNS ON CUT IN SECURITY BUDGET—SAYS ACTION WOULD BE "RECKLESS"

NEW YORK, June 23.—Richard M. Nixon said today that it would be "irresponsible and potentially dangerous" for the Johnson Administration to try to cut spending by trimming the national security budget.

The Republican presidential aspirant praised Congress for passage last week of a $6-billion spending cut and the 10 per cent surcharge but said these items were needed only because of past budgetary recklessness by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration.

The former vice president said in a statement issued here that the administration's policies "have brought the nation to the point where there are no longer good choices of where to cut spending. There are only various degrees of bad choices, some of which meet the immediate emergency only by risking the nation's future security."

Nixon said he found particularly disturbing indications that "the administration plans to follow the path of least political resistance and swing its economy ax heavily against the national security budget."

Nixon said that cutting the national security budget "at a time when America's strategic superiority is in increasing doubt, would be blind and reckless economy. It would be an irresponsible and potentially dangerous decision."

He said the Soviet Union is ahead of the United States in spending for research and development of advanced weapons systems and that "the programs now threatened with delay and reduction were included in next year's budget in a belated attempt to recover lost ground" and should not be cut.

Cuts should be made, he said, in both foreign and domestic spending "not directly related to present and future American security."

THE AMERICAN CITY: PROBLEMS AND PROMISES

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in a recent address before the U.S. Conference of Mayors, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Robert C. Weaver called upon the leaders of America's cities to give their support to the pending Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

This bill involves—

He declared—

a single, specific and absolutely essential nation goal: the building and rebuilding in the next ten years of enough good, decent housing to replace substantially all of the substandard housing in America. This is a necessary foundation upon which we can build renewed hope for the American city and for the poor and alienated among our people.

Mr. Speaker, this very important legislation will soon come before the House. I believe Secretary Weaver's explanation of its provisions and his recounting of the needs they will serve, present strong arguments for our approval of this bill. I urge all Members to read this speech and include it for reprinting at this point in the RECORD:

THE AMERICAN CITY: PROBLEMS AND PROMISES

(Address by Robert C. Weaver, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, annual conference, U.S. Conference of Mayors, Chicago, Ill., June 15, 1968)

SUMMARY

The coordinated national urban effort is only three decades old, while the problems of urban areas have been growing for generations. So, while we have not as yet through Federal programs reached equilibrium with the twin forces of growth and decay in our metropolitan areas, we have a good record. Large tasks lie ahead of us. But no nation as rich in natural and human resources as America can fail in those tasks, given the will and the courage and the essential optimism of a great people.

For a good many years now I have met with you during these annual conferences to carry on a dialogue about the problems and the promise of American cities, with emphasis on new Federal legislation. And I must say after going back over some of the speeches, they read like the Perils of Pauline. Every recent year has been a cliff hanger.

Two years ago I reported to you that we had made great gains in 1965 with the omnibus housing and urban development act. We had gained sewer and water grants and grants for acquisition of land, new programs for urban beautification and new aids for code enforcement. And we had won the rent supplement program after a hard battle.

But we were fighting for the Model Cities Program, then called the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966. And I told you we must

move on, we must fight against those who would shortchange our cities by defeating that program.

Last year, we had once more made substantial gains—in applying the rent supplement program, in reorganizing the Department and in changing the emphasis in many of our traditional programs—such as urban renewal and public housing. But again we faced the old problems—the Model Cities Program was under sharp attack; the Rent Supplement Program had suffered a severe setback in Congress. I said then, "Today, instead of celebrating victories, we are back in the same old battles."

This year I had hoped to come before you with our legislative battles behind us. Then I could devote this speech to reminiscing about past campaigns and philosophizing about the city and its future. It was an alluring prospect.

But it was not to be. Again I come before you and I say: Let us get on with the battle.

We have a very good bill this year—a very large and important omnibus bill for housing and for urban development. It has been well received in the Senate and we have that behind us. But it is still being fought in the House and we cannot afford to rest until it clears that final hurdle and becomes law. And, of course, after that we will have to get it funded through the appropriations route.

You have worked hard for this bill. You have testified in its favor, as an organization, and individually. Let us not lose any of that bill at this late date because we are overconfident.

The full weight of the Presidency is behind this bill, and it goes without saying that I will fight for it and for every penny of appropriations we have requested.

I realize that not every person in this audience is satisfied with what we are doing this year. Neither am I. But as always, in politics, we are dealing with reality. It seemed doubtful earlier this year that we would be able to get what we felt were minimum requirements, but it now seems eminently possible.

I know that I needn't say more on that point. You are the people on the firing line. You bear the burden in solving problems of such magnitude and complexity that I often wonder why any man today should want to be the mayor of an American city. Others have wondered why I wanted to be the Secretary of HUD. That we do so may not be much of a tribute to good sense. But your involvement is certainly a tribute to your courage. And those of us who know you well can only say, Thank God for that.

I realize full well that there is no one here today who doesn't know this year's Federal legislative program for the cities as well as I do. But you will have to bear with me for a moment. When I attend this conference and step before the podium, I have a knee-jerk reaction. I just have to talk about the programs.

The key word this year is volume. And the major refinement is volume of housing for low-income families.

Th task for the next decade is this:

To provide housing for a Nation in which new household formations alone will require 14.5 million new units.

To replace several million units that will be lost from the housing supply because of population changes, migration and market changes.

To replace or rebuild 5.8 million units now substandard and now occupied, and 2 million more that will become substandard out of the 30 million units already more than 30 years old.

These goals cannot be met without a full commitment by both the private market and the national government.

And so the President has given us these goals:

The construction of 26.2 million new housing units in the next decade. That is a big order when compared to 14.4 million units built in the past 10 years.

Public assistance for 4 million of these units. That is a big order when compared to the half-million of the last decade.

Public assistance to rebuild 2 million existing units. That is a very large order when compared to the 25,000 units of the last decade.

These goals cannot be met unless we bring in additional programs and a higher level of appropriations, which we have requested:

A new program to give families of low and moderate income opportunities to become home owners and a larger supply of decent rental housing. And so we have the subsidized mortgage interest rate program for home ownership and a deeper subsidy for rental housing.

A far larger public housing program, using the Turnkey concept for greater speed and economy.

A large acceleration in the rent supplement program.

National Housing Partnerships between private enterprise and the Federal Government, with tax incentives to help make the low and moderate income market more attractive to private investors.

Expanded assistance for other community facilities and services to help match the increased housing supply.

Expanding the rehabilitation of basically sound housing into an effective industry.

Emphasizing the need to divert more urban renewal efforts into projects which will provide more new and rehabilitated lower-income housing.

The President's goal was to provide the means during the first five years of starting construction and rehabilitation of 2.35 million units. That is still our goal.

What we are engaged in here is a single, specific and absolutely essential national goal: the building and rebuilding in the next ten years of enough good, decent housing to replace substantially all of the substandard housing in America. This is a necessary foundation upon which we can build renewed hope for the American city and for the poor and alienated among our people.

But if that is the foundation, it is by no means the only requirement for the years immediately before us.

As you know, there are many plans and many theories as to how our national resources can be directed to end hunger and poverty among our people, and to meet the overwhelming needs of our cities.

Plans for people run the gamut from increased food allocations to programs for the hard-core unemployed to a guaranteed annual wage. For the cities, they range from tax incentive plans to bring private enterprise into the picture to block grants for States and cities.

The process of studying the validity of these programs and considering means for their implementation is now going on at an unprecedented rate. Two years ago I could say that we had finally reached the point where we no longer dumped important urban problems into the attic of the Nation's conscience.

Today it is difficult to imagine that we ever did so.

Hardly a day passes that a mayor or a governor or an urbanologist—and that is a word so new we hardly know what it means—doesn't come out with a new proposal to help our cities and their people. In the past few months alone, half a dozen national publications have devoted whole issues or given major play to the city and its condition.

HUD is up to its ears in this kind of long-range planning and evaluation. Just to mention a few things relating to this one Department:

There is a Presidential commission under Edgar Kaiser studying housing and the construction industry. We have another national commission under former Senator Paul Douglas studying zoning, building codes and taxing policies. Both of these commissions, incidentally, have already proved their mettle. Proposals originating in these bodies are major elements in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

We have given out large contracts to major industrial firms to work out a variety of low-cost housing experiments.

We have established an Office of Urban Technology and Research within the Department and this cannot help but become a major factor in shaping the future of our experimental efforts.

The President has established an Urban Institute, a private, non-profit corporation with close ties to HUD and with a broad mandate to study the city with both public and private grants.

Outside HUD, we have John Gardner and the Urban Coalition and Urban America, and a vastly expanded effort by the large foundations, as well as many effective long-established agencies.

American universities and colleges, particularly those within the great urban complexes, have, after years of neglect, begun to build centers and institutions for the study of the whole range of urban problems.

And, again in HUD, I have the feeling that we are on the brink of making major breakthroughs with the Model Cities Program. As you know, 75 cities are already in the planning phase of this program, and we can expect to bring this number up to about 130 in the near future.

I realize, of course, that this is a complex and sophisticated program. Many of you are now in the most difficult phase of that program—how to fulfill the requirement for citizen participation. This is not a simple process, and I fully recognize its problems and complexities. I think you also know you should be fully involved in all our programs if your Model Cities efforts are to be fully realized.

And I would like to make an additional point here. It applies to not only the Model Cities Program, but to the matter of bringing a higher order of coordination to the process of governing the entire urban complex.

On the one hand, we are faced with the desire of urban people to feel a stronger sense of involvement in their own urban destiny. This applies to the poor, to the man in the ghetto. He not only feels alienated because he is left out in the general prosperity, but because he feels left out in helping make the decisions that directly affect his life. This is one reason we make such a strong point about citizen involvement in Model Cities planning. But is also applies to people at all income levels in the central city and the suburb as well.

At the same time we have an urgent necessity to bring about a more logical and practical method of planning and implementing those programs, such as mass transit and freeways, which affect the whole metropolitan area.

Regional Councils and Councils of Government are springing up across the country. They, too, put stresses upon our traditional institutions and upon our accepted political alignments.

So on the one hand you are being asked to share more responsibility and power with your own citizens. On the other hand, you are asked to plan and coordinate with governmental entities beyond your own boundaries. I can only urge you to enter these difficult areas with good will and open minds.

You are the men who govern the cities, and I would not presume to advise you as to how to go about meeting these new situations. But I would be the first to say you cannot turn your back on them. We have always maintained in this country that our Federal system is flexible enough to adjust to chang-

ing conditions, and that is its strength. I believe we are at a period in our urban history when that proposition will be given a severe test. We must not fail to meet that test. We cannot afford to. And I know that you will meet the requirements of the time.

There is another area in which flexibility and an open mind will be essential in coming months and years.

We now have the Civil Rights Act of 1968, with its historic provisions that make fair housing the law of the land in the United States.

There are two fundamental factors in this fair housing legislation:

It constitutes an affirmative statement of national policy that is clear and unmistakable. It says this: "It is the policy of the United States to provide, within constitutional limitations, for fair housing throughout the United States." But there is more than an affirmation of principle.

It specifies what housing is covered, and when, and it spells out whose rights are protected, who is charged with enforcement, and how policy is to become practice.

It will, in our estimation, directly cover 77 percent of the some 69 million housing units in the United States by January 1, 1970. and in some ways—advertising and real estate services, for example—it will affect all housing.

We are now involved at HUD in seeking voluntary compliance with the law. We have already had the splendid cooperation of such major organizations as the National Association of Home Builders and the Council of Housing, as well as a number of major builders and management firms.

But we know full well we are going to meet opposition as we begin to put the law into effect. Compliance will be brought about by persuasion and by legal action where necessary. We will be working through state and local fair housing agencies where possible, as the law prescribes. And there you will be directly involved, if you have local laws in which the rights and remedies are as strong as in Federal law.

But beyond that, you can be immensely helpful by taking an active leadership role in making the open housing legislation work. And this means becoming involved in the delicate and often irrational area of human relations by supporting the moral rightness of open housing.

This is the last time after a good many years—more that I like to think about—that I will be meeting with you in my present capacity.

I would like to make a few closing comments on the vast changes that have taken place during that period.

They are, as so many things seem in our society today, more than a little paradoxical.

When I arrived in Washington as Administrator of HHFA in 1961, that organization was a conglomerate of five relatively autonomous agencies. I was a referee and an arbitrator rather than an administrator. We were a ramshackle vehicle, a mechanism seriously deficient to its Federal responsibility for urban areas and their people.

We had good programs, but not enough of them. We had far too little money. We had many good people, intelligent and dedicated, but the will and the incentive to move ahead were often lacking.

And the cities were already in deep trouble, although recognition of that fact was generally lacking. The cost of meeting city services had risen sharply at the same time sources of revenue were declining.

Almost every city, large and small, had its share of the common problems—blighted commercial and industrial districts, slums, a hidden but pervasive poverty among many of its citizens, choked streets and deteriorated transit systems, dirt and foul air. I could go on, but you know the litany of urban problems as well as I do.

Since then the Federal effort has not only doubled, but tripled and quadrupled. We have pioneered in new programs—the first urban mass transportation grants and experiments, moderate-income housing, rent supplement housing, leasing and rehabilitation programs for public housing and the Turnkey process, code enforcement grants, new and expanded rehabilitation programs, Model Cities and metropolitan development legislation, open space and urban beautification grants, sewer and water grants and expanded planning programs, grants for neighborhood centers. These are not all, but they are emblematic of our growth.

We have a Department of Housing and Urban Development in fact as well as in name, and I firmly believe we have for the first time in our history, a basic Federal urban institution capable of administering to the problems of today, and of growing and changing to meet the problems of tomorrow.

The paradox lies in the fact that while our Federal programs and institutions have grown and changed, we have not as yet reached equilibrium with the twin forces of growth and decay in our metropolitan areas.

But let me make this point. Millions of Americans live in decent housing, who would not have if it weren't for FHA and public housing and the many other Federal housing efforts. Hundreds of American cities have begun to clear and rebuild and rehabilitate commercial and residential districts. That would not have been true had there been no urban renewal program. Thousands of American communities have better community services, sewer and water systems, transportation aids, and help in planning than they would have if there had been no HHFA or HUD.

We must keep in mind that the coordinated national urban effort is only three decades old, while the problems of urban areas have been growing for generations.

I think we have a good record. And I believe we now have the programs and the potential to make of our cities what we all want—places of decency and justice, of beauty and pride, of safety and urbanity.

No one of you will fail to recognize that during the past six years the mayors have established a new and higher status in Washington. President Johnson has frequently conferred with you, and he has set up effective liaison between you and the White House. In the person of Vice President Hubert Humphrey, there is an ex-mayor, a sophisticated champion of urban America, and an inspired spokesman for our cities.

Large tasks lie ahead of us. But no nation as rich in natural and human resources as America can fail in those tasks, given the will and the courage and the essential optimism of a great people.

All of us here love cities. We wouldn't be in this room if we didn't. The task of leadership is yours, but so are the rewards. I do not envy you your problems, but I do envy you the stewardship of our great cities.

I would like to thank you for the help, encouragement, and the sympathetic support you have given me during the years that I have had stewardship of the Federal urban effort. We have had our good times and we have had our bad times. That is inevitable in the conduct of public affairs. But we have come a long way together, always in decency, honesty, and respect and with high regard for the motives of one another.

It is inevitable that as I move on to New York and the challenge of establishing a new urban college, I will be less involved in administering urban programs on the national level. But I assure you I am not an old soldier and I have no intention of fading away. I will be around. I have no intention of giving up my love affair with the city; I simply want to concentrate the effort.

Henry Adams said that "He too serves a certain purpose who only stands and cheers." I assure you that I will be there, and I will be standing, and I will be cheering for the mayors of this country.

WISCONSIN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ADOPTS SOUND RESOLUTIONS OF PRINCIPLES AND PURPOSES

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative, at their annual meeting at Green Bay, Wis., on March 25–27 adopted a sound program of principles and purposes. Implementation of the 14 points recommended by WEC will result in continued growth for the rural electric cooperatives and their contribution to the national economy and welfare of our country.

So that other Members of Congress may know of the fine programs advocated by the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative, I am herewith submitting for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the resolutions adopted at the 1968 annual meeting of WEC. The resolutions follow:

PRINCIPLES AND PURPOSES

A statement of intent, beliefs, goals, adopted by delegates to the 1968 annual meeting of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative at Green Bay, Wis., March 25–27.

1. FUTURE FINANCING

We believe that rural electric cooperatives, in order to continue effectively in the service of rural people, must have access to growth capital in substantially larger amounts than at present, and in a form that will assure dependable continuity from year to year, therefore,

We urge this organization and its member systems to support efforts of the NRECA Long-Range Study Committee to develop a plan for such supplemental financing, after having first determined as best it can the future objectives of this member-owned, member-serving program.

2. BANK FOR TELEPHONE COOPERATIVES

We believe that dependable and fully adequate communications ranks with electric service as a factor in making possible the vital contributions of rural America to the economy of this country, and to the general health and welfare of its people, therefore,

We request the Congress to acknowledge the need to insure this continuing contribution in the future by authorizing establishment of a Rural Telephone Cooperative Bank in order to provide a source of growth capital for these organizations in adequate amounts.

3. RURAL/URBAN BALANCE

We believe that present problems of the nation's cities, caused or aggravated by overcrowded residential areas and abnormal competition for available jobs, and by undue pressures on educational and municipal facilities and services, are added to in serious measure by the continuing migration of about 100,000 rural people to the cities each year, therefore,

We propose that Wisconsin Electric Cooperative and all its member systems exert every effort and influence in support of sound development programs designed to improve job opportunity in rural areas and reverse the population drain that serves neither the city nor the rural area.

4. THE FARM PROBLEM

We believe that no amount of effort to improve rural employment potential will go far to cure rural economic ills unless it is coupled with positive moves to assure realistic financial rewards to our farmer producers of food and fiber, therefore,

We request Congress to develop means of assuring this necessary realistic level of farm income to help re-establish rural America as a satisfying place to live and to help preserve the traditional backbone of our rural economy, the family farm.

5. LAKE STATES FORESTRY COOPERATIVE

We believe rural income potential in a considerable amount of electric cooperative-served territory in Wisconsin, Minnesota and Michigan will be enhanced by the development of the best dollar return that can be provided at the local level by the substantial timber resource of these areas, therefore,

We recommend that electric and other cooperatives located in these areas support, through membership, at least, the new Lake States Forestry Cooperative, which seeks to promote locally-owned wood industry in these areas of timber production.

6. CAPITAL BUDGET

We believe public understanding of federal budgeting is more nearly correct when figures showing government lending and investment are not merged into one with government spending, therefore,

We endorse this year's separation of the budget into two accounts, the expenditure account and the loan account, and we suggest further clarification in the development of a long-range program of accounting for assets, and separate financing of capital outlays.

7. PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE

We believe that a civilized world, capable of tolerance and mutual contributions to the welfare of all mankind, demands that less fortunate areas be helped toward self-sufficiency and enlightenment and a satisfying existence by those more happily endowed, therefore,

We commend, as we have in the past, the mutually helpful relationship established between Wisconsin and the Republic of Nicaragua, and all similar relationships resulting from the Partners of the Alliance program, and recommend that beneficial ties like these be created where they do not now exist.

8. VOTING RECORDS

We believe that the boards, employees and members of electric cooperatives must be informed regularly of attitudes demonstrated toward their programs by state and national legislators, to help determine their measure as public servants, therefore,

We request Wisconsin Electric Cooperative and our national association to compile and distribute such records of voting as will contribute to this understanding.

9. HIGHWAY LIGHTING

We believe that the tragic toll of lives in auto accidents each year is a costly and unnecessary waste of our human resource, and we further believe that the persistent increase in such fatalities can and must be reversed, therefore,

We commend the Governor's Highway Safety Program as a sound step toward this reduction in accident slaughter, and strongly recommend that this effort be supplemented by providing for adequate illumination at intersections, railroad crossings, bridges and other hazardous areas along our rural roads.

10. NATIONAL POWER GRID

We believe that impressive reductions in the cost of electric power can be realized through use of giant generation units, extra-high voltage transmission facilities and nationwide interconnections of all types and sizes of systems, therefore,

We urge enactment of federal legislation, embodying principles contained in H.R. 12322, the Moss Bill, that will guarantee the benefits of this new and efficient technology to all by enabling all segments of the power industry—investor-owned, public-owned and consumer-owned—to participate in a National Power Supply System.

11. POLITICAL ACTION

We believe the future of cooperative rural electrification depends in large measure on sustained, nonpartisan political action, and that it is important to assure that legislators understand our needs and purposes, even in years when we are not actively involved in sponsoring legislation, therefore,

We request that Wisconsin Electric Cooperative develop and maintain a coordinated program of non-partisan political action to help provide this necessary understanding year after year.

12. COMMENDING FPC ROLE

We believe that the best advantages of consumer-owned power systems can not be realized without some assurance against excessive wholesale power costs, therefore,

We commend the Federal Power Commission for helping provide this important assurance in recent years, by means of informal proceedings which resulted in substantial reductions in wholesale costs to municipal utilities, small commercial utilities and electric cooperatives.

13. FORGING ALLIANCES

We believe that the continuing decline in rural population, and the consequent reduction in rural representation in the state legislature and the House of Representatives will prevent electric cooperatives from securing adequate annual loan funds, and destroy their ability to provide legal protection for their service areas, unless they can add the strength and influence of others to their own, therefore,

We emphasize our conviction that our cooperatives and associations must move promptly and effectively to establish understanding and mutually supporting relationships with individuals and organizations that share our major beliefs and aim toward common goals.

14. CO-OP HOUSING

We believe the President's recent Farm Message to Congress emphasized the desperate need for a new and imaginative effort to replace the more than three million substandard dwellings in rural America; we also believe that rural residents are entitled to the same access to decent housing at a reasonable cost as are urban residents, therefore,

We endorse once again the plan formulated by Wisconsin Electric Cooperative to transplant these familiar urban benefits into the rural areas of this country by adapting the successful housing cooperative device to this purpose; beyond this, we urge the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Farmers Home Administration and other appropriate agencies to assist in every possible way in order to prove this plan and make it available across the country.

CONTRIBUTION BY FRANK SCOTT BUNNELL HIGH SCHOOL

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I inform the House of a contribution by the Frank Scott Bunnell High School of Stratford, Conn., of $1,000 for the construction of a school in India under the school partnership program, sponsored by the Peace Corps.

Education is a prerequisite for world peace. It allows people to improve their standard of living, and it enables them to better understand the people of other nations. This contribution by the Frank Scott Bunnell High School will move us closer to the day when all of the people of the world shall have an opportunity to work together for the creation of peace, freedom and progress.

HUMAN RESPONSE TO THE SONIC BOOM

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of talk and too little definitive action about the problem created by sonic boom. I am seriously concerned that we are following a path that will expose millions of Americans to unhealthy and totally unacceptable noise created by supersonic aircraft.

In this regard I commend to my colleagues' attention an article appearing in today's New York Times concerning a report on human response to the sonic boom by the National Academy of Sciences. Under leave to extend my remarks I include that article in the RECORD at this point:

SUPERSONIC JETS FACE REDESIGNING—SCIENTISTS SAY NOISE DATA MAY RESHAPE TRANSPORTS

(By Harold M. Schmeck, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, June 25.—People seem to dislike the sonic boom enough to make the outlook dim for designs of the supersonic transport as they are now, a panel of scientists said today.

Research in this country and abroad suggests there would be many complaints in the wake of the high speed airliner's every flight over populated areas, a panel member said.

The panel reported to the National Academy of Sciences on "human response to the sonic boom."

Studies of biological effects, to date, show little cause for concern, the report said. It is the psychological effects that emerge as the big problem.

SEVERAL STUDIES ON BOOM

Because versions of supersonic transports are planned in the United States and in Europe there have been several studies of sonic boom effects on individuals and communities.

"As a result of such research the concern of the committee on SST-sonic boom in mid-1968 is considerably different from what it was over three years ago," said the report.

The studies show that no damage to hearing and no direct physiological damage is to be expected even when the sonic boom is far more powerful than any supersonic transport would be likely to generate. The studies also show that people do not like the boom.

"What seems called for at this juncture is an intensive long-range analysis based on varied measures of individual group and community responses to different levels of sonic boom," said the report.

The panel said it was unlikely that the first generation of supersonic transports

would fly at top speed over land areas. Plans indicate they will be primarily transoceanic carriers.

But the committee said research was urgently needed on the psychological aspects of the boom-producing shock waves of supersonic jets whether the first ones fly overland or not.

ON COMMUNITY REACTIONS

When a plane exceeds the speed of sound—660 miles an hour at flight altitude—the sound waves it produces build up into a conical wave front of great intensity. If the wave fronts formed by the nose and tail of the plane reach the ground before being dissipated they produce sonic booms that may be destructive.

"Community reactions cannot yet be predicted with certainty," said the report.

"We can only speak in terms of the probability of effective organized reaction. This will increase as the annoyance of the individuals increases; the effective expression may depend on some dramatic trigger incident or the emergence of a vocal leader of public opinion."

Individual as well as community responses to the sonic boom must be studied, the report said. It advocated special studies of the effects of sonic booms on sleep—the noise levels below which waking is unlikely, the effect of repeated booms on the level of sleep and the probability that individuals will awaken and the question of what levels of noise may aggravate a person's preexisting sleep disorders.

The committee said it was important to find out more about sonic boom effects, if any, on sleep during the day as well as at night, on conversation, skilled performances of various kinds and on daily routines.

Studies also should be done on the psychological effects of sonic boom on persons on ships, the panel said.

The report expressed cautious optimism that an acceptable supersonic transport for overland flights could be developed when the engineers are given more solid data showing what noise levels will be acceptable to the public.

Money will be saved in the long run if the studies are undertaken now, the report said.

The report on human response to the sonic boom reviewed research on the subject here and abroad during the last ten years. Chairman of the National Academy of Sciences panel that prepared the report is Prof. Raymond A. Bauer of the Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.

Other members are Prof. William D. Neff, Department of Psychology, Indiana University; Dr. Henry David, Division of Behavioral Sciences, National Academy of Sciences; Dr. Irwin Pollack, Mental Health Research Institute, University of Michigan; Dr. Howard Raiffa, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard; and Dr. Peter Rossi, Department of Social Relations, the Johns Hopkins University.

BOMBING RESTRICTIONS AND OUR OFFERS FOR PEACE

HON. WILLIAM O. COWGER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, Russia and her Communist satellite, North Vietnam, have taken every advantage of our offer to peacefully settle the dispute in the Far East. Since the President has further restricted our bombing of military targets in enemy territory, friendly cities in the South have been devastated During recent weeks the enemy has intensified their indiscriminate attacks on Saigon. Rocket and mortar fire has killed and wounded thousands of innocent and friendly allies. The "stop the bombing" advocates have been successful in saving the enemy capital of Hanoi, but their voices have been silent when our side sustains the casualties. Actually our soldiers have received a higher percentage of casualties since peace negotiations than before. President Johnson should tell the peace negotiators in Paris that either the devastation of the friendly cities stops, or we will immediately renew and intensify our bombing in the North. It is quite apparent that the enemy has taken advantage of our bombing restrictions and our offers for peace.

GAS GAMES INVOLVE COERCION, HIGH PRICES

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court's dictum that advertising should be judged by its "probable effect on trusting minds" is only one of the principles of business ethics which has been violated in the maze of service-station games thrust upon the American motorist in the past 2 years. Oil companies have financed the familiar games and their advertising through coercion of individual dealers, and, ultimately, through a rise in the cost of gasoline to the consumer.

If misleading advertising were the only issue at hand, the hearings of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies would already have accomplished their purpose; the newspaper articles which I am submitting to the RECORD reflect a growing awareness on the part of the American public that "giveaway games" seldom giveaway something for nothing. It is sad that advertising in this country must create in many honest consumers a constant attitude of skepticism and cynicism in the marketplace—an attitude easily carried over into other areas.

But equally serious is a problem which we have yet to solve and correct through our hearings: that of the manner in which the games and their advertising have been financed. Threats to dealers who refuse to participate in the games have been accompanied by a forced additional rise in the price of gas to the customers of dealers who have accepted them. A sense of fear over cancellation of station franchises and other forms of coercion has replaced the healthy profit incentive in the minds of hundreds of individual dealers as they make their decisions on participation in the games; only at this great price has it been possible for oil companies to force their gigantic game enterprises upon the dealer and the public.

It is to the credit of the Greenfield Recorder, whose editorials I submit here, and the many other papers and radio and TV stations in my district and across the country that these misdemeanors are being brought before the people. Only as the public is made aware of these practices can it successfully combat them, for, in the final analysis, the good that may come of our hearings rests upon popular consensus of what is right and fair in the conduct of business.

Two articles follow:

[From the Greenfield Recorder, June 20, 1968]

GIVEAWAY GAMES CHECKED

(By John A. Senior)

The merry game of give-away prizes, used for years as a gimmick to attract new business, appears doomed to a stormy road of critical inquest by no less an august body than a Congressional subcommittee.

Congressmen, when they are examining someone else's alleged misdemeanors, can be a fearsome lot. When their backs are up they leave no stones unturned to get the dirty truth.

Much like the dirt that can't hide from intensified you-know-what, the perpetrators and propagators of those foul give-away tricks will have no place to go but to Washington to fess up.

All except the most gullible of citizens take promotional advertising with a grain of salt, though the public is supposed to be protected against misleading advertising. Core of the give-away boil this time is the widely promoted offer of endless and fabulous prizes which gives the impression that everybody wins.

GASOLINE GIMMICKS

Congressman Silvio O. Conte, who is cosponsoring the subcommittee hearings on the so-called "gasoline games", says he has found evidence that the gimmicks are hurting not only the consumer, but the small businessman as well.

He quotes communications from a constituent who claims a sweepstakes type of game promoted by Gulf Oil Co. turned out to be part of a marketing scheme to sell transistor radios. Top prizes offered included a Rolls-Royce and five Mercedes-Benz autos and 100 color TV sets, but when the contest was over, no one had won any of the autos, and only five TV sets were won.

Another complaint came from an inquisitive customer of American Oil Co. who had the temerity to ask Amoco for a list of winners after the contest had ended. Besides stating all the prizes were "made available", Amoco told the customer in effect that the list of winners and the amount actually given away was none of his business.

JUST PITCHES?

Conte has promised Amoco officials will be called in to tell the whole story, as will those of other companies. He states: "The people have a right to know if these fancy promises are being kept or if they're just pitch-men type gimmickery."

Equally disturbing to the investigators is the information that refineries spent no less than $44-million on advertising their giveaway games. In itself that is a private matter for the refineries, but there's a hook—a few weeks ago, Conte notes, the price of fuel oil was raised five cents a gallon, and at a time of year when the consumer price usually goes down.

This would suggest that the companies are boosting their business at consumer expense while holding out faint promises of something for nothing. Conte figures the oil companies will have a tough time justifying the necessity of the increase while they are expending vast sums on the give-aways.

HURTING BUSINESS

Conte believes such activity hurts the small businessmen as well as the consumers. The consumers' problem comes from the in-

creased costs of the product, while the small operator, unaffiliated with one of the major oil companies, can offer no such attraction to his customers.

While the current investigation is generally aimed at the major oil companies, there could very well be repercussions in other directions. Most every large individual or chain operator today has some kind of special lure to tease more customers into his place of business.

END OF GIFTS?

If some serious skulduggery is uncovered by the subcommittee, the whole scheme of free gifts, contests and prizes could be shaken to the roots. This includes trading stamps, which have been a household word for generations.

It would be a sad thing to dump the idea entirely, but there should be some provision to equalize give-aways so that the small businessman can compete on equal footing with with the big one. There's something about the promise, however dim, of maybe being lucky enough to win the top prize without any more risk than a possible heart attack over the joy of winning.

On the other hand, a little extra courtesy and service from the service station operators will do as much to keep the customers coming back as does the juicy carrot dangling from a long stick and always just ahead and out of reach.

[From the Greenfield Recorder, June 15, 1968]

GAS GAMES

If you haven't yet won that $5, $10 or $5,000 from your favorite gasoline station, you'd better hurry. Chances are something soon may be done to shatter for all time your bid to make a quick buck.

Then again, perhaps you already have rolled up to the pumps and asked for your boodle of easy money. There are some who have made a profit from being steady customers. But the list is mighty small and the take is generally in the $1 and $2 range.

Beginning next week gasoline station giveaway games which some legislators contend "could constitute a fraud" will be investigated in four Washington hearings. Rep. Silvio O. Conte of this state and Rep. John D. Dingell of Michigan are chairman and senior minority members, respectively, of the subcommittee on regulatory and enforcement agencies relating to small business.

Rep. Conte has noted: "A few weeks ago the price of fuel oil was raised .05 cents per gallon at a time of year when traditionally the price of distillate is decreased. It seems to me extremely difficult for the oil companies to justify their increase in a cost of a necessity at a time when they are spending such vast sums on this type of highly questionable activity. Rep. Dingell has charged "The consumer is being forced to pay for too much propaganda for too little prize money."

It has been said, furthermore, that many dealers do not want to participate in these schemes, but are compelled by competition to offer money prizes and other gifts or be driven out of business.

It is difficult to foresee how the probe will turn out inasmuch as gasoline offers are only one step removed from the ancient game of stamps—pink, yellow, green, plaid and otherwise. And stamps have been around several generations with only an occasional threat. Some states, however, have ruled these out as unethical or highly questionable.

Oil company contests presumably would run out of steam without Congressional probes, if permitted enough rope. There is evidence now that customers are becoming aware of the unlikelihood of ever reaping a bonanza. When offered a choice of a game or a glass water tumbler the driver usually takes the latter. Most even prefer the old favorite, stamps.

The game probe, nevertheless, could pave the way for a long list of federal regulations which in turn could bring down the role of gimmicks in merchandising like a house of cards. And with these, of course, would go a lot of fun. After all, the public likes to be fooled.

WHY CURB GUNS?

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, a number of the newspapers in the district I represent have carried editorials on the anti-gun proposals. One which has recently come to me is from the Conroe, Tex., Courier, which I include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, as follows:

WHY CURB GUNS?

We grant that frontier days are history now, yet they gave to us the knowledge that our strength lies in our ability to protect ourselves as individuals and families when the need arises.

Certain elements in Congress, along with President Johnson are now trying to take away from us one of the most important of these rights.

They hope to put sharp curbs on the ownership of firearms, and history has taught us that once curbs begin they grow and grow and grow.

Our lawmakers are shocked by the recent assassination of Sen. Robert Kennedy, and this has caused some of them to abandon their resistance to curbs on guns.

But by the same token, Conroe residents still are shocked over last week's death of a local businessman in a traffic wreck and the recent death of a youngster on a motorcycle. Yet we aren't crying for cars and motorcycles to be practically outlawed.

These incidents are hazards of life. Smoking cigarettes and strenuous exercise for persons over 40 also are hazards of life, but we have no thoughts of outlawing them.

We agree that curbs should be put on the sale of firearms to youngsters under 18, and restrictions established on mail order sales . . .

But no regulations should force owners to register their guns, and there are many valid reasons, such as:

(1) Lawmakers constantly look for sources of new tax revenue. Soon they could start charging an annual tax on individual guns which could grow and grow to the point where the average man could not afford to keep one.

(2) Think of the value such a registration list would be to underworld organizations who have proven in the past that they can find access to almost any government secret. They would know where to go to steal a certain type of gun, and they would know neighborhoods "safe" to exploit because there were no guns.

(3) A sudden insurrection in the land would show the rebels where they would have to pick up private weapons to strengthen their control.

(4) A Communist take-over would give them possession of the gun list. They would start collecting weapons immediately, or disposing of persons who resisted.

A butcher knife, tire tool, hammer and a multitude of other items are just as deadly at close range as a gun. Should they be registered too? Ridiculous? Absolutely, but not out of the realm of possibilities.

We feel that ownership of guns is a historic American right . . . that it is one of the major basic strengths of this nation. And we feel that Congress is showing very little faith in the good judgment of the average American if it requires registration of all guns.

As an alternative, they could open avenues for more strict enforcement of present laws. They are good laws . . . at least they were until court rulings began pulling their teeth.

Let your Congressmen know how you feel on this issue. Write them.

DEGRADING TV PROGRAMS

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the television networks' programs and newscasting are off the beam. Drew Pearson calls attention to this most abominable degradation practised upon an unsuspecting public.

Only in recent months have I been a TV viewer to any degree. I did not realize previously what tripe is being dished out on television.

Youngsters are the victims of this sordid programing. It cannot be said that the TV portrayals are aiding in the curtailment of violence and the explosive crime rate. Violence and brutality are the keystones of many of the "top rated" programs enjoying what is called prime time on the networks.

Drew Pearson, in a recent column, listed many of these shows along with the sponsors of such degrading TV programs, and a valid suggestion is made that the public can correct this situation by writing their views to those who put up the money so that these TV programs can be broadcast.

The general run of the news reporting by the networks is repugnant to a sizable number of TV audiences. A letter writing campaign for wholesome news commentaries is badly needed.

The Drew Pearson column follows:

MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—During the national anguish over Sen. Robert Kennedy's assassination, the TV networks suddenly got nervous about video violence and tried to clean some of the bloodshed off the home screen.

ABC's spy series, "It Takes a Thief," dropped two assassination plots. A sniper story was discreetly edited out of the FBI series. ABC also hastily juggled episodes of "The Avengers," "Guns of Will Sonnett" and "Man In A Suitcase" in favor of something less homicidal. NBC and CBS made similar shifts in episodes of "Bonanza" and "Mannix," respectively.

Yet the networks, after a decent period of mourning, have now resumed their full schedule of violence. And they have already lined up two dozen shows for next season featuring gunplay, brutality, sadism, and terror.

The National Association for Better Broadcasting estimates that the average child between ages 5 and 15 watches the violent destruction of more than 13,400 persons on TV.

"Most are gunned down," reports Frank Orme, the association's executive vice president, "but fire, rape, poison, acid, spiders, snakes, crocodiles, pitchforks, knives, time bombs, live steam, poison gas, hypodermic

needles and an assortment of heavy blunt instruments are all used to add spice and variety and thrills to the spectacle of death."

CHILDREN ARE VICTIMS

He fears this mass mayhem is destroying children's natural capacity for sympathy and impressing them with the need for a powerful, totalitarian figure to protect them.

"Today's television," Orme says, "teaches children that violence is fun, evil is powerful, and the world around and beyond us is full of unknown terrors. Our cherished institutions and concepts are weak and subject to imminent destruction by callous brutes. To survive we must delegate the job of protection to powerful, single-dimension individuals who disregard the non-violent, democratic processes."

For all their remorse over the slaying of another Kennedy, the networks have made clear that they will continue to glamorize gunplay as long as it wins mass-audience ratings and sponsors' dollars.

Apparently the only way concerned parents can keep their home screens fit for children is to retaliate against the sponsors who pay for TV violence. As a start, we have asked the Better Broadcasting group, which has kept a critical eye on TV for 17 years, to list the ten shows most harmful to children. We have looked up the sponsors who keep these shows on the air.

1. The Avengers, ABC, Wednesdays. This show, which the NABB calls "horrific" and "disgraceful," has been sponsored by American Home Products, American Tobacco, Armour, Beechem, California Prune, Carnation, Champion Spark Plug, Colgate-Palmolive, DuPont, General Electric, Goodyear Tire, S. C. Johnson, L&M Tobacco, Mennen, Pittsburgh Plate Glass, Polaroid, Procter & Gamble, Seven-Up, Sterling Drug, Studebaker, Sunbeam, WM. Underwood, Warner-Lambert, and Yardley of London.

2. Felony Squad, ABC, Mondays. The NABB calls this "a vicious excessively violent, and morbid show." It has been sponsored by AC Spark Plug, Armour, DuPont, L&M Tobacco, Noxell, Schlitz Brewing, Shell Oil, and State Farm Insurance.

3. Guns of Will Sonnett, ABC, Fridays. This is described by NABB as "a shoddy western" that is "highly objectionable for children." Its sponsors have included AC Spark Plug, Bell Telephone, Brown and Williamson, Carter-Wallace, Colgate-Palmolive, Cool-Ray, R. T. French, International Playtex, Levi Strauss, Plymouth, and State Farm Insurance.

4. Cimarron Strip, CBS, Thursdays. "An hour of savagery, everything from near-rape to brutal revenge, a very bad show for youngsters," says the NABB. The sponsors have been Alberto-Culver, American Motors, American Oil, American Tobacco, Anheuser-Busch, Beecham Products, Block Drug, Buick, Colgate-Palmolive, Formula 409, Gallo Winery, General Foods, International Playtex, S. C. Johnson, Norwich Pharmacal, Charles Pfizer, Polaroid, Procter & Gamble, R. J. Reynolds, Shell Oil, Speidel, Sterling Drugs, Union Carbide, United Airlines, Volkswagen, and Warner-Lambert.

COMPLACENT FCC

The list of TV horror shows is lengthy; too long to be carried in full here. More will be listed in a future column.

Meanwhile, it should be noted that only rarely has the Federal Communications Commission taken exception to TV programming. Ordinarily the FCC automatically renews a TV license when it expires at the end of the three-year period. Two FCC commissioners, Kenneth Cox and Nick Johnson, recently issued a scathing indictment of their fellow commissioners for this automatic renewal policy.

President Johnson has a vacancy to fill on the FCC right now and can greatly improve TV programming by picking a commissioner who will side with the present Johnson-Cox minority.

In most countries TV channels are owned by the government, not private individuals. Thus most crime programs are kept off the air. Significantly, in no other country in the world is either the juvenile delinquency rate or the crime rate as high as in the United States.

One way to change this, without resorting to government ownership, is for the public to exert its influence on the companies which sponsor crime and horror, by both writing them and refusing to buy their products.

NEW CUSTOMS

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable, but nevertheless true, that mostly the people hear about the activities of their public servants when things go wrong. Thus, it has become a tradition to think of those engaged in public service as bureaucrats with little to do other than to harass the law-abiding citizens.

Sometimes this is, in fact, true. But in the large majority of cases, the people in public service are trying to do a conscientious, devoted, and intelligent job.

In that connection, the Washington Star on June 17, in an editorial entitled "New Customs," noted the debarkation at Kennedy Airport of a group of tourists from Europe in 13 minutes. That included going through passport control, health control, and customs inspection.

I say hats off to the new customs and a group of dedicated public servants.

Mr. Speaker, I now include the article from the Evening Star:

NEW CUSTOMS

A funny thing happened at Kennedy International Airport the other day. A flight came in from Europe and most of the passengers got through the debarkation procedures in 13 minutes.

That's passport control, health control and customs inspection, which has always meant dragging your bags about, opening them, having the contents thoroughly pawed and disarranged and then trying to get the bags back together and find a porter. In 13 minutes?

This astonishing new record was achieved very simply. First, the three checkpoints of health, passport, and customs were combined and performed by a single official at a single place. Second, that official assumed that most of the travelers were honest and did not do the traditional search-and-destroy act with the luggage. Unless there was some definite reason for search, bags were not opened at all.

This, of course, has been the system in Europe for years. All American travelers could have told the customs bureau about it but apparently nobody bothered to ask until recently. The new idea is just an experiment, but let us all hope it convinces the officials that it isn't necessarily un-American to presume that people are more interested in getting home than in cheating their government.

The new procedure is a much more practical way to assist foreign travel in America than any advertising campaign yet unleashed. One reason foreigners have stayed away in droves is surely the travelers' tales about the backward procedures of American entranceways.

For that matter, once word of the new method gets out, we may even lure back the expatriate Americans, some of whom are bound to have stayed abroad simply because they are unable to face the awful process of re-entering the country.

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE RESOLUTION

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the University of Tennessee board of trustees last week passed a resolution that could very well serve as an example for other institutions of higher learning in preparing for the possibility of campus disorder. This action has received much attention in the Tennessee press with headline treatment, for example, in the Nashville Banner of June 22.

I would like to include in the RECORD a news item from the Knoxville News-Sentinel of June 21, and an editorial from the Knoxville Journal of June 22, which present the University of Tennessee resolution, as follows:

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel, June 21, 1968]

PRAISES BEHAVIOR OF STUDENTS: UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE BOARD PLEDGES LAW AND ORDER

U-T's Board yesterday adopted a policy resolution that conduct or activities disruptive to U-T's educational process will not be tolerated. This is the full statement approved in an executive session of the Board:

"U-T's Board of Trustees has been highly pleased with the commendable and responsible behavior of the institution's fine students. The attitudes and actions of U-T students are particularly praiseworthy in view of the irresponsible activities promoted by small groups of students and nonstudents which resulted in serious disruptions at several major institutions in recent months.

"SEES NEED FOR FREEDOM

"U-T's exists primarily to offer higher education programs to young people and adults of the state. This Board recognizes that an essential requisite of higher education is the freedom of intellectual inquiry and expression.

"The Board further recognizes that this freedom is dependent upon the acceptance, by all members of the University community, of the responsibilities and restraints which make such freedom a reality for everyone concerned.

"TAKE ANY ACTION

"Pursuant to its commitment to both freedom and responsibility, it is the policy of this Board of Trustees that conduct or activities which are disruptive of the educational process will not be tolerated on any campus of U-T.

"While it is the Board's belief and hope that such disruptions will never occur at U-T, the Board wishes to make this policy a matter of public knowledge and does hereby authorize and direct the President and administration of the University to take any action which is necessary to maintain law and order and the integrity of the institution."

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal, June 22, 1968]

WISE MOVE BY UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE TRUSTEES

The Board of Trustees of the University of Tennessee, meeting here this week, took so

many important steps with reference to the future of the university that it is not practical to comment upon them all at one time.

For a starter, however, we would compliment the board highly upon its passage of a resolution which takes time by the forelock and gives the institution's administration the power at any time in the future to deal with any such crises as those which in recent months have erupted on the campuses of many colleges and universities.

Drafted by Federal District Judge William E. Miller, a board member, the text of the resolution passed by the board reads as follows:

"The University of Tennessee's Board of Trustees has been highly pleased with the commendable and responsible behavior of the institution's fine students. The attitudes and actions of UT students are particularly praiseworthy in view of the irresponsible activities promoted by small groups of students and non-students which resulted in serious disruptions at several major institutions in recent months.

"The University of Tennessee exists primarily to offer higher education programs to young people and adults of the state. This board recognizes that an essential requisite of higher education is the freedom of intellectual inquiry and expression. The board further recognizes that this freedom is dependent upon the acceptance, by all members of the university community, of the responsibilities and restraints which make such freedom a reality for everyone concerned.

"Pursuant to its commitment to both freedom and responsibility, it is the policy of this Board of Trustees that conduct or activities which are disruptive of the educational process will not be tolerated on any campus of the University of Tennessee. While it is the board's belief and hope that such disruptions will never occur at the University of Tennessee, the board wishes to make this policy a matter of public knowledge and does hereby authorize and direct the president and administration of the university to take any action which is necessary to maintain law and order and the integrity of the institution."

The Knoxville Journal would add its own praise, as set out in the first paragraph of the resolution quoted above, of the responsible posture maintained by the student body of the University of Tennessee on all its campuses in the past. The attitude of the UT student body reflects great credit upon its membership, and we foresee no likelihood that the empowerment by the trustees of the university administration will be called into use. Nonetheless, we believe it is a good thing for all concerned that the board went on record in a positive and unequivocal fashion.

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ACA

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 10th anniversary of the Americans for Constitutional Action. I take this opportunity to commend this responsibly conservative organization for its efforts to promote constitutional government.

In an era characterized by violent dissent, when objectors feel free to destroy as they disagree it is refreshing to see this organization advocate its principles with dignity and reason.

I cannot help but believe that the message which the ACA carries to the American people, of the role and duty of the people to the Government, and the Government to the people, is a strong, clear chord which will help guide us through our troubled times.

TAX INCREASE IS LESSER EVIL

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has been spending money recklessly for some time, and this has been especially evident since 1960. Federal receipts established new records each year, but, even these record receipts could not keep up with the outflow of Federal tax funds from Washington.

Since fiscal year 1961, we have had consecutive deficits—overdrafts are what our bankers are forced to call them—of $3.5, $7.3, $4.7, $6.0, $1.1, $3.6, $8.8, and $19.8 billion, making a total of $54.8 billion. On top of that, we faced an almost certain deficit of $25 billion this year without the cutback and tax revenue bill. Surely, this decade will be most properly labeled in the future history chronicles as that of the "Spending Sixties."

This $54.8 billion is sufficient to have paid for 2 full years of university education for every boy and girl in the United States between the ages of 18 and 21. Or, if this money had been applied to improving the diets of the 30 million undernourished people in America that we have recently heard so much about, we could have increased the weekly food budget for each of these 8 million families by $15 for the past 9 years.

Drowned out by the tumult of the clamor for more by the spenders, and overridden in the voting, were the admonishments of the more responsible legislators, of the fallacy of continuing to mortgage the future of our Nation and its citizens. Now, their words of warning have come true and are demanding retribution. Our national debt is over $356 billion, and the interest on that debt alone is over $15 billion for this year.

Foreign countries have lost much of their confidence in our monetary system, and gold has fled from our shores, and is no longer in the position of being a reserve for our currency.

There are over 12 million youths in the United States today of college age. Now, the inflation that develops in any economy where expenditures are made on borrowed funds has helped push college costs too high for many of the parents of these young people to be able to afford a college education. The Federal income taxes that are, and will be, paid this year to cover the costs of our interest on the public debt would have provided a scholarship of over $1,200 per youth.

Worse still, while there are other ways available to check this spending orgy, and to return to sane fiscal management of our budget, the administration has not aggressively sought to get foreign nations to pay for the cost of maintaining our Armed Forces in their countries. In Western Europe alone, our cash outlay has been $2.8 billion to secure the local governments from the world-conquering dreams of Soviet Russia. This amount of money would have almost covered our dollar drain and been a tremendous factor in righting our balance of payments.

There were other avenues open. Congress could have cut back, rather than expanded, some questionable programs; we should have delayed launching those ventures which lacked any priority, and we could have voted for much more efficient government. In my votes in the first session of the 90th Congress alone, I supported cuts in spending of many billions.

Thus, fortified with this knowledge and being strengthened in my convictions by the words of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the honorable gentleman from Arkansas, who stated:

> If we don't correct this situation, we're heading into a depression.

I have reluctantly voted for this bill which sets up a temporary surtax, and reduces Federal expenditures by $6 billion. While there is very little that can be said about the virtues of any tax-increase bill, there is one outstanding feature with the surtax, in that this measure will not add another burden on the low-income citizens. Generally, a family of four living on an income of up to $5,000 will not have any tax increase, nor will a single individual who has earnings of up to $1,900.

I am including a table as printed in the Washington Evening Star showing the effect of the surtax by tax brackets. The first column is taxable income, the second is 1967 tax, the third is the tax for 1968, and the last is the tax due in 1969:

SINGLE PERSON

$1,900	$147	$147	$147
$2,000	163	166	165
$3,000	333	358	350
$5,000	671	721	705
$7,500	1,168	1,256	1,226
$10,000	1,742	1,873	1,829
$12,500	2,398	2,578	2,518
$15,000	3,154	3,391	3,312
$20,000	4,918	5,287	5,164
$25,000	6,982	7,506	7,331
$35,000	11,627	12,499	12,208

MARRIED COUPLE, NO DEPENDENTS

$3,000	$204	$204	$204
$3,600	294	295	294
$5,000	501	533	522
$7,500	914	983	960
$10,000	1,342	1,443	1,409
$12,500	1,831	1,968	1,923
$15,000	2,335	2,510	2,452
$20,000	3,484	3,745	3,658
$25,000	4,796	5,156	5,036
$35,000	7,997	8,597	8,397

MARRIED COUPLE, 2 DEPENDENTS

$5,000	$290	$290	$290
$7,500	686	737	720
$10,000	1,114	1,198	1,170
$12,500	1,567	1,685	1,645
$15,000	2,062	2,217	2,165
$20,000	3,160	3,397	3,318
$25,000	4,412	4,743	4,633
$35,000	7,529	8,094	7,905

This seemed to be the only route left open in this Congress to get the reduction in Federal spending, to halt the loss of confidence in our money, and to provide some stability to our dollar as well

as to protect the innocent from further and wilder inflationary problems. Yet, in my mind, other more responsible avenues were available to this administration.

While I accept the responsibility of voting for this unwanted tax on the fruits of our citizens' labor, it still is most galling to know that many of the great liberal spenders still lacked the courage to "bail out the boat that they have helped to capsize."

DOCUMENTARIES ON HUNGER

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune, in its June 25 edition, comments editorially on recent television programs purporting to be "documentaries" on hunger in the United States. The editorial is welcome in that it endeavors to place the situation into true perspective.

The editorial is recommended for its soundness:

DOCUMENTARIES ON HUNGER

One of the television networks produced a program purporting to document hunger in America, and apparently was so pleased with its efforts that the show was broadcast twice.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, however, was not pleased. He provided some documentation of his own to support his charge that the show was a "distorted, oversimplified, and misleading picture of domestic hunger and what is being done to combat it." One example will suffice to illustrate the secretary's complaint.

The network presented a man and wife with 10 children living on the husband's part-time employment—"earning $3 to $4 a day when he worked." Despite this low income, according to the TV presentation, the family was required to pay $70 a month for food stamps, and "with this unrealistic purchase requirement, the family could not take advantage of the stamps."

The facts, according to Freeman, are that when certified for the food stamp program the family consisted of husband, wife, grandmother, and 10 children. The family's income was $180 a month from farming, part-time work, and a combined welfare grant and pension of $82 a month for the grandmother. Based on this income, the purchase requirement was $70 worth of stamps a month, which bought $128 worth of food.

Later when the husband was not working and the family income was reduced, the stamp purchase requirement was lowered to $18, which bought $108 worth of food. Instead of being unable to utilize the stamp program, the family has in fact purchased stamps regularly since last September, receiving $783 worth of food for an investment of $246, or three times as much food as it would have been able to buy without the program.

Regardless of how well intentioned, this is another example of some of the hokum the public is getting about the hunger problem. A few weeks ago a private citizens' group issued a report claiming concrete evidence of widespread hunger and malnutrition and implying that millions of Americans were at the point of starvation. The other day the House agriculture committee refuted it with a report indicating that while there is widespread malnutrition because of ignorance and local custom, there is very little hunger resulting from inability to buy food or get it under public assistance.

There is, of course, no need for widespread malnutrition in a country which produces more than enough food for everyone. The problem is more likely to be remedied by careful consideration of facts, rather than thru careless appeals to emotions.

RESPONSIBLE GUN CONTROL

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see a distinguished newspaper like the Washington Evening Star, reaffirm editorially yesterday what I have repeatedly urged with reference to new gun control legislation at the Federal level, namely that Federal registration and licensing is not the answer. It will not work. It cannot adequately be implemented without a national police force—which nobody wants—and it will not reach the unlawful gunman in any event. He will remain just as unlawful and just as secretive, with or without a Federal registration requirement.

What is needed, is a law under which it becomes just too risky to carry or use a gun in crime, that is, in the commission or attempted commission of crime, to be a separate Federal offense with a mandatory minimum sentence upon conviction. This will make those criminals who think at all, think twice before using or carrying a gun.

Also, a law that imposes upon the seller of a gun, a requirement that the buyer shall produce for the seller's public retention on file, a certificate from his home community that he has no criminal or mental record and is over 21 years of age.

I commend the Star editorial to the consideration of all who are concerned with the problem of what type of legislation will most responsively meet the problem of responsible gun control for this Nation.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 26, 1968]

THE REAL GUN MENACE

The President's latest message to Congress on gun controls is noteworthy in at least two respects.

It goes well beyond his former proposals and also beyond proposals offered by such ardent gun control people as Maryland's Senator Tydings. It is also more noteworthy for its emotional content than for any deterrent effect it could be expected to have on the use of guns by criminals—the real source of the gun menace.

When Mr. Johnson signed the omnibus crime bill on June 6 he said that its ban on mail order sales of hand guns, though it is stringent, was inadequate. He was right about that. He urged that there be a ban on mail order sales of shotguns and rifles. Again, he was right, and he pressed for legislation to forbid such sales.

While that proposal was pending, however, and before Congress could act, he sent up another message this week. In it, he called for the registration and licensing of all firearms—applying to new purchases as well as to guns already possessed by individuals. He called for monetary punishment of any state which did not fall into line.

Is there anything wrong with this? Let's take a look. Mr. Johnson said of the registration and licensing proposals: "Surely the slight inconvenience for the few is minimal when measured against protection for all." The "few" are the owners of the estimated 50 to 100 million guns in this country today. How would registration and licensing provide "protection for all"? This would be true only if it is assumed—an unwarranted assumption—that criminals as well as law-abiding citizens would come in and register their guns and apply for licenses to possess them.

The President gave some examples. Last Tuesday, he said, a filling station attendant was shot to death in the course of a $75 armed robbery. The robber was violating the law by using the gun in the commission of a felony. Is Mr. Johnson seriously suggesting that this robber, and the thousands of others like him, would have registered the gun and applied for a license? He also said that in 1967 there were 71,000 robberies with guns. How many of those victims would have been protected by a registration and licensing law? One other thing. Mr. Johnson said that with registration under modern computer systems "the owner of a gun anywhere in the country can be identified in a matter of seconds." True, if the gun owner had obeyed the law and registered his gun. Untrue if he had not registered.

Another interesting point: The President urges that any person who fails to register any kind of gun be subject to a fine of $2,000 and a two-year jail term. Under existing law in Washington, however, the maximum first-offense penalty for carrying a concealed hand gun on the street is only one year in jail and a $1,000 fine. Yet the person who carries a concealed gun is the potential murderer or robber.

It may be that registration and licensing would be of some help in discouraging improper sales or transfers of guns. But they are not going to stop the armed criminals or provide any appreciable "protection for all." As we suggested several days ago, the best way to achieve this protection is to provide really tough and if necessary mandatory jail sentences for anyone caught carrying an unlicensed gun or using a gun while committing a felony.

Why doesn't the President, as a companion piece to his appeal, get behind something of this nature?

ACA 10TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today, June 27, 1968, marks the 10th anniversary of the Americans for Constitutional Action. During these past 10 years, the ACA has done much to alert more people to significant issues.

All too often, people are urged to follow the prevailing dogma without analyzing its underlying rationale or its practicality. Far too many people are led to believe in the infallibility of the Federal Government. The ACA, on the other hand, has stood up to those who proclaim what are the fashionable liberal beliefs. By presenting contrary arguments, the ACA often sheds light on controversial issues and thereby enables our democracy to function more effectively. Unless all arguments are considered be-

fore making a decision, particularly a decision which can affect millions of Americans, our democracy falters. We ought not to accept ideas on faith. We ought only to act from understanding based on a careful study of all arguments.

The ACA has done much to contribute to the understanding of many issues. They have much to be proud of. I, for one, welcome their contribution.

LINES ON LIVING

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I think my colleagues will be interested in a most eloquent and thoughtful column, in the New Brunswick Daily Home News, written by Rabbi Haim Kemelman, of the East Brunswick Jewish Center. Rabbi Kemelman's words—on the recent tragedies and on American culture—should be read carefully by all.

The column follows:

LINES ON LIVING

(By Rabbi Haim Kemelman)

We are no longer cowboy country, neither are we a frontier nation. Yet, we are condoning the free traffic of firearms, the romanticizing of gun powder and the glamorizing of ballistic power, as if we were still Billy the Kid country.

But for this freedom "to keep and bear arms," which was originally meant as a constitutional states' right, and not an individual's privilege, we are paying an extremely heavy toll.

The gun cult in America's private war by possessors of firearms has exacted from the nation more than three quarters of a million casualties since the turn of the century—more than the total of all American war losses combined. What a startling figure for a causeless, heartless and undeclared civil war of unknown privates!

The national tradition of the gun is no less than a national tragedy. But the National Rifle Association, with its gun mystique philosophy, still believes that shooting freely is an American birthright and uncontrolled gunplay a patriotic heritage. "Happiness is a warm gun," exclaims the blunt caption under a blood-drenched photo showing a happy youngster blissfully rejoicing in the virile beauty of killing and in his possession of a shotgun and a rack of dead pheasants.

NRA happiness is the freedom to shoot or to kill, (animals, of course) without leaving any imprints, fingerprints, or records, (an eyesight examination is required for driving a car, not for shooting. Anything moving is a target.)

We are a record-conscious nation. We keep records of almost anything and everything. The driver, the pharmacist, the doctor, the dentist, the barber, the marrying couple—all are duly registered and licensed. Bicycles, cars, businesses, shops, planes, prescriptions and dogs are all punctually registered and recorded. Only firearms, the instruments of death that serve no purpose other than maiming or killing, remain unlicensed and unregistered (in most states) and totally free of any control. And that, again, is NRA's happiness, but the nation's tragedy and agony.

Ban the gun, we are repeatedly told. But that's hardly enough. Ban the gun-culture as well. Explode the myths, the legends of the romanticized gangsters. Undo the works of the modern mythmakers who have glorified the gun and the larger-than-life heroes who have wielded the gun power. Take Superman, Batman and oversize fiction out of drama and plot and put real people—not just hero and villain and shouting and shooting—with heart, soul and character, in television, entertainment, novels, books and comic books. Take the elements of tragedy, the blood-letting and the death dealingness out of everyday life, out of sight and out of the mind of children and they will be more cheerful, more moral and less war-like.

Ban also the gun-culture in the toyland, beginning with the tot. This week, I walked into the toy section of a department store and found much of it, resembling a torture chamber of misfigured characters and an astonishing array of doomsday machines—engine-powered, fuel and battery-charged. Their authenticity as to detail, size, structure and realism is so perfect that a Russian spy would hardly need to steal secrets from the Pentagon, knowing that he could easily buy them in a 5 & 10 cent store.

GUN NO EQUALIZER

Cannot we, the nation of missile power, with an ascent toward the stars, unshackle ourselves from the muscle power which still pulls us to our gravitational descent. Cannot we the people of brain-culture, with a knowledge of the inner space of the atom and the outer space of stars, unhinge ourselves from a brawn-culture of primitive force and raw impulse. The gun is no equalizer except for the grave. Any burden and irksome cost that gun-control measures will entail are indeed a small charge for saving whatever lives may be saved in America's totally unnecessary, undeclared and costliest war—the private war of the anonymous army of arms bearers.

The gun must be put out of the hands of the mentally deranged and morally demented. But the gun-culture must equally be taken out of the world of entertainment, amusement, books, toys, comic books, and any form of child's education and emulation. And if the home will be free of violent acts (verbal and visual) and the street will be liberated from gunsmoke and strife, vanquishing the yearning for brute savagery and the undisciplined tools of death and the unpredictable grip of death itself—then, the future Kings and Kennedys and parents and kids will not have to face the menacing strikes of bolting fire. Ban gun, will travel . . . unarmed and unharmed and unafraid.

ACA

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago Americans for Constitutional Action was formed as a counterbalance to certain liberal organizations such as Americans for Democratic Action in order to give more emphasis to the conservative viewpoint in our national affairs.

The organization included on its board of trustees some of the most outstanding men in America who have dedicated themselves to the proposition that we need to return to those constitutional principles which have so often been deviated from and abandoned in recent years. ACA during the past decade has attempted to promote constitutional government and has given much-needed emphasis to the conservative position on national issues.

Its periodic rating of Members of Congress on the basis of their voting record has been a helpful contribution to the collection of data on Congress and has been instrumental in shaping the course of our congressional actions. Although the organization is nonpartisan, it has lent its endorsement to candidates in an effort to promote the conservative and fiscally sound government policies which it espouses. ACA never endorses anyone without a specific request from the candidate but the weight of its backing has been helpful in many instances.

I am pleased to take note of the fact that this is the 10th anniversary of the organization and I believe that this decade of service has been of value to our national life. In these times when the so-called liberal position on many issues seems to get favored treatment from the news media, it is helpful to have an organization such as ACA which attempts in a small way to counterbalance that which is so freely available from the other side.

VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a recent report by the President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, entitled, "The People Left Behind," contains some very misleading disturbing, and in my opinion, false information regarding the programs of vocational agriculture in our public schools. I am referring to the summary statement of the report which says:

> Vocational Agriculture Programs are relics from an earlier era. They were developed in a period during which the welfare of the farm families was equated with the well being of rural communities and all rural people. This is no longer so. They were developed without anticipating the vast changes in technology to rural people. Instead of combating low incomes of rural people these programs have helped to create wealthy land owners while largely bypassing the rural poor.

This summary statement also mentioned that other farm programs fit into this category but only spelled out by name the program of vocational agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, when a detrimental statement such as this one is made about any program, it seems to me that documentary evidence should be supplied to back it up. As I said, this question was included in the summary of the report. Yet, I was unable to find any documentation appearing in the context of the publication to support such a statement. In the absence of such documentary evidence I assume that what the report is saying is, that vocational agriculture is a program designed to teach youngsters how to farm who never farmed. Indeed, this program is designed to teach both present and prospective farmers for proficiency in farming. But it is also designed to do much more and it does much more.

I know of no program that has adjusted more or better to meet the changes brought on by modern technology than has vocational agriculture. But by the very nature of its name—vocational agriculture—there are those who insist upon relating it to training only in production farming without going to the trouble to learn what it is doing in other areas. Apparently the members of the President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty are among this group. Agriculture is more than farming. It encompasses the broad range of agricultural occupations which, among others, includes servicing, sales, and processing of agricultural products. Production agriculture and related agricultural occupations comprise approximately 35 percent of or present total gainfully employed population and vocational agriculture provides training in all of these occupations which require skills and knowledge in agricultural subjects. Congress recognized the need for such training when it passed the National Vocational Act of 1963. This act provided for extended instruction in vocational agriculture to include training in agricultural related occupations, as well as production farming.

Mr. Speaker, I know for a fact in North Carolina that agricultural related industries recognize the need and importance for the program of vocational agriculture. A number of cooperative arrangements have been developed between vocational agriculture programs and agriculture-related industries whereby the vocational agriculture curriculum will include training in areas of interest to the industries. For example, all pulpmills in North Carolina are cooperating with one or more high schools in the training of students for employment in the timber harvesting industry. Each pulpmill is represented on a State advisory committee organized by the agricultural education section within the department of public instruction. This committee has assisted with the development of a course currently being taught to train students in timber harvesting. Not only are the pulpmills providing resource help but they are cooperating in the placement of students for supervised work experiences and for employment upon completion of the course.

Approximately 67.8 percent of the students currently enrolled in vocational agriculture at the 11th- and 12th-grade levels in North Carolina are enrolled in courses preparing them for off-farm agricultural employment. As with the course to train students in timber harvesting these courses are developed according to needs indicated by agriculture related industries and businesses. Many students are currently involved in supervised work experiences in farm equipment sales and repair businesses, feed mills, farm and garden supply stores, nurseries and florists, fertilizer and other agricultural chemical businesses, golf course maintenance, sawmills, livestock and poultry businesses, and many others too numerous to mention. The work experiences of these students are a continuation of their instructional program conducted in vocational agriculture in the high school and is under the cooperative supervision of the local teacher of agriculture and the employer.

I submit that such a program does not represent a "relic of an earlier era," as stated in the report of the President's Commission on Rural Poverty, nor does it bypass the rural poor. It is available to all—and it seems to me that if we have 14 million people living in rural poverty as the report states, it may be that one good way to alleviate the problem would be to encourage more rural people to enroll in a good sound course of vocational agriculture which is offered in our public schools. Possibly much more good may be realized from this than some of the fancy frills and experiments that we have been conducting during the past decade which, according to the report itself, must have accomplished little in rural America since it says that we have 14 million rural poor living there who have been left behind.

HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON THE ELECTION REFORM ACT OF 1968—H.R. 11233

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican policy committee supports the recently reported Election Reform Act of 1968, H.R. 11233. We urge that it be scheduled for immediate floor consideration.

For 2 years the House Republican leadership, the policy committee, and the Republican members of the House Administration Committee have worked for the enactment of clean-elections legislation. Specific and detailed election-reform legislation was drafted and introduced. The laws dealing with election campaigns must be revised and updated. The Federal Corrupt Practices Act was enacted in 1925. The Hatch Act was passed 28 years ago. Studies such as the 1962 Report of President Kennedy's Commission on Campaign Costs reveal that present laws invite evasion and are filled with loopholes. Absent basic reform, public confidence in the election process may be eroded.

On June 27, 1967, H.R. 11233 was reported by a subcommittee of the House Administration Committee. It is similar in content to the legislation that died in committee after it was favorably reported by the subcommittee in the closing weeks of the 89th Congress. It contains the basic reforms advocated and supported by the Republican congressional leadership. Unfortunately, despite repeated Republican efforts to get this vital legislation out of committee, progress has been painfully slow.

Now, 1 year later, after much prodding by, and with the unanimous support of, the Republican members of the House Administration Committee, H.R. 11233 has finally been ordered reported and is ready for floor action.

The weak proposal recommended by the Johnson-Humphrey administration has been shelved in favor of the strong measure that was developed by the Republican members. Through the incorporation of the following Republican provisions, honest reporting of campaign contributions and expenditures and streamlined enforcement procedures would be insured:

First. A five-member bipartisan Federal Elections Commission is established to receive reports and statements regarding campaign contributions and expenditures.

Second. The Commission is given full and complete authority to enforce the provisions of the act. It shall be the duty of the Commission to make reports and statements available for public inspection and to prepare and publish summaries and reports.

Third. Candidates for Federal office and political committees supporting such candidates that accept contributions or make expenditures exceeding $1,000 in any calendar year, are required to report contributions and expenditures.

Fourth. Donations by an individual of more than $5,000 to any candidate for Federal office or any committee supporting such candidate in any calendar year are prohibited.

Fifth. Conventions, primaries, and party caucuses are placed under the reporting and disclosure provisions of the bill.

Sixth. The disclosure of gifts or honorariums of more than $100 is required of candidates for the House and Senate as well as incumbents.

Seventh. Members of the House and Senate are prohibited from using contributions derived from a fund-raising event or activity for personal or family purposes.

Unfortunately, a provision that would assist in regulating the campaign contributions by political action committees supported by a corporation, trade association, or labor organization has been deleted from the bill. Political expenditures by these groups are substantial and require additional regulation. This is reflected by the following excerpt from the report, entitled "Financing the 1964 Election," by the Citizens' Research Foundation of Princeton, N.J.:

> Labor groups and other miscellaneous nonparty committees contribute to campaign chests, or wage parallel campaigns on behalf of selected candidates and causes. The Democratic financial picture, in particular, is not complete without data on labor financing.
>
> In 1964, 31 national-level labor committees made gross disbursements of $3.7 million, compared with 21 committees disbursing $2.3 million in 1960. Labor transfers out, consisting mostly of allocations to other committees and candidates, were $2.9 million, or more than twice as much as in 1960; allocations to candidates for Congress were about twice their 1960 level. In 1964 and 1960, numerous labor committees spent more than they raised, indicating accruals from collections in non-election years.

We believe that to have effective election reform legislation, the provision regulating the campaign contributions by political action committees must be reinstated. This can be done through the adoption of an appropriate amendment

during the House consideration of the bill.

Due to the 2-year delay in enacting this legislation, the reporting and disclosure provisions cannot be implemented during the 1968 campaign. As a result, the millions of dollars in contributions and expenditures in the primary and preconvention campaign remain largely unreported and subject to no official scrutiny. Moreover the reporting and disclosure provisions with respect to the general election remain weak and subject to little or no enforcement.

The passage of H.R. 11233 during this session of Congress will insure that the Federal Elections Commission is established and ready to receive contribution and expenditure reports and statements prior to the 1970 election. This is high priority legislation. It must receive immediate consideration.

LET'S GET TO WORK ON OUR AIRPORTS AND AIR SAFETY

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, Congress now has before it at least two major proposals designed to promote the effectiveness of our Nation's airports and aviation system. In light of the serious demands being made on our air facilities, and in light of the tremendous expansion planned for the near future, I feel we should give these proposals our immediate attention.

I would hope that some action could be taken on an airport aid program this session, particularly since the lead time required to effectuate such broad activities is at least 2 or 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, without going into exhaustive detail as to the specifics of the bills before Congress, I would note that the administration bill envisions the creation of a trust fund, very similar to the highway trust fund, to be used to finance expansion of municipal, public airports. Generally this fund would be created through the usual appropriation processes.

The leading alternate plan calls for an air-travel tax of about 2 percent, with the proceeds of this tax to go to a trust fund. This proposal, which apparently has the support of the airline industry, would make specific distinctions in the amount and scope of aid extended to those airports which serve commercial carriers on the one hand, and those serving general aviation, on the other.

I feel it is important that Congress, through appropriate committees, take an immediate look at these proposals. I would hope that a good hearing record could be compiled this year.

If for no other reason, we should do this in order to promote air safety, which is at the heart of this whole problem. The problems of air congestion at our major air centers is one which will not improve by itself. Along this line, I think it is important that we look at our own house to assure that the Government is doing all that is possible. It is one thing to provide financial assistance to help localities improve and expand their airports, but it is quite another to make sure that the FAA traffic control equipment is the most modern and up to date available. I am also informed that there is a now-present shortage of approximately 3,000 air traffic controllers. This is a frightening realization.

Mr. Speaker, this is one area where we simply cannot let events slide. The issue must be considered from every angle. We certainly should not wait for a major air collision over a large metropolitan area to stir us to action. I hope prompt consideration will be seen this year. Some of us may be living on borrowed time.

ACA

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, a full 10 years have passed since a small band of eminent citizens met together for the first time to discuss the founding of a national organization dedicated to protecting and forwarding constitutional government. Since that day a decade ago when Senator KARL MUNDT, the late Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr., the late Senator Styles Bridges, and others met, the concept which they pioneered has taken root and flourished.

Under the chairmanship of Adm. Ben Moreell, Americans for Constitutional Action has played an instrumental role in American politics. By instilling sound principles and supporting sound candidates, ACA has blazed a trail for individual rights and better government which few organizations can equal.

Ten years is a long time, and it would be impossible for me to even begin to list the many significant achievements of ACA. They are legion, and have helped to provide better representation for Americans from every corner of our land. They have crossed party lines and enlisted Democrats and Republicans of good will in the unending quest for balanced, constitutional government.

And today, in retrospect, it is evident that the long years of hard, unsung effort have payed off in terms of results. Today, on the eve of a great national election, the forces favoring responsible conservatism seem stronger now than they have been for many a long year.

I place much of the credit for this where it belongs—with that splendid bipartisan organization whose 10th anniversary we are observing today, Americans for Constitutional Action.

Despite the constant challenges and doubts which continue to confront our constitutional form of government, I have every confidence that it will continue to survive intact as long as it has defenders like ACA working tirelessly on its behalf.

BEATRICE, ALA., INDUSTRIAL DRIVE MOVES BRISKLY

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Beatrice, in Monroe County, Ala., is a town with a population of 575. It is blessed with aggressive leadership, excellent highway and rail connections, an abundance of good industrial land, and a willing and eager labor force of about 6,000 persons within a 25-mile radius.

The thing that sets Beatrice apart is that its people are aware of the fact that the town must grow and provide jobs for its young people or it will die on the vine. An active effort is being made to clean up the town, provide good schools and recreation, and bring in new industry.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Beatrice is a good town in a growing county, and all new-industry folks looking for a place to locate should come down and have a look. They will like what they see.

An interesting article about Beatrice appeared in the Mobile Register on June 20, 1968, and I include it in the RECORD at this point:

BEATRICE INDUSTRIAL DRIVE MOVES BRISKLY

(By Buddy Smith)

BEATRICE, ALA.—An intensified drive to attract new industries and business to Beatrice, started last year, is moving along briskly.

The latest addition to this northeast Monroe County town is a wood yard built by St. Regis Paper Co. and is now ready for operation. It will be used to stockpile pulpwood hauled from the woods by truck before it is shipped to the mills by rail.

Container Corp. of America has operated a wood yard at Beatrice for several years.

Beatrice is located in an excellent timber-producing area and the economy of the town long has been closely associated with forest products. Conrad Wall, secretary-treasurer of the Beatrice Industrial Board, said a medical economic survey of the community has just been completed by the Sears Roebuck Foundation. The survey shows that there is a need for a doctor in Beatrice and that the community can support a doctor economically. "We are going all out to acquire a doctor here," Wall said.

There will be month-long cleanup campaign in the community during July, Wall said. The fight against dirt and litter will be a joint program sponsored by the town of Beatrice, Monroe County, Beatrice Industrial and Kiwanis Club.

A new town marshal has been appointed for Beatrice. He is Ralph K. Wall and is the first marshal the town has had in 12 years.

There are numerous signs of growth throughout the town which has a population of 575 within the city limits and many more in the vicinity.

A new nine-acre subdivision is under construction. A street to provide access is being paved by the town. The town has erected two street lights in the subdivision and will provide water service there. Construction on two houses will begin as soon as the street is paved, Wall said. Electric power already has been installed.

Development of the subdivision is a cooperative venture between the town of Beatrice and the county. Comm. Jerry Steele and Mayor Thomas A. Black coordinated the county and town efforts.

The State Employment Service recently completed a labor survey in this vicinity. The survey showed that there are about 6,000 persons available for work within a 25-mile radius of Beatrice, excluding Monroeville, which is 18 miles away, and Camden which is 21 miles away, in Wilcox County. The town's water system has been extended one-fourth mile already this year and a new proposal for another extension is under study by the Town Council. The proposed expansion would extend the system an additional four miles. It would be financed under a federal loan-grant program.

The People's Exchange Bank of Beatrice is preparing to build a new building across the street from the present bank.

Transportation being necessary to acquiring industrial plants, Beatrice is well located for both rail and highway traffic. The highway between Monroeville and Beatrice is being straightened and widened. The first link between Monroeville and Peterman is nearing completion.

Recreation is another big factor in a town's growth and Beatrice's facilities are increasing. A big 95-acre state lake near Beatrice will be opened for public fishing, July 25.

With the establishment of Patrick Henry Junior College at Monroeville, Beatrice is located within easy commuter distance of higher educational facilities.

MR. CECIL SIMS ENHANCED CITY

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the city of Nashville, Tenn., was saddened this past week by the loss of Mr. Cecil Sims, a most prominent attorney, civic leader, and community builder.

Over his life much of his time and many talents was spent in the service of others and his contributions will stand as a lasting memorial to that service.

I had the personal privilege of working with Mr. Sims in one of his many humanitarian activities, United Cerebral Palsy of Middle Tennessee in which he worked with effective dedication.

Mr. Speaker, many of the contributions to our community made by Mr. Sims have been noted in editorials from our two Nashville newspapers, the Nashville Tennesseean and the Nashville Banner and I would like to have them printed in the RECORD at this point, commending them to my colleagues for their consideration. In the passing of Mr. Sims our community has lost a leader and many of us have lost a true friend.

The editorials follow:

MR. CECIL SIMS ENHANCED CITY

Mr. Cecil Sims, one of Nashville's most prominent attorneys and civic leaders, is dead at the age of 75.

During a long and active legal practice here, Mr. Sims left many landmarks in Tennessee law. A senior member of the firm of Bass, Berry and Sims, he defended in court the state's first limited constitutional convention. And in 1953 he served as an able delegate to the convention from Davidson County.

Although his profession was law, Mr. Sims was involved deeply in seeking a better educational system. He drew up the compact which established the Southern Regional Education Board. He served for 15 years as a member of the old Davidson County School Board, taught at the Vanderbilt law school and served as president of the Vanderbilt Alumni Association.

Mr. Sims was a board member of United Cerebral Palsy of Middle Tennessee and chairman of the Cerebral Palsy Telethon here. A new treatment facility being built in Nashville will be named the "Cecil Sims Center."

Once active in politics, Mr. Sims served as a state senator and was a friend and advisor of Sens. Cordell Hull, Kenneth McKellar and Estes Kefauver. When southerners threatened to walk out in the 1948 Democratic convention, he took the floor to urge moderation and restraint.

Mr. Sims will be missed not only as an outstanding attorney, but as a man of warmth and gentleness who left a community enhanced by his presence and service.

CECIL SIMS

Dignity marked the personality of Cecil Sims, and dedication his address to every responsibility assumed in the public interest. For he was that kind of man; conscientious in leadership or support of causes espoused by deep conviction. To enumerate them would be to inventory the total product of a long life usefully employed in the service of his community, state and nation.

Distinguished in law, his career centered in that profession; his scholarship a benefit to Tennessee in occasions of constitutional test and revision. A true friend and benefactor of education, he served his alma mater as a member of the Vanderbilt University Board of Trust, the quality of his work in that institution reflected as professor in its law school, and as chairman of its committee for a new Law School Building.

In humanitarian endeavor his devotion showed in work of the United Cerebral Palsy organization, the local treatment facility of which will wear his name. In political and civic affairs, he lent the initiative and assistance of tireless colleague.

Such was the scope of his interests, identifying him with the daily life of the city he loved and whose respect he enjoyed in an earned place on its honor roll. A great family man, that devotion was reciprocated. A man of deep convictions, backed with courage, he was esteemed no less for the guiding qualities of a Christian gentleman. His was an influential life in that regard, for human betterment.

His death brings wide regret to the city that knew him well—by long and close association—which was his chosen home community and direct beneficiary of gifted labors; and which, like the state and the nation, is a better place for his having lived in it.

EX-SERVICEMEN NOT RIOTERS

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Stars and Stripes for June 27 contains an editorial that comments on a matter which deserves further statement and widespread appreciation. Entitled "Ex-Servicemen Not Rioters" the editorial points out that the young men who have served in our armed services do not lend themselves to the senseless riots and civil disorders that have beset our Nation. The editorial follows:

EX-SERVICEMEN NOT RIOTERS

If one may judge by arrests in the Nation's capital of agitators, looters, arsonists and kindred performers few of them are veterans of service in Viet Nam, Korea or elsewhere. This speaks well for the indoctrination in citizenship duties and ambition that the various services instill in their people.

A vast number of Viet Nam veterans, for example, are taking advantage of the government's education aid program and its job preparation help. The young man out of the service, be it on land, sea or in the air, has worked in the closest type of team collaboration with his comrades. He has seen the results of co-ordinated effort and purpose. Nine times out of ten he comes out of the service a better man than when he entered. The idea of being recompensed for doing nothing is not nurtured in his military surroundings or by his companions. He has other matters on his mind than the destruction of constituted authority.

The low apparent record of trouble with the law on the part of veterans speaks particularly well for the Negro. Undoubtedly a great many of them have been pressured to join in on demonstrations against their government, demonstrations that seem inevitably to lead to conflict with the law enforcement people of the land. If any of them have been arrested in Washington, they have not been identified as veterans.

Another sign that the veteran is not a ready customer for organizers and pressure group operators is the fact that no substantial ex-servicemen groups have been formed to protest the war in Viet Nam. With politicians and others in high places deriding the Administration's efforts in Viet Nam, it is rather significant that substantial protest groups have not been formed among veterans.

Perhaps the viewpoint of a farmer boy in Virginia who only recently completed his term of service and returned to the plows and dairy cows of his father's place, in a measure, explains why he has not been a ready customer for the organizer.

"No," he said in answer to a question whether the soldier out there would like to fold up operations and come home, "we've got a job to finish. We could not let down the decent people out there. We know the job has to be finished."

The young man happened to be white, but we suspect that his darker-skinned comrades in arms have a similar viewpoint.

It speaks well for the job top commanders and their subordinates down the line have done in handling the youth of the Nation sent to them.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF ACA

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to note that today marks the 10th anniversary of the Americans for Constitutional Action and this event is worthy of note.

I commend the ACA for the job it has tried to do over these years, that of indicating who stands where in the conservative-liberal spectrum and of assisting those responsible Members who consistently put country above self. I am sure that the officers and trustees of ACA would acknowledge that their measurements are not always as perfect and as precise as they would like but it cannot be realistically denied that their efforts have not been well-intentioned and extremely helpful.

There is a vital need in American politics for an organization such as ACA. Its function of encouraging and promoting constitutional government should be lauded by everyone who shares their concern and mine that too many Americans, in and out of Government, have lost touch with the fundamentals that have served this country so well so many times in our past. For what ACA has been able to do to recall those fundamentals to us, I am grateful and I wish them every success in future years and hope for an even stronger organization and a stronger voice in these discouraging times.

ANSWER OR BE JAILED

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, on June 8 of this year, the Scranton Tribune printed a perceptive editorial. It is one which I wish to call to the attention of all my colleagues.

The editorial addresses itself to an issue of the census of 1970, and the other censuses which will be taken in the future. Will we, in taking this census, require that Americans answer the most personal questions possible under threat of fine and imprisonment.

I have entered legislation which would not permit this to be done. The editorial position of the Scranton Tribune supports that bill. I hope that many more of my colleagues might consider the sponsorship of such legislation. I believe it to be a significant and just cause. The editorial follows:

ANSWER OR BE JAILED

How would you like to be fined $100 or sent to jail for 60 days because you refused to answer an impudent, impertinent, nosy questionnaire sent to you through the mails?

Well, that's what's going to happen to you when the 1970 census gets under way unless the present plans of the Bureau of the Census are changed by congressional action. For the Census Bureau has prepared such a questionnaire containing more than 100 intrusive questions which pry into your privacy and intend to make it mandatory for you to answer them or suffer the penalty of fine or imprisonment.

For years the American people believed the census was conducted for the sole purpose of counting the number of people residing in the United States and that's the way it has been. But the Washington bureaucrats now intend to make something else out of it.

Their questionnaire is going to ask for such things as your income from each and every source, including alimony, public assistance, unemployment compensation, disability insurance, pensions and investments.

They're going to ask you to place a value on your property or state the amount of rent you pay, how far you went in school, what's your marital standing, your employment and your military history. They'll also ask you who shares your bathroom and kitchen facilities and to give them an inventory of your household appliances. They want to know if you have a dishwasher, television set or sets, radios, automobiles or a second home.

And all of this information will be compiled and made available to any who desire it.

Already a group of more than 20 members of Congress are sponsoring legislation to stop this inquisition. These men, quite rightly, want the mandatory questions confined to seven simple ones including your name and address, relationship to the head of the household, sex, date of birth, race or color, marital status and names of people in your home.

But the Congressmen won't be able to effect this change unless you, yourself, lend a hand. So why not take the time right now to write your Representative and your Senators and tell them you want your privacy protected? It could save you from going to jail.

THE AMERICAN DREAM

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, in honor of the great day we will celebrate next Thursday, July 4, I would like to place in the RECORD a sermon for the occasion by Rev. Charles R. Ausmus, pastor of the Lincoln Park Baptist Church in Knoxville, Tenn., and a leader in the Tennessee Baptist Convention. His words speak for themselves, as follows:

THE AMERICAN DREAM

(An Independence Day sermon by Charles R. Ausmus)

I. THE DREAM

It was the dream of the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock. It was the dream of the settlers at Jamestown. It was the dream of those who fought and won the War of Independence. It was the dream of Washington at Valley Forge, the dream of the First Congress. It was the dream of every school established on our shores. It was the dream of every forlorn alien who sought a new life in the New World.

What was that dream? It was the dream prophesied by Joel that, "Your sons and daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams and your young men shall see visions." It was the Judeo-Christian dream of the time when the lion would lie down with the lamb, when all the earth would be at peace, and that men everywhere would beat their swords into plowshares, and that every man with his family could dwell safely under his own vine and fig tree. The dream of ancient Israel was that the Lord's house should be built on the tops of the mountains and the people would flow into it to glorify God!

So far this dream has been kept alive at great cost and sacrifice. It cost us a war of 1812. It cost us a war with Spain and Mexico. It cost us a family blood bath in the war between the States. It cost us our finest men who were buried at Flanders Field, and those who hit the Normandy Beaches and fought the Battle of the Bulge. It cost us the ships and precious lives of our men out across the wide Pacific. Our men paid dearly in Korea, and now suffer and die in Vietnam.

It cost the labor, toil and sweat to build America from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Our forefathers lived, toiled, and died that that dream might become a reality. The dream of peace, justice, equality and opportunity for the pursuit of a full and happy life.

II. THE PRESENT NIGHTMARE

In these perilous days we have come nigh to losing the American dream. We do not sing and shout the dream as we did before. Today our power is unparalleled and still growing. Our affluent society is awesome and still increases. Our scientific technology and ingenuity is amazing. Our barns and our banks are full. Our machines and computers are marching like a mountain to the sea.

Yet, like Diogenes of old, we walk the streets with a lantern in daylight looking for an honest man. Jesus likened our generation to children playing in the marketplace. Paul describes the nightmare of our day when he wrote, "Men love themselves, covet, boast, blaspheme, disobey God and man, unholy in life, loving pleasure more than they love God, having a form of religion but denying the only Lord God."

This is a nightmare of material progress and moral poverty; lying has become propaganda, selfishness is just self interest, greed is profit, liberty has become license and lust masquerades as love.

Ours is a nightmare of punks, hoodlums, red-necked racists, kids at the beaches, pregnant high school girls, the dope addicts, the vandals, the TV addicts, sick viewers of sick movies and sick readers of sick books. Our generation lost its sense of color, of black and white in sin; they see only convenient gray. Ours is a nightmare of Beatles, beatniks, barbarians, brewers, bottles, blubber, ballyhoo, brass, bureaucrats, boycott, borrowing, bankruptcy, barbiturates, boredom and breakdown. No wonder we have sired a generation of spiritual dwarfs and moral invalids.

III. HOW TO REALIZE FULFILLMENT

There are some basic, homespun ideas that must be practiced if we are to realize fulfillment of the American dream.

1. We must recognize, respect, and worship the Almighty. Our coins proclaim, "In God we trust"; our pledge to the flag contains the words, "under God". This must be real and from the heart.

2. We must get back to the church. Let the life of the community be centralized in the church or the local synagogue. Religion must be central.

3. We must build Godly, Christian homes. A place where the family dwells together in love, peace, and the worship of the God of the family.

4. We must magnify the school. Not as a place for riots, lootings, and burnings; but as a sacred place of study, concern for truth, and the search for knowledge and wisdom.

5. We must have respect for the dignity of the individual, regardless of race, color or station in life. We will treat every man as a fellow citizen, as a brother in Christ, and have confidence in and trust him as a man. Jesus taught us to "Love thy neighbor as thyself" and "Love one another as I have loved you".

6. We must live under law. We must obey the law. This nation was founded on a dream of "men living by law". The law is for the protection of a man's person and his property. We either turn to law or burn with anarchy!

7. We must have respect for those in positions of authority. Be it the parent, the teacher, the policeman, the judge, the governor, or the president. The position and the man in that position merits our respect and cooperation.

8. We must magnify and dignify labor. Our calling, our profession, or our job of work must have meaning. It is reported that one large oil company interviewed 11,000 people and found only 300 who were willing to work in the business world. A man is a man only when he produces more than he consumes. Only a mouse would dream of doing less.

9. We must magnify *service*. The lowly Nazarene came "not to be ministered unto, but to minister and give his life a ransom for many". He taught us "He that would be greatest among you, let him be servant of all." It is the *service* we render to our nation, our fellowman, in the name of Christ that brings the blessing of God to our lives.

10. In the last analysis we must recover

a sense of the sacred. A draft card is sacred; it points to my identity in relationship to the defense of my country. The judge's bench is sacred; the flag is sacred; the policeman's badge is sacred; the government building is sacred; the Bible is sacred; the church is sacred; property and human life is sacred. May God help us to realize the American dream.

What is the final ending?
The issue can we know?
Will America outlive radicalism?
Will worldly altars go?
This is our faith and dream
Our wild hope, and who shall scorn?
That by the power of God
This nation shall be reborn!

GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in all the furor over the question of gun control legislation there is a tendency to overlook voluntary efforts that are being made by the business community to establish greater control over the sale of weapons. In that respect I commend Sears, Roebuck, and Co., and others for policing itself, and for taking steps to see that juveniles are not permitted to purchase firearms. Under unanimous consent I submit a copy of a letter I received from Mr. John Wheeler, vice president of government relations, Sears, and a copy of the company bulletin implementing the new policy for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

SEARS, ROEBUCK & CO.,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1968.

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: In light of pending proposals for stricter controls over the sale of firearms, you may be interested to know the policies established by Sears, Roebuck and Co.

A number of years ago Sears elected to impose a total, company-wide prohibition against the sale of hand guns. This prohibition has remained in effect and will continue.

On April 26, 1968, Sears placed into force a policy which prohibits the mail order sale of rifles, shotguns, and other types of sporting guns as well as ammunition. Furthermore, Sears will not sell firearms or ammunition to any person under twenty-one years of age. These company rules restricting the sale of guns and ammunition prevail throughout the country, even though such sales would accord with State laws.

Enclosed for your information is a copy of a company bulletin which implements the described policies. Please call on me if you would like to have any additional information.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. WHEELER,
Vice President, Government Relations.

RECORD OF FIREARMS SOLD AND RESTRICTIONS ON THE SALE OF AMMUNITION, FIREARMS, AIR RIFLES, AND AIR RIFLE SHOT

(Section I—Retail stores)
(Section II—Control stores)

Effective immediately, it is Sears policy not to sell any guns or ammuntion to anyone under 21 years of age and to not accept orders for shipment direct to customer's home address. This includes rifles, shot guns, hand guns, air rifles, pellet guns, as well as ammuniton for these guns. At time of sale and again at time of customer pickup, customer must show proof of age 21 years or over, such as a driver's license, draft card, birth certificate, etc.

The provisions of Bulletin S-380 Rev., dated May 27, 1958, (Secs. I & II for Retail and Control Stores) regarding local or state restrictions on sales of guns, air rifles and ammunition, also apply, including the keeping of records or receipts and disbursements of firearms.

RETAIL STORES—DIVISIONS 6 AND 200

Require proof of age 21 or over as described above when customer buys and picks up gun or ammunition. Do not accept any orders for guns or ammunition for shipment or deliveries direct to a customer address. Require proof of age 21 or over on any guns or ammunition put on "Lay-Away".

RETAIL STORE CUSTOMER SERVICE DEPARTMENT

Require proof of age for guns or ammunition placed on "Lay-Away", before giving to customer, a time of final payment.

CATALOG ORDER PLANTS

Advise all selling units, Catalog Sales Offices, Catalog Sales Merchants of Sears policy, that telephone orders and orders for shipment direct to customer's home address cannot be accepted. Accept orders only in person for shipment to store for customer pickup. At time of sale and again at time of customer pickup, customer must show proof of age 21 years or over.

To be assured that package is not given to a customer without proof of age over 21 years, selling units should write on the sales check "Proof of Age 21 Required", and control stores should apply stickers on package near shipper labels, "Proof of Age 21 Required."

On Direct Mail and Metropolitan telephone orders, advise customer Sears policy is not to accept any orders by mail or by phone for any guns or ammunition. Such orders must be placed with Sears Catalog Selling Units for shipment to stores for customer pickup. At time of sale and again at time of pickup, customer must show proof of age 21 years or over.

Approved:

G. M. Metcalf.
H. A. Benthin.
J. W. Button.
T. F. Wands.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICANS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ACTION

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, at a time when so much of politics is succumbing to a growing emotionalism and the "cult of the personality," it is a genuine pleasure to observe the 10th anniversary of a bipartisan citizen group which has successfully dedicated itself to levelheaded, consistent striving for better constitutional government. Americans for Constitutional Action stands as a striking example of the right way of working for good government.

As a nationwide, nonprofit organization dedicated to political action, ACA has helped countless conservative candidates take their case to the people, and in granting its coveted distinguished service awards, has recognized the accomplishments of hundreds of Members of the Congress. Last year alone, 149 Members of the 90th Congress accepted the distinguished service award, and it is encouraging to note that 41 freshmen Members, although not eligible for the award, were among those in attendance—a heartening indication of the resurgence of responsible conservatism which is sweeping the country.

ACA has earned the outspoken admiration and respect of many of the Nation's lawmakers. Ten years have passed since Adm. Ben Moreell, former Gov. Charles Edison, Dr. Walter Martin, Loyd Wright, and the late Henning W. Prentis, Jr., conceived and organized ACA. Today the cherished dream which they transformed into a reality, is stronger than ever. In the years ahead, I trust that ACA will continue to be one of the great bastions of constitutional government, and a great force for good in American politics.

I hope that many happy, well-deserved anniversary tributes are in store for Americans for Constitutional Action in the years ahead.

THE REAL CRIME MENACE

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much concerned over the developing tide of emotionalism surrounding gun control legislation, and particularly the piecemeal manner in which the President has chosen to make his views known to Congress. On June 19, the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 was signed into law which includes provisions to substantially control certain traffic and sales of handguns. At the same time, the President avowed he would press for the extension of these provisions to cover long guns, a plea that was promptly taken up by the respective committees in both the House and Senate. Within days, another message was submitted to Congress calling for national registration and licensing, to include a photograph and fingerprints, of all guns and gun possessors.

It is time for a moratorium on mass demonstrations. It is time for courts to stop catering to criminals. It is time for living by the law. It is time for praying preachers and fewer political parsons. It is time to stop exploiting the fears and prejudices of minorities. It is time for politicians to stop overpromising. It is time for civil rights leaders to be civil. It is time for students to study, and it is time for workers to work. It is time to reflect upon our past and to think about those principles that have made us the greatest of nations—those embodied in the Constitution.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, throughout the consideration of gun control legislation over the years, the real gun menace—the criminal—is made reference to in a barrage of statistics, presumably to demonstrate that it is the gun which is the

culprit and with the inference that stringent gun laws will deprive "the vicious, the irresponsible, and the insane" of a tool with which to commit a criminal act. Not a word is implicit in all of this legislation that would provide for strong deterrents to the criminal user or carrier of a firearm in the commission of a felony by the imposition of severe penalties. It is this person that society must be protected from rather than being lured into believing that the deranged individual will be less a potential criminal or his acts less damaging by a complacency that he can be prevented from coming into the possession of a firearm. Taken to its logical conclusion, the only gun control legislation that might approach effectiveness in accomplishing this would be to outlaw all guns, except for duly constituted law enforcement authorities, so that it can then be presumed that anyone possessing a gun is a potential criminal. Surely, this is not the weight or intent of public opinion.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that on June 26, I and my knowledgeable friend and colleague, Congressman ROBERT G. WATKINS, introduced H.R. 18142, to prohibit the use in the commission of certain crimes of firearms transported in interstate commerce. First-time offenders would be faced with mandatory imprisonment of not less than 10 years, while a second offense would be punishable by imprisonment for not less than 25 years.

I have been very much interested in the many news stories on this subject which have appeared in newspapers throughout the country, particularly in recent weeks. A good many, riding the emotional waves for more and more gun controls, are accelerating a popular attack against guns while the deterrents to the criminal are notable by their absence. However, in the June 26, 1968, issue of the Washington Evening Star, there appeared an editorial, "The Real Gun Menace," and an article under the byline of Mr. Frank Getlein, "Gun Control Laws for Criminals, Too," which are eye-catching because they see through the morass of illogic to the real villain—the criminal. I include them at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 26, 1968]

THE REAL GUN MENACE

The President's latest message to Congress on gun controls is noteworthy in at least two respects.

It goes well beyond his former proposals and also beyond proposals offered by such ardent gun control people as Maryland's Senator Tydings. It is also more noteworthy for its emotional content than for any deterrent effect it could be expected to have on the use of guns by criminals—the real source of the gun menace.

When Mr. Johnson signed the omnibus crime bill on June 19 he said that its ban on mail order sales of hand guns, though it is stringent, was inadequate. He was right about that. He urged that there be a ban on mail order sales of shotguns and rifles. Again, he was right, and he pressed for legislation to forbid such sales.

While that proposal was pending, however, and before Congress could act, he sent up another message this week. In it, he called for the registration and licensing of all firearms—applying to new purchases as well as to guns already possessed by individuals. He called for monetary punishment of any state which did not fall into line.

Is there anything wrong with this? Let's take a look. Mr. Johnson said of the registration and licensing proposals: "Surely the slight inconvenience for the few is minimal when measured against protection for all." The "few" are the owners of the estimated 50 to 100 million guns in this country today. How would registration and licensing provide "protection for all?" This would be true only if it is assumed—an unwarranted assumption—that criminals as well as law-abiding citizens would come in and register their guns and apply for licenses to possess them.

The President gave some examples. Last Tuesday, he said, a filling station attendant was shot to death in the course of a $75 armed robbery. The robber was violating the law by using the gun in the commission of a felony. Is Mr. Johnson seriously suggesting that this robber, and the thousands of others like him, would have registered the gun and applied for a license? He also said that in 1967 there were 71,000 robberies with guns. How many of those victims would have been protected by a registration and licensing law? One other thing, Mr. Johnson said that with registration under modern computer systems "the owner of a gun anywhere in the country can be identified in a matter of seconds." True, if the gun owner had obeyed the law and registered his gun. Untrue if he had not registered.

Another interesting point: The President urges that any person who fails to register any kind of gun be subject to a fine of $2,000 and a two-year jail term. Under existing law in Washington, however, the maximum first-offense penalty for carrying a concealed hand gun on the street is only one year in jail and a $1,000 fine. Yet the person who carries a concealed gun is the potential murderer or robber.

It may be that registration and licensing would be of some help in discouraging improper sales or transfers of guns. But they are not going to stop the armed criminals or provide any appreciable "protection for all." As we suggested several days ago, the best way to achieve this protection is to provide really tough and if necessary mandatory jail sentences for anyone caught carrying an unlicensed gun or using a gun while committing a felony.

Why doesn't the President, as a companion piece to his appeal, get behind something of this nature?

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 26, 1968]

GUN CONTROL LAWS FOR CRIMINAL, TOO

(By Frank Getlein)

It was not surprising that some kind of gun legislation finally made some kind of headway in Congress. That body doesn't need much to catch on. Three assassinations did the trick, especially the second and third coming so close and the third victim's relationship to the first.

What did surprise many observers was the reluctance to move in Congress even after all three killings.

Why the reluctance? Hard as it is to face, for the passionate advocate of gun laws, the reluctance in Congress probably has reflected accurately a similar reluctance in the people at large, a reluctance only dissipated by the horror of recent events.

Part of the problem stems from the general association of ideas the people have acquired about the passionate advocates themselves.

In the popular view, for example, these passionate advocates of gun laws for everyone are equally passionate advocates for the rights of accused persons, including persons accused because they were caught in the act. Oddly enough, no one has attacked the quarter of a million dollar bail set for Sirhan Sirhan as outrageously high, but if the victim had been the ordinary liquor store operator or dry cleaner who is the usual target of criminal guns, it is not at all unreasonable to suppose that such a bail would have brought howls of protest from the very voices now urging gun controls.

That's the trouble with the current gun control laws. It isn't the laws themselves so much as their advocacy by what lots of people consider the pro-criminal crowd. Looked at from that point of view, the proposals, even the most far-reaching of them, are seen as steps to disarm the citizenry completely so that criminals can enjoy even more protection than they now do and feel even freer to prey upon the householder and storekeeper.

Like all laws, gun laws will in theory apply equally to rich and poor, to law-abiding and criminal. But, from the point of view here under discussion, in practice laws are not applied equally at all. The ordinary, honest citizen is governed chiefly by regulation, even by computer, rather than by policemen. Whereas the police can be accused of brutality and courts can be persuaded to make police stop being hateful to muggers and stick-up men, it is absurd to accuse a computer of brutality. No court in the land has ever laid a glove on a government-operated memory-bank, however faulty its memory.

When a criminal knocks over a liquor store and shoots the proprietor, he is immediately informed that he need say nothing at all, that he is entitled to counsel and that the community will undertake to provide him with a lawyer if he so wishes.

In sharp contrast, consider the honest citizen set upon by a malfunctioning computer in the Internal Revenue Service. He is brutally assaulted by a bill for past-due taxes plus interest that accumulated while the computer was getting around to developing its peculiar disability.

If he writes in protest, he gets another collection of numbers, an even higher bill and is informed that IRS will shortly move to seize his bank account and other property if he does not get up the dough fast. Not a word is said about his rights. Nobody offers him free legal services or even admits that he is entitled to paid legal services. There is no due process, only due taxes. The machine is always assumed to be right, the citizen wrong, despite universal experience with feeble-minded computers in banks, department stores, the Army, Navy and Marines.

Translating this impression of how laws are applied equally, the reluctant citizen easily envisions people from the Internal Firearms Service grabbing his bank account until he hands over his weapons, perhaps even having to go out and buy weapons in order to have some to hand in.

But the actual criminal, in this view, would be protected here as elsewhere. If his gun were confiscated, it would be discovered that the police lacked a search warrant or that their information was obtained by eavesdropping or that he had confessed without a lawyer; in any event, some flaw would put the gun back in his hands and him back on the street.

The easiest way to get universal support for the gun laws would be for the advocates of such laws to pledge their support by applying the laws to everyone, even criminals.

PESSIMISM ON THE FARM

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, one of the great midwestern daily papers, the Min-

neapolis Sunday Star, carried an editorial of some concern about the lack of "growth" in the agricultural sector from the Upper Midwest Economic Report.

The editorial reports that farm incomes in the month of March 1968, in the entire Ninth Federal Reserve District, dropped 20 percent from March 1967. One of the first signs of this depressed income was shown in the 33 percent fewer tractor sales than the previous year. Not only is the farmer's purchasing power down because of poorer prices, and less farm receipts, but also because of the shortage of low-rate farm loans.

The editorial follows:

The bright economic picture in the Upper Midwest, which shows continuing growth in employment, wages and housing construction, is marred by a decline in the farm sector.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, in its monthly statistical report, notes a sharp drop in spending by farmers, and blames it on pessimism and uncertainty over 1968 prices and income. The decline shows up most clearly in purchases of farm tractors, which were off 33 per cent in Minnesota during the first three months this year, compared with the same quarter in 1967. A 20 per cent drop in March alone was recorded for the entire Ninth Federal Reserve District.

The farmers' pessimism has some solid basis in fact. Estimates made last year had indicated improved farm incomes for 1968, but Department of Agriculture statistics now show district crop receipts in March declined 32 per cent from the same month a year ago. This more than offset an 8 per cent increase in livestock receipts. Total cash farm receipts for the first quarter were off 1.1 per cent from the same three months in 1967.

The rosy statistics coming from other segments of the district's economy tend to obscure this dismal agricultural scene. But unless the decline in farm income and spending is reversed, its effects are certain to snowball, beginning at the cash register of the small town merchant and eventually showing up in lower tax receipts for the state governments.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF INDIAN RESERVATIONS

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, in recommending against passage of a bill for the inducement of industry to move onto Indian reservations, H.R. 10218, the Department says:

There is now pending before the Congress H.R. 10560—the Administration's Indian Resources Development legislation. That bill was carefully developed to meet a number of the special problems of Indian reservations in creating and attracting industries. It includes an authorization of $500,000,000 for an Indian loan guaranty and insurance fund and for a direct loan revolving fund. It also authorizes corporate charters to Indian groups to give them a structure through which they could compete with other communities to attract industry. We believe it will do a more effective job than H.R. 10218.

It is true the administration has had a bill introduced which would do these things, but the bill still languishes in the Indian Affairs Subcommittee and I am sure will not be passed because, while the provisions sound real good, they are not practical.

For example, this $500 million Indian loan guaranty and insurance fund and a revolving loan fund only puts an Indian reservation in the same category as the cities of the various States who have some such similar program.

How can anyone expect an industry to move out into a remote area such as an Indian reservation, where transportation costs are very high, in preference to a town or city on a highway and on a railway where the city can offer almost the same incentives?

The way their bill authorizes corporate charters to Indian groups is to give them a structure through which they could compete with other communities to attract industry. They failed to say, however, how they propose to give the reservation an opportunity to compete with "other communities" where transportation costs are materially less than they will be to the industry on that reservation.

I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, to move forward with an antipoverty program that will work instead of just giving lip-service to the problem.

CHATTANOOGA WINS NEW FRIENDS

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, we in Chattanooga were delighted to host the recent convention of the National Baptist Sunday School and Baptist Training Union Congress. And it was with a special pride that I subsequently read some of the nice things which this fine group of visiting men and women had to say about the city and people of Chattanooga.

At a time when so many of our great urban areas are plagued with tensions and violence, I think that the atmosphere of cordial hospitality and goodwill which typifies Chattanooga holds the key to at least part of a solution. In two informative articles appearing in the June 21 and 23 issues of the Chattanooga News-Free Press, the comments and reactions of some of these recent visitors were extensively covered. Because of their interest, I submit the articles for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) News-Free Press, June 21, 1968]

VISITING BAPTISTS HEAP PAEANS OF PRAISE ON CITY

(By Jere Sellars)

Chattanooga has been "a delightful surprise," "the most wonderful reception anywhere," "the friendliest city we've been in," and "the most integrated."

The people of Chattanooga are "friendlier than at home," "so hospitable," "more God-like than anywhere we've been," . . . and on and on with almost embarrassing intensity words of praise and appreciation have welled from the delegates to the National Baptist Sunday School and BTU Congress about the city, its people and the beauty of the countryside.

The Rev. Donis Myers of Philadelphia called Chattanooga "the most integrated city I've ever seen. The integration that there is in the minds and hearts of the people, not just in the laws. I've been going to these conventions for 20 years and I've never seen anything like it."

Mrs. Sally Huffman of Cleveland, Ohio, said, "It's just wonderful, everybody is so friendly. This is my fifth convention and the people are just friendlier here. And there are so many nice churches and schools."

The Rev. J. D. Williams of Pensacola, Fla., was delighted that "even the service station attendants are as friendly and helpful as they can be, really sincerely friendly.

"All types of places, all sorts of business, it's been a delightful surprise and not at all what I expected.

"Everybody really made me feel that they were glad I'd come and wanted me to come back. And I want to come back now that I've been here. There is just such a wonderful spirit of friendship," he said.

"The weather and the people are warm—very warm—warmer than I'm used to at home," said Ronald Smith, a youth delegate from St. Paul, Minn.

"Before we left home we were given a list of 'don'ts' to go by since we were coming to a Southern city, but we haven't had to use it because we've been accepted as people.

"This will be as good or better than last year's convention in Milwaukee. The facilities were more conveniently located there, though."

Fritzi Mitchell of Chicago, another youth delegate, found that she had been treated, just as friendly as if "I'd lived here all my life. And the mountains are so beautiful, we drove in and enjoyed the scenery so much."

A Los Angeles lad remarked that the cab drivers in Chattanooga are "a lot friendlier than the ones at home." A gray-haired matron from Detroit replied that Chattanooga has been "just wonderful, God bless you."

All week, remarks have been overheard from delegates who marvel in awed tones at the hospitality and warm reception they have encountered all over the city—there has been one complaint—"It is a little warm," remarked a delegate when he was pressed about any reservations he might have aside from his enthusiastic endorsement of Chattanooga.

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) News-Free Press, June 23, 1968]

BAPTISTS LEAVE, FEEL CITY REALLY SOMETHING SPECIAL

(By Jere Sellars)

More than 8,000 Negro Baptists are returning to their homes in all parts of the nation this weekend with the firm conviction that Chattanooga, its people, its press and its surroundings are "really something special."

Dr. J. B. Cayce, outgoing director-general and new vice president, said that 5,287 Baptists would be credited with registration and completion of the training courses. He estimated that 3,000 family members and guests accompanied the delegates.

Voicing the apparent consensus, Dr. Pauline Campbell, director of youth activities for the National Baptist Sunday School and Baptist Training Union Congress, said Friday night at the Youth Rally, "I just don't know what to say about Chattanooga. I may move here myself. It looks like you have to come down South to be up North."

Her sentiment was greeted with applause and "amens."

There will be convocational services this morning in the Community Theater, but the business of the 63rd annual convention closed Saturday afternoon with the executive board meeting.

Class periods and special projects, including the William Jernigan lecture series, went right up to the wire Saturday morning before the start of the last general session just before noon.

Resolutions to brand the Vietnam war "immoral" and urging an anti-war letter-writing campaign and asking the parent National Baptist Convention U.S.A. Inc. were not put to a vote before the general assembly as previously reported.

MAXWELL HONORED

The body did vote to award president-emeritus Dr. O. Clay Maxwell an honorarium for life and to furnish his and Mrs. Maxwell's travel expense to all future conventions he can attend.

The executive board accepted the invitation of the Florida delegation to hold the 1969 congress in Miami.

The Rev. Louis Brooks, pastor of Chattanooga's New Zion Baptist Church and general chairman of the convention, accepted the high praise offered by Dr. Edward A. Freeman of Kansas City, Kans., newly elected congress president.

"I don't think we have ever had a better organized convention, or one where the host committee did a better job of getting things ready for us," said Dr. Freeman.

The Rev. Brooks responded that Chattanooga was "grateful to the congress. You have benefited us spiritually, morally and financially. It has been a blessing to have you here."

Coverage praised

Dr. Freeman credited the Chattanooga Times and the Chattanooga News-Free Press "with the best and fairest coverage given to us by any newspapers anywhere. Your coverage exceeds anything we have seen before," he told attending press representatives.

Executive board members began to rise and interject their own commentary of their experience here, all good, concluding with Dr. Freeman's report that a policeman and a cab driver, both with a quarter century or more on the job, had told them that theirs was the most cordial group ever to come to the city. He responded that Chattanooga had certainly been the most cordial city.

"I was raised right down here in Atlanta and I can remember when I came to Chattanooga as a boy and the only place we could go was the ball park. Now we are graciously received everywhere, in the stores, the restaurants and the hotels.

"I now think of Chattanooga as just an American city—not just a Southern city with what that used to mean. You surprised us, and it was a wonderful surprise," he said.

A highlight of the congress was the first banquet to be given in honor of the Sunday School superintendents and teachers and BTU directors in the 63-year history of the congress. The fete was held at the First Baptist Church in the Golden Gateway and the visitors were served by members of the church.

OPEN SOCIETY TAKES RISKS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the El Cajon (Calif.) Daily Californian]

OPEN SOCIETY TAKES RISKS

Outrage over the assassination of Sen. Robert Kennedy has taken the form of harsh indictments of our whole society. The most common pejorative used to describe American civilization these days is "sick." The doctrine of collective guilt is widely accepted.

There is a sense in which this indictment is deserved. We as a people bear the responsibility for the condition of our nation's soul; it is not a matter which can be assigned to individual leaders or "forces beyond our control."

Perhaps our outrage over a senseless and brutal act like the murder of Senator Kennedy is mere sham until we become equally indignant about a permissive attitude toward other manifestations of violence or its enthronement as a part of our culture.

It is foolish to think that violence can ever be controlled if American citizens have in their homes around 50 million guns, with no very serious efforts made until now to restrict possession and the sources of supply.

And a steady diet of violence on television screens and in movie theaters builds up a tolerance for such behavior which is bound to have an unhealthy effect on attitudes.

Even people to whom we look for guidance in selecting entertainment have on occasion become entranced with the tawdry offerings of Hollywood. Many critics were gushing with praise for that blood-spattered flick, "Bonnie and Clyde," and were distressed because it did not win an Academy Award as the best picture of the year.

These criticisms are justified, but they should be balanced with observations about other aspects of our society which at least in part help explain why violence occurs with greater frequency here than in some other places.

No other country has opened its doors to such diverse populations and attempted to amalgamate so many different races and creeds. Countries with fairly homogeneous populations can gloat about their aversion to violence and discord, but that is really empty boasting. It isn't much of a challenge to create a tranquil society where everybody has essentially the same temperament, the same color of skin and the same cultural heritage—and where immigration policies are terribly restrictive.

But to attempt on a massive scale to assimilate into one nation the multitude of nationalities, religious sects and races that make up America's population is the ultimate test. That is a tremendous task and to expect such a project to succeed without some turbulence is asking the impossible. On the other hand, if the upheavals become too frequent or go unchecked the result is chaos and irreparable damage to the basic structure of society itself. The task is always to minimize the trouble.

America has had much success in reconciling diverse people from all over the globe—certainly more success than any other nation. We are experiencing great difficulty at the moment, but it is not too much to hope that in the years ahead even these troubles will dissipate. After all, in the decades from 1830 to 1870 it was the Irish who were raising cain in our cities. There were probably pessimists then who thought it was hopeless to try to assimilate these fiery sons of Erin into the body politic. But it happened, and we all benefit because it did.

Those who come to this country from other lands often bring with them their old-world frustrations and grievances. Such is apparently the case with the accused assassin of Senator Kennedy. He is a Jordanian reported to have a fanatical hatred of the Jews, which points up the fact that ours isn't the only nation where passions run deep.

The open society takes more risks than those which are closed. Russian or Chinese leaders don't have to mingle with the people—and risk getting shot—because they aren't popularly elected. That's playing it safe. They build walls and fences to keep people out, or in, and let nobody take up residence who might undermine the state.

So before making sweeping condemnations of our own country, and donning the hairshirt, it might be well to take a look at history. That will help to keep such tragic events as Kennedy's assassination in perspective.

REBUILD WOODSHED

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial printed on June 23, 1968, in the Blade-Tribune of Oceanside, Calif., entitled "Rebuild Woodshed." I believe that it deserves wide circulation, as follows:

REBUILD WOODSHED

The United States of America, strongest and richest and most materialistically capable power in the world today, has gone into its periodic flagellant orgy of masochism, crawling about on its collective knees and begging forgiveness for its genius, its ambition, its drive, its health and its virulence because of a public tragedy.

It is not new, this self abasement. It happens almost daily in varying degrees of intensity.

It happens when the baby cries and daddy walks the floor all night instead of plugging mommy's ears.

It happens when there's a mugging in a "decent" neighborhood and we blame the successful guy down the street who amassed so much affluence he tempted a "good" boy to go bad.

It happens monthly when we look at the FBI crime rate statistics. "Look," we say, "at the crime in the streets. We've abolished capital punishment, eased up on jail terms, increased probation and paroles, turned penitentiaries into country clubs. What have we done wrong?"

It should be obvious what we have done wrong.

We have gotten rid of the woodshed and turned the disciplining—even the serious punishment—of our young over to tender-hearted Mom. Mom was first to abolish capital punishment. She did it at home. And the consequences of that symbolic petticoat folly—with its attendant "don't you hit him, you brute" admonitions—cometh home to roost like cockroaches.

The Supreme Court merely formalized the job.

It is becoming increasingly obvious to the majority of people across an aroused America that what we have done, in reality, is abdicate the running of the nation to a bunch of toggy-brained, under-nourished, over-haired, ivy tower theoreticians who tossed away common sense and the tried-and-true in favor of a permissive, progressive, preposterous parade of ridiculous theorems that have ruined a number of successive American generations and nearly ruined the nation.

A senator is shot.

President Johnson, like the predictable doll when its button is pushed, appoints a commission.

We haven't taken time to digest the book published by the Kerner commission—the last commission.

Eugene McCarthy, spaniel-eyed and professional, intones the opening liturgy of the national masochistic chant: "We must all share the guilt."

Must we all share the guilt, too, of Benedict Arnold, Jefferson Davis, Warren Harding and Judy Garland?

Pompous, play-acting, over-paid and under-talented psychiatrists take to the airwaves with lip-smacking relish and invent

new scientific platitudes to explain the bad that is baked into apple pie.

All the politicians in the world ride down upon us on the wornout hobby horse that the assassination of John F. Kennedy made: that the assassination of Martin Luther King nourished.

"This horrible thing," all the parade intones, "is a product of our guilt, of our environment, of our civilization, of our affluence. Sell all your worldly goods and wear sack cloth now, henceforth and forever."

In any instance, the diet is as appetizing as a bushel of wetnoodles dipped in dried buffalo dung.

In this particular instance, the wooden heads who ride the hobby horses, the psychiatrists, McCarthy and the President are patently, individually and collectively off the track.

The assassination of Robert F. Kennedy had no relationship to those that were prior—nor to our national environment.

The accused assassin was no American. He was a native of Jordan, a militant Arab who hated Kennedy because of his stated leanings toward the state of Israel.

He allegedly shot Kennedy on the anniversary of the start of the brief Arab-Israeli war of 1967.

He is said to have written his intent to do so.

The act was as much connected with the environment of the United States today—or yesterday—as were the Mau Mau uprising in Kenya, the discovery of Australopithecus in Africa or the evolution of the hunting habits of the Bengal tiger.

We are guilty, all right.

We are guilty of erasing the definitive borders between good and bad, the true and false in our civilization.

We are guilty of turning over the administration of our affairs and the expression of our likes and our dislikes to a vociferous few who display a giant vocabulary and a pigmy mentality.

If you haven't lost your faculties entirely through disuse, you could start resuming the mastership of your own governmental fate by letting your congressman—and your newspaper—know how you feel about rioting students who need their fannies kicked; about looters and arsonists who should be stopped by any necessary force; about murderers who should die for their crimes; about self-serving legal folderol that makes it possible for the guilty to go unpunished for years; about politicians who give you words rather than facts; melon-headed charm rather than hard-headed logic.

Letters to congressmen and to editors should not come from the cranks in our society. They should come from every man; they should represent the opinion of the majority.

When they do, as they once did, we can hope to regain control of our nation and our fate.

TENTH YEAR OF THE ACA

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, today marks a milestone in the checking on the conscience of the Congress. The Americans for Constitutional Action have for 10 years today been advising the folks back home just exactly what individual Members have done in the way of voting.

I personally feel that the ratings of the ACA are extremely important in a man's standing for reelection, and I am proud to say that my record mirrors the fiscal responsibility and integrity the organization has stood for this past decade.

There is no doubt but that the Americans for Constitutional Action will be a factor in our political scene for many years to come, and I sincerely hope that their objectives will stay parallel with mine during the years that the voters in my district choose to elect me as their representative in the Congress.

WGAU EDITORIAL: "IS AMERICA SICK?"

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 1968, WGAU radio station in Athens, Ga., presented an editorial on the question "Is America Sick?" Since this is a question that many Americans are asking today, I believe that it would be beneficial to all of the Members of Congress to read this interesting editorial. I submit it, therefore, for insertion in the RECORD:

IS AMERICA SICK?

Is America sick?

WGAU says, "No!"

Did the average American feel a deep revulsion and sorrow when prominent American citizens were felled by assassin's bullets?

WGAU says, "Yes!"

Do more people than ever before in the history of the United States have a chance for a better life?

WGAU says, "Certainly!"

Were the assassins of President John F. Kennedy; Civil Rights Leader, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; and Senator Robert Kennedy, average Americans?

WGAU says, "Of course *not*!"

Take Lee Harvey Oswald, the assassin of President John Kennedy. Oswald had renounced his citizenship and had lived in Communist Russia for years. When he returned to this country, he involved himself in Cuban Communist publicity work. Oswald killed the President . . . not the American public. Check on James Earl Ray, accused of murdering Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Is Ray an average American citizen? Not on your life! He has a criminal record dating back to 1949. Ray was a deviate who had ostracized himself from society by a *long* series of his unlawful actions.

Consider the last murderer who killed Senator Kennedy. Was he an average American? Sirhan Sirhan was from Jordan. True he had lived in America for the past ten years, but he had never made a move to become an American citizen. Sirhan was certainly not an average American.

So, who's sick?

Can it be that in the desire of America to continue to be the freest nation in the world that the average citizen has been left open to the violence and depredations of the less moral? Have we gone so far in the protection of individual rights, that the rights of the majority are being encroached upon? Have we made our laws so permissive to a prospective criminal, and so protective to him, that law enforcement officers can scarcely make an arrest much less a conviction?

These are all serious questions which will have to be answered in the very near future.

But to the question right now . . .

Is *America* sick?

WGAU says . . . The answer is "No!"

HEW SEEKS TAKEOVER OF VA MEDICAL SYSTEM

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I suppose I should not be surprised after over 20 years in Washington, but even after this lapse of time I am amazed at the voracious appetite of large Government agencies which continually seek to gobble up others under the guise of increasing the efficiency of a particular program or bringing better coordination within the framework of an existing structure. I refer in this instance to the latest effort of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Secretary Wilbur J. Cohen to take over all of the independent health programs of the Federal Government and consolidate them into one general administration with primary responsibility to that Department.

Gluttony, centuries ago, was listed as one of the seven deadly sins, but this fact has never percolated down to the thinking of some of the bureaucrats here; their desire for new functions and power is insatiable. The present Secretary apparently has a long memory, and recalls that what he is proposing today dates back at least back to the first Hoover Commission report which proposed a unified medical administration for all health, medical and hospital programs in one agency.

That uncalled for and unwise proposal was rejected just as I am hopeful the present effort by Secretary Cohen will be.

The net result of Secretary Cohen's brainchild, insofar as the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration is concerned, could be:

First, transfer, consolidation, or closing of existing VA hospitals at the discretion of the Secretary.

Second, opening of VA facilities to all members of the community regardless of their service in period of war.

Third, elimination of non-service-connected care for lack of available beds.

It requires no great imagination to see that one of these steps would effectively end the concept of VA medical care as we know it today.

I have read, from time to time, statements quoting anonymous high officials in HEW that the Department was "unwieldy," "difficult to administer," "should be broken up into at least three separate agencies or departments," but Secretary Cohen in his letter of June 14 to the President has apparently never heard of these proposals or if he has, has chosen to ignore them, for he proposes to make HEW an even greater octopus. The letter which he sent the Chief Executive on June 14, aside from dealing with internal organization of HEW and the Public Health Service, seeks to acquire additional jurisdiction under the guise of "coordinating all Federal health programs" and establishing responsibility for such agencies as the Veterans' Administration to report to the President

through a Federal Interdepartmental Health Policy Council.

This proposal if it should be adopted would in effect destroy the independence of the Veterans' Administration medical program by removing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the VA Chief Medical Director from any final decision on health programs affecting the veterans of this Nation. Today the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has direct access to the President on all matters affecting the Veterans' Administration, including the largest medical care program operated by the Federal Government—that operated by the Veterans' Administration. Under the proposal of Secretary Cohen the Administrator would have to report to the Federal Health Policy Council, who, in turn presumably would funnel its recommendations through an HEW Under Secretary for Health to the Secretary of HEW, and in turn to the President. It does not take an individual who is familiar with the workings of the Washington bureaucracy to understand that any recommendation made by the VA would be fragmented, broken down and diluted in such a fashion that by the time it reached the President it would be completely unrecognizable.

The veterans of this country have come to look upon the Veterans' Administration as a one-stop agency where and when they need assistance they can obtain it whether it relates to compensation, pension, education, insurance, housing, medical care, or any other of the salient features of the veterans program. The proposal that Secretary Cohen made to the President on June 14 would completely destroy this concept insofar as the medical program is concerned. Secretary Cohen is seeking to interpose himself between the veterans of this country and their Commander in Chief.

Under date of January 30, 1967, I was advised by the then Secretary of HEW, John W. Gardner, that no transfer of VA to HEW was contemplated. This information was received after I had remarked on the floor of the House on January 16, 1967:

> In view of the unfortunate recommendations of the administration in the last Congress concerning the closing of Veterans' Administration hospitals, I am shocked that any further tampering with the operations of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration would be considered by any other Federal agency. I am also constrained to make the observation that in view of the magnitude of the operations of the Veterans' Administration, if there is to be any transfer of medical functions, logic would dictate that the health functions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would go to the Veterans' Administration.

As far as I know, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is not asking to take over the activities of any function of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, but the method of such consolidation and my remarks in January 1967 are still pertinent. Consider, if you will, information contained in this remarkable 35-page document which Secretary Cohen presented to the President to the effect that in 1969 fiscal year the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will expend $116 million in direct hospital and medical services, while at the same time the Veterans' Administration will expend $1,291,000,000 on medical care for veterans. Of course, I can understand Secretary Cohen's appetite for this broad medical program. The Public Health Service has not been remarkably successful in recent years in direct medical care. It has been fraught with all kinds of problems and perhaps if another agency which has been running well and treats approximately 100,000 patients a day and has an active working relationship with 80 medical schools, it would bring to HEW a relationship and vitality which it now lacks and which it apparently cannot achieve on its own.

For those who may think that I am an alarmist for overstating the case, I would like to quote from this lengthy document of Secretary Cohen's so that there will be no doubt as to where the Secretary is tending. On the first page of this report, which has been forwarded to the President, it is stated that a number of recommendations are presented to achieve a more balanced and effective operating of all health and health-related programs of the Federal Government. Immediately following that, the point is made that the Secretary of HEW should become the President's chief adviser on Federal health and he would be responsible for coordinating all Federal health programs. Further, Secretary Cohen points out that his Department "does not exercise policy guidance over the broad Federal health establishment" and that he does not have an adequate mechanism for such a coordination. He then raises the question which in effect asks why the Veterans' Administration should have the largest hemodialysis program in the country by raising some question about "the decision that the Federal Government will provide, through the Veterans' Administration treatment of VA beneficiaries suffering kidney diseases, without making this expensive and lifesaving care—kidney dialysis—available to other members of the population in need of it." This one quote points up the bias existing in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare toward the Veterans' Administration, and perhaps jealousy or envy are terms which should be better used, to describe the situation. The VA can be proud of its activities in this field, and I am sure that it would be most happy if the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had provided as many of these kidney units, or more, than the Veterans' Administration now operates. Certainly no one interested in the care and treatment of ill individuals would be opposed to the extension of such lifesaving devices as the need requires and on as broad a basis as possible. Keep in mind, too, that the Congress has lavished appropriations on HEW in recent years for all kinds of broad medical programs with few restrictions.

Perhaps another one or more quotes will underscore the seriousness of the situation I am describing. On page 28 of this unusual document it is stated that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare "does not have the means to guide or influence actions of other Departments of the Federal Government which draw heavily on the Nation's health resources and involve large expenditures. The Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration, for example, administer programs—without adequate coordination—which may yet fail to make the contribution which they are capable toward maximum use of the Nation's health resources."

Further, Secretary Cohen urges that he "should be designated as the President's chief adviser" and "agent in the oversight of all Federal health activities."

In describing the activities of the Interdepartmental Health Policy Council, Secretary Cohen emphasizes that any recommendations on the activities of the Department in the health field "would report through the Secretary directly to the President." Such procedure would effectively eliminate the VA from any policy role.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if this grandiose scheme of Secretary Cohen's is adopted, and I regret to say that it is being seriously considered in the executive branch, it will completely rob the Veterans' Administration of its independent status insofar as health and medical programs are involved. It inevitably means that the 165 Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliaries would be consolidated, closed, eliminated, and disposed of in a fashion which appeals to the Interdepartmental Health Policy Council and it very likely would not reflect to any substantial degree the wishes or views of the Veterans' Administration and would certainly provide for no representation of the needs of the veterans of this country.

Appetites for power are indeed hard to satisfy, and this vast bureaucracy of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare apparently has an insatiable appetite for gobbling up other activities. Not content to administer medicare, social security, welfare, and vast educational programs, it now must seek out to cover up its deficiencies in the above-named programs to take over other programs which are working well but are administered by, thank goodness, smaller agencies which are more responsive to the people's wishes and to the will of the Congress.

I do hope that before we face a new series of closings or consolidations of Veterans' Administration hospitals that the Members of this House will make known their opposition to this uncalled for and unwise proposal of Secretary Cohen.

AMERICANS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ACTION

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 10th anniversary of the Americans for Constitutional Action which supports the election of conservatives to Congress.

During the 10-year span since its organization, the ACA has supported conservatives of both parties in an effort to counter the extreme liberal imbalance that our Government has suffered in recent years.

ACA annually compiles the voting records of all Members of Congress on key rollcall votes, grading these voting records in adherence to constitutional principles.

This has been an invaluable service to the American people who have been alerted to the voting records of their Congressmen and Senators.

The ACA is deeply concerned about the tremendous problems besetting our Nation today. The ACA's nonpartisan leadership sees these crises as falling into four general categories: First, loss of national sovereignty and deterioration of our national defense; second, disregard for law and order; third, ruinous inflation and monetary policies; and, fourth, loss of faith in the American dream.

ACA has backed 807 conservative candidates for Congress in the elections of 1960, 1962, 1964, and 1966. A total of 569 were elected for a remarkable 70.5 percent of success for ACA-supported candidates.

The conservative resurgence in Congress and throughout the Nation has been assisted immeasurably by ACA's activity.

On this 10th anniversary occasion, I certainly offer my warmest congratulations to this patriotic organization, and wish them continued success in their efforts for America.

A RETURN TO FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY IN GOVERNMENT

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have recently gone through the great debate on fiscal responsibility and approved the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968. This act was intended to slow down the dangerous and headlong plunge the Federal Government has made in recent years toward national bankruptcy.

A minority of Members of this body, both Republicans and Democrats, have, during the past 8 years of the New Frontier and the Great Society, consistently opposed many of the wasteful programs that have been ramrodded through Congress by the liberal majority.

These too-few Members have cried out against continued deficit spending, the mounting public debt and interest payment on that debt, and more than a dozen increases in the debt ceiling. These Members, and I was proud to join them during my first term, have warned, time and again, that there must be a day of reckoning and that day obviously is here according to the debate on the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ACA

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 10th anniversary of the Americans for Constitutional Action, a political action group whose chairman and trustees serve without compensation to promote Constitutional government in the United States.

POSITIVE PROGRAMS FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE

I congratulate the ACA for 10 years of constructive, positive, fundamentally sound thinking and work. The nonpartisan policies of ACA are based upon principles which have long served to make Americans self-reliant, and America strong as a nation. Those principles include:

First. Fiscal responsibility: a sound currency and a balanced Federal budget.

The purpose of my remarks here today, Mr. Speaker, is to commend an organization that was founded 10 years ago today for the sole purpose of promoting constitutional government and encouraging a return to fiscal responsibility in government without which no government can long survive as truly representative of the people.

That organization, Americans for Constitutional Action, has publicized the issues and debates as they arose and kept the people informed of the votes on these issues. ACA publishes an analysis and statistical evaluation of the voting records of Members of Congress. Included in the tabulation are the recorded votes on those legislative measures which, in the opinion of Americans for Constitutional Action, have a significant bearing on the preservation of the spirit and principles of the Constitution, as they were defined by the Founding Fathers of our Republic.

Never in the history of this great Nation have we needed to be reminded of these principles as we do today as these principles are attacked not only from without but also from within our country by its own citizens.

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower recently said that he had never encountered a situation more depressing than the present spectacle of an American deeply divided over Vietnam and urged that we close ranks on the homefront.

And there are those on the homefront who, under the cloak of civil rights, or freedom of speech, encourage civil disorder and outright violation of constitutional law and claim immunity under the very Constitution they violate.

Mr. Speaker, I commend an organization such as Americans for Constitutional Action for its 10-year record in defense of the principles of our Constitution, the greatest document of human freedom and liberty ever written and adopted by a government of free people.

May we all join in preserving these principles.

Second. Protection of the rights of States and the people.

Third. Private ownership of industry with minimum Federal interference and competition.

Fourth. A maximum of individual freedom consistent with preservation of public order.

Fifth. A competitive private enterprise economy.

Sixth. Maintenance and enforcement of law and order.

Seventh. Strong national defense and preservation of national sovereignty.

Eighth. Cooperation with allies to develop a strong free world.

Mr. Speaker, many Americans share the concern of the Americans for Constitutional Action and support candidates committed to sound, constitutional government. In the 1966 elections, ACA supported 225 congressional candidates, and 180 were elected to the 90th Congress. Americans for Constitutional Action, during the 10 years of its existence, has provided support to a total of 807 candidates for the Senate and House. Of this number, a total of 569 have been elected. This is a remarkable overall average of 70.5 percent. Such a record shows clearly the basic support of the American people for the principles which those candidates, and ACA, have advanced.

Adm. Ben Moreell, the chairman, and other officers and trustees of Americans for Constitutional Action are to be congratulated on their 10th anniversary. The long list of distinguished trustees includes such patriotic Americans as Edgar N. Eisenhower, John Wayne, Gen. Thomas A. Lane, Hon. Katherine St. George, and many others. The late former President Herbert Hoover was a most distinguished trustee of the organization. The principles for which these patriotic Americans stand are as old as this Republic. But these principles and the rights which they protect cannot be taken for granted.

VIGILANCE FOR FREEDOM

American freedom can be diminished if constant vigilance is not maintained. The ACA, in supporting candidates true to constitutional government, provides such vigilance, and for that service Americans should all be grateful.

WASHINGTON NEWS NOTES

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there follows the July edition of my Washington News Notes:

Huntington Beach's nuclear-powered desalting plant gets the go-ahead from the Metropolitan Water District board of Directors . . . "I'm delighted," Hosmer says. "It's important to Orange County and the rest of Southern California, the U.S. and much of the world" . . . Nuclear desalting can solve mankind's water problems for all time . . . Craig is a senior member of the Congressional committees dealing with both water and nu-

clear power . . . He's an acknowledged national leader in both fields.

Hosmer predicts a bill creating a Redwood National Park in Northern California will pass the House soon . . . Boundaries of the park will finally be written during a House-Senate conference on their different versions on the bill . . . This is the thorny part . . . Conservationists insist on very large boundaries while lumber companies want to stay in business.

Pravda, the Soviet Communist Party newspaper, and the Russian ambassador to the U.N. both have assailed Congressman Hosmer recently for his habit of pointing out defects in the proposed Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons . . . They call him a "thick-headed American Congressman" . . . Craig doesn't mind . . . "I am pleased to be in the opposite camp from the Kremlin," he says . . . Hosmer thinks the proposed treaty is full of loopholes and calls it a "hoax" . . . The Congressman's 17-year-old son was listening to his short-wave radio one night and heard Radio Moscow also attacking his Dad!

The new 32nd District's Congressman Craig Hosmer will ride in the Huntington Beach Fourth of July Parade . . . Then he flies to San Francisco to address the prestigious Commonwealth Club of California on the peaceful uses of nuclear explosives . . . He'll tell them how billions of dollars of new gold might be mined cheaply with nuclear explosives.

Representative Craig Hosmer is his proper title, but custom makes it Congressman Craig Hosmer . . . The USC Law Center recently made him a "doctor" . . . It decided to change the Bachelor of Laws degree he received in 1940 to a Doctor of Jurisprudence . . . He's also Captain Hosmer, USNR. He's an "Admiral" in Nebraska's "Navy" and a "General" in Guam's "Militia" . . . Does that make him Capt. Congressman Dr. Hosmer? . . . "Call me Craig," he says.

In a poll of 32nd District residents last January, 65% said they were not in favor of the President's 10% income tax surcharge . . . But on June 20, Hosmer voted for the measure as it passed the House . . . A $6 billion mandatory cut in Federal spending was a key part of the bill . . . He says things have changed since January, particularly the recent international run on U.S. gold and some serious increases in the cost of living . . . He says he chose the "lesser of two evils. The spending cut and tax boost are strong medicine. But the possible alternatives are uncontrolled inflation and a violent depression which would turn the country into a poorhouse."

Capitol Hill is guessing that Congress will adjourn about August 1 for the two political conventions, but will have to reconvene after Labor Day for a "rump" session . . . Craig doubts that Congress, particularly the Senate, can complete all its business by August, particularly if the Non-Proliferation Treaty comes up for ratification.

Mail on the gun control issue has run hot and heavy . . . Hosmer has received hundreds of letters, pro and con . . . He's valiantly trying to answer them . . . "I've been in Congress for 16 years and have rarely seen such a flood of mail," he says . . . Craig is cautious about rushing into legislation in the heat of emotion, but feels that guns should be kept out of the hands of lunatics . . . Congress already has acted to ban the mail-order sale of handguns, and other legislation pertaining to long guns is in the mill . . . Hosmer "realistically" forecasts it is almost certain to pass . . . His concern is that a bad law could result in more rather than less lawlessness . . . Criminals will get guns, law or no law . . . He favors reasonable controls on the sale of guns, but doubts that registration would be significant in terms of overall national goals . . . The real answer, he says, is stricter enforcement of existing laws.

In that regard, the President's signature on the Omnibus Crime Bill is a major step forward . . . Hosmer was afraid the bill might be vetoed, but it was signed at the 11th hour. As a long-time critic of Supreme Court Decisions which make conviction of criminals difficult, Hosmer hailed the Bill's provisions which ease up on Court-decreed limitations on the use of confessions, and which permit the use of wiretapping under strict court control . . . As part of his fight against the deterioration of law and order, Craig is sponsoring a Constitutional Amendment giving citizens a "paramount right" to protection of their persons and property over the rights of criminals to avoid conviction.

The Congressman still has a few speaking dates open during the periods August 5 through 9 and August 26 through 30. These are the weeks of the national political conventions so he is able to leave Washington. Program chairmen and others interested should write him about a commitment.

Young men interested in attending West Point or the Naval, Air Force or Merchant Marine academies should write to Congressman Hosmer immediately . . . He's accepting applications from young men living in his District (Seal Beach, Rossmoor, Huntington Harbor or any part of Huntington Beach west of Beach Blvd. and seaward from Edinger Ave., Long Beach and part of Lakewood) . . . His academy appointments are made on the basis of merit . . . Appointees for classes commencing in July 1969 will be made before the end of 1968 . . . Time is running short . . . Candidates must write at once to Congressman Craig Hosmer, House of Representatives, Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

Passage of the historic Colorado River Basin Project bill recently is a great victory for California and the other Southwestern states, Hosmer says . . . It guarantees Southern California's right to a minimum of 4.4 million acre feet of water annually from the Colorado River . . . Previously, local water supplies from the river could have been raided by other states . . . The law now prohibits this and gives arid Southern California an invaluable "water bank account" . . . Hosmer was particularly pleased with the passage . . . He's a ranking member of the Irrigation and Reclamation subcommittee which originated the bill, and was one of the key members in its strategic move through the House.

In the photo, Craig presents miniature U.S. flags to Navy Secretary Ignatius (right) and Chief of Naval Operations Adm. Moorer in support of a "Pride in America" campaign to encourage display of the flag on patriotic holidays.

And all this goes to prove that the news from Washington isn't necessarily bad all the time.

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ACA

HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, next week, we will celebrate, with appropriate ceremony, the 192d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence.

Last week, we let pass unnoticed an equally important milestone in our history, the 180th anniversary of the ratification of the Constitution of the United States.

This week, today, marks the 10th anniversary of the organization dedicated to the preservation and promotion of the original spirit and principles of those inspired documents upon which our Nation is founded. In these troubled times, we would be remiss not to pause and pay tribute to that organization—Americans for Constitutional Action.

Through the dissemination of factual information through high schools, colleges, libraries, and the general public, Americans for Constitutional Action have made the people of America more aware of their roles and obligations as private citizens. Through other programs Americans for Constitutional Action have made officials more aware of our Nation's needs and their responsibilities, as trustees of our Nation's welfare, in attempting to meet these needs. Among public officials—local, State, and national—Members of Congress have benefited most from the activities, support and encouragement of Americans for Constitutional Action.

Americans for Constitutional Action stand firm for the propositions that their power of Government rests in the people and that the will of the people must be expressed through the elected representatives in Congress.

Americans for Constitutional Action stand firm for the propositions that lawlessness must not be tolerated, that better living conditions depend upon bettered abilities, thrift, hard work, personal pride, and ambitions.

Americans for Constitutional Action stand firm for the proposition that rights and responsibilities must be coupled together.

Tragically, there are too few who share the concerns and join the efforts of Americans for Constitutional Action.

For myself, for my fellow countrymen, and for generations to come, on this anniversary of their patriotic endeavors, I extend my everlasting gratitude to Americans for Constitutional Action. May their good works multiply as they begin their second decade of unselfish service to sustain, strengthen, and defend the spirit and principles of the Constitution of the United States as defined by the Founding Fathers of our Republic.

THE 78TH DIVISION AT KILMER U.S. ARMY RESERVE CENTER WINS PUBLIC RELATIONS HONOR

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, at the 24th annual Silver Anvil Award banquet, held on May 16 at the Plaza Hotel in New York City, Maj. Gen. John G. Cassidy, commanding general of New Jersey's crack 78th Division of the U.S. Army Reserve, received the Silver Anvil from the Public Relations Society of America

for the most outstanding "Promotional Publicity—Government" during 1967.

Mr. Speaker, I insert following my remarks a press release issued by the Public Relations Society of America describing this great honor.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to extend my personal congratulations to General Cassidy and the officers and men of the "Lightning Division" who have once again earned the respect of the people of the State of New Jersey.

The release follows:

THE 78TH DIVISION AT KILMER USAR CENTER WINS NATIONAL PUBLIC RELATIONS HONOR

NEW YORK, N.Y., May 17.—The 78th Division (Training) U.S. Army Reserve, Kilmer USAR Center in Edison, N.J., received the Silver Anvil Award from the Public Relations Society of America for the most outstanding "Promotional Publicity—Government" program during 1967, here at the Plaza Hotel last night.

Major General John G. Cassidy, Commanding General 78th Division, accepted the award from PRSA President Edward P. VonderHaar during the Society's 24th Annual Silver Anvil Award Banquet.

The 78th Division undertook a saturation publicity program to make the public aware of the importance of the Army Reserve, to instill "esprit de corps" among the Division members, and to interest young men in joining the 78th Division. At the end of the year the total enlisted ranks rose from 2,451 to 3,036, a gain of almost 25%.

One other New Jersey organization also won a Silver Anvil Award during last night's ceremonies. The Boy Scouts of America in New Brunswick won the Award in "International Relations—Non-Profit."

It marked the first time an Army Reserve unit had won the coveted world-wide honor.

A total of 25 organizations within the United States, Canada, Europe and Southeast Asia were presented Silver Anvils, the highest award of merit in the public relations field, during last night's ceremonies. This year's competition saw a total of 280 entries.

The Silver Anvil Awards are presented annually by the Society to stimulate and encourage improved public relations performance. The awards are given to programs which incorporate sound public relations objectives and philosophy and meet the highest standards of performance, production, presentation and execution.

The eight categories in which entries are judged include: Community Relations; Institutional Programs; Special Events and Observances; Public Service or Affairs; Promotional Publicity; International Public Relations; Emergency Programs; and Special Audience Programs. Each category is further sub-divided into sections of Business (included Industry Groups); Government or Military; and Non-Profit Organizations. The competition is open to member and nonmembers alike.

The Public Relations Society of America is a professional association of public relations executives with more than 6,000 members in the United States, Canada and several other foreign countries.

CONCERN OVER ALLEGED INCREASE IN BRIBERY OF BANK OFFICIALS

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday's Washington Post carried a story concerning the sentencing of one of seven defendants convicted in a scheme to defraud a federally insured bank. Judge Edmound L. Palmieri termed the classification of the crime as a misdemeanor "appalling" and "fantastic." He urged the Justice Department to restudy the inadequate penalties with a view toward recommending stronger penalties to the Congress. Judge Palmieri's actions are to be commended and I assure all concerned of my wholehearted support for legislation designed to make the bribery or attempted bribery of a bank employee a serious offense carrying with it the stiffest possible penalties.

But one should be more concerned about Assistant U.S. Attorney Givens presentencing report observation that "bribery of bank officials has been uncovered in an increasing number of investigations" and that the situation poses "a serious problem to the community" and has "the most harmful impact on the integrity of the banking system."

If in the judgment of a U.S. attorney our banking system is in the slightest jeopardy because of increased briberies, then the immediate attention of the Congress is required. As chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee I am worried about the particular threat that this type of criminality poses to the whole concept of federally insured banks.

The grave reports in this story will be carefully looked into by my committee. I do not intend to make any rash decisions but will wait until all of the facts have been explored. I have written this day to the Attorney General, asking for a full explanation of the statements contained in U.S. Attorney Givens' presentencing reports and all of the background material and evidence supporting the allegation.

More important, I have asked the Attorney General to supply my committee with any evidence of any increase in the bribery or attempted bribery of bank employees throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I assure the Congress that if there is the slightest indication that the reports are substantial, then the House Banking and Currency Committee will proceed to hearings and promptly thereafter offer the strongest possible legislation to the House permitted by its jurisdiction. I will keep the Members informed.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the article entitled "Felony Charge Urged in Bank Briberies" appearing in the June 22, 1968, edition of the Washington Post:

FELONY CHARGE URGED IN BANK BRIBERIES

(By Morton Mintz)

A Federal judge has termed it "appalling" and "fantastic" that under a 55-year-old Federal law bribery of a bank official is punishable only as a misdemeanor and not as a felony.

The judge, Edmound L. Palmieri, urged that the "utterly inadequate" maximum prison sentence of one year be restudied by the Justice Department, with the thought that a recommendation for longer sentences be made to Congress.

The request was relayed to Justice by the prosecutor, Assistant U.S. Attorney Richard A. Givens, after the issue came up recently in District Court in New York City.

The occasion was the sentencing of Rocco Sedito, 55, one of seven defendants in a case involving a scheme to defraud the Federally insured Meadowbrook National Bank.

Sedito pleaded guilty to causing a bank official to take bribes.

In an affidavit prepared for the sentencing proceeding, the prosecutor said he and his codefendants "engaged in a large-scale effort to undermine the integrity of the banking system through payments to bank personnel on a wholesale basis."

Givens also said in the affidavit that "bribery of bank officials has been uncovered in an increasing number of investigations" in the New York City area.

The situation "poses a serious problem to the community" and has "the most harmful impact on the integrity of the banking system," the affidavit added.

The Judge agreed with Givens that harsher penalties were needed as a deterrent. Palmieri said, "Bribery of a responsible bank official and the siphoning out of funds improperly, in violation of all the rules that the Government takes pains to apply to banks, can result in innocent people who have faith in their bank being destroyed."

In the affidavit, Givens said that in 1966 Sedito and Rocco Santarsiero, a co-defendant, arranged 16 known loans, totaling $80,000, for persons, most of whom could then not be found. The reason was that phony identifications were used by the applicants.

The applications were filed mainly at Meadowbrook's Rockefeller Center Branch. There, the affidavit continued, Sedito and Santarsiero paid Francis Colletta, a bank employe, to aid in processing the applications.

Colletta, who was not named a defendant, was said in the affidavit to have shared these payments with John Benigno, a vice president of the bank. Benigno has pleaded innocent and awaits trial.

"The Government's investigation indicated that the applicants were required to pay part or all of the proceeds of the loan to Santarsiero and Sedito," the affidavit said.

Sedito was indicted last Jan. 31. He told the FBI he would turn himself in. But, the affidavit said, he was a fugitive for seven weeks, until arrested on another charge.

Saying that he never imposes the maximum sentence on a person who pleads guilty, Judge Palmieri, on May 31, sentenced Sedito to nine months.

SNOWMAN REVISITED

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 26, the Dallas Morning News, one of the outstanding statewide newspapers of Texas, printed a lead editorial concerning law enforcement. I insert this editorial in the RECORD:

SNOWMAN REVISITED

The nation is faced with a very real crime crisis and President Johnson has risen to the occasion—or at least as near to it as he usually does—with another questionable solution.

The Johnsonian play in the crime-busting game was predictably devised with the liberal section of the grandstand in mind. It will no doubt gain some grudging cheers from that sliver of the population, for the President's is the standard liberal approach to every problem: Pass a new law and set up a new program.

In this case, the administration's attempt

to snow the population is particularly ironic. It intends to pass a law to discourage people who break laws for a living. This law, which calls for federal licensing and registration of guns, among other things, will hardly be heeded by those citizens who use weapons in working at the trade of law violation. Thanks to the liberal establishment, the criminally inclined have discovered that they can today get by with murder, literally and figuratively—why should they bother about the latest sham?

The new law that the President has advertised with such dramatic hokum as "protection for all" will therefore apply primarily, if not entirely, to the law-abiding rather than the lawless. This, too, is vintage liberal. It's the wrong solution to the wrong problem, applied to the wrong people.

The law is described as "tough", a description that under current conditions seems rather strange. How can a law be tough without tough law enforcement?

In that regard, suffice it to say that the "tough" law against guns was initially requested by none other than our top federal lawman, Ramsey "Let-em-Loot" Clark. The nation got a close-up look at the attorney general's law enforcement strategy during the April riots when the policy was demonstrated before television cameras.

Many Americans have bitterly fought on principle every type of antigun law, even those relatively mild forms of gun control that the majority of the population favors. Their argument has been that the mild restrictions are but the first step in a series aimed at disarming the private citizen, in defiance of his Second Amendment right.

The President now adds considerable credence to their case. This latest is his third proposed curb on citizens' firearms and each has been more restrictive than the one before it.

The current grand design will deny the right to use guns not only to criminals—it says here—lunatics and dope addicts, but to "any others whose possession of guns would be harmful to the public health, safety or welfare."

Now there's a little time bomb that could have nuclear results. Given the regulation attitudes of the liberal establishment that has run the county so splendidly the past few years, that description could be made to fit everyone who stands to the right of Arthur Schlesinger Jr., south of the Potomac or higher than the official poverty ceiling.

Our creative Supreme Court has shown itself capable of spinning revolution out of a comma in the Constitution. If the President's latest brainstorm becomes a law for the high court's progressives to work with, that innocent-looking phrase could mean anything. And, given time, it will.

THE PLIGHT OF THE HUNGARIANS: SOVIET ECONOMIC EXPLOITATION

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member of this House remembers the stirring events in Poland and Hungary during October of 1956 when freedom loving fighters in those countries strove mightly but unsuccessfully to throw off the yoke of Soviet communism.

The many instances of Communist persecution of the minorities, especially of the Jews and other religious sects, are most disturbing—just as disturbing as the consistent Communist oppression of minority rights in the various countries which they militarily and politically occupy.

We are especially indebted to an article by Dr. Z. Michael Szaz, associate professor of history and political science at Seton Hall University, for a current review of the situation as it exists today in Hungary.

Dr. Szaz has long been active in publicizing the plight of minorities under Communist rule and promoting relief for these minorities.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I submit this outstanding article by an outstanding Hungarian-American, Dr. Szaz, entitled "The Plight of the Hungarians: Soviet Economic Exploitation" published in the American Security Council's regular publication, Washington Report for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Report, June 10, 1968]

THE PLIGHT OF THE HUNGARIANS: SOVIET ECONOMIC EXPLOITATION

(By Dr. Zoltan Michael Szaz, associate professor of history and political science at Seton Hall University)

The memory of the exhilarating days of October 1956 in Poland and Hungary remains with us. It was in these countries that the Communist monolith was for the first time shaken by the angry revolt of the suppressed nations. The result had been a temporary liberalization all too soon revoked in Poland and a bloody repression of the Hungarian government and the heroic freedom-fighters by Soviet armies.

In 1968, Hungary on the surface fails to display its characteristics of 1956. The 35,000 dead freedom-fighters and the Nagy group of the 1956 government are still labeled counter-revolutionaries and described as lackeys of capitalism and fascism and anti-Party diversionists. Fifty to seventy thousand Soviet troops still occupy the country and opposition to the regime takes the form of inefficient work, spiritual emigration and pressure for more economic benefits rather than open defiance.

A sadness rests upon the land despite the neon lights of the Gellert Hotel and the nightclubs visited by Western tourists in Budapest. The birth rate is one of the lowest in Europe and the rate of abortions, legalized and performed in hospitals for minimum fees, has exceeded for years that of live birth. The government, realizing that the necessary construction of housing would interfere with the expansion of capital goods industries, socialist planning and economic commitments to the Soviet Union, consequently disregards the warning voices among the medical profession demanding a change in the abortion law. The generation of 1968, though opposed to the tyrannical features of the regime and to its ideological conformity with Russian Communism, remembers too vividly the 1956 experience, the inaction of the West and the resolute Soviet counter-measures, and knows that it has been left to its own devices to press even for a minimal easing of communist dictatorship.

Despite the lack of militancy, the regime does not feel it can dispense with the presence of Soviet troops. They, too, remember the October days of 1956 and fail to demand from Moscow the same elbow-freedom which Czechoslovak and Rumanian leaders have gained for themselves. Besides East Germany, Hungary alone qualifies as the ideal Soviet satellite in Europe since both Party Secretary Kadar and Premier Fock realize the narrowness of their popular base and cannot afford even a limited relaxation of Party dictatorship for fear of the reform getting out of hand.

At the present, the Soviet Union, in turn, has various levers of pressure against Hungary. The presence of Soviet troops could be used both in case of internal unrest and if the Government were to pursue policies inimical to Soviet interests. Their presence restricts the options available to Hungarian Communist politicians as there is a great difference between using troops already on the soil of the country to be invested and an open invasion of state frontiers which would have to be the case in Rumania and Czechoslovakia.

HUNGARY AS THE ECONOMIC SATELLITE OF THE SOVIET UNION

With the limited decline of the official Cold War in Europe, military intervention remains only the ultimate weapon of the superpowers to be used only *in extremis*. Today the most important bond between Hungary and the Soviet Union consists of the economic dependence of Hungary on the Soviet Union while the political weakness of the Hungarian Communist leadership prevents even a Czechoslovak type of liberalization and renders any discussion of Hungary's defection from the Soviet bloc wishful thinking. The economic bonds, however, also represent a sizeable contribution to the efficiency and capacity of Soviet industry and to political and economic infiltration by the international Communist movement into neutral, third world countries.

Hungarian foreign trade provides a perfect example. Over the past twenty years, Hungarian-Soviet foreign trade increased more than fifty-fold and reached the amount of $1.1 billion. The Soviet Union was, in 1966, the most important trade partner of Hungary and was responsible for over one-third of annual Hungarian foreign trade. According to the 1968 Hungarian-Soviet Trade Agreement the share of Soviet trade will expand to 40 percent by 1970.

Of the trade items, 68 percent of Hungarian imports from the Soviet Union in 1966 consisted of basic raw materials. A total of 85.1 percent of the crude oil, 92.3 percent of crude oil products, 97.5 percent of the pig iron and 95.1 percent of iron ore imports to Hungary came from the Soviet Union in 1966 as did 100 percent of nickel and unalloyed ingots, 88 percent of aluminum and 89 percent of aluminum semi-finished products. The major iron and steel combine in Hungary, the Danubian Iron Plant, uses Soviet ore from Krivoi Rog (800 miles away) exclusively. Crude oil flows to Hungary through the "Friendship" pipeline and the Thermal Plant at Szazhalombatta transmits high-voltage Soviet current representing a sizeable portion of energy consumed in Hungary.

In short, Hungarian dependence on Russian iron ore, aluminum and energy resources is well-nigh complete and could not be reduced without serious bottlenecks and a restructuring of the economy. Dependency was expanded by the February 26, 1968 agreement reached by the Soviet-Hungarian Committee on Economic and Technical Cooperation calling for the establishment of "industrial branch labor committees" of mixed character enabling the Soviet managers to gain a major voice in production plans and import quotas.

The breakdown of Hungarian exports to the Soviet Union is even more telling. Twenty-five percent of Hungarian machinery and engineering production, (50 percent of all Hungarian exports to the Soviet Union) are reaching their destination in the U.S.S.R. For the period 1965–70 Soviet foreign trade agencies ordered 41 chemical and synthetic material plants and 130 ships of various types. The entire Hungarian ship and dock industry works for the Soviet Union, one of the reasons for the fast growth of Soviet merchant marine and light navy units. Tele-

communication equipment plays an important role, too. The Soviet Union monopolizes Hungarian exports of wide-band microwave and microwave PM equipment, telephone switchboards and technical transmission installations. Telecommunication items form the largest single monetary value item with $39.2 million and compose 29.1 percent of Soviet imports of these articles from all over the world. Control and measuring equipment produced in Hungary finds its way mostly to the U.S.S.R. The railway stock industry also exports to the Soviet Union.

Technological assistance extended to the Soviet Union, though a two-way street, provides important premiums to the U.S.S.R. In the last three years, 1,100 complete sets of Hungarian technical documents were given to the Soviets and 1,500 Russian technical experts visited Hungary to study Hungarian production methods. The Consolidated Lamp (*Egyesült Izzó*) factory equipped seven large-capacity light tube plants in Baku, Yerevan, Smolensk, Poltava and three other Soviet cities.

The Soviet Union has full control of the only raw material in Hungary which is a surplus ore, namely bauxite. The November 15, 1962 agreement with Hungary, a steady source of irritation for the Hungarian public, represents a perfect example of neo-colonialist exploitation. In 1967 Hungary started the production of increasing quantities of alumina. From this year, until 1970, an annual 60,000 tons of alumina will be delivered to the U.S.S.R. which will ship back one ton of raw aluminum for every two tons of alumina. After 1970 production is to be increased to 120,000 tons annually. Originally Hungary was promised world market prices for her alumina, now the Soviets charge 5,000 forint (1,700 old rubles) for one ton of aluminum for the electric power used in producing it and additional transportation charges from the Volga region to Hungary are also added to the Soviet aluminum price. The official communist argument that the use of Soviet electric power is more economical is a specious one and an excuse for separating one of the stages of continuous processing of the only plentiful raw material from the economic structure of Hungary. The completion of the planned Danube Hydroelectric Plant and another oil-based power station could have provided the needed energy resources for aluminum smelting in Hungary.

Economic exploitation takes various forms. Intra-bloc trade pricing by the Soviet Union toward Hungary includes the "monopoly corrective" coefficient in regard to raw materials. This became necessary when in the 1960's raw material prices fell on the world market and, therefore, Hungary would have improved her trade balance with the Soviet Union as 50 percent of Hungarian exports to the U.S.S.R. consist of finished products. Maintaining that the decline of raw material prices on the world market was a result of neo-colonialist exploitation of the newly independent countries, the Soviet Union successfully insisted upon higher raw material prices in her trade with Hungary. In order that the final burden of the Russian profit may revolve on the Hungarian consumer, Soviet pressure led to a domestic Hungarian price increase of primary and extractive materials as well. In some cases bloc nations like Rumania resisted the "monopoly corrective" and they were offered the alternative of providing credits to the U.S.S.R. in order to develop new sources of raw material and fuel.

Finally, Hungary's trade balance with the Soviet Union is strictly negative. While almost all satellite nations struggle with this problem, the magnitude of Hungarian indebtedness is unique and is a result of the major credits extended by the Soviet Union to overcome the dislocation of Hungarian industry in the wake of the 1956 Revolution and the ensuing work stoppages and slowdown strikes. The total trade deficit between 1957 and 1964 reached 3.678 billion forints (or 1.27 billion old Soviet rubles). Repayment of these loans, to be completed by 1970, means both a mortgaging of the parts of the Hungarian industry of special interest to the Soviet Union for years and also the transfer of Hungarian hard-currency earnings to the Soviet Union, indirectly helping the Soviets to import high-quality Western goods.

ECONOMIC REFORM IN HUNGARY

Beginning January 1, 1968, the Budapest Government introduced sweeping changes into the planning and management of its economy. The serious problems in the agricultural and light industrial sectors, the inadequate rise in productivity and the low quality of many industrial products were factors which could not be avoided or cured by ideological shibboleths.

The reform represents, however, no return to market economy. Most capital goods and armament prices remain strictly state-controlled and these industries continue to work regardless of the cost calculations. This disparity will in the future, too, distort the effect of some efforts to move closer to the law of supply and demand. Even in the category of industrial and consumer goods, only a limited price fluctuation is permitted within fixed limits set by the state. This precaution was taken in order to avoid skyrocketing the prices of consumer goods which are still in relatively short supply and to avoid the necessity to expand investments to these industries. With a few products, prices were completely freed and the law of supply and demand may be permitted to function.

Even the present concession to the profit motive will cause difficulties to a system where state control and centralized planning were developed to a perfection in the past. In order to bring about the introduction of the reform, commonly called New Economic Model (NEM), the state had to organize summer courses in 1967 for plant managers with the curriculum based on textbooks of American business graduate schools and some courses even for Communist Party functionaries. Several Communist economic writers also admit that the managerial gap between Hungary and the West exceeds that of the technological imbalance.

The reform's immediate effects were varied. The free choice to change jobs, the increased importance placed on the factory labor contract instead of the old state-dictated industry-wide contract, and the greater flexibility conceded to management are undoubtedly improvements, but simultaneously prices rose for many commodities and unemployment is an immediate consequence of rationalization measures.

The reason for unemployment was the previous practice of overemployment in commerce and industry alike. The surplus work force, used for featherbedding purposes in order to eliminate an evil attributed exclusively to capitalist economy, will now have to find new positions which cannot be created overnight and dislocation of the labor market will continue at least for two to three years. Despite the cushioning by the exception of capital goods and armament industries from rationalization, unemployment became a serious enough problem to cause the Budapest Government to sign a treaty with East Germany even before instituting the New Economic Model for the transportation of over 25,000 Hungarian youth, mostly high school graduates to work in East Germany for a period of three years. Thereby, the regime hopes to reduce unemployment rolls and remove, for the long period of adjustment, potentially troublesome political elements.

Similar factors are at work regarding consumer goods prices. With the consumer deciding what products to buy, even if only to a limited degree, the problem of unsalable goods and large factory inventories becomes important to the managers who may be fined 25 percent of their salary if their enterprises continue to lose money. The production of better quality goods results in higher prices since the losses occurring as a result of sales made at prices below production costs can no longer be charged against the state as was the case before. The alternative would be either a sudden firing of all surplus employees or the introduction of Western technology which is not available.

NEW ECONOMIC MODEL AND FOREIGN TRADE

The basic problems in foreign trade persist despite the New Economic Model. These include Hungarian dependence upon Russian raw materials which is matched by fixed Soviet priorities to the production of many of the potentially hard-currency producing and competitive branches of Hungarian industry such as electronics and shipbuilding. Thus, Western trade, unless indefinitely financed by Western loans, could not result in a reorientation of Hungarian trade structure, or an opening to the West.

There is no sign, however, that the Budapest regime would be interested in such an economic opening to the West. The American trade mission of 1966, visiting Budapest at the worst psycho-political date (the tenth anniversary of the Hungarian fight for freedom), reported very limited opportunities and common enterprises proposed in the field of housing and light industries were usually rejected by the Budapest government as far as Western countries were concerned.

The Kadar-Fock Government is not interested in promoting the political and economic interests of Hungary which are directed toward a Western reorientation—a rejoining of Europe. Its representatives, in contrast to the desires of the Hungarian people, have become the ideal satellites of the Soviet Union. The question is: when will the winds of liberalization from Prague overcome the trauma of the defeated revolution of 1956 and start a political disintegration of the economically semi-bankrupt communist regime in Budapest.

OUR FINANCIAL PICTURE

HON. JAMES C. GARDNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, my vote against H.R. 15414, the bill providing for a 10-percent surtax and a $6 billion reduction in Federal expenditures, was based on the conviction that the American taxpayer should not be saddled with the responsibility of improving our current economic crisis, which was brought about by mismanagement and overspending by the Johnson administration. A combination of events has brought us today to a dangerously critical financial position. However, the blame for this rests squarely upon the administration and not the individual taxpayer.

It is clear what has basically thrown our financial picture out of order—the costs of the Vietnam war, combined with the failure of the Johnson administration to take significant steps to adjust our economic conditions to meet this demand. For the period from July 1, 1965, to July 1, 1968, we will have spent well over $50 billion on the costs of this war alone. An additional $26 billion is budgeted for fiscal 1969—without meaningful fiscal adjustments to meet this increased burden.

We are presently facing budget deficits of close to $25 billion for both fiscal years 1968 and 1969. After eight successive budget deficits since 1961, the national debt has increased from $289.2 billion in 1960 to $335.4 billion, an increase of $46.2 billion.

Since 1960, budgeted expenditures of the Federal Government have risen 102 percent, while the population of the country grew only 10 percent. Contrary to common belief, most of this increase has occurred in domestic expenditures, not in defense spending.

We are in an extremely difficult balance-of-payments situation which threatens to get worse as increased prices reduce our trade surplus. The U.S. balance-of-payments deficit from 1961 to 1967 totals $16.4 billion.

We are experiencing significant inflation today, with prices rising at a rate of some 4 percent a year. The cost of credit is also sky high, with interest rates in some cases reaching the highest in a century.

The strength of the dollar is being questioned all over the world. The diminishing confidence in the dollar has been most obviously expressed in the rapid purchasing of gold in foreign markets by foreigners. Our supply of gold has diminished to just over $10 billion.

It is evident that the policies of the Johnson administration have not adapted to these circumstances and situations and, in fact, are responsible for our current economic crisis.

The administration has been slow to face the fact that we cannot maintain a policy of guns and butter without suffering serious consequences. Our financial house should have been put in order several years ago, at the first signs of crisis. Instead, the Johnson administration insisted on conducting business at home as usual, completely disregarding the tens of billions of dollars that we are spending in Vietnam.

Not only do I believe the surtax places the expense and burden for our economic crisis on the wrong shoulders, but I also feel that it is entirely the incorrect way to attack and solve our problems. The only adequate solution is a reduction in Federal expenditures of at least $10 billion. However, this should be done through setting spending priorities, and not through across-the-board cuts in all programs. As I have stated numerous times, sizable cuts could be made in foreign aid, the space program, public works, development of the supersonic transport plane, Government research and development, and highway beautification—all of which would have a selective impact on our economy. These cuts would involve, for the most part, postponement rather than cancellation of these programs. What is most important, they would have a less-depressing effect on the economy than the across-the-board tax increase.

The sad fact is that the 10-percent tax increase will, in effect, cause inflation. Many businesses have already said they will have to raise prices to compensate for the additional tax. So again, the American taxpayer is asked to pay not only a 10-percent surtax but more for the goods he is buying.

COMMUNIST COLONIALISM IN AFRICA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, while the U.N. operation by the Red-Black power bloc has all but declared war against Rhodesia—in fact, by article 13 of its recent declaration urges "moral and material assistance" to overthrow the Smith government, nothing is said of the sinister African buildup by the Red Chinese as the real threat to international peace.

Or can it be that the U.N. is promoting the Red Chinese invasion to instigate armed war and insurrection against Rhodesia and South Africa?

What is "colonialism"—a word used so recklessly by some members of the U.N.?

Mr. Speaker, I submit the Lawrence Fellows' report from the New York Times for May 25 and two other reports of the same paper for May 30 for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 25, 1968]

CHINESE COMMUNIST PRESENCE IN EAST AFRICAN NATIONS GROWS

DAR ES SALAAM, TANZANIA, May 24.—Although the Chinese are rarely seen on the streets here, Chinese communist projects seem everywhere.

The technical help and the loans and gifts the Chinese have bestowed on the Tanzanians exceed by far what the Tanzanians are getting from anyone else.

The Chinese have helped set up a joint shipping line with Tanzania, employing two 10,000-ton freighters. Tanzania paid her share with an interest-free loan from Communist China that the Tanzanians must start repaying only in 10 years and then from the profits they make on the line.

The Chinese have just finished building a textile mill at Ubungo, near Dar es Salaam, which Tanzanians are to pay for with another interest-free Chinese loan.

They also provided the Tanzanians with a 50-kilowatt radio transmitter at Mabibo, also near Dar es Salaam, with the same financing arrangement. A police-training camp at Moshi is staffed by the Chinese. They are also running a $15-million farming project at Ruvu. And they are providing loans and grants that the Tanzanians need to resume agricultural and road-building projects suspended when diplomatic relations were broken off with Britain and that source of money dried up.

LAST ENGINEERS ARRIVE

About 150 engineers and technicians from Communist China arrived in Dar es Salaam yesterday. They are the last of a team surveying for a 1,000-mile railway that the Chinese have undertaken to build from here to the Copper Belt in neighboring Zambia.

There were no Government announcements or fanfare about their arrival, but a crowd of Africans stood on the thin white shore that lines the harbor and watched the glistening blue-and-white liner Yao Hua slip into harbor and drop anchor.

It was a curious spectacle: the Chinese stepping into launches one after another, without smiling or speaking to be carried ashore and driven away in crowded minibuses. The Africans giggled, but seemed not to talk much to one another about this evidence of China's growing presence in black Africa.

For the other foreigners in Dar es Salaam, swilling beers and exchanging alarming tales under paddling overhead fans in crowded bars these sticky nights, there is no more favorite topic of discussion than the Chinese. What do they hope to achieve in Africa? Why have they done so well in Tanzania when they have failed so miserably in so many other places in Africa?

RELATIONS TURN SOUR

After a promising start, China's relations with Ghana and the Central African Republic turned sour. From Burundi the Chinese supported the rebellion in the Congo and eventually got themselves thrown out. Their relations were strained in Kenya and Uganda when they were caught providing funds for the opposition, Dr. H. Kamuzu Banda, President of Malawi, called their hand for having tried to bribe some of his ministers into joining the opposition. In the Congo and Mali the Chinese were well received, but they failed to make any headway in the rest of the continent.

China's big initial success in Africa was in helping to stage a revolution in Zanzibar in 1964. It has never relinquished its hold on the island and has never made a political misjudgment serious enough to jeopardize its influence there.

With the union of Zanzibar and the mainland state of Tanganyika to become the state of Tanzania, even those who thought the islanders had been swallowed up wondered if they would ever be digested. Tanzania's politics have moved erratically but unmistakably to the left ever since.

This enormous, primitive country of more than 360,000 square miles—as big as France and Germany together—has 12 million people, most of whom care little about politics, scratching out no more than a peasant's existence on land that is abundant and that could be as productive as any in Africa. There is remote, scattered mineral wealth in the southern highlands that no one has bothered to exploit.

It is difficult to accept the idea that the Chinese are very interested in anything Tanzania has to offer now, or that the Chinese very badly need Tanzania's reassurance that China is leading a revolutionary force in the world. But Tanzanian Government leaders are easily excited about the continued presence of white governments in southern Africa.

The Tanzanians are receptive to the flow of Chinese weapons, for they can get them nowhere else as easily. A grip in Tanzania, whose vast area touches eight other countries, would give the Chinese a wide periphery in Africa and a base on the western littoral of the Indian Ocean. A project like the railway will give them valid reason to put thousands of people into the mineral-rich heart of the African Copper Belt that runs from Zambia into Katanga Province of the Congo.

MILITARY AID TO REGION

Of enormous potential importance is the military equipment and training that the Chinese provide for the dozen "liberation" movements based in Tanzania.

But not all of the weapons have gone to rebels operating against the white-dominated southern region. The rebellion in the Congo was kept alive by weapons sent by rail from Dar es Salaam to Kigoma. And a convoy of weapons bound for Uganda was stopped by the police in Kenya.

Dr. Banda has accused President Julius K. Nyerere of Tanzania of allowing plots against him to be hatched in Tanzania. Even the Watusis, in their long-bogged down invasion of Rwanda, got their Chinese weapons through Tanzania.

But the railway that the Chinese have undertaken to build is a far more spectacular idea, and they have wasted no time getting the project under way.

The job could be done in 15 months and the construction could begin then. The Chinese have already promised to finance the construction.

The Chinese have also offered to talk about providing diesel locomotives and rolling stock for the railway.

Both President Nyerere and President Kenneth D. Kaunda of Zambia were anxious to get the railway. Mr. Nyerere sees it as a way to open up his southern region to development and to enhance the value of the port of Dar es Salaam. Mr. Kaunda wants the railway so that he need not ship copper out through white-governed Rhodesia and Portuguese Mozambique.

Mr. Kaunda was at first reluctant to accept the Chinese offer to build the railway, but he changed his mind when he failed to arouse any interest in the project in Britain, France, West Germany or the United States.

All of the nations seemed worried by the big initial investment and the time it would take for the railroad to start turning a profit. The United States offered to pay for a comprehensive transportation survey that would establish the economic facts of the matter, but the Africans were not interested.

President Nyerere was less worried than was President Kaunda about the political implications of bringing in the Chinese. He has always argued that big slices of Communist aid would help offset the old preponderant influence of the West in Africa.

Mr. Nyerere approached Soviet leaders and was turned down. The world bank was also approached, but it advised the Africans to ask instead for help to improve the crude road that is now being used to some extent to truck copper to Dar es Salaam.

Eventually Presidents Nyerere and Kaunda accepted the offer the Chinese had made to Mr. Nyerere when he visited China in 1956.

Several diplomats in this city are frankly puzzled about the intentions of the Chinese. The railway could take seven or eight years to build, they say, terming it an unusually long period for any country to commit herself to a project so sensitive and unsettled a part of Africa.

They feel that the Chinese will inevitably run into frictions that have been met by Britain, the United States, West Germany, Israel, Nigeria and every other country that has made any major contributions in Tanzania.

The Chinese are obviously aiming at the rich heart of Africa, but it is considered a long shot.

[From the New York Times, May 30, 1968]

CHINESE TO HELP BUILD MALI-TO-GUINEA RAILROAD—PEKING ANNOUNCES PACT FOR SECOND SUCH PROJECT IN AFRICA—LINE WILL HOOK UP WITH ONE THAT RUNS TO THE ATLANTIC

HONG KONG, May 28.—Peking has agreed to help build a railroad that will give Mali access to the sea through Guinea. The agreement reflects Peking's pragmatic approach toward a number of small African nations and is evidence of its continuing interest in developing a foothold in Africa.

The agreement resulted from a visit to Communist China by a joint Guinean-Malian delegation headed by the Foreign Minister of the two countries.

The delegation met with Mao Tse-Tung, Chairman of the Communist party's Central Committee, Premier Chou En-lai and other top officials.

Peking gave no details of the project, nor did it say how much it would contribute in technical or financial aid. A report by Hsinhua, the Chinese press agency, said only that an "agreement on the construction of the Guinea-Mali railway" had been signed.

The agreement was signed by Li Hsien-nien, China's Finance Minister; Ousmane Ba, Foreign Minister of Mali, and Louis Lansana Béavogui, Foreign Minister of Guinea.

According to informed sources here, the proposed railway will run from Bamako, the capital of Mali, across the border into Guinea, meet an existing line that joins Kouroussa and the sea.

Last year Peking signed an agreement with the Governments of Tanzania and Zambia to build a 1,000-mile railway between the two states. Last week, 150 more Chinese engineers arrived in Dar es Salaam, the last of a team surveying for the railroad there. The survey could be completed in 15 months and the construction seven or eight years.

No details have been officially announced about China's contribution to the Tanzania-Zambia project. One Western estimate put the cost at about $400-million, but an African estimate was $250-million.

In 1964, two-thirds of China's aid commitments overseas were to newly independent countries in Africa. During 1965 and 1966 Chinese aid generally was cut back but Peking has continued to provide technical assistance and some loans to African States. Last year China granted an interest-free loan of $16.8-million to Zambia.

While some African countries have complained that China's well-publicized promises have not always been fully kept, others have benefited from the channeling of Chinese aid into piecemeal but useful projects. In February 1967 a factory built with Chinese aid began processing 400 tons of sugar cane daily in Mali a country that had previously imported sugar.

Peking has had angry exchanges with a number of African countries notably Kenya. Five African states have expelled Chinese diplomats or severed relations with Peking, reversing early Chinese successes. However, its provision of specialized aid has impressed a number of African leaders.

Reports by African students in Peking that they had been victims of racial intolerance, and charges by some African leaders that Chinese representatives had engaged in subversive activities have harmed China's reputation in Africa. The successful completion of the two railway projects might help counter this adverse publicity and open more doors to it on the African continent.

[From the New York Times, May 30, 1968]

U.N. BANS TRADE WITH RHODESIANS—SECURITY COUNCIL BARS ALL COMMERCE AND TRAVEL

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., May 29.—The Security Council ordered today a complete trade and travel blockade of Rhodesia in a move against the rebel white minority regime of Prime Minister Ian D. Smith.

The effect of the decision, while intended to be mandatory on all United Nations members, was considered more political and psychological than practical with South Africa and Portgual continuing to supply Rhodesia with oil and to market her exports.

Members of the Security Council said the resolution should convince Mr. Smith of the firmness of international opposition to the continuation of a regime in Rhodesia that the United Nations considers illegal and racist.

The resolution, adopted unanimously by all 15 members of the Security Council, tightens supervision of an earlier selective embargo against Rhodesian exports. It also denies arms and aircraft to the Salisbury Government.

But it contains no provision for sanctions against member nations that disregard the Security Council decision. The step was taken under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, which provides for economic sanctions to end situations that are a threat to peace.

RESOLUTION IS COMPROMISE

The resolution was a compromise between a British draft and a stronger draft proposed by Algeria, Pakistan, India and Senegal calling for use of force to bring down the Smith Government.

Lord Caradon of Britain, this month's President of the Security Council, turned over the presidency for today's vote to Arthur J. Goldberg, the chief United States representative, because of Britain's position in the conflict with Rhodesia.

Lord Caradon said after the vote that Britain was not prepared to enter into an economic confrontation with South Africa over Rhodesia.

While Britain is firmly opposed to use of force against Rhodesia, Lord Caradon said Britain felt that perseverance in economic sanctions "will convince the illegal regime that their rebellion can lead nowhere but to economic stagnation and political isolation."

Agha Shahi, Pakistan's permanent representative, said the sponsors of the harder draft had chosen a compromise in the interests of unanimous support in the Security Council, including Britain, for "international isolation" of the Smith Government.

Mr. Shahi said the world expected Britain to continue to refuse to grant Rhodesia independence until "majority rule is established."

FULL TRADE EMBARGO

The resolution, with 23 operative articles, establishes a full embargo on all trade and financial relations with Rhodesia, except for "humanitarian" matters such as medical supplies and pension payments.

The full embargo extends the ban adopted by the Security Council in December, 1966, on the sale of oil to Rhodesia and the purchase of nine main Rhodesian exports, including tobacco, asbestos, chrome, sugar, meats, and hides and iron ore.

There has been substantial evasion of the earlier resolution. Rhodesia has continued to ship its main exports through neighboring South Africa and the Portuguese African territories of Mozambique and Angola. Rhodesia has also maintained a substantial level of trade with Zambia and the Congo.

The resolution adopted today provides for a Security Council committee to supervise enforcement of the embargo. All member countries are supposed to file regular reports on trade with Rhodesia with Secretary General Thant.

The Security Council also decided that all United Nations members should prevent travel to Rhodesia by their citizens, and refuse to recognize passports issued by the Smith Government. This was designed to block tourism, as well as commercial travel.

Isolation of the Salisbury regime through the United Nations has been pursued by Britain ever since Mr. Smith and his political movement based on white settlers declared Rhodesia independent.

This action, in 1965, was declared illegal by Britain, which at that time was the colonial administrator of Rhodesia. The establishment of the independent regime was carried out by Mr. Smith and his supporters without a vote consulting Rhodesia's four million black residents. The British had insisted that independence be accompanied by a guarantee of majority rule.

The Soviet Union and France, which had abstained on the earlier partial embargo, joined the majority today in the unanimous vote, thereby strengthening the Security Council's stand on Rhodesia.

The resolution included recommendations to member nations to interrupt telecommunications with Rhodesia and suspend consular relations. The United States maintains a consular agent in Salisbury, but no diplomatic representative, since Washington does not recognize the Smith Government.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 26, 1968]

STRIFE RIDS SOUTH CHINA, ARMY BELIEVED POISED

HONG KONG.—Increasingly deadly factional strife is ripping through southern China and, by most reports reaching Hong Kong, the Red Army is doing little or nothing to stop it.

There is growing belief among some top

official China analysts here that the army is deliberately allowing violence to reach a stage at which the military can take over in the name of restoring peace and order.

These men say the situation is chaotic in Kwangtung, the province of 40 million people bordering Hong Kong. Officially unconfirmed but generally accepted reports say hundreds are being killed nightly in three-way battles among anti-Maoists and rival factions claiming to support Communist Party Chairman Mao Tse-Tung.

REFUGEE CRISIS FEARED

The increasing fear here is that the army may wait too long, all control will break down, and Hong Kong will face a refugee crisis much more severe than in 1962, when a quarter million fleeing Chinese tried to cross into the British colony.

Hong Kong authorities sent back at least 100,000, but they estimated 60,000 to 70,000 lost themselves in Hong Kong's steep rocky hillsides.

More and more reports pour into Hong Kong of bloody violence in Kwangtung.

More and more bodies of apparent victims of that violence float into Hong Kong and Macao. So far 20 Chinese bodies have been picked up and travelers between Hong Kong and Portuguese Macao insist they saw dozens more along the 40-mile ferry route.

EIGHTEEN TIED WITH ROPES

Eighteen bodies, including at least one of a teen-age girl, were tied with ropes around the neck and then down to the hands and feet. They obviously had been executed before being thrown into the water, probably in the Pearl River that comes to the South China Sea from Canton, capitol of Kwangtung.

Presumably they were victims of the vicious factional fighting that is tearing through Canton. If they had been executed by officials or regular army troops, the bodies would not have been thrown in the water for the world to see.

Visitors to Canton report gunfire echoes through the city every night. In rural areas, they say, pitchforks, scythes, and clubs are used to kill and maim.

One traveler said hospitals in Canton, are so crowded with victims of the fighting that scores lie on pallets in corridors and porches.

SOLIDARITY DAY

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, since its erection in Washington, D.C., some 6 weeks ago, Resurrection City, the poor people's tent city near the Lincoln Memorial, has been marred by uncertain leadership, a widely fluctuating population and outright hostility toward the Government and the so-called power structure in America.

In previous reports to you, I have described the struggle between the militants and the moderates for the reins of power, the dwindling of Resurrection City from 2,500 to about 400 people, and the rudeness, the hostility, and the point-blank threats aimed at various departments of the executive branch of our Government as well as the Congress.

It has often seemed in the past 6 weeks that the people in Resurrection City have deliberately cut themselves off from society. Burly marshals with clubs have prevented many visitors, including your Congressman, from entering the grounds. On several occasions, well-meaning Washington citizens have stretched out their hand in friendship only to have it slapped away—or ignored.

For example, this last week a supermarket truck drove up to the tent city loaded with food. But no one would help the driver unload the truck so he drove away. Another day, a Negro plumber from Washington worked in the sun all by himself on his day off attempting to improve the sanitation system at Resurrection City. In spite of repeated calls for volunteers to assist him, no help was forthcoming while he dug the ditch and laid the pipe alone. A tall, strapping, obviously healthy man, a resident of Resurrection City, stood by watching as the volunteer began to fill the ditch. The plumber asked if he would help. "I came here to put down my shovel—not pick it up," the muscular resident replied. The volunteer finished his job alone.

The Reverend Jerome McFarland, a Negro minister, pastor of the Evergreen Baptist Church in Washington, was disturbed by the plight of the genuine poor at Resurrection City and the failure of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference to give them adequate assistance. He formed a Christian Committee of Concern to help the poor, but when he attempted to circulate a simple information sheet at Resurrection City to determine the needs of the people, he was blocked. Reverand McFarland was apparently stopped because he was not interested in politics but in people.

This week came the climax—Solidarity Day which attracted approximately 50,000 people to the Lincoln Memorial to hear speeches and diatribes about the poverty in America—and the war in Vietnam.

The main speaker was Mrs. Martin Luther King, Jr., who has long been one of the most vocal opponents of the Vietnam war. Mrs. King described the war as "the most cruel and evil war in the history of mankind."

Those people who fought Hitler and naziism in the Second World War would undoubtedly disagree as would the surviving families of the millions who died in Nazi gas ovens and concentration camps.

Rev. Ralph Abernathy attempted to best Mrs. King in rhetoric, declaring:

> The promise of a great society was burned to ashes by the napalm in Vietnam and we watched the Johnson administration perform as the unwitting midwife at the birth of the sick society.

As you know, I am no supporter or defender of the Great Society or the Johnson administration, but talk about "napalm" and "the sick society" is so wide of the mark as to offer little promise for future cooperation toward a redress of whatever inequities do exist in this country.

And yet in the face of such loaded language, Whitney Young, head of the Urban League, declared:

> The Nation and the Congress must listen to us now before it is too late; before the prophets of violence replace the prophets of peace and justice.

What Mrs. King, Young, and Abernathy, with his talk about staying in Resurrection City until "justice rolls out of the Halls of Congress," must realize is that solutions are achieved by a dialog—not a monolog; by people working together in mutual trust and harmony; by an understanding of the other man's position as well as your own.

Much can be done, much is being done, much will be done to bring prosperity to every American who will work for that prosperity. If the leaders of the Poor People's March will put aside politics, stop asking the Federal Government for $20, $40, $100 billion and work with State and local government as well as the private sector to locate and create jobs, they can help to make the American dream we all share that much more of a reality, rather than be parties to turning it into a nightmare of unrestricted lawlessness in which no one's rights are protected or liberties kept secure.

COMMON ENEMY—UNITED FRONT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the May-June 1968 issue of Michigan Conservation, which is published by the Michigan Department of Conservation, carries a most revealing article outlining the department's efforts to control and end the use of certain persistent insecticides because of the extremely harmful impact they have on fish and wildlife. Ralph A. MacMullan, director of the Michigan Department of Conservation, is the author of the article and he is to be commended for taking action to reduce the insecticide threat. So that my colleagues may have the opportunity to see this article, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

COMMON ENEMY—UNITED FRONT

(By Ralph A. MacMullan)

Recently, in the pages of this magazine, I announced a Conservation Department opposition to the continued use of certain persistent insecticides which have seriously polluted our environment. We in the Department took this stand only after exacting discussions, and in full expectation that there probably would be some misunderstandings and no small amount of public opposition.

I am now pleased to report that many persons in Michigan have apparently been more disturbed about the threat of these chemicals than we in the Conservation Department at first believed possible. This concern appeared last fall when the Environmental Defense Fund, a group of public-spirited private citizens, invited 56 Michigan communities into court to stop them from further use of the persistent chemical DDT for Dutch elm disease control. I can now report that at this writing at least 33 Michigan towns and cities have agreed to stop using DDT in Dutch elm disease control in municipal tree-spraying and park maintenance programs. Much of the "pressure" for this very significant and progressive change came from concern expressed by residents of these communities. We hope that the remainder will soon join the widening public condemnation of such chemicals.

Of most encouragement to me, however, has been the concern expressed by individual citizens and responsible organizations, both in Michigan and throughout the nation. Most who have written to the Department appear to be well aware of the problem. We sense

in their letters an awakening awareness of the need to arrest the deterioration of man's environment. "I would like to commmend you on your courageous forward-looking program to prevent further contamination of our environment by the use of hard pesticides," wrote a former agriculture extension worker. A housewife sent a five-page handwritten letter which starts: "I say Hooray for the coho salmon if it means the end of DDT and other hard pesticides . . ." (DDT levels in Lake Michigan salmon have been shown to be dangerously high for reproduction of the coho.) The president of a large construction company wrote: "I am real pleased with the stand you and your Department have taken in regard to hard pesticides. As we both know, they should have no part in the scheme of things, either in our state or nationally, and I'm sending along a letter to both the Governor and my Congressman giving my views on this matter." A biologist at the Brookhaven National Laboratory in New York wrote: "I want to convey my congratulations on your article "The Case Against Hard Pesticides," originally published in Michigan Conservation and republished in the Congressional Record where I saw it. The impact of that article is very great; its conclusions are correct and supportable in detail. I admire your courage and appreciate your leadership." A young woman student wrote: "The effects of pesticides are obvious and if continued, quite deadly. Your article is helping to bring to the attention of the American people that this subject has been all too long suppressed."

I find much encouragement in Governor Romney's appointment of a highly qualified three-man committee to come up with a statewide policy statement on the future use of pesticides. Prior to this we had supported bills in the state legislature which would set up a state Pesticide Control Board. Such a board, would review all major pesticide uses in the state, and would recommend actions and methods which would control the uses of such chemicals in our environment. It may take some time to establish such a law, but it may safely be stated that some system of control along these lines is definitely going to be part of Michigan's future.

No *one* person, or *group* of people, or *industry* is responsible for the growing contamination by persistent pesticides—not the farmer, nor the suburban back yard mosquito fighter, nor the tree sprayers, nor the orchardists, nor the chemical companies, nor the forest products industry, nor any body of citizens. We are *all* involved and we are all guilty of past excesses. We have all been willing to accept the easier and possibly cheaper road offered by the persistent pesticide.

But all of us should be careful and responsible with our thoughts and feelings on this subject, just as we should similarly be careful and responsible in use of insecticides. Experience has taught us that in this pesticide business, misunderstandings easily arise and what often starts out as a simple statement of position or expression of concern takes on a different meaning as it travels from written to spoken words.

Misunderstandings have developed on this point of who or what we oppose, and therefore I want to re-emphasize the position that we in the Conservation Department have taken:

1. First and foremost, we are not opposed to all pesticides, but only to a few which are dangerous because they persist in the air, water and soil for years and even decades after application with harmful effects on living organisms.

2. We believe the use of these few chemicals—DDT, Aldrin, Chlordane, Dieldrin, Endrin, Heptachlor, and Lindane—should be strictly regulated and eventually eliminated as research develops effective substitutes for them. To the above list, BHC and Toxaphene should now be added. Also, additional research in months and years to come might indicate the need to control other chemicals not now on the list. However, I am happy to say that the general thrust of research and development in the field of insecticide production is in the direction of non-persistent chemicals, and we are hopeful that chemical companies will rapidly phase out production of these old, persistent, and troublesome insecticides.

3. Most specifically, we think DDT should be eliminated now, because there are good substitutes which meet the needs of agriculture, Dutch elm disease control, mosquito suppression, the home gardener, and the housewife. For example in February, Michigan State University stopped recommending DDT for Dutch elm disease control, and the Michigan Department of Agriculture recently cancelled its use for mosquito control. The finding that DDT is the most probable cause of coho salmon losses in our hatcheries is a clear and obvious signal that we have a serious problem in Lake Michigan. We just can't afford to use any more DDT in Michigan.

4. Where effective substitutes that are safe for general public use aren't yet available, we agree that persistent insecticides may have to be used in isolated situations and where it can be assured they will not escape into the wider environment.

5. When the use of persistent pesticides is proposed, the disadvantages or potentially harmful effects of this use should be carefully weighed against the expected benefits.

6. We realize that the safer substitutes may cost more and may be less effective for the immediate purpose. These increased costs will be borne by the public, meaning all of us, just as the costs of water pollution control and other environmental protection programs must be the responsibility of society as a whole. It will cost a paper company to clean up its waste discharge, but that company will pass along this cost to its customers. No one group should have to foot the bills. A clean environment benefits everybody, and everybody will have to pay his share to achieve it.

Finally, let me add a personal note: we in government work sometimes feel that social advances can only be made through the use of laws, funded programs, directives, and such other legalized procedures of society. We tend, perhaps, to overlook or forget the responsiveness of a public which is very often willing to work with government to solve mutual problems without the need of additional laws. We, in the Department of Conservation, have seen this in recent years in our conservation law enforcement program. We asked the public to help, and the public helped. Again, in this issue of banning hard pesticides, we have asked the public to help, and the public is helping. There are no laws which say that people can't use hard pesticides, yet the use of these chemicals in Michigan will be at a far lower level this year than in years past, simply because people are concerned and are helping. Furthermore, we already know from the public response to date that we may well look forward to the day when these persistent, troublesome pesticides will no longer be manufactured, because people simply will not buy them. And when that day arrives, my fellow conservationists, we may congratulate ourselves that we have made progress.

THE "PUEBLO": HOW LONG, MR. PRESIDENT?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 157th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

WE MUST ACT ON GUN CONTROL

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the issue of gun control has caused millions of Americans to speak out in a strong voice for legislation that would require the licensing and registration of firearms on a nationwide basis. A poignant report on this matter is being sent to the people of my State of Pennsylvania by our senior Senator, JOSEPH S. CLARK.

Under unanimous consent I include this report in the RECORD:

WE MUST ACT ON GUN CONTROL

Sometimes it takes a while for the people to make their voices heard, but when they do they can work legislative miracles. Back in 1965, when I first joined in introducing a strong Federal gun control bill, the people were silent. The only voices heard were those of the noisy gun lobby. For my efforts on behalf of strong gun control legislation the only reward I got was a deluge of letters, largely inspired by the National Rifle Association, running 10 to 1 against gun control. I also earned the enmity of many well intentioned hunters, some of whom promised to remove me from office at the first opportunity.

But times change, even though it sometimes takes tragic events to change them. Last summer I pleaded with the Congress to act promptly on gun controls. There was a tragic prophecy in my words: "We simply must pass a law to keep guns out of the hands of felons, youths, and irresponsible persons. As a longtime cosponsor of this bill, I say to my colleagues in the Senate, let us pass the gun control bill now, this year, before another summer comes with its menace for our cities."

TWO TRAGIC MURDERS

But the Congress sat on its hands, and the country paid a frightful price. In April Martin Luther King was shot to death allegedly by an escaped convict with a rifle purchased over the counter in a different state—a rifle which could not have been purchased if the gun bill had been law—and our nation's cities erupted in an unprecedented spasm of violence, burning and looting.

Again I went to the Senate floor to urge my colleagues to act. "Let us now," I said, "before we are visited by national tragedy yet again, pass the federal gun control bill." But the National Rifle Association was still in the saddle, and Senator Edward Kennedy's amendment to ban mail order sale of long guns, which I strongly supported, was voted down by the Senate 53 to 29.

No one at that time could have dreamed that the new national tragedy which I had feared would come so swiftly and so terribly. The brutal and heart-rending assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy has shaken the nation to its core. And at last the American people are waking up and speaking out.

The result is that a number of Congressmen and Senators who have played footsie with the gun lobby in the past are beginning to have second thoughts, and are now ready to vote for an adequate gun control law. It is long past time to do so.

THE HIGH COST OF INACTION

Last year more than 100,000 Americans were shot—more than 19,000 of the shootings proved fatal.

Every year more than half the 10,000 murders in the United States are committed with guns; more than half the 20,000 suicides

are carried out with guns; and over 2,000 accidental deaths are caused by guns.

In the first 5 years of this decade, more than 200 policemen were murdered with firearms. Only nine were killed by other means. More than four law officers continue to be killed every month in this country while attempting to preserve law and order.

We have got to put an end to the spirit of violence which has seized this country. It is not enough just to ban mail order sales of pistols and long guns. What we need is an effective nation-wide system of gun registration and licensing. I have joined in sponsoring bills to create such a system.

There is no other civilized, industrialized nation in the world which is as lax as this country in regulating the acquisition and possession of firearms. Virtually all of them require firearms registration as a minimal measure in protecting the public safety; many have far more severe restrictions.

We must get over the notion that possession and use of a gun is either a testimonial to our manliness or a guarantee of our freedom. As the tragic events of the past several years has shown, guns may well be the agents by which free democratic institutions are destroyed, not preserved.

Society must defend itself against the menace of the gun in the hands of the dope addict, felon or juvenile delinquent. It can do so, I am confident, without abridging the privilege of the law-abiding hunter or sportsman to own and use a gun. None of the measures before the Congress would require law-abiding citizens to surrender guns they now have. None of these measures infringes on the constitutional right to bear arms, which is related to the need to maintain a well regulated militia.

TV AND THE MOVIES—AN EDUCATION IN VIOLENCE

Spend an evening in front of your television set this week, and count the killings. Then go out to your neighborhood theater and see a popular thriller. We have become so used to seeing violence and brutality portrayed that we scarcely notice it any more—on the surface. But isn't it possible that it is doing something to us and our children without our knowing it, as individuals, and as a nation?

I respect as much as anyone the right to free artistic expression of the people who make our movies and television programs. But the public has a higher right to call a halt to the progressive brutalization of our senses—and our children's as well—by the media's obsession with death and violence.

AMERICANS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ACTION

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, today, the Americans for Constitutional Action marks its 10th anniversary. I think it only appropriate that we comment upon their fine work.

The ACA performs a real service to the country. One may not agree with every position ACA takes, but year in and year out their rating system is useful to all citizens and particularly to all students of politics.

I am delighted to take note of this 10th anniversary and to take the opportunity to commend the ACA for the tremendous contribution they make to our system of government.

THE UNFINISHED LETTER

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker. Some time ago, a young man on guard duty in Vietnam used the light of exploding flares to write a letter to his pastor, the Reverend Payton Smyers of Cabool, Mo., and members of the church. In his letter, Pfc. Jackie Montgomery expressed his appreciation for the support of the people back home, and went on to write a moving, sensitive account of his thoughts and feelings as he fought to safeguard the American dream of peace. He wrote movingly of the effect of Negro-white solidarity in Vietnam, the right of our position there, and the need for belief in God. He asked the townspeople to stand behind his fighting friends and asked especially for the greatest force of all—prayer.

The letter was never finished. Jackie Montgomery, soldier, was killed in action before he could complete his masterpiece of love and hope. In tribute to that fine young man, and to give wider voice to his unique perception, I enter "The Unfinished Letter" in the RECORD, as follows:

REV. PAYTON SMYER,
Pastor, Free Will Baptist Church,
Cabool, Mo.

Rev. and Mrs. PAYTON SMYERS and MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH: It is dark and I am near my foxhole on guard. There are flares exploding steadily, so I can see enough to write a little.

I got a letter from home last week. Mom said the church always remembers us in their prayers. Due to the situation here I can tell you that there are no words I can find to express my appreciation for those prayers.

I have seen many pastors change over in that church. I remember when the roof seemed a hundred feet high and when I had to stand on tiptoes to see over the altar. It has always been my church.

The people there I have seen come and go, old and young and I knew them all. And now I must thank all of you for remembering me.

There is one thing I would like to mention here. When you pray do not only ask God for safety, strength, and courage, but always remember to thank him for that which he has already given us. Every day is Thanksgiving here. Every hour is Thanksgiving here. There are no atheists. I have met one man with agnostic views, but he is new and has not yet seen action. I'm sure he will change, for those back there who believe God is dead, send them here for awhile. You run into God every time you turn around.

Our Easter services were well worth telling about. We were camped in a graveyard. We had no Chaplain, so our Squad got together for a brief service. We read of the Resurrection and then we prayed. It was very short and very simple, but I will never forget it.

The news from home has been of interest to us. The hope of peace talks, the President's decision not to run for re-election, but the deepest feeling came from the news of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King. I was under a poncho with three Negroes, when we heard the news. We discussed it not as three Negroes, and one white man, but as four men. One made the remark that if the people back home could only see how we live together, work together, care for one another over here, then there would be no consideration given to color.

Another incident which seemed remarkable to me, occurred shortly after I arrived here. My Fire-team Leader, a large colored man from St. Louis, and I were on observation post near a school for students of Buddha. One student walked over to the Baines and holding their wrists together pointed and laughed at the differences in color. Then he pointed at my wrists without laughing. Baines pointed to his own hand and said "Negro", he then pointed at my hand and said "Caucasian". The Vietnamese student looked a little confused. Then Baines held our wrists together and said, "Both Americans". The student understood this. The simple words were perfect. I even seemed to understand a little better myself.

It is for us all that I hope you will pray, and if there are any among you who refuses to pray for a man because of his color then write and tell me. I will pray for him.

I have listened to the words of you people for twenty years, and in every case, I was able to profit from them. I am not a preacher, but if you will allow me to say a few words about things which I have learned here I would feel better. I know now that I always took the finer things of our life, for granted. There is little freedom here. After dark anyone who moves in rural areas is suspected of being VC, and they are responded to accordingly. It is a cold way of doing it, but it is necessary. There is little electricity. The village huts have no windows or doors. Seldom do you see floor other than dirt. The sanitation problem is tremendous. It seems that all of the things we understand as necessities at home are no more than a distant hope for these people. They are kicked from house to house taking refuge anywhere, as the war goes on around them. The VC move into a village. The people move out. We move in and obliterate the village. That is the common sequence.

Our town of Cabool has been well represented in this war. We have suffered, but we have suffered little in contrast to some places. We ask you to stand behind us. You hold the greatest, most effective weapon in this war. That is prayer. Remember us. There are many who seldom hear from home. I have been lucky, friends and relatives have written regularly. But for these who seldom hear from home I wish there was something you could do just to let them know you are thinking of them, not only the Church but the entire town should join together in support. We think we are doing the right thing. Your encouragement would confirm our beliefs.

And for those who question our right of being here, I ask, did the Doughboy have the right to fight in Europe in 1917? Did we have the right to respond to the bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941? Did we go wrong in defending Korea in the early 50s? The question is not whether we have the right, the question is, do we have the responsibility. Isolationism is dangerous for a major power. I believe we have the responsibility.

Before long we will all be returning home, God willing. Again you people will be interrupted in your night's sleep by the loud noise of screeching tires on the pavement. You'll again become annoyed and disgusted with this younger generation. It is true we are lively in our youth, but remember we are young. Call us down when we need it. We don't deny we often need it.

But here in Viet Nam you never hear anyone say "Why Me?" We understand why. It is our time to live. We are the ones, who are responsible. Please remember when we come home that it is our time to live and I will guarantee we all will live better for we have seen a life without freedom.

And also in your prayers please remember all the boys in uniform regardless of location. There are many who fail to receive proper credit for their work only because they are not here. Without them our work here could not possibly function. Remember them for they do as much as we do.

JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION CONFIRMS THAT FISCAL 1969 EXPENDITURE CUTS ARE A SHAM

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today written President Johnson for confirmation of a news item which appeared on UPI Tuesday, June 25. The news item indicated that President Johnson was planning to delay making expenditure cuts until after the Congress had acted on all appropriation bills. If this is true it is an admission that the $6 billion expenditure cut is a sham and that President Johnson has not accepted it along with the tax increase.

Following is a copy of the letter to President Johnson and a statement I made on the subject:

JUNE 27, 1968.

The Honorable LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: The UPI wire service carried the following news item on Tuesday, June 25th:

"The White House indicated Tuesday that it might be months before President Johnson reaches any decision on where to cut the $6 billion from his budget for fiscal 1969. White House Press Secretary George Christian said he did not see how the President could make any cuts until all the appropriation bills for the budget have been approved by Congress.

"So far only two of the more than twenty appropriation measures have been approved and sent to the President.

"Thus the President may put off any final decision on the spending cuts voted by Congress until the lawmakers complete appropriations action—action which may not be completed before the end of the summer."

Would you please confirm the accuracy of this statement.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

According to UPI report of Tuesday, June 25, the White House has indicated that it might be months before President Johnson reaches any decision on where to cut the $6 billion of expenditures from his budget for fiscal 1969. White House Press Secretary George Christian said he did not see how the President could make any cuts until all the appropriation bills for the budget have been approved by Congress.

I have written the President for confirmation of this report, but assuming it is true, it is tantamount to an admission that the $6 billion expenditure cut is a sham and that President Johnson has not accepted it as consideration for his $10 billion tax increase.

I took the floor of the House of Representatives to emphasize that we must tie down where line-item cuts in the fiscal 1969 expenditure level would be made, and when they would be made if expenditure cuts were to be realistic. Otherwise, as I stated on May 14, May 29, June 3, June 4, and June 20, we would have no cuts at all and inflationary forces would not be diminished by the tax increase. My fears appear to be confirmed by the press reports of yesterday.

The Expenditure Control Act as passed by the House on June 20 does not prevent the President from continuing to spend at current excessive levels. Already the projected expenditure level for fiscal 1969 has been increased to $189 billion from $186 billion.

Inflation is not cut back by cutting the private sector's power to spend through a tax increase if the Government spends the additional revenues collected. To insure that Government curtails expenditures, meaningful line-item expenditure cuts must be spelled out and scheduled to go into effect beginning July 1, 1968.

Fiscal year 1969 begins in 4 days and only 6 months of it will be under the Johnson administration. If any cuts are to be effective in the Johnson administration's 6 months these cuts should have already been scheduled.

GREEK JUNTA NEEDS TIME TO REACH GOALS, NOT CENSURE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., writing for the Chicago Daily News, has presented a most interesting observation on the present situation in Greece, which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues.

It has long been my belief that the best way we can restore democratic rule to Greece through parliamentary government is to continue pressing the present regime for a restoration of constitutional rights.

I do not believe that shutting Greece off from the rest of the Western World is going to hasten the day for her return as a constitutional monarchy or republic.

I never cease to be amazed at those who are so quick to watch with impunity the destruction of freedom in many major countries of the world and yet get their zeal all worked up about the current situation in Greece.

Any way you look at it, the present government in Greece has kept that nation from falling into Communist hands and creating havoc throughout the whole of Europe.

I believe Mr. Buckley places this entire subject into proper perspective.

His article follows:

GREEK JUNTA NEEDS TIME TO REACH GOALS, NOT CENSURE

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

ATHENS.—The report on the situation in Greece submitted to the Council of Europe is on the whole hostile to the revolutionary government, and recommends that the Council exert pressure on the Greek government to (a) liberalize the current draft of the constitution, (b) grant full freedom to all non-Communist parties to organize themselves prior to the vote on the new constitution, and (c) pledge itself to activate instantly the whole of the constitution the day after it is voted on, always assuming of course that the judgment is favorable. And so on and so on and so on.

The subject becomes tedious, not because the destiny of personal freedom in Greece is a tedious subject, but because everybody and his mother has been instructing Greece on how to proceed to bring about true democracy and the maximization of freedom.

Under such a barrage, it is no wonder that many Greeks, while adamantly holding by the necessity to reintroduce freedom in Greece, are cynical about the concern of Western democrats. Suddenly everyone has become an expert on democracy, and its shortcomings in Greece. "We shall not be surprised," wrote the Athens newspaper Eleftheros Kosmos, "if (the critics) print visiting cards mentioning 'democrat' as their occupation."

The salient points are these:

The government is pledged to put forward a constitution by next September. The present draft of that constitution permits a "constitutional court" to proscribe political parties or organizations, whose goals are "likely to overthrow the established social order." It is maintained in Athens that this isn't really different from the workable West German Constitution which has similar arrangements. In fact, there are differences: the West German code talks not about "the social order" but about "the democratic order."

All the ministers in the Papadopoulos government are pledged to come forward with a constitution that guarantees individual human rights as unequivocally as the human rights provisions of the United Nations and the Council of Europe. These rights are not yet elaborated: but no one is discussing a postponement of the September deadline. And critics who insist on instant application of the paradigm tend to forget that the existing government exists because the antecedent situation proved unworkable; at any rate, that is the rationale of the revolution.

No constitution will ever produce a divine and eternal equilibrium between freedom and order. Papadopoulos is not likely to succeed where Plato and Aristotle failed. The principal Democratic contenders for the Presidency of the United States are under severe pressure to denounce the junta in Greece. Richard Nixon, quite wisely, had declined to do so.

If Greece is headed for a long night of tyranny, there is time to bring pressure. But on the existing record, Greece is engaged in trying one more time, previous attempts having failed, to bring freedom and a national regeneration. We should lower our voices, and give them time.

OUR LAWLESS LAND

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, a most eloquent and moving plea for the return of decency and sanity to our law enforcement system was recently brought to my attention. It is in the form of a poem entitled "Our Lawless Land," by Robert D. Barr, a retired police officer.

I believe this poem expresses very well the feelings of many patriotic and concerned citizens who are disturbed by the recent tendency of our Supreme Court to be meticulously devoted to safeguarding the rights of the accused, and at the same time to be relatively indifferent to the rights of victims—to the protection of their lives and property.

I hope this poem will be read widely in America, for it is a sensitive and im-

passioned protest against the chaos and tragedy which are presently afflicting our Nation.

The poem follows:

OUR LAWLESS LAND

(By Robert D. Barr, retired police officer)

The Supreme Court sings the same old song—
It's our opinion we can't be wrong,
Our judgment's right we take this stance
And give the killer another chance.
Now he's got rights believe you me
To kill again when we set him free;
We'll slap his wrist this naughty boy
Then close our eyes and just act coy.
He'll travel on his bloody way
While orphans weep and widows pray.
We have police protect our lands
Then with our laws we tie their hands;
We pause a while to say a prayer
Then travel on with a listless air.
The time has come to make a stand
And take the gun from the killer's hand;
The game he plays he plays for keeps
And we look on while the orphan weeps.
Hear ye! Hear ye! Men brave and strong
It's time to right things that are wrong;
Let's change the law, make our selection
So all good people will have protection.
Untie those hands we tied so tight
They'll stop the wrong and protect the right;
We'll place our trust in God above
Then pray for peace and world wide love.

GREAT CONTRIBUTIONS OF ADMIRAL RICKOVER

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I think that we are all very much pleased and reassured to know that our great, distinguished, and very able friend, Admiral Rickover, will continue his invaluable service with the Navy.

All of us in the Congress who have been privileged to witness the tremendous contributions to the Nation, to the Navy, and the defense of the country of this great American well understand the most exceptional achievements of Admiral Rickover.

His foresight, vision, great ability, tenacity of purpose, and willingness to stand up and fight, when necessary, for his objectives, have been principally responsible for the great state of readiness of our naval forces of our times. Admiral Rickover has labored persistently and ably to insure our sizable fleet of attack submarines, our Polaris submarines, and many scientific innovations and advances in the implementation of our modern Navy.

His efforts to utilize nuclear energy in naval craft constitute historic markers in our naval progress that has brought immeasurable benefits to our defense, our national posture in defense matters, and the use of nuclear propellants.

I am very happy to learn of the admiral's new term of service, and express my heartiest congratulations to him and his family, and the personal admiration and gratitude which I so deeply feel for this great man's outstanding contributions to our country.

All Americans, who believe that our country is worth defending and worth fighting for, may be very proud of Admiral Rickover and very grateful for what he has done to strengthen our defense by building up our nuclear Navy.

Through strength and courage, let us devote ourselves as Americans to the cause of peace, security, and freedom. In that way, we can best serve our country and humanity, and it is a great tribute and honor to Admiral Rickover that he is dedicated so totally to this cause.

ANOTHER LOOK AT THE NEWS

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, appeals for cool reason and moderation in the national dialog on antifirearms legislation are rare. Further, most comment seems to issue from self-appointed oracles. Accordingly, I think my colleagues will find an editorial which appeared in the June 21 issue of the Daily Signal of Huntington Park, Calif., as rewarding as I did. The editorial by Mr. Tom Hageman follows:

ANOTHER LOOK AT THE NEWS

(By Tom Hageman)

Seldom has an issue become so emotional as the current controversy over gun control or the lack of it.

On the one hand we have those who hold so strongly to a desire to own arms anonymously and without restriction that they are willing to join in some kind of "holy crusade" to do away with the opposition.

And on the other hand there are those who feel so righteous in their cause that they seem to be saying "turn in your guns or we will kill you."

Caught right square in the middle of all this is a very clear majority of citizens who want only what is right.

So, what IS right in this issue as it applies to June 21 in year 1968?

Does each family need a small arsenal to protect itself from the underworld?

Most of us have no way of knowing a truly big underworld character when we see him and few, if any, of us have found it necessary to engage in a gangland shootout in the normal course of going about our daily routine.

But if a riot erupted shouldn't I have the right to protect my family with a gun, if necessary, and without having to wait 5, 10, or 15 days before I could complete a purchase?

I don't happen to own a rifle, but if I wanted to go hunting deep in the mountains why shouldn't I be able to borrow a gun from a friend? Under some recently proposed legislation I would become a criminal for possessing a gun not registered to me and the friend who loaned me the gun also would become a law violator.

The really "big picture" of gun ownership and regulation is confused by extremes of emotion today and for obvious reasons no practical new legislation is possible at the moment.

But it is equally obvious that current gun controls and regulations and the enforcement of existing laws is inadequate.

At the moment what we need the most is guidance from responsible leadership, silence from opportunistic politicians and time to do what is right.

JAMES BALDWIN: IT IS WHITES WHO MUST "COOL IT"

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Americans of all persuasions are rightfully dismayed at our continuing state of domestic upheaval and turmoil. When this dismay gets converted, however, as it so often does, into expressions of the hope that black America should simply "cool it," we accomplish nothing. The oppression that millions of black Americans feel cannot, and should not, be constrained. The injustices that still abound in this land require not avoidance, but rather our continuous and vocal attention.

An interview in the current—July 1968—issue of Esquire magazine with James Baldwin gives one eloquent Negro's response to the earnest and, I feel, misguided white appeals for further patience in our ghettos. Mr. Baldwin's response, stated most simply, is for whites to "cool" the vicious oppression that the black community must still contend with.

This interview makes provocative and trenchant reading. I hope my colleagues will consider Mr. Baldwin's comments with care.

The article follows:

JAMES BALDWIN: IT IS WHITES WHO MUST "COOL IT"

Question. Can we still cool it?

BALDWIN. That depends on a great many factors. It's a very serious question in my mind whether or not the people of this country, the bulk of the population of this country, have enough sense of what is really happening to their black co-citizens to understand why they're in the streets. I know as of this moment they maybe don't know it, and this is proved by the reaction to the civil-disorders report. It came as no revelation to me or to any other black cat that white racism is at the bottom of the civil disorders. It came as a great shock apparently to a great many other people, including the President of the United States and the Vice-President. And now you ask me if we can cool it. I think the President goofed by not telling the nation what the civil-disorders report was all about. And I accuse him and the entire administration, in fact, of being largely responsible for this tremendous waste and damage. It was up to him and the Vice-President to interpret that report and tell the American people what it meant and what the American people should now begin to think of doing. *Now!* It is already very, very late even to begin to think of it. What causes the eruptions, the riots, the revolts—whatever you want to call them—is the despair of being in a static position, absolutely static, of watching your father, your brother, your uncle, or your cousin—no matter how old the black cat is or how young—who has no future. And when the summer comes, both fathers and sons are in the streets—they can't stay in the houses. I was born in those houses and I know. And it's not their fault.

Question. From a very short-range approach, what should the federal government do, right now, to cool it?

BALDWIN. What do you mean by the federal government? The federal government has come to be, in the eyes of all Negroes anyway, a myth. When you say the federal government, you're referring to Washington and that means you're referring to a great many people. You're referring to Senator

Eastland and many people in Washington who out of apathy, ignorance or fear have no intention of making any move at all. You're talking about the people who have the power, who intend to keep the power. And all that they can think of are things like swimming pools, you know, in the summertime, and sort of made up jobs simply to protect peace and the public property. But they show no sign whatever of understanding what the root of the problem really is, what the dangers really are. They have made no attempt, whatever, any of them, as far as I know, really to explain to the American people that the black cat in the streets wants to protect his house, his wife and his children. And if he is going to be able to do this he has to be given his autonomy, his own schools, a revision of the police force in a very radical way. It means in short that if the American Negro, the American black man, is going to become a free person in this country, the people of this country have to give up something. If they don't give it up it will be taken from them.

Question. You say that existing jobs are just make-work jobs. What kind of job program should be adopted?

BALDWIN. It's very difficult to answer that question since the American Republic has created a surplus population. You know it's created not only people who are unemployable but who no longer wish to be employed in this system. A job program involves, first of all, I would think, a real attack on all American industries and on all American labor unions. For example, you're sitting in Hollywood. And there are not any Negroes, as far as I know, in any of the Hollywood craft unions: there is no Negro grip, no Negro crew member, no Negro works in Hollywood on that level or on any higher level either. There are some famous Negroes who work out here for a structure which keeps Negroes out of the unions. Now it's not an Act of God that there aren't any Negroes in the unions. It's not something that is handed down from some mountain; it's a deliberate act on the part of the American people. They don't want the unions broken, because they are afraid of the Negro as a source of competition in the economic market. Of course what they've made him is something much worse than that. You can't talk about job programs unless you're willing to talk about what is really holding the structure together. Eastman Kodak, General Motors, General Electric—all the people who really have the power in this country. It's up to them to open up *their* factories, *their* unions, to let us begin to work.

Question. They would have to begin, say, on-the-job training programs for those. . . .

BALDWIN. Yes, and by the way I know a whole lot of Negroes on the streets, baby, who are much brighter than a lot of cats dictating the policies of Pan American. You know what this country really means by on-the-job training programs is not that they're teaching Negroes skills, though there's that too; what they're afraid of is that when the Negro comes into the factory, into the union, when he comes, in fact, into the American institutions he will change these institutions because no Negro in this country really lives by the American middle-class standards. That's what they really mean by on-the-job training. That's why they pick up a half-dozen Negroes here and there, and polish them up, polish them off, and put them in some ——— college someplace, then expect those cats to be able to go back on the streets and cool the other cats. They can't. The price in this country to survive at all still is to become like a white man. More and more people are refusing to become like a white man. That's at the *bottom* of what they mean by on-the-job training. They mean they want to fit you in. And furthermore, let's tell it like it is. The American white man does not really want to have an autonomous Negro male anywhere *near* him.

Question. In on-the-job training programs, the white American structure wants a worker who is trained, who shows up regularly at eight-thirty in the morning and works till five in the afternoon.

BALDWIN. Yeah, well I know an awful lot of cats who did that for a long, long time. We haven't got to be trained to do that. We don't even have to be given an incentive to do that.

Question. Would you say, then, that many black people have been able to go nowhere, so they've lost any feeling that it's worth working regularly?

BALDWIN. That is part of what we're talking about. Though it goes deeper than that, I think. It's not only that. What is happening in this country among the young, and not only the black young, is an overwhelming suspicion that it's not worth it. You know that if you watched your father's life like I watched my father's life, as a kid much younger than I watches his father's life; his father *does* work from eight to five every day and ends up with nothing. He can't protect anything. He has nothing. As he goes to the grave, having worked his fingers to the bone for years and years and years, he still has nothing and the kid doesn't either. But what's worse than that is that one has begun to conclude from that fact that maybe in this Republic—judging now on the evidence of its own performance—maybe there isn't anything. It's easy to see on the other hand what happens to the white people who make it. And that's not a very attractive spectacle either. I mean I'm questioning the values on which this country thinks of itself as being based.

Question. What you are calling for, then, is a radical change in thinking by government and industry.

BALDWIN. Yes.

Question. And given the inertia plus . . .

BALDWIN. Fear.

Question. . . . fear and whatever else there may be, any such changes seem . . .

BALDWIN. . . . seem improbable.

Question. Certainly, they will come slow. A union will not throw open its doors and bring in several hundred people from the black community right away. Now my question is . . .

BALDWIN. You've answered your question.

Question. "Sweeper jobs," then, just won't work?

BALDWIN. No. I'll tell you what you will do. You will do what you did last summer and the summer before that. You'll pour some money into the ghetto and it will end up in the hands of various adventurers. In the first place, thirteen dollars and some change is not *meant* to do anything. And a couple of cats will make it, and the rest will be where they were.

Question. But can you buy time with this kind of program; enough time for the longer term changes?

BALDWIN. You could if you meant it. What's at issue is whether or not you mean it. Black people in this country conclude that you mean to destroy us.

Question. But if industry and government seriously planned job-training programs, and the unions opened up?

BALDWIN. Look, the labor movement in this country has always been based precisely on the division of black and white labor. That is no Act of God either. Labor unions along with the bosses created the Negro as a kind of threat to the white worker. There's never been any real labor movement in this country because there's never been any coalition between black and white. It's been prevented by the government and the industries and the unions.

Question. What would be the first step a union could take to demonstrate that it seriously wants to correct such inequities? What should the leadership do?

BALDWIN. Educate their own rank and file. Declare themselves. And penalize any member of the union who is against it.

Question. What can industry do on a short-range basis?

BALDWIN. I'm not sure that you should be asking me these questions at all. But I'll do my best to answer them. What can industry do? Well you know, the same as the labor unions. The labor unions won't have Negroes in the unions above a certain level. And they can never rise out of that local, or do what they might be able to do if they weren't trapped in that local at a certain level. Industry is perfectly willing to hire me to dig a ditch or carry a shovel. It isn't going to hire me to build a city or to fly a plane. It is unable to look on me as just another worker. There are exceptions to this rule, obviously, to be found everywhere. But this is the way it works and the exceptions, in fact, prove the rule.

Question. Do you think it would help if industry were to get involved as co-sponsors of low-income housing?

BALDWIN. No. I think we've had far more, more than enough of low-income housing which simply becomes high-rise slums.

Question. Well, if they were not high-rise slums?

BALDWIN. I don't want any more projects built in Harlem, for example. I want some one to attack the real-estate lobby because that's the only way to destroy the ghetto.

Question. But what about building low-income housing out in the suburbs where factories are beginning to move?

BALDWIN. Well, that depends on the will of the American people, doesn't it? That's why they are in the suburbs—to get away from me.

Question. What about certain plans of industry to set up factories or businesses which would be owned by ghetto people? Would you see this as a positive step?

BALDWIN. What would be produced in those factories?

Question. Piecework, small items subcontracted by larger manufacturers.

BALDWIN. It's a perfectly valid idea except that in order to do that you have to eliminate the ghetto. Look, it is literally true that from a physical point of view those houses are unlivable. No one's going to build a factory in Harlem, not unless you intend, you know *really* to liberate Harlem.

Question. Well, New York State, for example, plans to build a State office building in Harlem.

BALDWIN. In Harlem. I know exactly where they're going to build it, too. And at the risk of sounding paranoiac, I think I know why. It's going to be where the Black Nationalist Bookstore is now, and one of the reasons for it, I am convinced, is simply because the Black Nationalist Bookstore is a very dangerous focal ground—125th Street and Seventh Avenue. You know, it's what in Africa would be called a palaver tree. It's where Negroes get together and talk. It's where all the discontent doesn't begin, exactly, but where it always focuses.

Question. Wouldn't you think that would be a very foolish idea, because you can always pick some other place to meet and talk?

BALDWIN. Yes, but the American white man has proved, if nothing else, he is absolutely, endlessly foolish when it comes to this problem.

Question. Let's talk about the average citizen, the white man who lives on Eighty-ninth Street and Riverside Drive, what should he be doing?

BALDWIN. It depends on what he feels. If he feels he wants to save this country, he should be talking to his neighbors and talking to his children. He shouldn't by the way, be talking to me.

Question. What should he be telling his neighbors?

BALDWIN. That if I go under in this country, I, the black man, he goes too.

Question. Is there any action he can take? Pressure on the local government?

BALDWIN. Pressure on his landlord, pressure on the local government, pressure wherever he can exert pressure. Pressure, above all, on the real-estate lobby. Pressure on the educational system. Make them change textbooks so that his children and my children will be taught something of the truth about our history. It is run now for the profit motive, and nothing else.

Question. What about the white suburbanite who fled the city, while making sure the blacks stayed there? What does he have to do now?

BALDWIN. If he wants to save his city, perhaps he should consider moving back. They're his cities too. Or just ask himself why he left. I know why he left. He's got a certain amount of money and a certain future, a car, two cars, you know, scrubbed children, a scrubbed wife, and he wants to preserve all that. And he doesn't understand that in his attempt to preserve it he's going to destroy it.

Question. What about the poverty program, does that offer any remedy?

BALDWIN. Are you joking? There has not been a war on poverty in this country yet. Not in my lifetime. The war on poverty is a dirty joke.

Question. How would you improve it?

BALDWIN. By beginning it.

Question. In what fashion?

BALDWIN. Look, there's no way in the world to do it without attacking the power of some people. It cannot be done unless you do that.

The power of the steel companies, for example, which can both make and break a town. And they've done it, they're doing it. Everybody knows it. You can't have a war on poverty unless you are willing to attack those people and limit their profits.

Question. Is it a matter of limiting the profits of industries only, or is it also a matter of limiting the power of the politicians?

BALDWIN. But the politicians are not working for the people; they're working for exactly the people I say we have to attack. That is what has happened to politics in this country. That is why the political machinery now is so vast, and so complex no one seems to be able to control it. It's completely unresponsive to the needs of the American community, completely unresponsive. I'm not talking only as a black man, I mean to the whole needs of the American people.

Question. You mean insofar as it responds to industry?

BALDWIN. It responds to what it considers its own survival.

Question. What would you say ought to be done to improve the relationship of the police with the black community?

BALDWIN. You would have to educate them. I really have no quarrel particularly with the policemen. I can even see the trouble they're in. They're hopelessly ignorant and terribly frightened. They believe everything they see on television, as most people in this country do. They are endlessly respectable, which means to say they are Saturday-night sinners. The country has got the police force it deserves and of course if a policeman sees a black cat in what he considers a strange place he's going to stop him; and you know of course the black cat is going to get angry. And then somebody may die. But it's one of the results of the cultivation in this country of ignorance. Those cats in the Harlem street, those white cops; they are scared to death and they *should* be scared to death. But that's how black boys die, because the police are scared. And it's not the policemen's fault; it's the country's fault.

Question. In the latest civil disorder, there seems to have been a more permissive attitude on the part of the police, much less reliance on firearms to stop looters as compared with last summer when there was such an orgy of shooting by the police and the National Guard.

BALDWIN. I'm sorry, the story isn't in yet, and furthermore, I don't believe what I read in the newspapers. I object to the term "looters" because I wonder who is looting whom, baby.

Question. How would you define somebody who smashes in the window of a television store and takes what he wants?

BALDWIN. Before I get to that, how would you define somebody who puts a cat where he is and takes all the money out of the ghetto where he makes it? Who is looting whom? Grabbing off the TV set? He doesn't really want the TV set. He's saying ———. It's a judgment, by the way, on the value of the TV set. Everyone knows that's a ——— ———. He doesn't want the TV set. He doesn't want it. He wants to let you know he's there. The question I'm trying to raise is a very serious question. The mass media—television and all the major news agencies—endlessly use that word "looter." On television you always see black hands reaching in, you know. And so the American public concludes that these savages are trying to steal everything from us. And no one has seriously tried to get to where the trouble is. After all, you're accusing a captive population who has been robbed of *everything* of looting. I think it's obscene.

Question. Would you make a distinction between snipers, fire bombers and looters?

BALDWIN. I've heard a lot about snipers, baby, and then you look at the death toll.

Question. Very few white men, granted. But there have been a few.

BALDWIN. I know who dies in the riots.

Question. Well, several white people have died.

BALDWIN. Several, yeah, baby, but do you know how many Negroes have died?

Question. Many more. But that's why we're talking about cooling it.

BALDWIN. It is not the black people who have to cool it.

Question. But they're the ones. . . .

BALDWIN. It is not the black people who have to cool it, because they won't.

Question. Aren't they the ones who are getting hurt the most, though?

BALDWIN. That would depend on the point of view. You know, I'm not at all sure that we are the ones who are being hurt the most. In fact I'm sure we are not. We are the ones who are *dying* fastest.

Question. The question posed, however, was whether snipers could be classified as true revolutionaries; fire bombers, as those overwhelmed with frustration and seeking to destroy the symbols of their discontent; looters, as victims of the acquisitive itch?

BALDWIN. I have to ask you a very impertinent question. How in the world can you possibly begin to categorize the people of a community whom you do not know at all? I disagree with your classifications altogether. Those people are all in the streets for the same reason.

Question. Does some of our problem come from our flaunting the so-called good life, with its swimming pools, cars, suburban living and so on, before a people whom society denies these things?

BALDWIN. No one has ever considered what happens to a woman or a man who spends his working life downtown and then has to go home uptown. It's too obvious even to go into. We are a nation within a nation, a captive nation within a nation. Yes, and you do flaunt it. You talk about us as though we were not there. The real pain, the real danger is that white people have always treated Negroes this way. You've always treated Sambo this way. We always were Sambo for you, you know, we had no feelings, we had no ears, no eyes. We've lied to you for more than a hundred years and you don't even know it yet. We've lied to you to survive. And we've begun to despise you. We don't hate you. We've begun to despise you. And it is because we can't afford to care what happens to us, and *you* don't care what happens to us. You don't even care what happens to your own children. Because we have to deal with your children too. We don't care what happens to you. It's up to you. To live or to die. Because you made our life that choice all these years.

Question. What about the role of some of the black institutions. Does the church have some meaning still in the black community insofar as the possibility of social progress is concerned?

BALDWIN. You must consider that the fact that we have a black church is, first of all, an indictment of a Christian nation. There shouldn't be a black church. And that's again what you did. We've used it. Martin Luther King used it most brilliantly, you know. That was his forum. It's always been our only forum. But it doesn't exist anywhere in the North anymore, as Martin Luther King himself discovered. It exists in the South, because the black community in the South is a different community. There's still a Negro family in the South, or there was. There is no Negro family essentially in the North, and once you have no family you have no church. And that means you have no forum. It cannot be used in Chicago and Detroit. It can be used in Atlanta and Montgomery and those places. And now since Martin is dead—not before, but certainly since he is dead—that forum is no longer useful because people are repudiating their Christian church in toto.

Question. Are they repudiating Christianity as well?

BALDWIN. No more intensely than you have.

Question. Then the black church is dead in the North?

BALDWIN. Let me rephrase it. It does not attract the young. Once that has happened to any organization, its social usefulness is at least debatable. Now that's one of the great understatements of the century.

Question. In that case, what is the role of Adam Clayton Powell?

BALDWIN. Adam Clayton Powell is not considered a pastor, he is considered a politician. He is considered, in fact, one more victim. People who can't stand Adam would never, *never* attack him now. Crimes which Adam is accused of—first of all, the people in Harlem know a great deal more about that than anybody who has written about it. That's one thing. And for another, as long as you don't impeach Senator Eastland, it's a —— tip and we know it. We're not fighting for him, we're fighting for us.

Question. What about some of the other leaders of the black community?

BALDWIN. The real leaders now in the black community?

BALDWIN. The real leadership now in the black community you've never heard of. Roy's not a leader, Whitney's not a leader.

Question. Floyd McKissick?

BALDWIN. Floyd's not a leader either, but Floyd *is* closer to the tempo, to the pulse. First of all, leaders are rare. A man is not made a leader by the mass media of this country. Martin was a leader in spite of all the oppostion he got, even from black people. Because that's what he was. And because he loved his people. He loved this country.

Question. Stokely Carmichael?

BALDWIN. Stokely in my view is perhaps a little too young. Look, I'm nearly twenty years older than Stokely. I can't answer that question. Stokely is a leader for a great many people. Stokely is even more than that, Stokely is a *symbol* for a great many people. A great many emasculated black boys turn to Stokely because he's fighting against their emasculation. I understand that, and the're right. I may have my own disagreements with

Stokely from time to time but I'm on his side. What Stokely is saying essentially is true and that is why people are so uptight about Stokely. Because they can't deny what he is saying. And what he is trying to do is anathea to the white people of the United States because what he is saying is that we have no hope here. These white people are never going to do anything for us because they cannot. Also, as long as we are on the subject of Stokely, let me point out to you that Stokely has never said he hated white people. And I happen to know him and I know he doesn't. What he is insisting on is black autonomy, and *that* puts everybody uptight. That's all he is saying. What he is suggesting that frightens the American white people is that the black people in this country are tied to all the oppressed and subjugated people everywhere in the world. Furthermore, he is saying very clearly, and it's true, that this country which began as a revolutionary nation has now spent God knows how many billions of dollars and how many thousands of lives fighting revolution everywhere else. And what he's saying is that black people in this country should not any longer turn to President Lyndon Johnson, who is after all at the very best (and this is an understatement; I'm speaking for myself now) a very untrustworthy big daddy. But to other black people, all the other people who are suffering under the same system that we are suffering from, that system is led by the last of the Western nations. It is perfectly conceivable, or would be if there were not so many black people here, that the Americans might decide to "liberate" South Africa. Isn't it? That is to say, to keep the horrors of communism away; all the freedom fighters in South Africa would turn South Africa into another Vietnam. No one is fooled about what you are doing in Vietnam. At least no black cat is fooled by it. You are not fighting for freedom. You don't care about those people. You don't care about my people and I know you don't care about theirs. You're fighting for what the Western world calls material self-interest. And that means my back. My stolen tin, my stolen diamonds, my stolen sugar. That's what it means; it means I should work for you forever.

And I won't.

But the idea is that people who are divided by so many miles of the globe, and by so many other things, should begin to consider themselves as a community, should begin to consider that they have something in common—this is what Stokely says. What they have in common is to get the man off their backs. It's a very dangerous and frightening idea for Americans, because it happens to be true.

Question. Do you feel that there's a conscious understanding of American imperialism by . . .

BALDWIN. The Americans are not imperialists. According to them, they're just nice guys. They're just folks.

Question. But we are talking about a form of imperialism . . .

BALDWIN. We're talking about the very last form of imperialism, you know—Western imperialism anyway—the world is going to see.

Question. But do you feel that the under class of black people, given an insufficient education, understands the specifics of this imperialism you describe?

BALDWIN. We understand very much better than you think we do, and we understand it from the letters we get from Vietnam.

Question. Is there any white man who can . . .

BALDWIN. White by the way is not a color, it's an attitude. You're as white as you think you are. It's your choice.

Question. Then black is a state of mind too?

BALDWIN. No, black is a condition.

Question. Who among the white community can talk to the black community and be accepted?

BALDWIN. Anybody, who doesn't think of himself as white.

Question. Among the Presidential candidates, whom do you feel would be accepted as speaking in good faith? Richard Nixon?

BALDWIN. You must be joking?

Question Nelson Rockefeller?

BALDWIN. Maybe, that would depend very much on what he does now. I don't put him down.

Question. What about Robert Kennedy?

BALDWIN. What about Robert Kennedy indeed! Bobby's a very, very, very bright man. The best thing said about Bobby Kennedy, and I'm not trying to cop out on this, was said by Al Calloway in that rather curious issue about Soul that Esquire just did. Al said that if Soul could be studied and learned, he'd learn it. He'd study and learn, but it can't be studied and learned. I've had one very publicized thing with Bobby so that anything I say is suspect. He's very bright, and all the liberals will be on his bandwagon. He will probably be President. Almost surely he will be. And what can I say? I have to leave it open. I, myself, will not be on that bandwagon. I think he's very shrewd but I think he's absolutely cold. I think he may prove to be, well, very dangerous.

He's very attractive. He says all of the right things, you know, not always at the right time. And I can see the kind of appeal he'd have; after all, he is the brother of J.F.K. But I'm in another position. I have to be as clearheaded as I can be about it and look beyond the particular event or the particular man. I would not myself put my life in his hands.

Question. Do you know anything of Eugene McCarthy?

BALDWIN. Nothing at all. I can't discuss him. But I ought to say that it's been a very long time since I've had any respect for *any* politician. I have to say, too, that I'm looking through the political spectrum from the standpoint of my rather bitter forty-three years in this country. What I'm also saying is that if I endorse anybody, no matter what it means, I don't want to tell black people to vote for so-and-so or him or her because I don't want to be killed by those black people when they discover they've been betrayed.

Question. Hubert Humphrey?

BALDWIN. Forget it.

Question. Do you care to expand on that?

BALDWIN. No, just forget it. I point to his record since he became Vice-President. The flaming liberal.

Question. Do you think the riots can be considered in another light than simply an outburst against the system? Are they possibly also, consciously or unconsciously, a struggle to bring to a culture purification by blood?

BALDWIN. Well, that refers back to Thomas Jefferson, I think, who said, "I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just."

Question. He also said that the tree of liberty should be watered with blood . . .

BALDWIN. The blood of tryants. We call it riots, because they were black people. We wouldn't call it riots if they were white people.

Question. What does the death of Martin Luther King signify?

BALDWIN. The abyss over which this country hovers now. It's a very complicated question and the answer has to be very complicated too. What it means to the ghetto, what it means to the black people of this country, is that you could kill Martin, who was trying to save you, and you will face tremendous opposition from black people because you choose to consider, you know, the use of violence. If you can shoot Martin, you can shoot all of us. And there's nothing in your record to indicate you won't, or anything that would prevent you from doing it. That will be the beginning of the end, if you do, and that knowledge will be all that will hold your hand. Because one no longer believes, you see—I don't any longer believe, and not many black people in this country can afford to believe—any longer a word you say. I don't believe in the morality of this people at all. I don't believe you do the right thing because you think it's the right thing. I think you may be forced to do it because it will be the expedient thing. Which is good enough.

I don't think that the death of Martin Luther King means very much to any of those people in Washington. I don't think they understand what happened at all. People like Governor Wallace and Mister Maddox certainly don't. I would doubt very much if Ronald Reagan does. And that is of course where the problem lies, with people like that, with people we mentioned earlier, and with the institutions we mentioned earlier. But to the black people in this country it means that you have declared war. You have declared war. That you do intend to slaughter us, that you intend to put us in concentration camps. After all, Martin's assassination—whether it was done by one man or by a State Trooper, which is a possibility; or whether it was a conspiracy, which is also a possibility; after all I'm a fairly famous man too, and one doesn't travel around—Martin certainly didn't without the government being aware of every move he made—for this assassination I accuse the American people and all its representatives.

For me, it's been Medgar. Then Malcolm. Then Martin. And it's the same story. When Medgar was shot they arrested some lunatic in Mississippi, but I was in Mississippi, with Medgar, and you don't need a lunatic in Mississippi to shoot a cat like Medgar Evers, you know, and the cat whoever he was, Byron de la Beckwith, slipped out of the back door of a nursing home and no one's ever heard from him since. I won't even discuss what happened to Malcolm, or all the ramifications of that. And now Martin's dead. And every time, you know, including the time the President was murdered, everyone insisted it was the work of one lone madman; no one can face the fact that this madness has been created deliberately. Now Stokely will be shot presently. And whoever pulls that trigger will not have bought the bullet. It is the people and their representatives who are inciting to riot, not Stokely, not Martin, not Malcolm, not Medgar. And you will go on like this until you will find yourself in a place from which you can't turn back, where indeed you may be already. So, if Martin's death has reached the conscience of a nation, well then it's a great moral triumph in the history of mankind but it's very unlikely that it has.

Question. Some people have said that the instant canonization by white America is the cop-out . . .

BALDWIN. It's the proof of their guilt, and the proof of their relief. What they don't know is that for every Martin they shoot there will be ten others. You already miss Malcolm and wish he were here. Because Malcolm was the only person who could help those kids in the ghetto. The *only* person.

Question: I was just about to say, we white people . . .

BALDWIN. . . . wished that Malcolm were here? But you, the white people, no matter how it was done actually, technically, you created the climate which forced him to die.

Question. We have created a climate which has made political assassination acceptable . . .

BALDWIN. . . . which made inevitable that death, and Medgar's, and Martin's. And may make other deaths inevitable too, including mine. And all this in the name of freedom.

Question. Do you think "cooling it" means accepting a culture within a culture, a black culture as separate?

BALDWIN. You mean, white people cooling it?

Question. Yes.

BALDWIN. White people cooling it means a very simple thing. Black power frightens them. White power doesn't frighten them. Stokely is not, you know, bombing a country out of existence. Nor menacing your children. White power is doing that. White people have to accept their history and their actual circumstances, and they won't. Not without a miracle they won't. Goodwill won't do it. One's got to face the fact that we police the globe—we, the Americans, police the globe for a very good reason. We are protecting what we call the free world. You ought to be black, sitting in Harlem, listening to that phrase. We, like the South African black miners, know exactly what you're protecting when you talk about the free world.

Question. Are there some viable black institutions that . . .

BALDWIN. Why does a white country look to black institutions to save it?

Question. Well, to begin a dialogue, to find out what should be done . . .

BALDWIN. That is up to you.

Question. But doesn't white America need instruction from . . .

BALDWIN. . . . the streets of any ghetto.

Question. But on the streets of any ghetto can you learn . . .

BALDWIN. Ask any black junkie what turned him into a junkie.

Question. But what I'm after are programs that you can work with.

BALDWIN. What you mean by programs is a way of alleviating the distress without having it cost you anything.

Question. Well, even if we're willing to spend the money . . .

BALDWIN. I'm not talking about money.

Question. But if we are willing to change our point of view . . .

BALDWIN. Well, then, the person to talk to is first of all your own heart, your wife, your child. It's your country too. I've read a great deal about the good white people of this country since I came back to it in 1957. But it's the good white people of this country who forced the black people into the streets.

Question. Do you think it counts for anything having a mayor like John Lindsay walking the streets?

BALDWIN. I like John Lindsay. Just because he walks the streets, perhaps. Or for the same reasons I like J.F.K., you know, with enormous reservations. He's somewhere near the twentieth century at least.

Question. What kind of President should we have? Would a black President help?

BALDWIN. You're going to need somebody who is willing, first of all, to break the stranglehold of what they call the two-party system. John Lewis was right on the day of the March on Washington, when he said we can't join the Republican Party because look who that is made up of. We can't join the Democratic Party—look who's in *that* party. Where's *our* party? What we need is somebody who can coalesce the energies in this country, which are not both black *and* white, into another party which can respond to the needs of the people. The Democratic Party cannot do it. Not as long as Senator Eastland is in it. I name him, to name but one. I certainly will never vote for a Republican as long as Nixon is in that party. You need someone who believes in this country, again, to begin to change it. And by the way, while we're on this subject, one of the things we should do is cease protecting all those Texas oil millionaires who are one of the greatest menaces any civilization has ever seen. They have absolutely no brains, and a *fantastic* amount of money, *fantastic* amount of power, *incredible* power. And there's nothing more dangerous than that kind of power in the hands of such ignorant men. And this is done with the consent of the federal government. With the *collusion* of the federal government.

Question. Are there any natural allies for the black people?

BALDWIN. We're all under the same heel. I told you that before. We are all under the same heel. That's why everyone was so shocked when Fidel Castro went to Harlem. They think Negroes are fools, as Langston Hughes put it once. Second-class fools, at that.

Question. You feel that any people who are oppressed outside the United States are natural allies for the black American?

BALDWIN. Yes. From Cuba . . . to Angola. And don't think the American government doesn't know that. This government which is trying to free us is also determined we should never talk to each other.

Question. In *The Fire Next Time* you questioned whether the black people want to be integrated into a burning house. Do you still feel they do not have the same goals of materialism as the white man?

BALDWIN. I think Stokely's right when he says that integration is another word, you know, the latest kind of euphemism for white supremacy. No, I don't want to be integrated into this house or any other house. I don't want to become . . . like you. You, the white people. I'd rather *die* than become what most white people in this country have become. What one is after is something else, which is exactly what Martin was after, and this was community. You know, I just want you to leave me *alone. Just l-e-a-v-e-m-e-a-l-o-n-e!* And then we can take it from there. And above all, leave my child alone.

Question. Do you think that the local community control of schools is necessary?

BALDWIN. Schools and policemen.

Question. Why policemen?

BALDWIN. Look, we live in Harlem, let's say, or we live in Watts. The ——— who comes down there with his cap and his gun in his holster, he doesn't know what my day is like. He doesn't know why I get drunk when I do. He doesn't know anything *about* me at all. He's scared ——— of me. Now, what—the— ——— is he doing there? All he can do is shoot me. He's a hired concentration-camp keeper. I can police my own community far better than you ever will. Because you can't. It's not in you to do it. I know why somebody there is upset when he is upset. The cats were right when they were told by somebody, some cop, some leader, some mayor, to go home. They said *you* go home, we *are home*, baby. We can take care of ourselves. This is the message we're trying to get across; we don't need you to take care of us. Good Lord, we can't afford to have you take care of us any longer! Look what you've done. To us. And to yourselves, in taking care of us. No. I think the black people in this country should run their own schools, and run their own police force. Because you can't do it. All you can do is bring in tanks and tear gas . . . and call the National Guard when it gets too tight. And think you can fight a civil war and a global war at the same time.

Question. There used to be a New York City regulation that a policeman couldn't reside in the precinct to which he was assigned. You are saying that the regulation should require him to live there.

BALDWIN. Yeah, I'm telling you that.

Question. Do you have any hope for the future of this country?

BALDWIN. I have a vast amount of determination. I have a great deal of hope. I think the most hopeful thing to do is to look at the situation. People accuse me of being a doom-monger. I'm not a doom-monger. If you don't look at it, you can't change it. You've got to look at it. And at certain times it cannot be more grim. If we can look at it, we can change it. If we don't look at it, we won't. If we don't change it, we're going to die. We're going to perish, every single one of us. That's a tall order, a hard, hard bill to pay; but you have been accumulating it for a very long time. And now the bill is in. It is in for you and your children, and it is in all over the world. If you can't pay your bill, it's the end of you. And you created in this country a whole population which has nothing to lose. It's part of your bill. There's nothing more that you can do to me, nothing more at all. When you, in the person of your President, assure me that you will not tolerate any more violence, you may *think* that frightens me. People don't get frightened when they hear that, they get *mad*. And whereas you're afraid to die, I'm not.

Question. So the one thing that is fairly certain about cooling it is that the National Guard . . .

BALDWIN. I am not the one to be cooled.

Question. But it can be said that the National Guard, the police, tear gas, these methods are not the answer.

BALDWIN. I suggest that the mayor of every city and the President of this nation go on the air and address the white people for a change. Tell *them* to cool it.

Question. In the most recent disturbances, why have certain black leaders attempted to get other black people off the streets?

BALDWIN. To save their lives. Not as a favor to you. Nobody wants this generation to die. Except the American people.

Question. You would say, then, that we have a lot to answer for?

BALDWIN. I'm not trying to accuse you, you know. That's not the point. But you have an awful lot to face. I don't envy any white man in this century, because I wouldn't like to have to face what you have to face. If you don't face it, though, it's a matter of *your* life or death. Everyone's deluded if they think it's a matter of Sambo's life or death. It isn't a matter of Sambo's life or death, and it can't be, for they have been slaughtering Sambos too long. It's a matter of whether or not *you* want to live. And you may think that my death, or any diminution, or my disappearance will save you, but it won't. It can't save you. All that can save you now is your confrontation with your own history . . . which is not your past, but your present. Nobody cares what happened in the past. One can't afford to care what happened in the past. But your history has led you to this moment, and you can only begin to change yourself and save yourself by looking at what you are doing in the name of your history, in the name of your gods, in the name of your language. And what has happened is as though I, having always been outside it—more outside it than victimized by it, really, in a sense; outside it surely, you know, slaughtered by it, victimized by it, but mainly *outside* it—can see it better than you can see it. Because I cannot afford to let you fool me. If I let you fool me, then I die. But I've fooled *you* for a long time. That's why you keep saying, what does the Negro want? It's a summation of your own delusions, the lies you've told yourself. You know *exactly* what I want!

Question. So that when we come to you with the question, How do we cool it?, all we're asking is that same old question, What does the Negro want?

BALDWIN. Yes. You're asking me to help you save it.

Question. Save ourselves?

BALDWIN. Yes. But *you* have to do that.

Question. Speaking strictly, from your point of view, how would you talk to an angry black man ready to tear up the town?

BALDWIN. I only know angry black men. You mean, how would I talk to someone twenty years younger than I?

Question. That's right.

BALDWIN. That would be very difficult to do. I've tried, and I try it, I try it all the time. All I can tell him, really, is I'm with you, whatever that means. I'll tell you what I

can't tell him. I can't tell him to submit and let himself be slaughtered. I can't tell him that he should not arm, because the white people are armed. I can't tell him that he should let anybody rape his sister, or his wife, or his mother. Because that's where it's at. And what I try to tell him, too, is if you're ready to blow the cat's head off—because it could come to that—try not to hate him, for the sake of your soul's salvation and for no other reason. But let's try to be better, let's try—no matter what it costs us—to be better than they are. You haven't got to hate them, though we do have to be free. It's a waste of time to hate them.

JAMES BALDWIN: MOSES AS A BLACK CAT

In 1961 James Baldwin wrote an article for Esquire (about Norman Mailer) in which he said, "Here I was, at thirty-two, finding my notoriety hard to bear . . . I was beginning to realize, most unwillingly, all the things love could not do. It could not make me over, for example. It could not undo the journey which had made of me such a strange man and brought me to such a strange place."

That we are all in a strange place now is undeniable; that James Baldwin knows the terrain of the place and the path that brought us here is on record. He has journeyed from Harlem, where he was one of nine children, to an expatriate's life in Paris, where he lived for nearly ten years, back to the life of a successful writer in Manhattan, which is very different from Harlem. Along the way he has written Go Tell It On the Mountain, Notes of a Native Son, Nobody Knows My Name, The Fire Next Time, Blues for Mister Charlie, other plays, novels, short stories and essays, and a just-published novel, Tell Me How Long the Train's Been Gone.

Above all, his journey has been so near the heart of the civil-rights movement that Baldwin's voice has become the one to tell us most clearly where we are and how we came here.

When the first civil-rights legislation was passed, after World War II, most white Americans believed that inequality between the races could be eliminated through court decisions. But in 1955, only a year after the Supreme Court had ordered schools desegregated, Baldwin wrote (Notes of a Native Son), "To smash something is the ghetto's chronic need. Most of the time it is the members of the ghetto who smash each other, and themselves. But as long as the ghetto walls are standing there will always come a moment when these outlets do not work. . . . If ever, indeed, the violence which fills Harlem's churches, pool halls, and bars erupts outward in a more direct fashion, Harlem and its citizens are likely to vanish in an apocalyptic flood."

In 1962, at a time when most Americans were congratulating themselves on finally having done something right about race relations (". . . in almost every aspect of American life it is possible to point to dramatic improvement in the status of the Negro over the last twenty or ten or even five years," said The New York Times), Baldwin published The Fire Next Time. "A bill is coming in," he warned us, "that I fear America is not prepared to pay . . . a vengeance that does not really depend on, and cannot really be . . . prevented by, any police force or army: historical vengeance, a cosmic vengeance. . . ." The book drew attention because of Baldwin's distinction as a writer; what was not foreseen was how thoroughly—and how soon—its warning would be substantiated. In the Summer of 1964 the violence he had written about did erupt outward, into Watts, Newark, Detroit, Washington, Chicago and a hundred other cities.

It is for this reason that Esquire, at a time of fresh tragedy, returns to him. A new bill has come in to us. Interviewed two days after the funeral of Dr. Martin Luther King, during a nightmare of riots, vengeance and martial law across the country, Baldwin tells us what it is we are paying for, and how much of the accounting is still due.

CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the history of this century is written, the name of Chief Justice Warren will take its place among the very great men in America. His 15-year stewardship of the Supreme Court brought forth rulings that began to correct the wrongs inflicted a century ago, and have set America on a course toward the fulfillment of constitutional rights for each of its citizens.

Chief Justice Warren's name will be linked with those other remarkable Chief Justices who led the Court during turbulent times in our country's life. The Chief Justice has been described by one of his former law clerks as "a rare man, because he comes so close to representing the consensus of decent opinion." The Warren Court, as it has come to be known, has demonstrated how profound an effect Chief Justice Warren's quiet exercise of decent opinion can have on the destiny of a great nation. How fortunate we are to have had the era of the Warren Court under the leadership of this very fine, vigorous, and wise person.

The Washington Post this morning editorially paid a most deserving tribute to the Chief Justice on the occasion of his retirement. It expresses the respect and affection that every American who treasures constitutional rights has for him.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to repeat the Post editorial for the RECORD:

WARREN STEPS DOWN

The retirement of Chief Justice Earl Warren removes a massive figure from the national scene. For more than a quarter of a century, the Chief Justice has been a man to contend with in national affairs. First as one of the Nation's most successful politicians and later as its most widely known Chief Justice, Earl Warren has won a major place in history. He has presided over the Supreme Court during one of the stormiest and most productive eras in its 179 years. And he has given vigorous and wise leadership to its deliberations while adding immensely to the stature of the office he has held.

Almost no one could have foreseen when Earl Warren was appointed Chief Justice in 1953 the major role the Court was to occupy in American Government in subsequent years. But the group of men which will always be known as the "Warren Court" has set the pace for many major changes in America's daily life. They broke the noose of discrimination and segregation that was dragging the Nation down and, for almost 10 years, constituted the only part of the Federal Government willing to face up to the problems of civil rights. They fractured the old-line politics of the Nation, when that politics seemed to hold a deadly grip on any means of reform, by terminating rural domination of legislative apportionment. They reformed the Nation's criminal law by fulfilling the promise of the Constitution that men, rich or poor, black or white, will have equal rights. They stood fast against the vilest kind of outcries and upheld the First Amendment's guarantee of free speech, broadening its meaning in terms of political debate, public controversy, and artistic achievement.

In all these areas, it is difficult to sort out Chief Justice Warren from the other members of his Court. It is the constitutionalism of Justice Black, more than any other justice, that has dominated the Court in recent years. But the Chief Justice has joined fully in almost all the Court's major decisions and has drawn the lightning of public criticism to himself by electing, quite properly, to be the Court's spokesman on many of its most crucial issues.

The growth of Earl Warren, the Justice, during the 15 years has been immense. Early criticism that his opinions were too sweeping and lacked the craftsmanship of some of his predecessors has faded. Beyond that, however, it has become clear that he saw his role on the Court as that of explaining its work to all the Nation in terms that could be widely understood and of, at times, raising fundamental issues that the Court was not deciding but ought to be opened for public debate.

The Chief Justice of the United States, however, is more than just the presiding member of the Supreme Court. He is also the executive head of the Federal court system and the symbol of the Nation's belief in rule by law. In these roles, Chief Justice Warren probably has been the most successful of the 14 men to fill the office. He has taken great interest in strengthening and modernizing the court system and, with Justice Tom C. Clark, has fostered many long-needed administrative changes. As a symbol of a Nation ruled by law, he has traveled all over the world, always an eloquent spokesman for the idea of equal justice under law, always eager to encourage other nations—and the world—to improve their legal systems so that force is replaced with law. For that reason he is almost as widely known, and perhaps more widely respected, abroad than he is at home.

The 15 years in Washington have not been easy for Earl Warren. He has been subjected to a stream of abuse unequalled in modern day public affairs. His critics have questioned his honor, his integrity and his loyalty; they have demanded his impeachment and even his death. Although the political juices that won him three terms as Governor of California must often have urged him to fire back, he has taken this abuse quietly, as a justice should, and has been a model of decorum and solemnity, mixed with just the right amount of humor and humaneness.

Some of the men who have been Chief Justice of the United States have passed into history with hardly more than a sentence. But Earl Warren will stand in history as one of the great Chief Justices. His name, most likely, will be linked with those of the other three Justices who led the Court through major turning points in its and the Nation's life—John Marshall, Roger B. Taney, and Charles Evans Hughes. For more than that no judge can aspire; for more than that the Nation cannot ask.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICANS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ACTION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most impressive, effective, and unique organizations with legitimate and profound influence on the Washington scene

is the Americans for Constitutional Action. The ACA marks its 10th anniversary today and in the past decade has been a stalwart, progressive and dedicated supporter of constitutional government.

One of the unique contributions of the ACA has been its index in which it very objectively evaluates the voting record of House and Senate Members. The thoroughness of the ACA index is such that it is regarded by liberals and conservatives alike as the soundest analysis of Members' voting patterns.

The ACA has developed very effective research programs in its support of sound principles of government and by its programs it has earned esteem and respect.

Adm. Ben Morell was the driving force behind the ACA and his efforts have been augmented by Maj. Gen. Thomas Lane, retired; Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, retired; and the very capable and dedicated executive director, Charles McManus.

Another unique feature of the ACA is that it does not "lobby" legislators. It makes its evaluation of voting records after the vote has been cast and never indicates in advance a position on a particular piece of legislation.

JEROME J. KEATING TO RETIRE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Jerome J. Keating, the able president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, has announced that he will voluntarily retire from his office at the biennial convention of his organization next August.

There are only a few men in the entire field of organized labor who are as deserving of the praise, respect, and commendation of this House as Jerome Keating.

Ever since he became a national officer of the letter carriers, 33 years ago, he has been a giant—a giant of integrity, of ability, of compassion, and of courage.

During the past 6 years, as president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, he has been an outstanding leader of men, a leader possessed of a deep sense of responsibility—not only for the men he represents, but for our beloved country as well.

When I first came to Congress, in 1959, Jerome Keating was vice president of the Letter Carriers and the editor of their magazine, the Postal Record.

He was also the legislative technician for the association, and I was impressed by his knowledge and understanding of this subject.

Like many other Members here today, I learned a great deal from him about the problems of postal employees.

As with so many men who have achieved true success, Jerome Keating is a modest man. He has never sought his full share of the spotlight; he has never demanded his full share of the popular applause.

Instead, he has been content to stand by and let others take the bows. Surely it is time now for him to receive the measure of appreciation which he so fully deserves.

Mr. Speaker, Jerome Keating is one of the more gentle and considerate public figures I have ever known. His course has been one of gentle reasoning, of firm argument and persuasive factual presentation.

Whenever he has appeared before a committee of the House, he has been magnificently prepared and, invariably, his testimony was conclusive and decisive. It was a pleasure to hear him testify, and certainly it was instructive to those who heard him.

A man of quiet dignity, Jerome Keating has represented his people with fervor and firmness. And yet, in all the time I have known him, I am not aware that he ever placed any selfish consideration above the best interests of our Nation.

He has had the courage, at times, to take a stand which might have been unpopular with his membership because he felt such a stand was in the best interest of the Nation as a whole. This is the supreme test of leadership, and Jerome J. Keating passed it with flying colors.

There are literally hundreds of Members of the House of Representatives, over the years, who consider Jerome Keating as a personal friend. We shall miss his steady and inspiring presence on the Hill; we shall miss his warm personality and his wisdom.

Certainly all of us can hope sincerely that he and his wonderful wife, Marion, will have many happy, golden years of retirement ahead.

No one deserves it more, and no one could leave the arena of active legislative work with warmer or more heartfelt affection and respect from those who have worked with him.

CARRY ON, ACA

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, for 10 years, Americans for Constitutional Action—ACA—has been assisting constitutional conservatives of both parties in congressional elections.

For 10 years, this group of genuinely dedicated Americans has persevered without fanfare in the traditional American way—by hard work and unrelenting energies directed toward furthering our constitutional form of government.

For 10 years, they have scrupulously dispensed all moneys available to them to support those persons subscribing to the same beliefs; that is, to uphold the original concepts of the founders of our country. And they have constantly grown and progressed with an almost in-built sense of timing for the time at hand and the job to be done.

Today, ACA embarks upon a second decade of service to the country and Congress. Although their aims remain the same, their methods of achieving them have adjusted to the times. Their defeats have become vehicles to renewed efforts and gains.

Though all of their energies are currently channeled toward the 1968 elections, their eyes are on those that follow. And their motto might well be, "For I would be as a whetstone without the power to cut but to make steel sharp." Carry on, ACA; may you continue to keep Congress sharp.

THE STORM KING MOUNTAIN CASE

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the May 1968 issue of the Sierra Club Bulletin carries an interesting article by an able and conscientious lawyer and personal friend, Mr. David Sive. Mr. Sive is chairman of the Atlantic Chapter of the Sierra Club. He served as counsel for the Sierra Club in its intervention in the second round of hearings held by the Federal Power Commission concerning the controversial Storm King project, proposed by Con Edison for construction on and below Storm King Mountain in the Hudson Highlands.

Those concerned with the law controlling the use of our natural resources will recall that the FPC originally issued a license for the project in 1965. This ruling was reversed by the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in a landmark decision. The court instructed the FPC not only to develop a complete record and hear all witnesses on the issue of destruction of natural resources and on alternative methods of producing power, but also to carry an affirmative duty to develop the relevant evidence on its own. The role of the FPC, said the court, was not that of an umpire "blandly calling balls and strikes," but was rather that of the guardian of our resources, required to assure itself that the entire story is told, whether by the proponents or by the Commission staff.

The reopened hearings in the Storm King case consumed months of time and volumes of testimony. Briefs were submitted to the examiner in October 1967, and he has not yet made his recommendations to the Commission.

I ask that Mr. Sive's interesting and well-written article be included in the RECORD, since it serves as a fascinating and well-documented description of the nature of testimony that can be brought in to require consideration of the intangible costs and effects of massive construction and public works projects that may look very well on paper, without adequate consideration being given to these factors.

The article follows:

NATURAL BEAUTY AND THE LAW

(By David Sive)

The present proceedings before the Federal Power Commission involving Storm King Mountain, *In the Matter of Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.*, Project No.

2338, quite likely constitute the broadest and deepest consideration of the nature and place of natural beauty in any legal proceedings to date.

The basis of the "beauty issue," as it has been referred to by the Hearing Examiner and attorneys in the proceedings, is contained in large part in one sentence—by now perhaps classical—in the opinion of the Court of Appeals reversing the original grant of a license to Consolidated Edison to construct the Storm King pumped storage reservoir. After pointing out the errors of the Commission in its grant of the license to Consolidated Edison and requiring new proceedings to receive additional evidence, the Court described the ultimate questions to be examined in the renewed proceedings. The renewed proceedings must, it said: ". . . *include as a basic concern the preservation of natural beauty and of national historic shrines, keeping in mind that, in our affluent society, the cost of a project is only one of several factors to be considered.*"

The intervenors opposed to the project, primarily the Scenic Hudson Preservation Conference and the Sierra Club, rely upon this statement of principle as no less than the beginning of the adoption of a philosophy to which Thoreau pointed more than a century ago as part of our developing law of natural resources. Thoreau stated it in this fashion: "Most of the luxuries and many of the so-called comforts of life are not only not indispensable, but positive hindrances to the elevation of mankind."

It may well be that the society of Thoreau was not "affluent." Ours certainly is, in that, by applying to our social and economic organization some small fraction of the intelligence we apply to going to the moon, we certainly can provide every person with not only the necessities but some of the comforts of life. Both Thoreau and the Court of Appeals hold that, beyond those necessities and, shall we say, necessary comforts, we must make a choice and that perhaps the choice should at least sometimes be to elevate rather than fatten mankind.

The mandate of the Court of Appeals was interpreted by the Scenic Hudson and Sierra Club attorneys to require a presentation to the Federal Power Commission Hearing Examiner of a sophisticated analysis of the nature and degrees of scenic beauty. The attorneys' position has been that scenic beauty can be objectively analyzed and degrees of scenic beauty can be stated. This point is made at the beginning of the principal brief submitted to the Hearing Examiner by attorneys for the Sierra Club:

"The Court's direction as to the nature of the renewed proceedings requires an appraisal and analysis of the scenic beauty and of the place in history of Storm King Mountain and the surrounding area, for only by such an appraisal and analysis can the 'basic concern' of 'the preservation of natural beauty and of national historic shrines' be properly considered alongside the 'cost of [the] project.' . . .

"The cost of the project and its overall economic benefit, if any, as compared to the cost of the alternatives, can be measured quantitatively. That measurement of the overall economic benefit, if there be any, is the subject of another section of this Brief. The beauty of the Mountain cannot, of course, be measured with precision. Beauty in a landscape, like that in music or art, is to some extent, subjective. There nevertheless are standards and experts, and natural beauty can be the subject of analysis, with sufficient definiteness to distinguish that which is worthy of preservation.

"The Court of Appeals requires this. It was held that we may not sacrifice a great scenic asset for an insignificant or doubtful economic gain. On the other hand, of course, we cannot, even 'in our affluent society,' sacrifice important goods or services, be they necessities or luxuries, willy-nilly, each time that some individual or group is called upon to sacrifice its favorite view of its favorite landscape.

"A vital question of the renewed hearings, therefore, was 'How beautiful is Storm King?'"

Both Scenic Hudson and the Sierra Club did produce the testimony of several experts on scenic beauty, including Professor Charles W. Eliot, II, of Harvard; Charles Callison, Executive Vice President of the National Audubon Society; Dr. Vincent Scully, Professor of Art History at Yale; and David Brower, Executive Director of the Sierra Club. All of them testified that Storm King and the Hudson River at Storm King were not simply places of scenic beauty, but no less than the supreme river scenery in the eastern United States.

Mr. Callison called the Hudson at Storm King "the most beautiful stretch of river scenery in the United States." Professor Scully's description was perhaps the most lyrical:

"It rises like a brown bear out of the river, a dome of living granite, swelling with animal power. It is not picturesque in the softer sense of the word but awesome, a primitive bodiment of the energies of the earth. It makes the character of wild nature physically visible in monumental form. As such it strongly reminds me of some of the natural formations which mark sacred sites in Greece and signal the presence of the Gods; it recalls Lerna in Argolis, for example, where Herakles fought the Hydra, and various sites of Artemis and Aphrodite where the mother of the beasts rises savagely out of the water. While Breakneck Ridge across the river resembles the winged hill of tilted strata that looms into the Gulf of Corinth near Calydon.

Hence Storm King and Breakneck Ridge form an ideal portal for the grand stretch of the Hudson below them. The dome of one is balanced by the horns of the other; but they are both crude shapes, and appropriately so, since the urbanistic point of the Hudson in that area lies in the fact that it preserves and embodies the most savage and untrammeled characteristics of the wild at the very threshold of New York. It can still make the city dweller emotionally aware of what he most needs to know; that nature still exists, with its own laws, rhythms, and powers, separate from human desires."

The elements of the beauty of the Hudson at Storm King were analyzed also by one of the nation's leading cartographers, Richard Edes Harrison. He produced shaded maps of several rivers of eastern North America where the rivers break through the main chain of the area's most dominant feature, the Appalachian Mountains, demonstrating that of them all the Hudson is the widest and most dramatic. It is an estuary, through which ocean-going vessels may pass to Albany, 80 miles north of the gorge. It is an American fjord.

Each of the several experts classified the Hudson at Storm King as equal in scenic beauty and magnificence to many of our national parks.

The beauty of the mountain and the surrounding area has not been seriously disputed by Consolidated Edison, although it has not accepted the analysis of degrees of scenic beauty. The company's principal point has been that the project would not mar the beauty of the mountain because from most angles at most seasons of the year it would, they say, not be seen, the main project works being placed underground in the revised plans announced just before the resumption of the hearings. Scenic Hudson and the Sierra Club disputed this company claim. The issue of the precise visibility of the project works was the subject of many hundreds of pages of conflicting testimony.

The claims of Scenic Hudson and the Sierra Club that the construction of the project and of the attendant facilities, particularly a visitors' information building and a recreational complex designed to show the project to visitors, would seriously damage the value of the mountain and the surrounding area as objects of natural beauty are not based solely, however, upon the degree of visibility of the project works. The conservation organizations have raised an issue of the effect of the project upon the "integrity of the mountain" itself.

This point on the "integrity of the mountain" itself was made in the testimony of another of the Sierra Club witnesses, Richard Pough. He testified that the ultimate value of the scenic beauty was its impression on and in the minds of the persons who perceive it. If those who perceive the mountain and the surrounding area, although much of the project works may be camouflaged by paint, plantings, artificially roughened rocks, and other devices, understand that the mountain is subordinated to the project, the end result is appreciation and admiration of the company's engineering works and not of the works of the Creator of the mountain.

The point is summarized in the following extract from the Sierra Club's principal brief submitted to the Hearing Examiner:

"It is this character and 'integrity of the Mountain' (Pough, 14,786) and the surrounding areas that must be borne in mind in determining the extent to which the Project, and all that goes with it, will mar the natural beauty of Storm King and its environs. If its meaning is changed, in the eyes of those who behold it, its supreme value as a preserver and embodiment of the spirit of the New World . . . to a whole nation, particularly the vast millions in its greatest metropolitan area, is forever lost. In that event, no combination of orders of this Commission, funds of the Applicant, and skill of its eminent landscape architects, can be any more successful in putting the earth, rocks and trees of Storm King back together again, than were all the king's horses and all the king's men in the case of Humpty Dumpty. Painting concrete green cannot deceive its beholders into believing that it is the handkerchief of the Lord, or, if it can, this Commission should not, in the absence of some overwhelming economic necessity, direct such deception."

The point was alluded to in another aspect of the proceeding. During cross-examination of one of the company's landscape architects, Herbert Conover, counsel for the Club asked, "In your work, sir, that is the work of the recreational site and planning department of your firm, have you ever been commissioned or requested to determine whether a given area of any substantial size should be left alone?" Before Mr. Conover could answer, counsel for the company asked what was meant by the phrase "left alone." The answer by club counsel was, "As God made it."

In their principal brief, the attorneys for the company commented upon these references to God: "Scenic Hudson and the Sierra Club have taken the position that the project area should be 'left alone,' which counsel for the Sierra Club defined to mean 'as God made it' (45/7503). As discussed in connection with proposed finding 152–155 above, the record amply demonstrates that the project area is not now, nor has it been for many generations, 'as God made it.'"

This aspect of the issue of the nature of the mountain, if and when the project goes through, was discussed in these terms in the Club's reply brief.

"The point being made was that proper planning in some areas is that they be left alone, at least as much as they can be. Mr. Conover shortly thereafter said 'yes' to the question of whether he had ever determined in areas in which he worked to leave a substantial area alone (7504).

"The point of counsel was not that all of Storm King Mountain or the Black Rock Forest can or should be left alone. They, as

Times Square, cannot be completely restored to their condition, as 'God made it.' The question is whether the works of man on Storm King should be permitted to change the Mountain from something which—though not heretofore completely 'left alone'—is some measure of His Glory, into the Applicant's Gadget."

Not only must the Hearing Examiner, the full commission, the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and, ultimately, the Supreme Court, if appeals are taken, determine the beauty issue itself, but they must determine the significance of a place of great natural beauty in "a comprehensive plan for improving or developing" the waterway. The basic provision of the Federal Power Act governing the grant or denial of the application requires that the project: "be such as in the judgment of the commission will be best adapted to a comprehensive plan for improving or developing a waterway or waterways for the use or benefit of interstate or foreign commerce, for the improvement and utilization of water power development, and for other beneficial public uses, including recreational purposes. . . ."

It is the "law of the case" that "recreational purposes" include the preservation of natural beauty. Scenic Hudson and the Sierra Club claim that the preservation of natural beauty requires the preservation, as close to their natural state as possible, of those areas which, although not wilderness in the western sense, are nevertheless demonstrations of the power and majesty of nature. The Hudson River Highlands, in general, and Storm King Mountain, in particular, can serve that purpose. As stated by Professor Eliot: "The Highlands—today as 100 years ago—represent contact with natural forces in contrast with urban and man-made conditions. Here, in that rugged terrain one can sense mystery and adventure, explore and discover, and experience the majesty of space and the land."

These are some of the principal points involved in the momentous case now before the Federal Power Commission involving the future of Storm King Mountain. The depth and breadth of the issues have made it a national controversy. The effects of the ultimate determination will be far-reaching upon fundamental issues of the use of our national resources.

CAN LAWS MAKE MEN EQUAL?

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with our colleagues the text of a speech given by my friend and brother at the bar, Hon. Walter Owens, which merited a standing ovation by the membership of the Columbus, Ga., Kiwanis Club.

The address is incisive in its clear approach and level headed logic. It is inspirational in its references to the past with its words of leadership for today.

The address follows:

THE SOCIAL ORDER IT IS TODAY: CAN LAWS MAKE MEN EQUAL?

(By Walter Owens)

"Equality" . . . That's the battle cry now, in the U.S. and around the World.

But what does it really mean? Are all men actually equal? Can they be made equal by laws or by other government action?

Does liberty necessarily provide equality? Can democracy guarantee it?

This problem of "equality" may be in many ways the greatest problem of our day.

During the past summer the air was filled with the sounds of conflict in Birmingham, Chicago, New York and Danville. It was also redolent with discord within the United Nations, and within the backward countries demanding recognition. Accompanying these was the endless struggle of labor and capital, and the seemingly endless drain of our resources into the giveaway programs at home and abroad. The air was charged with social electricity as individuals, groups and nations fought for new status under the banner of equality.

Equality has intoxicated the modern world. Men walk starry-eyed through streets and halls dreaming of new days and improved status. The whole world seems in a pep-rally mood, and the bonfires grow larger and burn more fiercely, even as the songs, chants and shouts of the participants become lounder and more fervent. In a thousand tongues men scream their demands for equality, for place, for recognition, for "rights", for privileges.

As one listens, he frequently hears the words, "All men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." But the words never end there, but hurry on to declare that it is the responsibility of government to make all men equal and to maintain equality amongst men. Still other words are heard, declaring that democracy has failed to establish equality, and that men, therefore, must now turn to socialism and Communism.

We look around for evidences of equality in nature, and find none. Trees and hills are not the same in breadth and height. Rivers and Lakes are not of uniform size. Not all animals and birds are swift and beautiful. The lion does not recognize the equalness of the antelope, nor the fox the rabbit. Some fields are fertile and others sterile, and clouds and puddles are not the same, though both are water-created. In nature inequality seems to prevail, and yet the inequalities of nature produce the beauty we admire.

As I think of it, the same is true of history. Nations and races do differ in size, wealth, prestige, power, creativity and vision. Some soar like eagles. Some build like beavers. Some grow like vegetables and weeds in the garden called the earth. Between individuals, races, groups and nations there are broad differences, and equality is not a characteristic of either nature or human nature.

Having reached this point, I ask the question, "Can we have both freedom and equality?" Someone has said "Freedom without equality tends to become license. Equality without freedom tends to produce stagnation." How can these great objectives be secured without damage to the highest social system men have yet devised—democracy?

Looking back across history, I realized that the Jews preached concern for the poor, but not equality. The Greeks preached democracy, but not equality. The Romans preached justice under law, but not equality. The Middle Ages in Europe preached Christ, but not equality. In fact, not until the French Revolution did men openly affirm that "Men are born and always continue free and equal in respect to their rights", and not until our Declaration declared that "All men are created equal" did the world come alive to the possibilites of equality. These two events placed a new chemical in the cup of life, and the contents of that cup are changing men.

Here I paused to rethink the words, "All men are created equal". Are they? I could see that all men are created equally helpless, equally ignorant, equally inexperienced, equally sin-touched, but I could not see how they could be said to be created equal in any other sense. Men do not begin life with an even start for all. Their beginnings are marked by differences in pedigrees, health, educational and moral levels, economic strength, social status and personality potentials. There are broad differences in temperament, talents, drives and desires. They do not begin life on a common line.

And what of the so-called unalienable rights, such as life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness? Life is the gift of God, and so are liberty and happiness—in a certain sense. But being born is never enough. Getting here alive is only a beginning. In order to really live, one needs medical science, proper nutrition, adequate care, and a chance to become educated and equipped for adult responsibilities. As to liberty, it is not something that comes with birth. Liberty is man-created, man-achieved and man-maintained. God approves it, but man must win it.

Happiness is a by-product of a way of life rather than something granted us by birth. It, too, is something we achieve by effort. It depends on many things; employment, purpose, personal development and the right use of the opportunites and duties of life. Life God gives, but liberty and happiness we must achieve.

Having reached that state of mind, I wondered why men ever thought that government could make men equal and keep them equal. How can mere laws produce equality amongst men on a heart level? How can coerced fellowship ever become real fellowship? How can Brotherhood by Bayonet become real brotherhood?

That Government has a role to play in the mighty moving drama of man's progress is not to be denied. Our Constitution and our Bill of Rights stand to affirm it. It is the function of Government to state the conditions of liberty, equality and responsibility, but unless it is the will of the people to give life to the law, it will not work. The Prohibition era proved that beyond our contesting.

Then why do we believe and state in our legal documents that "all men are created equal", and have "unalienable rights"?

It is because we must find some means of limiting the powerful and of protecting the rights of the weak. Great power, unpoliced, tends to become destructive power. The rights of the weak tend to be lost in a land where only the strong prevail.

We all understand this, even as we all realize that the clamor for equality is always a push from below rather than a pull from above, although it has often been both in these United States. Slaves have never enjoyed being slaves. The poor have never enjoyed being poor. The exploited have never been happy with exploitation. Those who fail have never been proud of their shortcomings, and the employed have always felt that it would be better if they were the employers.

It is from this level of life that the hunger for equality rises. It is here that Utopia displays its broad green fields and still waters. It is from here that the valley of Shangri-La appears as the answer to all the ills of man. It is the hopelessness of the masses that provides the soil for hope in those who will not surrender to the accidents of birth and environment, and it is well that it is so.

And yet, one must face facts. In any classroom of pupils only a few qualify under the Letter A. Below these leaders of the class are the B students, and then the C's and then the D's, and then the F's. Some, by ability and effort, rise to the top, while others, because of lack of ability or application, take their places on the descending curve of scholarship.

In every nation it is the same. Only a small percentage of people have the ability, the desire, the drive, the willingness to work and sacrifice, to foresee and prepare for success in any realm. The people who struggle to succeed are never interested in equality, but

in superiority. Their goal is never the level of the masses, but a level above the masses. They endorse and espouse liberty because it creates for them a favorable climate in which to think, plan, create, work and achieve according to their abilities and desires. They never pace themselves by the speed of the mediocre, but by the speed of the best. They are never satisfied by crumbs; they want half loaves and whole loaves.

It is such people who made America possible, and who have always led men in the upward climb. They are, in truth, the benefactors of the race. It is their ideas and creativeness that establish businesses and industries, thereby providing employment for others, and the taxes that make community and national progress possible. They furnish our best leadership, and give to the nation our best guarantee of security. It is because of them that progress is produced in all areas of life—the intellectual, the artistic, the economic, the governmental and the social. While they did not build America alone, they provided the means whereby our nation came into existence and has continued on its upward way.

Looking critically at such a line of thought, we realize that the success of the few creates the inequalities that loom large in the minds of the many. The haves highlight the have-nots. It is the successful who outline the failures and all others who take their places on the curve of life as it sweeps downward.

So it seems to me, as it must be obvious to us all, that—

It is the nature of some men to succeed, and others to fail.

It is the nature of some men to get by, and others to achieve.

It is the nature of the have-littles to want more.

It is the nature of the successful to seek to dominate.

It is the nature of those who are unsuccessful to resent it.

It is the nature of the poor to envy.

It is the nature of the wealthy to assume unjust privileges.

It is the nature of those who inherit wealth to use it well, to misuse it, or to feel guilty because they have it.

It is the nature of the intellectuals who receive their compensation from taxes or the gifts of the economically successful to advocate a change of system in order to get one wherein the intellectuals will be as generously rewarded as business executives under free enterprise.

It is because men are unequal in ability and drive, in opportunities for recognition and advancement, in rewards for work done and services rendered that people become restless socially. It is the inequalities of humanity that create the crusaders for equality. In the eighteenth century men looked to democracy as the answer to the inequalities amongst men, and now in the twentieth some men look toward socialism and Communism.

Democracy, as we have tried to shape it in America, has been heavily impregnated with the Ten Commandments of Judaism and the spirit of Jesus. Because of this, we are suspicious of any system that advocates the big lie, covetousness, greed, the stealing of property, the destruction of life, and the taking away of liberties. Democracy condemns without reservations the confiscation of private property and capital by the state and the regimenting of human beings like animals on a farm. Our democracy is not perfect. Imperfections exist, but its virtues exceed those of any other system mankind has tried.

These observations cause us then to reach certain opinions concerning American democracy:

1. Democracy was never created to be a leveler of men. It was created to be a lifter, a developer of men.

2. Democracy was created to let the gifted, the energetic and the creative rise to high heights of human achievement, and to let each man find his own level on the stairway of existence.

3. Democracy was created to help men meet responsibilities and shirk no duties. That is why our nation has been concerned about the honest needs of its citizens. We lead the world in justice, even though justice does not always move with prompt alacrity. Our nation has been noted for the size of its heart, and not merely for the size of its pocketbook.

4. Democracy demands that the nation be governed by the capable, the honorable, the far-seeing, the clear-seeing, and not by mediocre men. In the beginning, it was so! May it be so again.

5. Democracy demands more from men than any other system in the realm of self-discipline, dependability, cooperativeness, industry, thrift and honor. Democracy will not work when party politics are not guided by basic ethical principles. For a part to foster class consciousness, class conflict, misrepresentation, covetousness, violence, theft and an open defiance of established law is to breed anarchy.

6. Democracy must give to all its people the following rights:

The right to equal learning.

The right to equal employment.

The right to equal treatment.

The right to equal justice.

The right to adequate housing.

The right to vote.

I am convinced that governments of themselves cannot make men equal or remake men into the being they ought to be. That is *a spiritual venture*, not an economic and political one. A change from democracy to either socialism or Communism, or a change from private capitalism to state capitalism, will not solve the basic problems of mankind; it merely shifts the areas of power and restricts liberty.

I am disturbed, therefore, when church leaders and church groups seem to advocate socialistic means and objectives as the answer to the problems of democracy, and especially the problems of equality. This is especially true when certain leaders voice slogans that appear logical, but are not. Let me name four:

1. *"The world owes every man a living"*. No, it doesn't! Ethics have never said so, and I have never known any man worth his salt who has claimed special rights under such a slogan. It is the cry of the lazy, the inept and the failures. Such a slogan is a far cry from our meeting the needs of the needy, which, of course, is our duty.

2. *"Production for use, and not for profit"*. That sounds good, but it is as phony as a Russian promise. It is profits that have produced the blessings of our nation and enabled her to be a blessing to the nations of the world. Profits are essential to the general well-being of society. When the state takes over under the slogan of "use, not profits", men lose their liberties and their standard of living.

3. *"Human rights, not property rights"*. As I look out over the world, one thing is clear: Where there are not private-property rights, there are no human rights. Private-property rights form the seed bed in which human rights mature. As long as private-property rights are clear, human rights will flourish. In view of the discussion nowadays about "violence" and non-violence and the demonstrations designed to emphasize the "demands of the poor", it might be helpful for the leaders of these movements to read what Abraham Lincoln said more than 100 years ago in a speech delivered on March 21, 1864, to the Workingmens Association:

"Property is the fruit of labor: property is desirable: it is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise.

"Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built . . ."

The guaranteed annual wage and rent subsides are wrong in principle. Money should be loaned at little or no interest to the poor and underprivileged to use in an appeal to their pride to achieve. If it is never paid back, nothing is lost anyway because it is given away under the other methods. This has nothing to do with race because the white poor out number the negro poor, three to one. It is on the basis of need that the Government should lend money to encourage these people to try the free-enterprise system and taste the fruits of accomplishment. The disabled and the sick must be supported by Government programs, of course, but those who can work should be encouraged to do so. Any such Government program should be closely allied in partnership with private business and industry.

4. *"The end justifies the means"*. That statement is not true. It was just such a statement that produced the torture of the martyrs, the burning of witches, and the denial of life and liberty to the inhabitants of current communistic lands.

Organized religion and Churchmen, whether lay or clerical, black or white, Protestant, Catholic or Jew, who seek to solve the problems of our society through socialistic processes, rather than democratic ones within the free-enterprise system, are heading down a road that leads toward darkness. Only by encouraging citizens to envy, to covet, to be class conscious, to foster class conflict, and to approve stealing and even murder, can such objectives be attained. To realize them, would bring about a broad denial of law and order, and the orderly handling of social problems. Whenever we encourage people to misrepresent facts, to use force wrongfully, to flaunt law and order and to stimulate bitterness and hatred, we depart from logic, Americanism and Constitutional Government.

I unhesitantly oppose the use of socialistic and communistic methods in the solving of the problems of our free-enterprise democracy. Our problems are problems of human nature rather than of economics and sociology. The man who has two cars is not preventing another from having one. The man who earns $50,000 a year is not robbing him who receives $300 a month. The man who owns a good house does not thereby force another man to dwell in the slums. And the people who prosper under our system cannot be blamed for the problems that plague the lives of those who compose the lower 25 per cent of the nation. The so-called privileged are not always a credit to either church or state, but they are not, in the main, parasites on the body politic. *We are, therefore, wrong when we damn the successful, the wealthy, the enlightened and the patriotic in order to gain what we call equality.*

Having said that, let me hasten to add that the redistribution of wealth will not solve the human problem that plagues us. Wealth is not fairly distributed in any land under the sun; it never has been and, I presume, never will be. Nor do we solve social predicaments when we blame the top 20 per cent of our people for the inequities that seem to mark the 80 per cent.

Nor is it logical for our Government to be forever emphasizing the neglected duties of the employer, while ignoring almost totally the neglected duties of the rest of us. The wealthy have many sins to confess, but so do we all. And when we come to the advocacy of moving from private capitalism to state capitalism, and the listing of the sins of democracy while ignoring its multiple virtues, and assuming that virtue resides in the have-nots, but not in the haves, I can only

shake my head at the presumed wisdom of such positions.

Let no one hearing my voice conclude that I am speaking as a have or a defender of the haves. Let no one believe that I am unconcerned about those in our midst whose rights are often ignored and whose status is questioned. I am not blind to the sins of the privileged any more than I am the sins of the underprivileged. The business leaders do not need my voice to defend their position: they are strong defenders of themselves. But I have walked the roads of life with men of all classes, and have reached one conclusion: "There is none righteous, no, not one!" We are all bearers of the tell-tale gray of selfishness. The 5 o'clock shadow is on all our faces.

What the worlds needs is a change of heart, a change of climate born of faith in God, a reaching up that there may be a reaching out, a confession that produces a new dedication. *This*—governments and laws cannot create, for governments and laws are but the reflection of the standards of a people.

The problem of equality may be in many ways the greatest problem of our day. We cannot solve it by government. Only when we as a religious people take seriously the teachings of the Old Testament and example of Jesus shall equality and liberty exist without detraction or subtraction. Only when we stand before God confessing our needs shall we be empowered to meet the needs of others.

If I must choose between liberty and equality, I must choose liberty and then hope and work for equality, for such seems to me to be the only way.

SHOULD EVERYBODY GO TO COLLEGE?

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the New York Sunday News carried an excellent article which demonstrates the growing awareness in America that every child need not go to college to be successful in life.

The rapidly developing skilled trades are facing the increased demand for better vocational education programs.

Mr. Jack Metcalfe, author of the Sunday News article, has performed a notable public service by bringing his findings to public attention.

Mr. Metcalfe's article follows:

SHOULD EVERYBODY GO TO COLLEGE?

(If you've got kids, you undoubtedly think so—but there are plenty of blue-collar jobs paying wages a Ph.D might envy. And now that industry and government have waked up to the sorry state of vocational training, the skilled trades will become more attractive to high school graduates.)

(By Jack Metcalfe)

Those tantalizing ads—the ones that promise up to $200 a week for auto mechanics or $12,000 a year for computer programmers or $720 a month for running a sewing machine in a ladies' garment factory—they kid you not.

Such jobs do exist, and they often pay that much or better. You don't need a college degree to be an electrician, a bagel bakery truck driver or a drill press operator, and their wages are the envy of many a Ph.D. To say nothing of the $35,000-a-year-plus often paid pilots of jet airlines.

There's just one catch. Although you don't have to go to college to make it as a flier or in nine occupations out of 10, specialized training is a must in the air or on the ground if you expect to make it big.

This June, as in every commencement season, countless young Americans have graduated from high school to face this cruel fact. They are woefully unprepared to get and hold a decent job. They are victims of a system which has downgraded vocational education, making it all too often an inferior program for inferior students.

This sorry situation exists because, as Rep. Roman C. Pucinski (D-Ill.) explains it, "for too long we have been obsessed in this country with the goal of a college education for everyone.

"There are millions of youngsters in this country who are either not motivated or are not capable of an academic education. These millions are the victims of our nation's misconceived order of education priorities."

Some of these young Americans—and their older neighbors—are hopelessly boxed in. Vocational education opportunities simply may not exist for them. Or if they exist, they may be pathetically out of touch with the realities of today's automation-oriented society. They may be in communities where vocational training for girls consists in learning how to sew aprons, and for boys in instruction in making bookends.

In other cases, there may be different barriers, some of them purely psychological.

"Parents," says Hugh C. Murphy, director of the Labor Department's Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, "tend to be sometimes oddly inflexible about their children's future, and this can lead to rather harsh, unmanageable realities.

"For example, some parents are reluctant to face up to the fact that Johnny may never make it through college, or that he simply may prefer something else."

If Johnny is propelled toward college in these circumstances, Murphy says, real heartbreak may result. He'll probably flunk out or drop out for lack of interest.

In testimony before Congressman Pucinski's House Education subcommittee, which is considering legislation that would drastically upgrade and expand vocational education, a prominent government official, Grant Venn, pressed the delicate nerve of parental pride—of status, if you will—still harder when he said:

"There is no question that all of us hope our child is going to be a great research physicist, writer or whatever. We see the neighbor's child. Vocational education is very necessary for the neighbor's child."

TRAINING FOR ALL

On a more sober note, Venn, who is the U.S. Office of Education's associate commissioner for adult and vocational education, testified that it is not just the neighbor's child but everyone who today must get some sort of occupational training.

In the past, he said, schools had a role in "selecting out" students. He explained that when "a large proportion of our labor force used muscle power and unskilled help," schools helped determine which students would drop out and go straight to work.

"Youngsters could enter the labor force with nothing more than a willingness to work, a healthy body and muscles and learn on the job to become effective citizens and effective workers," said Venn, adding as an afterthought:

"In fact, a lot probably made contributions to graduate schools and universities through the money they earned and the success they had."

Nowadays, however, this school of hard knocks has virtually been closed down. Every year, one million youths—who once could have continued their education on the job—are no longer able to do so.

Unemployable in the highly skilled jobs that are available, they are the most likely to be jobless or to be hired to do thankless and unpleasant work. They are the ones who are on the street. They are the ones who are "social dynamite."

Ohio's superintendent of public instruction, Martin W. Essex, expressed the problem dramatically in his testimony before Pucinski's subcommittee:

"Suddenly, within a decade, muscle power has become obsolete. For the first time in all the eons of the human race, man cannot market a strong back."

For some young Americans, the solution, of course, always will be to go to college. If they have the motivation, the money and the mentality, this course can be ideal. Statistics show that average unemployment among college graduates is half as great as among the rest of the population.

But obviously it is no secret that mere possession of a college degree is no automatic guarantee of a fat salary, Just the reverse. Colleges can serve as high-class "aging vats," keeping post-adolescents away from the real world until they are old enough to be shunted into a ratrace for which they have not been prepared.

To many members of the mortar-board set, this is precisely as it should be, colleges should not, they say, be "trade schools."

For those not afflicted with "white-collarism," whose schooling needs are less exalted and more basic, the answer may be in apprenticeship training in one of the 350 occupations which offer such programs in the U.S.

With this background, a skilled worker's prospects for steady employment are excellent, Blue-collar pay is generally good, often better than a college graduate's. Sometimes, technicians take home pay checks so big that they could be mistaken for the payoff to a lottery winner.

Labor Department official Murphy equates the apprenticeship system with a college education. The time required usually is the same—four years, although some apprenticeships last as long as six years and some can be completed in two.

In a survey of apprenticeship opportunities in occupations ranging from accessories mechanic to zinc etcher, Murphy stresses one big advantage. Unlike a young man beginning college, an apprentice begins earning money as soon as his training starts.

At the outset, his pay is half the journeyman's scale. He will draw from $1.75 to $3 an hour in most areas. This will increase every six months, Murphy writes, until at the end of his apprenticeship he will reach the journeyman's scale—from $3.50 to $6 or more an hour.

Only then, of course, does the college graduate even begin to look for a job. In most cases, it has cost $12,000 for his bare minimum expenses for his four college years, and he probably has little or no work experience to offer a prospective employer.

But an apprenticeship costs the apprentice nothing, and he earns while he learns. When certified as a journeyman, the worker may get from $7,000 to $10,000 yearly base pay in most parts of the country.

To start toward this goal, the applicant must first meet strict eligibility requirements. They vary with the occupation, but they cover such points as age minimums and maximums, health, physical dexterity and learning potential.

One requisite for most apprenticeship programs is a high school diploma.

The applicant also must pass written and oral examinations. These may deal with mechanical aptitude as well as mathematics, science, English and other academic subjects, including drafting.

If accepted, the apprentice follows a course of closely supervised on-the-job practice and off-the-job classroom instruction. Classroom instruction—a minimum of 144 hours a year—usually is given in vocational school, either during working hours or in the evenings.

All aspects of the apprenticeship program are clearly defined and specified in a collection of rules, regulations, definitions and activities called "standards," which are usually drawn up by representatives of employers and unions. In addition, most standards are prepared in cooperation with Murphy's Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training and are registered with the BAT.

BIAS BARRED

All standards which are registered with the Labor Department's BAT contain this pledge:

"Selection of apprentices shall be made from qualified applicants on the basis of qualifications alone, without regard to race, creed, color, national origin or occupationally irrelevant physical requirements . . ."

This commitment to non-discrimination against minority groups is being paralleled in an area that—until you give it some serious thought—appears curious. That is the government's effort to spur women to move into those skilled trades which are particularly suitable for their abilities but which they have traditionally skirted.

Women make up only about 3% of America's total skilled workers, some 260,000 in all. Yet there are 28.7 million women in the civilian labor force, 37% of the nation's entire total 77.6 million.

Some occupations, bookbinding, for one, have long attracted women workers. But tokenism has been the rule as regards women in other crafts—except in wartime when Rosie the Riveter and her sisters were in great demand.

Women were often snubbed because of a mistaken belief that there were major sex differences in aptitudes and interests. These ideas have largely been exploded; aptitudes which are generally required for the skilled trades are, for the most part, as common among individual girls as among individual boys. And of course, the 1964 Civil Rights Act forbids job discrimination because of sex.

Because of this new emancipation, the number of girls in some fields has been increasing at a faster rate than boys since 1962 (although the total number of boys entering, of course, is greater). These crafts include auto mechanic, baker, printer, decorator and window dresser, optician lens grinder and polisher, tailor and upholsterer.

About one third of the women in craft jobs are foremen—twice the comparable proportion for men.

NONTAXING JOBS

The Labor Department has broken down occupations into categories according to the amount of strength they require. Sedentary jobs, such as jeweler and camera repairman, don't overtax a woman's strength; they involve lifting a maximum of 10 pounds. Light strength requirements, which include lifting a maximum of 20 pounds, also are considered open to women. Examples are lens grinder, electronic mechanic, office machine serviceman, electrical appliance repairman and such auto servicemen as the tuneup, carburetor and front-end man.

This representative sample of crafts which are well-suited to women as well as to men has been compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, along with the earnings which can be expected:

Aircraft mechanic, including such specialties as electronic auto pilot mechanic, airborne electronic computer repairer, radar repairer and aircraft sheet metal repairer. Scheduled airlines mechanics average about $155 weekly.

Auto mechanic, which has almost as many subdivisions as the aircraft mechanic—tune-up man, automatic transmission specialist, bonder for auto brakes, electrician repairman for automatic window, seat and top lift equipment, etc. Skilled mechanics working for auto dealers average some $152 weekly.

Business machine serviceman, which ranges from repairmen for statistical machines and dictating-transcribing equipment to sophisticated electronic computers. Experienced servicemen's pay ranges from an average $95 to $150 weekly, with the most highly skilled computer specialists earning $235 weekly or more.

Furniture upholsterer, who may work on household furnishings or seats in autos, airplanes or railroad cars. Helpers average from $50 to $70 weekly, while experienced upholsterers earn up to $180 weekly.

Radio and TV service technician. Beginners can expect from $70 to more than $100 weekly; experienced servicemen get up to twice as much.

Tool-and-die maker, a highly skilled and creative occupation with an average top wage of $166 or more weekly.

Pay scales cited for these crafts are somewhat misleading; they tend toward the conservative side. This is because many are national averages, dragged down by low wages paid in depressed or rural areas.

In major metropolitan centers, notably New York, the cash rewards for such skills and other specialities requiring a high degree of training can be far more impressive.

The building trades in the New York area are a prime example. According to a survey of this field prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics' New York regional office, basic journeymen's wages here include:

Boilermakers, $6.37 an hour for a 35-hour week, plus employers' contributions of 5% to insurance-welfare funds, 5% to pension fund and 5% for vacation pay.

Carpenters, $6.15 an hour for a 35-hour week, plus hourly contributions of 37 cents to insurance, 30 cents to pension.

Engineer operators of heavy steel erection cranes, $6.75 an hour for a 40-hour week, plus hourly contributions of 4% to insurance, 6% to pension and 35 cents to vacation pay.

Machinists, $6.40 an hour for a 35-hour week, plus a 6% contribution to insurance.

Non-specialized painters, $4.90 hourly for a 35-hour week, plus hourly contributions of 4½% to insurance and 5% to pensions.

BLS regional chief Herbert Bienstock points out, however, that these statistics are only the basic minimums. Because of incentive pay, generally for overtime and holiday work, building trades employes and craftsmen in similar skilled occupations usually make far more than the minimums.

How much is another matter. No accurate over-all statistics are available. But there have been reports, for instance, of operating engineers, whose cranes have booms over 140 feet long, who have grossed upwards of $20,000 a year, thanks to overtime and fringes.

Best-known of the building trades wage scales is for inside wiremen electricians, who have a basic 25-hour week for which they get $5.47 an hour.

This pay seems relatively low, even with additional employer contributions of 3% hourly to insurance and welfare funds, 3% toward pensions and 4% for vacation pay. But the electricians are obliged by their union agreement to work another hour daily—at overtime—and in practice they usually work still another hour daily or more—also at overtime. It all adds up.

There's another side to the building trades coin, though, and that is uncertain employment. One point meriting serious consideration in selecting a trade is, of course, what the opportunities for craftsmen in a particular specialty is expected to be.

Over-all, the outlook for skilled workers is bright, with demand for them escalating at a heady rate. The government estimates that total jobs will have increased 18% by 1975, with the number of professional and technical workers up a whopping 54% by then.

The trick, obviously, is to track down or be directed to a field in which there will be plenty of jobs. School vocational guidance counselors, state employment service offices, the Labor Department's apprenticeship information centers and field offices of the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training are all good sources of leads.

The need to expand and improve vocational guidance programs as well as to provide lifelong job placement service was stressed during congressional hearings on the pending vocational education bill.

Legislation proposed by Pucinski and Rep. Lloyd Meeds (D-Wash.) would authorize the federal government to pump a total of $2 billion by 1972 into all sorts of vocational education projects that would, in cooperation with states, break new ground.

NEW COURSES

Much of this money would be used to spur education of the poor, who now are increasingly school dropouts or pushouts. It also would go to expand vocational training in regular high schools.

This would end the current policy, which, according to testimony of Dean Rupert N. Evans of the University of Illinois College of Education, "gives the student a diploma but nothing else, for he is unprepared for any activity in contemporary life."

Hopefully, the new program would erase the current bleak statistics. Today only three million of America's 12 million high school students are getting vocational education. Of them, only 1.7 million are actually enrolled in courses leading to what used to be called "gainful employment."

Today, committed to the "glorification of the elite," the federal government spends almost $3 for higher education for each dollar that it puts into the vocational education kitty. Yet only 20% of all high school graduates go on to college.

But more than money is needed to upgrade the status of vocational training. It must be sold to the teachers and administrators no less than to the students.

POSTAGE STAMP WITH A MESSAGE: "REGISTER AND VOTE"

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today was the first day of issue for a new 6-cent postage stamp which carries an important message for all Americans: "Register and Vote."

During the course of the year, the Post Office Department introduces a number of special issues of postage stamps.

Each issue provides a service in its own way, and I want to commend the Department and the Postmaster General's advisory committee for its wise discretion in approving stamp issues.

To me, none of the special stamps can be any more important in its own way than the stamp which is being issued today.

The theme is "Register and Vote" and we cannot emphasize enough the importance of this right and this responsibility of every adult American citizen.

The franchise to vote is a bulwark of our democracy. A free vote—a free choice—is an opportunity that many other peoples all over the world would love to have. We in America have it.

Unfortunately, there are too many of our citizens who do not exercise their right to vote. This is not peculiar to any

one community, to any one area, or, indeed, to any one political party.

The Department is introducing today a beautiful stamp which has a most important message for all of us. Register and Vote. Every single person in our Nation will see this message. My hope is that they will heed it—that they will register and vote.

Mr. Speaker, it was a great honor and privilege for me to take part in the important first-day ceremony. Postmaster General W. Marvin Watson was the principal speaker.

Also present were several of our colleagues: The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], ranking minority member of our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, who spoke briefly; the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON], a member of our committee; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO], a former member of our committee and now a member of the Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, following is the text of the Postmaster General's remarks:

POSTMASTER GENERAL WATSON SPEAKS AT CEREMONY FOR "REGISTER AND VOTE" STAMP

I participate in this important ceremony today with very mixed feelings.

On the positive side, this postage stamp is both service and symbol.

It is a service because it will work as a silent reminder to millions of Americans exhorting them to exercise a basic right.

It is a symbol, because it reflects the culmination of one of the oldest and most basic struggles in American history—the struggle for universal suffrage.

Looking through the pages of American history, we are sharply made aware that voting rights were won only gradually, after many major battles. These were sometimes fierce struggles, waged with great intensity. Political careers waxed and waned, flourished or were crushed on the outcome of the struggle.

In the beginning of our Republic, and for half a century afterwards, the battle was for suffrage not restricted to those who owned property.

For the prevailing view during the adolescence of our nation was that government is, and ought to be, founded on property, and that only those who have property should be permitted to have a voice in government.

That conviction was deeply held, and fell away only after many years.

But the battle for suffrage was not yet fully won.

For the institution of slavery still lived to mock democratic principles, and the vote was denied women.

Finally, slavery was struck down, though, to our shame, the Negro did ont gain full voting rights until the 89th Congress heeded President Johnson's plea and passed the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The demand for manhood suffrage as a political right created the climate for the woman suffrage movement. Here, too, the road was not easy. Many brave women quite literally risked their lives, went on hunger strikes and accepted prison terms before the 19th Amendment was adopted in 1920.

All through these great efforts to gain the vote, there were two basic theories of voting. One was aristocratic; the other democratic. The aristocratic theory really never accepted Jefferson's view that all men are created equal and have the same natural rights. Voting, this theory held, was a privilege, not a right. And it was a privilege to be conferred only upon such adult citizens fit to exercise it.

The democratic theory held that citizenship implied the right to participate in the civic life of the community—in short, the right of a man to say how he should be governed.

Recently, with the 24th Amendment striking down the poll tax, and with the "one man, one vote" decision of the United States Supreme Court, this democratic view has reached its final victory.

The fight has now been won.

In fact, the day is not too far off, when, as President Johnson proposed, the vote will be extended to 18-year olds.

After so much effort, so many struggles, such major sacrifices, one would believe, one would expect, that every citizen would rush to exercise this hard-won right, this golden prize.

But the statistics on voting tell a far different story.

Far from universal use of universal suffrage, voting is a minority occupaiton, a kind of political badminton in a nation of baseball players.

While Americans overseas are willing to die, and in fact are dying, to protect the right of others to self-government, at home the right is neglected.

In 1960, there were 108 million Americans eligible to vote.

Of those, but 65 per cent, or 69 million, actually voted.

And since the Presidential vote was almost evenly split, about 32 per cent of the eligible voters actually determined the outcome of the 1960 Presidential election.

The American people feel that minority rule is distasteful and undemocratic. Yet, we are the world's foremost example of minority rule—*with the consent of the people.*

Compare our record with that of the elections in South Vietnam where 80.8 per cent of the registered voters cast their ballots on September 11, 1966. Those votes were cast despite threats of death, despite Communist attacks on polling places, despite bombs placed in voting booths.

Here we have no threats, no attacks, no bombs—and no more than 65 per cent care to vote.

What to do about this wall of apathy between the voters and the exercise of a basic right?

I cannot claim a final answer. But I can accept the responsibility of the Post Office Department to do what it can in this area. And so we have issued this stamp to remind our fellow citizens that since they now have the right to vote, it is their duty to employ that right.

And I am pleased that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee which recommended issuance of this stamp could be with us today. They deserve the congratulations of every citizen concerned with a healthy form of government.

This stamp will appear on millions and millions of letters. It will say silently, "Let your voice be heard. Register and vote!"

ACA ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the English statesman and philosopher Edmund Burke said it first and said it best:

The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing.

Fortunately for our Nation and the constitutional principles upon which it was founded good men in organizations like Americans for Constitutional Action have been doing a great deal.

Today, ACA marks its 10th birthday. The principles for which it stands today are right principles worthy of support. The action which ACA has taken in support of these principles has been outstanding. Worthy of special commendation has been the effort of this organization to keep the American public informed of the voting records of Members of Congress, that the truth might be made plain, and the people helped toward realistic political decisions based on performance, and not promises alone. I want to pay special tribute to the national chairman of ACA, Adm. Ben Morrell, a partiot in every sense of the word; to Gen. Thomas A. Lane, ACA's president, who has retired from the Army but not from the fight for freedom and for constitutional principles; to Charles MacManus, the indefatigable executive director of ACA, and to Jim Price, the able and energetic Alabama chairman of ACA.

As long as there are dedicated, principled organizations like ACA, Mr. Speaker, we need have no fear for the future of this constitutional Republic.

LINCOLN AND THE LAW

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, is it rule of law or rule of the mob? It looks as if the answer to this question today indicates that it is the rule of the mob—a complete disrespect for law and order.

But an editorial in the Johnson City Press-Chronicle on Monday, June 24, 1968, quotes Abraham Lincoln in a speech he made in 1838, which touched on the same subject matter at that time.

This editorial, entitled "Lincoln and the Law," points out, in Lincoln's words, a message that should be heeded today:

LINCOLN AND THE LAW

Rule of law or rule of the mob?

This is a big question today.

But it is not a new question.

Ever since man has been on this earth the struggle between law and the mob has gone on.

We have only to read our history books—or our Bible. Christ was crucified because a mob prevailed over the law.

It is interesting to note that Abraham Lincoln was concerned about mob violence as far back as 1838, many years before he became President of the United States.

In an address before the Young Men's Lyceum in Springfield, Ill., on Jan. 27, 1838, Lincoln said this:

I hope I am over wary; but if I am not there is, even now, something of ill-omen amongst us. I mean the increasing disregard for law which pervades the country; the growing disposition to substitute the wild and furious passions in lieu of the sober judgment of courts; and the worse than savage mobs for the executive ministers of justice.

This disposition is awfully fearful in any community; and that it now exists in ours, though grating to our feelings to admit, it

would be a violation of truth and an insult to our intelligence to deny accounts of outrages committed by mobs from the everyday news. They have pervaded the country, from New England to Louisiana—they are neither peculiar to the eternal snows of the former, nor the burning suns of the latter—they are not the creature of climate—neither are they confined to the slaveholding, or the nonslaveholding states. Alike, they spring up among the pleasure-hunting masters of Southern slaves, and the order-loving citizens of the land of steady habits. Whatever, then, their cause may be, it is common to the whole country . . .

By instances of the perpetrators of such acts going unpunished, the lawless in spirit are encouraged to become lawless in practice; and having been used to no restraint, but dread of punishment, they thus become absolutely unrestrained. Having ever regarded government as their deadliest bane, they made a jubilee of the suspension of its operation, and pray for nothing so much as its total annihilation . . .

Lincoln continued at length with details of burnings, pillagings, lootings and other outrages against the law. Then he spoke some words that should be recalled and underscored by all Americans today. On the question of what we can do to secure a greater respect for order and decency, he said:

The answer is simple, Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well wisher to his posterity, swear by the blood of the Revolution never to violate in the least particular the laws of the country, and never to tolerate their violations by others. As the patriots of '76 did to support the Declaration of Independence, let every American pledge his life, his property and his sacred honor to the support of the Constitution, and laws—let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father, and to tear the charter of his own children's liberty. Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles in her lap:

When I so pressingly urge strict observance of all laws, let me not be understood as saying there are no bad laws, nor that grievances may not arise, for the redress of which no legal provision has been made. I mean to say no such thing. But I do mean to say, that although bad laws, if they exist should be repealed as soon as possible, still while they continue in force, for the sake of example they should be religiously observed. If such arise, let proper legal provisions be made for them with the least possible delay . . .

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO ACA

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to salute Americans for Constitutional Action on this day—their 10th anniversary.

Americans for Constitutional Action—or ACA—has done an outstanding job in acquainting the people of the United States with the significant issues before the Congress.

Particularly at this time, in the face of probably the most severe financial crisis in the United States since World War II, ACA, in pointing up those issues wherein a vote has been cast for or against sound fiscal policies, gives a valuable yardstick by which an incumbent's record can be judged. The same can be said for its support of our Federal Constitution—by promoting adherence to the checks and balances which have made it possible for us to grow from scattered settlements into the greatest Nation the world has ever known.

Mr. Speaker, I wish a very happy birthday to ACA and extend a sincere hope that it will be around for many more in this great service it renders to the people of the United States.

THE CONSTITUTION AS A GOAL

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, this excellent speech given at the New Albany, Ind., National Cemetery recently by a New Albany resident, Mr. Ron Hutchens.

Mr. Hutchens reviews the provisions of this country's Constitution, then pointed to where we, as Americans, have failed to see that the principles in this great document are being carried out.

It is a lesson in history for all of us from a fine and perceptive young American. The speech reads as follows:

THE CONSTITUTION AS A GOAL

We, the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

This is the Preamble to the Constitution of the United States. It was ratified in September of 1787 and went into effect March of 1789, 179 years ago.

Many feel that the Constitution was the best written American document, providing Americans with a system of fundamental laws and principles of government, state and society. But what many Americans fail to realize is that the Constitution only presents a goal. A destination in which we, the people of the United States, must aim toward and not away from.

To re-examine the Preamble, we see first "establish justice." Each of us, through our own personal experience, would agree that this safeguard has been numerously abused. Crime has become an ever-more pressing problem on American society. Crimes committed increase daily while their convictions continue to decrease.

"To insure domestic tranquillity." Detroit, Cleveland, Baltimore, Newark and now even Louisville is evidence enough to convince us that this is not a reality. These civil disorders should be enough to motivate us to strive toward this goal.

"Promote for the general welfare." Many poor Americans feel that this should be phrased as to promote for the middle class. Poverty and the poor is now brought into the picture of American Problems.

And finally "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Posterity is the future generations of Americans including the Negro, Indian, Puerto Rican, Oriental along with the White. This too only becomes a goal for Americans, as long as we have racists preaching the superiority of one race and discriminating against all others.

But let's go further than just the introductory paragraph of the Constitution. Opposition in and out of Congress to the Constitution, in that it was not sufficiently explicit as to individual and state rights, led to an agreement to submit to the people immediately after the adoption of the Constitution a number of safeguarding amendments. These amendments to the Constitution are often referred to as the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights goes all the way from the individuals right to trial to the states right to make their own laws. But there are two specific amendments which seem to protrude above all others; Article 14 & 15.

To paraphrase Amendment 14, it states that it is unlawful for any state to make a law which will deprive an American citizen of life, liberty or property without due process of law. Many minorities, whose ancestry is different than our own but whose citizenship is of the United States, question the mere existence of this amendment. State governments have ignored this amendment by over-ruling it with the earlier amendment, Article 10, which sets aside the rights of the state to make laws. But regardless of one's logic, it becomes quite irrational to ignore this Constitutional Amendment.

The 15th Amendment, condensed, says it is unlawful to deny a citizen the right to vote because of race or color. The 15th Amendment seems to be an excellent example of both achieving a goal and representing a goal. It remains a goal as long as one man is discriminated against because of his race or color when trying to vote. But it also shows that we can achieve these goals, for today much of the "refusing to allow one to vote because of race or color" has been eliminated.

The Constitution conveys excellent safeguards, privileges and rights but it is up to us, the people, to see that they are achieved. We, as Americans cannot ignore any longer.

We must strive toward these destinations, these goals "in order to form a more perfect Union."

ACA'S 10TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, today a national organization dedicated to the preservation of the Constitution of the United States observes its 10th anniversary. I refer to Americans for Constitutional Action, which has performed valuable public service for a decade in bringing to the attention of the American people the voting of various Members of Congress of both political parties, in order that the popular vote may honestly reflect the preferences of the voters forearmed with knowledge of the true record of the men and women who have represented them in the National Capital.

While I, for one, do not agree with each and every position that ACA has taken, nor, for that matter, with its selection of particular votes as truly representative of a pattern of individual voting, there is no question but that on balance the objective of this fine organization has been to help elect to Congress men and women in both parties who will work to preserve and strengthen our constitutional form of government and not to wreck it.

The ACA goal is to help all Americans to become more aware of their role as voters and as citizens in terms of obligations and responsibilities as well as privileges and rights. Information furnished voters throughout the Nation by ACA is, on the whole, a distinct contribution to increased public understanding

of the pros and cons of national and international problems. Contrary to some fund-raising schemes in the form of influence peddling, ACA's position is solid and substantial. It seeks fiscal responsibility and a balanced budget. It wants firm and just law enforcement. It deplores permissiveness while encouraging proper exploration of new ideas and new concepts within the framework of settled constitutional precepts.

All Americans deplore the mess in Vietnam. We are appalled and grieved by the awful casualties, the loss of life, the human suffering and the waste imposed on our military by civilian policies of gradualism largely motivated by political considerations of an administration that has subordinated the lives of Americans and the national solvency to a blatant quest for votes on the homefront. But ACA has not intruded into the arena of those legislative actions unrelated to protection of the U.S. Constitution. Its activism has been in behalf of the restoration in America of a system of government in which the constitutional separation of powers between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches is maintained and strengthened. Such a cause is most worthwhile. Would that more Members of Congress and more good citizens in the executive branch of our Government would join in restoring to America the values and the goals that were those of our forefathers.

It does not strengthen this Nation to deny the Lord's Prayer in our public schools—or to refuse to restore the concurrent enforceability of State sedition laws—or to vote to exempt poverty program workers from limitations by Federal law on political activity—or to recklessly increase the national debt beyond our capability to pay in the foreseeable future. These and similar issues have been ACA's criteria for measuring legislative responsibility in action. It is to be congratulated on this 10th anniversary as an organization of public-spirited men and women that has contributed greatly to strengthening our Nation.

THE PRESIDENT TAKES FIRST STEP IN GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I support the President's signature of the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1968.

To accept this legislation does not say that we are satisfied with all of its provisions. As the President said:

> The measure before me carries out many of the objectives I sought. But it also contains several other provisions which are unwise and which will not aid effective law enforcement.

I agree with the President, and attempted in two procedural votes to return the bill to conference so that some of the objectionable provisions in titles II and III could be revised.

However, given the magnitude of our problems and the lateness of this session, I believe the President was right to act now on the recommendations of his special Crime Commission which will end a decade of inaction on gun legislation, and provide urgently needed educational, research, and training assistance for our local law-enforcement officers who bear the prime responsibility for the prevention and control of crime.

The tragic events that have shocked this country over the last few years have amply demonstrated the absence of meaningful gun controls in this country; this law, while admittedly limited in scope, takes the first and most obvious step—one which I have personally advocated since coming to Congress—of banning interstate sale of handguns, and prohibiting their sale to minors.

The President was right to take this first step, and has since asked Congress to extend this ban to rifles, shotguns, and ammunition, which I endorse, and further, to require the registration and licensing of all firearms, which I believe should have proper hearings before the appropriate committees in both Houses before this Congress is adjourned.

Weighing the good features against the undesirable, and after consulting with the wisest counselors available to him, the President said:

> On the basis of their advice and my own searching examination, I have decided that this measure contains more good than bad, and that I should sign it into law.

I concur with this decision. The Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1968 is a vigorous response toward solving today's problems of crime in our local neighborhood and city streets and should have our full support.

HAROLD KOHN HONORED BY OPTOMETRY

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in New York State we are fortunate in having in our midst a very distinguished gentleman and attorney at law, Harold Kohn, Esq., who is this week being honored for 34 years as general counsel of the American Optometric Association.

In 1923, Harold Kohn, then a young attorney, was retained by the "Optometrical"—as the word was used in those days—Society of the City of New York. That retainer was the beginning of a lifetime of association with the optometric profession and Mr. Kohn's career, as indeed his very life, has ever since been intertwined with the emergence of optometry as a fully fledged health profession. In 1925 the Brooklyn Optometric Society looked at what their colleagues across the East River were doing and also decided to retain the services of the young attorney. Five years later the New York State Optometric Association likewise sought Mr. Kohn's services. Evidently Mr. Kohn must have been doing something right during those years for his prowess reached the ears of the national optometric body and in 1934 he was retained as general counsel to the American Optometric Association. For all of the intervening years he has maintained his close contacts with optometry and today Mr. Harold Kohn is unquestionably the country's leading authority on the legal aspects of optometry in all 50 States.

Now, at the age of 74, Mr. Kohn is relinquishing his postion as general counsel of the American Optometric Association and optometrists from around the Nation, as well as from other countries, will honor him upon the occasion of the 71st Annual Congress of the American Optometric Association in Miami, June 26–29. Indeed the entire congress has been dedicated to Mr. Kohn.

Harold Kohn has been the recipient of innumerable honors and awards. In 1956 the New York State Optometric Asociation presented him with the Frederic A. Woll Memorial Award—the highest honor bestowed by that State association, and this was the first time the award had ever been presented to a nonoptometrist. In 1959 the Massachusetts College of Optometry awarded Mr. Kohn an honorary degree of doctor of optical science, and just 3 weeks ago, on June 8, in Memphis, Tenn., the Southern College of Optometry presented Mr. Kohn with a similar honorary degree of doctor of optical science. Pennsylvania has also paid homage to Harold Kohn, for in 1964 he received from the alumnae association of the Pennsylvania College of Optometry a plaque in grateful recognition of his many contributions to the profession. Numerous State optometric associations have awarded Mr. Kohn honorary membership in their ranks, and this week, during the course of the Congress of the American Optometric Association, Mr. Kohn will be awarded an honorary membership in that professional body.

It was my privilege to enjoy for a number of years a rather close working association with Mr. Kohn and I can vouch that Harold Kohn's outlook, his humanity, his concern for social justice, his genial manner, his never-failing courtesy—whether it be to friend or opponent—all these warm human qualities are in full measure of the necessary degree to have earned him the high esteem, respect, and affection in which he is held not only by the Nation's optometrists, but also by those of us outside the profession of optometry who have been privileged to know him and to cherish his friendship.

CANADA'S TRUDEAU

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the recent elections in Canada have given Pierre Elliott Trudeau and his Liberal Party a clear majority in Parliament. Mr. Trudeau, to be sure, is an attractive personality and has quite a rapport with the younger voters. Unfortunately, he has quite a rapport with the "new left" and

the "old left" if his past record is any indication.

Father Daniel Lyons, S.J., in his column of June 16 in Twin Circle, delves into the background of Mr. Trudeau. As a newcomer to politics, Trudeau's past history is comparatively unknown. Father Lyon's account of Trudeau's past would seem to indicate that United States-Canadian relations might have some rough going unless Trudeau puts his leftist leanings in the past.

I include the above-mentioned column from Twin Circle of June 16, 1968, in the RECORD at this point:

FATHER LYONS VIEWS THE NEWS

There is serious concern in Canada over their new Prime Minister, Mr. Pierre-Elliott Trudeau. He has long been an admirer of socialism, and has had strange and persistent tie-ins with Communism. Let's look at his record. He was in Shanghai when the Communists took over in 1950, and was an ardent admirer of Mao Tse-tung. On returning to Montreal, in 1951, he founded *Cite Libre*, a journal with a strongly Leftist slant. Among those who collaborated closely with him were such leading members of the Communist party as Stanley Ryerson, its top theoretician and editor of the *Marxist Review;* Pierre Galinas, director of agitation and propaganda for the Communist Party in Quebec; and Professor Raymond Boyer, who was convicted of Soviet espionage.

In the following year, 1952, Mr. Trudeau lead a delegation of Communists to the Economic Conference in Moscow. In 1953 he was barred entry into the United States as an "inadmissible" person. In 1955 he launched *Le Ressemblement*, a front for the far left. In 1960, he led a Communist delegation to Peking for a Red victory celebration there. In 1961 he was intercepted by the U.S. Coast Guard while he was trying to get to Cuba. In the same year he joined a group of Marxists in writing a book entitled *Social Purpose for Canada*. The chapter written by Mr. Trudeau praises Mao Tse-tung, and urges the socialists not to "water down" their socialism. He said they should make the approach to socialism more "flexible," and welcome federalism "as a valuable tool which permits dynamic parties to plant socialist governments in certain provinces, from which the seed of radicalism can slowly spread."

On page 373 in the same book he refers to "that superb strategist, Mao Tse-tung," and declares that Mao's experience "might lead us to conclude that in a vast and heterogenous country, the possibility of establishing socialist strongholds in certain regions is the very best thing." Mao's methods are not "socialism" in the ordinary sense of the word, but that is what the Communists always call them.

In 1962, despite widespread protest, Mr. Trudeau got appointed as a professor at the University of Montreal. It became a pro-Castro stronghold. In 1963 he called the Liberals "idiots" because they accepted nuclear arms. But by 1965 he decided to use the Liberal Party as an instrument to escalate himself into political power. He and two other well-known Leftists, Jean Marchand and Gerard Pelletier, were elected to Parliament, forming the "New Guard" of the Liberal Party. In 1966 he was appointed Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister Pearson. In 1967 he was named Minister of Justice. He was credited in the Communist press with such feats as the reinstatement of a pornographic hippie publication, *Georgia Straight*, which had been banned by Mayor Campbell in Vancouver for obscenity. He also introduced the bill to legalize both abortion and homosexuality, and spearheaded the shift of Canadian justice from a religious to a "humanistic" basis.

Mr. Trudeau has only been a Member of Parliament since 1965. Canadians hardly know his views. He has never been known to criticize Communism, and said he found the Marxist views of Harold Laski "the most stimulating and powerful influence" he has encountered. One of his first official statements as Prime Minister was to call for much closer relations between Canada and Red China. He was elected Prime Minister by a highly organized, emotional campaign of adulation which was heavily financed, and in which the mass media played a powerful role. The mass media, however, neglected to bring out the truth about his background.

These are the facts about the new Prime Minister in Canada, and concerned Canadians are worried and anxious about the situation. Americans, too, have reason to be worried. It has often been said by well-informed persons that the Communist world could take over Mexico almost any time. The three Communist Parties there are intensively active. But the United States depends on Canada more than on any other country. We have invested 21 billion dollars there, more than in all of Europe combined. We sell more to Canada than we do to all of South America, and our balance of trade with our northern neighbors is favorable to the tune of 1.25 billion dollars each year.

I am not trying to argue that Mr. Trudeau is a Communist. But to concerned Americans, as well as Canadians, he certainly bears watching. All the more so since so many people lack any concern.

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE CONTROL ACT OF 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1968

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the Revenue Expenditure and Control Act marks a signal achievement in our efforts to reinforce the American economy, prevent further hardships from emptying the pockets of the poor, and reassert congressional authority over the budget. The passage of this legislation is crucial to solving the Nation's myriad monetary dilemmas. I know that it was a difficult decision for the Members of this body to ask the American people for more taxes; for myself, the decision came only after a long and exhaustive consideration of the many issues involved. I believe that an examination of these issues clearly points up the great need for this bill.

MONEY MADNESS

Perhaps the greatest need argument for the tax bill is found in the problem of inflation in the United States. We are now faced with a spiraling inflation in this country which threatens to get far worse in the coming year. It appears that the pull of excessive demand for goods is now the primary source of inflationary pressures; the only way to relieve this type of pressure is to manipulate incomes so that they are closer matched to spending, and so that savings are put in equilibrium with investments. Otherwise, the demand for goods and services will push prices higher and higher, beyond the reach of the average citizen. As this process continues, the economy moves closer toward an explosion.

Indeed, inflationary pressures have already forced prices to a near breaking point. In April of this year, the consumer price index rose at an annual rate of 4.1 percent—the highest rate since the Korean war. An annual rate of 5 percent is projected for the month of June.

Now, it is not difficult to see what happens in this sort of situation. When you have an excessive budget deficit and continue to put pressure on the economic system with no fiscal controls—such as higher taxes—the inevitable result is tight money. The fact is that when we fail to exert proper restraints on the economy, the system acts to save itself. It acts as an animal trapped in a corner with no good samaritan to save it; faced with destruction, the animal strikes out angrily regardless of who or what is in its way. The economic "animal" strikes out to preserve itself with tight money; and tight money carries with it the ugly partner of high-interest rates. This process is exactly what has been happening in the United States during the past year.

Between May 1967 and May 1968, the interest rate on corporate triple A bonds was up from 5¼ to 6¼ percent. The interest rate on home mortgages in most parts of the Nation now exceeds 7 percent. What this means in real terms is that, for example, the foundation is knocked out from under the housing industry: Mortgage rates are too high, people cannot contract to build homes. It means that vital school and hospital construction are brought to a virtual standstill. It means that highway construction is slowed if not halted. Of course, the list goes on and on; tight money inevitably brings severe damage to the entire economy. Just as the cornered animal ends up destroying itself with a blind attempt at survival, so the economic animal, left to its own devices, tends to destroy itself, and us.

A failure to exercise proper fiscal control on an inflationary spiral means, if you will excuse the shift in metaphor, an abdication of any responsibility for the economic engine. Rather than driving the engine, we are driven by it almost to the point of distraction. We can easily recall the days of 1966 when the Federal Reserve Board was forced to impose monetary restrictions and alarmingly high interest rates to curb the runaway engine; we certainly did not want that action to be unfortunately necessary again in 1968.

The only proper response to this condition of inflation was for the Government to tighten its own belt and ask the people of this country to do the same. It is a simple fact of the "new economics" that when you have a sluggish economy, you must decrease taxes; and when you have a bulging, rapidly expanding economy, you must have a tax increase. I notice that many people are willing to follow the new economics in times of economic slowdowns by priming the pump and scaling down taxes; these people must be willing to heed the instructions on the other side of the coin in times of economic runaway.

Of course, it is very difficult to increase taxes and still remain popular. We will not be popular heroes for passing this

legislation. However, I wonder if we would have been popular favorites if inflation wrecked our economy? If people were unable to build houses or send their children to not-so-crowded schools? Would we have been flooded with congratulatory telegrams if an American dollar were worth less abroad than the paper upon which it is printed? And would we have received accolades if a recession were allowed to strike the Nation?

Certainly, it is not easy to ask the people of this Nation to pay more taxes; however, what is easy is not necessarily right, and what is right most often is very hard. Without this tax bill, we would have taken the easy road to calamity. Someone said, very accurately I think, that if we passed higher taxes we might not be able to return to this Chamber in November, but that if we did not pass higher taxes, this Chamber might not be worth coming back to in the fall. I am sure that the American people will justify actions made not in regard to political expediency, but out of concern for the welfare of our Nation.

INFLATION TAX

Indeed, without this tax bill, we surely would have had a tax anyway: a tax produced by uncontrolled inflation which would have struck with special ferocity at the poor, people with fixed and low incomes in the United States: pensioners, life insurance beneficiaries, social security recipients, welfare cases. As prices continued to soar upward, these people would have borne the burden, almost alone, of paying "inflation taxes." Let us take a typical example. A retired man receiving social security walks into his neighborhood grocery store now and pays about 33 cents for a loaf of white bread; as inflation continues with no fiscal controls, the price of white bread jumps to 35 cents, and then 40 cents; at the same time the prices of milk, meat, vegetables, and other necessary items go up and up. But remember, his income does not rise at all. It remains the same. while his income's purchasing power goes down. Obviously, the social security recipient is paying an extra amount for his food because of inflation—and that additional amount is what I mean by "inflation tax."

The poor people and the pensioners bear the brunt of this heavy tax; while the wealthy feel it little or not at all—until, of course, high interest rates strike at the very heart of American economic progress. The tax bill, then, comes as a definite relief to those Americans whose incomes are low or locked into a fixed salary schedule. Without the bill, these Americans would have been among the first and hardest hit by the inflationary spiral.

DOLLAR DANGER AND DRAIN

Another important reason for the tax bill deals with the stability of the American dollar. Rarely has the dollar been in more trouble than at this point in our history. The gold flow from our national vaults seems to be endless, as the scale measuring the balance of payments tips heavily against us. In January 1960, the American gold supply was listed at $19.4 billion. By January 1964, this figure had dropped to $15.5 billion. And by June 2 of this year, the gold supply had plummeted to a low of $10.3 billion.

Coincidental with this downward movement has been the steadily dipping confidence in the dollar. For a short period in March, Americans traveling abroad were even unable to have their dollars accepted by many commercial concerns. Now, as the stability of the dollar is doubted and threatened, peoples of the world have looked to this Government for a willingness to prevent further fiscal decay. Mr. Speaker, I submit that a failure on our part to pass the tax bill would have been interpreted by the peoples of the world as final proof that the American Government was unwilling or unable to maintain its financial credibility. However, with the approval of the Revenue Expenditure and Control Act, we have taken a meaningful step toward slowing down an otherwise unrestricted, often chaotic flow of gold from our shores; we have demonstrated our intention to hold the line on the value of the American dollar; and we have made it possible for faith in our monetary system to be restored.

DOLLAR DEFICIT

The national budget deficit is closely connected to our fiscal headaches. The Treasury Department report for 1968 shows that up to June 12 of this year, we spent $27.5 billion more than our income. Even more heavy expenditures are now forthcoming at the close of the fiscal year. Moreover, official estimates project a $25 billion budget deficit for next year. Taking this potential deficit—and the actual figure could turn out to be even higher—and coupling it with no decrease in Government spending, there is every reason to believe that we would exceed the $365 billion legal national debt ceiling by December; at that point, unless Congress increased the debt limit even more—which would be patently unwise—the Government of the United States would no longer be able to pay its bills.

The legislation we have just approved includes a provision for speeding up the collection of certain corporate taxes. This provision should produce additional revenue of $15.5 billion by mid-1969. This additional revenue added to the $6 billion spending cut reduces the potential budget deficit by some $20 billion. In other words, from the threat of a $25 billion deficit, this bill takes us to the manageable figure of an estimated $5 billion deficit. Moreover, it guarantees that the Government will be able to pay its electric bills next year.

SPENDING CUT

As I stated before, Mr. Speaker, if the Government asked the American people to tighten their belts, it was necessary for the Government to do likewise. The $6 billion spending cut has been greatly criticized as a stab at domestic social welfare programs. I, myself, have long worried over this matter and therefore supported only a $4 billion cut in the budget.

However, I feel that there is no inevitable reason why the $6 billion cut should or will be aimed at vital domestic projects. For one, I place my trust in President Johnson, who has no interest in mind except the welfare of the United States and who has amply demonstrated his concern for societal progress in this Nation, to carefully avoid any potential injury to social programs through the spending cut. Secondly, there is room in the budget for cuts other than in welfare projects. The congressional conferees exempted only $84 billion of President Johnson's budget from the spending slash. This leaves a total of $102 billion which is legally available for cuts; there are many nonessential areas in this figure which could be handily sliced, without damaging the splendid domestic programs of the Great Society.

TAX REFORM

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the bill we have passed is far from perfect. While it does meet the needs I have outlined in this presentation, there is another need whose surface is only scratched by this legislation. I refer to tax reform.

The bill offers some encouragement in this area by requiring the President to submit to Congress by December 31, 1968, a comprehensive program of tax reforms. But this is not enough; the Congress must begin to take action now.

Mr. Speaker, I submitted a bill—H.R. 13586—in October of 1967 which is aimed at closing many of the loopholes in our system of taxation which allow the wealthy to escape without paying certain tax revenues. My bill would eliminate many of the gross inequities in our estate taxes, would repeal the privilege of groups to elect multiple surtax exemptions, would increase gift tax rates to estate tax level, and would reduce oil, gas, and other mineral depletion allowances by about 12 percent. The oil industry in this country is now given a 27.5-percent allowance for depletion in tax payments. I can find little or no justification for this situation. I can find little or no justification for people raking in a fortune of deductible revenues from the estate of a deceased person. I can find no justification for allowing individuals to sidestep taxes under the guise of receiving a "gift" from an employer or friend.

Mr. Speaker, if we would only pass a tax reform bill, indeed, if we had passed one like mine by now, we would not have had to worry about cutting too much from the budget and thereby endangering vital domestic programs. There are millions of dollars in revenue which slip through our fingers every year because of the inequities in our system of taxation. Were we to collect these revenues, the wealthy would not be pauperized; but perhaps the poor would be able to live a little better.

The Congress has faced up to one responsibility by passing the Revenue Expenditure and Control Act; it must now face up to another, equally important task: closing the tax loopholes. We simply cannot justify further tax hikes if we permit so many millions of dollars to go into hiding between January 1 and April 15 every single year.

I, for one, am going to press this Congress to pass tax reform legislation, such as the type I have introduced, as soon as possible. It is indeed disconcerting that so many people are willing to criticize

the spending cuts but unwilling to consider tax reform. You just cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Speaker, coupling the bill we have now passed with a tax reform measure will provide for a truly stable and equitable economic structure in this Nation. Before the cart gets too far in front of the horse, let us act to guarantee that all Americans pay their fair share: no more, and no less.

CONCLUSION

I think it useful to remember, Mr. Speaker, that while this tax bill forces all of us to dig a bit deeper into our pocketbooks and wallets than we did this past year, the new surtax still gives us a level of taxation which is below the level existing at the time we passed the tax decrease bill in early 1964. Moreover, it leaves us with a tax rate that is still the lowest of any nation in the civilized western world. Yet, even this relatively small tax increase will provide the kind of economic stability we so desperately require.

THE REDWOODS: THE BEGINNING OR THE END?

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, when white men first visited our continent's Pacific shores, redwood forests of some 2 million acres stretched nearly 400 miles along the California coast. Some of these gigantic woodland spires, name Sequoia sempervirens, had survived fire, flood, and storm for 20 centuries. Loggers moved in with ax, saw, and team. The demise began for a primeval forest. The tallest living things were toppled for shingles and siding, coffins, and patio furniture. Mankind was making man's kind of progress.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the House of Representatives will soon exercise its responsibility to preserve some of the fragments remaining from that once great forest. In my opinion, we should seek to establish a Redwood National Park equal to and representative of the majestic trees for which it will be named.

Many people are troubled by indications that the proposal to come before the House will be less than an ample and significant park area. What we should strive for in a redwood national park is the creation of a meaningful unit which is worthy of designation in the National Park System. A pipestem park along the borders of Redwood Creek would not be in balance with the resources which the world's wealthiest Nation can devote to this purpose.

I ask consent to include with my remarks an article by Edgar and Peggy Wayburn, entitled "Prologue" and "Epilogue," which appeared in the October 1967, annual of the Sierra Club Bulletin. The material follows:

PROLOGUE

They were there long before mankind had known there was a Pacific, those immense, incredible forests. From the Big Sur country they extended northward four hundred miles along the wild, rocky, beautiful coast—crowding the broad river flats, clothing the steep slopes, and crowning the ridges. They were forests such as man had never seen, anywhere, with trees so huge it sometimes took a dozen men to circle one—trees so tall no one could know their height until they fell.

The trees were somber Greek columns in muted colors, branches held high, needles dedicate against the distant sky. Sunlight slanting through sought out the big-leaf maples, the alders, the dogwood, and the oaks. And in spring, even without sunlight, myriad small flowers brightened the forest floor.

The coast redwoods, *Sequoia sempervirens*, are among the survivors of a great genus. Crowded westward by geological and climatic changes, the tallest living things make their last stand along the rim of the Pacific. From the time of the dinosaurs to the time the white man came.

Spaniards found them, the Russians and Englishmen followed, and the tough pioneers came. The early records are scant, and some are difficult to believe: A tree 32 feet in diameter stood on the Oakland hills, one naturalist noted. Others there were so tall that English sailors in 1816 used them to sight a course from beyond the Golden Gate. Around Bolinas, great groves of redwoods stood "as fine as any," and the Bolinas harbor rivaled San Francisco as a timber port until it silted in.

Eureka was forest. Cresecent City was forest. On the Elk River in Humboldt County, a tree yielded 420 feet of logs, and the salmon ran so thick in Bull Creek a wagon couldn't cross it in the spring. It took 15 years of steady logging to cut the great trees of Jolly Giant Creek near Arcata. And everyone thought the redwood forests were without end.

Disappointed goldseekers swelled the ranks of loggers in the 1850's. They turned from the Mother Lode to mine the coastal forests instead. They sailed north from San Francisco, and at almost every creek they discovered a new strike—a grove of trees to stagger a man's imagination. By 1860, they were all the way to Crescent City, and the blue smoke of a sawmill drifted from the mouth of every sizable stream.

In 1879, when the first major proposal was made for a redwood national park (by Secretary of the Interior Carl Schurz), the young industry was becoming Big Business. During the next two decades—while small sporadic attempts were made locally to save trees—busy entrepreneurs succeeded in gathering into private hands virtually all the redwood forests. By 1900 the chance had been lost for the nation to save a redwood park out of the public domain. Parklands would have to be bought back from private owners, and on the owner's terms.

The park idea persisted, and logging went inexorably on. In 1911 a California Congressman introduced a House joint resolution to investigate the "advisability and necessity" of establishing a coast redwood park. His resolution failed. The donkey engine and band saw sped up operations, and by the time passable roads penetrated the redwood region, thousands of devastated acres were suddenly on display. The Save-the-Redwoods League was formed in 1918 to rescue the redwoods, and high on its agenda was the establishment of a national park.

In 1920, Madison Grant, one of the League's founders, wrote in *National Geographic Magazine*, "Four great forests stand out prominently. They are (1st) the groves along the Eel River, culminating in the Bull Creek Flat and the Dyerville Flat; (2nd) the immense Redwood Creek grove; (3rd) the Klamath River groves, and (4th) the Smith River groves at Mill Creek. Each has its peculiar beauty and it is difficult to choose among them." Mr. Grant went on to note that Redwood Creek was "peculiarly adapted for a national park."

A redwood national park bill passed the House in 1923, but died in the Senate. Logging continued vigorously behind some of the roadside strips the League had begun to acquire. By 1942 half the primeval forests had been cut.

The depression brought a chance to buy redwood parklands. Largely through the efforts of the Save-the-Redwood League, the state acquired some of its finest redwood groves—at Bull Creek, Prairie Creek and Mill Creek. The redwood industry was glad to get the money. In 1946 Congresswoman Helen Gahagan Douglas proposed the Roosevelt Memorial Forest, 2.4 million acres to be administered by the Forest Service, and 340,000 acres, including state parklands, to be set aside in four memorial park units. But the economy had improved, and her ideas lost out.

Timber operations continued to accelerate. Chain saws and bulldozers moved into the woods. The great trees fell faster and faster; it now takes less than an hour to fell a giant. The Save-the-Redwoods League fought to make the state parks bigger, and the roadside strips longer. The dream of a redwood national park faded.

But the dream still has one place to be realized—at Redwood Creek. It is some measure of the redwood forests that, after 115 years of steady logging, such a place remains at all. For one last chance.

EPILOGUE

Think, if you can, of the time contained in a million years, of the days and nights in ten thousand centuries, of the mighty forces of the earth working throughout that length of time on the land where the redwoods grow. How many storms swept in from the sea to beat against those shores, how many savage winds and tides and floods? How many wildfires raced unchecked? How many earthquakes shook and shaped that land?

Think of a forest living on through all those adversities as the redwoods did along the foggy rim of the Pacific, trees having within them a mighty will to survive. Some trees stood for more than 2,000 years and when they fell, there were others left to go on living. The continuity of that great forest was not really challenged until man, with his ability to change and destroy, found it. Now, in a little over a century, most of the primeval forest has fallen, and it is still falling.

If there had been no redwoods, man doubtless would have managed. But there were redwoods, and there seemed to be so many reasons to cut them. (Somehow we always contrive to explain, to our own satisfaction, the things we do because we feel we must do them. There were reasons when the hillsides of Lebanon were stripped bare, too.) There were cities to be built and rebuilt, there was the market for shingles and shakes and sidings, for grape stakes and railroad ties, for fence posts, cigar boxes, coffins, panels and patio furniture.

And so, for every 100 acres of redwoods that we found, we have cut about 90. Because some people cared, we have dedicated about 2½ acres out of each 100 for California redwood state parks. Some of these fragments of the primeval forest are small, almost as tall as they are wide. But you can walk among their trees and consider the long, dim corridors of time and sense how the world was a million years ago.

How "saved" these redwoods are we do not know. Hundreds of the greatest park trees have been toppled by floods made lethal with run-off from stripped watersheds. Some of the best park groves have been severed by a freeway, their dignity and quietness lost in the roar and smell of trucks and cars. Other fine parks are threatened with the same fate. Logging defines the boundary of almost every

park, leaving trees exposed to wind and storm.

And the forests we have cut? For decades they fell like the great forgotten forests of the east—the pines of Maine and Georgia, the hardwoods of Ohio—without thought or plan or care for the land. But the will to live is deep within the redwoods, and the great stumps try hard to sprout new trees. In some places, new forests have come back in fortuitous second growth. In other places, they have not grown again and no one knows just why. The scientific study of redwoods is recent and still experimental.

The men who are cutting the last primeval redwoods today—and who want to cut on to the end—are very reassuring. Many level the forest and scrape bare the forest floor with bulldozers, and re-seed with fir and pine and spruce where the redwoods grew. They speak of harvesting overmature trees, of tree-farming and sustained yield. Sometimes they talk of growing redwoods like a crop of corn. But the economic crop, and the crop they plan to grow, will be for pulp, and this they say honestly.

What this honestly means, of course, is that where the great trees once grew for centuries, small trees will stand for 40 years or so. The land that bore the giants will bear stripling—as long as it bears anything. There is serious question as to whether the steep, fragile slopes of the redwood region can survive "sustained yield" as it is practiced. In too many places, bedrock has already emerged, the rivers are thick with silt, the streams are ugly gullies.

The hour is very late for a redwood national park. The time of choice is gone. Of the four great forests Madison Grant described, just one survives with a national park potential. The groves of the Eel, the Klamath, and the Smith have been logged too long. At Redwood Creek, the last great contiguous groves are left, with trees to equal any, and a sweep of forest from coast to ridge top with marvelous complexity of the redwood forest flora. This is the last chance to save enough.

But in a democracy, the machinery to make a park grinds slow. We take time to argue, especially where money is concerned, and this park must be bought. While we argue, the chain saws are not idle. Dozens of trees can fall in a day. A bulldozer can tear apart in a morning the soil laid down for a hundred centuries. And men who do not want this last-chance park have the power to destroy it.

If they do destroy it, if we let them, if we find it too costly to stop them, how will we explain to those who come after us? Redwoods are unique among all living things on earth. All men should have a chance to stand among the ancient forests, to touch the trees and reflect on how life can continue on this planet. Timeless until we came, these forests are entitled to survive, let us say, even if there were no men at all. If they are our heritage, we are their stewards. Just how responsible is our stewardship?

WHAT THE FLAG MEANS TO ME

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in these times when patriotism often does not seem to burn as fiercely in the breasts of American citizens as in former days, it is heartening to see the desire of our young people to stand up for the ideals and principles upon which our country was founded.

Miss Jane McNamara, a fifth grader and a winner in the Flag Day contest at Central Elementary School in Andover, Mass., has written an inspiring essay which I shall share with my colleagues at this point in the RECORD:

WHAT THE FLAG MEANS TO ME

(By Jane McNamara, Central School, Andover, Mass.)

To me the flag means our country. Not my country and not your country, but *our* country. When I look up at our flag I think of what John F. Kennedy said, "Ask what you can do for your country, not what our country can do for you."

The stars on the flag mean all the states in the United States. I think everyone who lives in the United States of America should honor and respect the flag like the men who go to war to fight for our country.

Our flag, means to me, the home of the brave and the land of the free, a place I always want to be!

OUR FLAG: SYMBOL OF FREEDOM

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, a young constituent of mine, Lloyd Arnold, 14, son of Mr. and Mrs. Herbert E. Arnold, of 3969 North 38th Street, Milwaukee, presented a flag that had flown over the Capitol to the Townsend Street School in Milwaukee. I am including the speech that Lloyd gave on that occasion with the thought that it might be of interest to my colleagues:

FLAG PRESENTATION SPEECH

(By Lloyd Arnold)

Madam President, Mr. Zarem, Faculty and parents of Townsend Street School, the origin of our National Flag parallels the story of the origin of our Country. The first Flag had 13 stars and 13 stripes to represent the original 13 colonies.

Realizing that a flag with a star and stripe for each state as it entered the Union would be out of proportion, Captain Samuel C. Reid, United States Navy, suggested to Congress that the stripes remain 13 in number to represent the 13 colonies, and that a star be added to the blue field for each new State coming into the Union.

A law of April 4, 1818 resulted that a star be added for each new State on the 4th of July after its admission. The 50th star added in 1960 made Hawaii the 50th State in the Union.

General Washington, when the Star-Spangled Banner was first flown by the Continental Army, is said to have described its symbolism as follows:

"We take the stars from Heaven . . . the red from our Mother Country, separating it by white stripes, thus showing that we have separated from her. The white stripes shall go down to posterity representing liberty."

Our Flag is a symbol of freedom today through-out the world.

All Life Scouts working for Eagle must complete a School, Community or Church Project, together with 21 merit badges earned . . . 11 required . . . and 10 badges of the Scouts own choosing to be eligible for the rank of Eagle. I have 17 Merit Badges thus far and will complete the remaining 4 this summer and go before the Board of Review.

As Senior Patrol Leader and Life Scout of Troop 4 and working for my Eagle Rank, I chose a *School* project and earned enough money by collecting old newspapers and selling them to buy this Flag that flew over our Nation's Capitol.

With the Cooperation of Congressman Reuss, I have completed my project.

I wish to say "Thank you" to Townsend P.T.A. for their sponsorship of our Troop, to Mr. Zarem, the Principal for his interest in Troop 4 by permitting us to meet here every week through-out these many years.

Mr. Zarem, Madam President, will you come forward, please?

At this time it is with great pride that I present this American Flag to you and Townsend Street School.

I hope you will place it in an area for all the present and future students, faculty and parents of Townsend Street School to *see* . . . to *cherish* . . . and to *pledge their allegiance.*

Thank you.

AID: NEW AVENUES FOR POPULAR PARTICIPATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, our experience with the foreign aid program has shown us that those countries which are developing most rapidly are those which have used private resources to full advantage. Private enterprise and institutions—American and foreign—are essential to the task of democratic development. Government assistance, while also essential, will never be sufficient.

In the last decade, we have become increasingly more aware of the need to increase the role of private investment and other non-Federal resources in assisting developing nations. The response of our Government to this growing awareness has been to designate the private sector as a top priority area in the aid program, thereby giving new direction to our efforts to assist in the development of friendly nations.

With the passage of title IX in the 1966 Foreign Assistance Act, AID instituted a whole range of programs designed to encourage private initiative. To facilitate the participation of the private sector in the development process and advance the objectives of title IX, AID engages in activities ranging from underwriting feasibility studies and making loans on terms favorable to American businessmen to consulting with American business specialists in the search for new ways in which private enterprise can be of greatest assistance in foreign development.

To further augment these activities, the 1967 Foreign Assistance Act established the AID Office of Private Resources which engages its total energy in marshalling private investment and expanding the private sector. President Johnson has termed his effort "the best long term route to rapid growth in the less-developed world."

Thus, Mr. Speaker, today we witness a change in the character of our aid program and recognize a new priority being given to the discovery of new avenues for popular participation in the development process. We note firm steps in a new direction—to promote private investment and encourage the growth of private enterprise—an emphasis which will assuredly mark our future programs. AID has changed. We must not ignore this change, nor can we afford to be ignorant of its implications.

As a prelude to a series of remarks on this topic that I will address to you in the coming weeks, I, at this time, call to your attention a speech presented before the National Farmers Union 66th annual convention by W. G. Carter, Executive Director of AID's Private Resources Development Service:

AID'S CREATIVE PARTNERSHIP

(Address by W. G. Carter, Executive Director, Private Resources Development Service, Agency for International Development)

Our country is committed to foreign aid for a very simple reason—it is the right thing to do. Assisting the developing nations of the world is not a sacrifice—it is an opportunity to make a better world for all of us. Your great organization has recognized this for decades. I know of no grass root organization—particularly here in the heartland of the United States—more committed to creative international cooperation than the National Farmers Union. We know we have your support and, even more importantly, your active participation—and are very deeply grateful for it.

However, there is no blinking the fact that foreign aid is in trouble—deep trouble. While the reasons for this are complex, one element seems to loom very large—that is the image of foreign aid as a "government-to-government handout" program. I would like to discuss this with you today.

Congress believes that personal initiative and private organizations in the developing countries must be encouraged and strengthened. So do we—and we are working at it.

Congress believes that private U.S. business and non-profit organizations should be used as much as possible to do the job. So do we—and they are being used.

In spite of this, many people on Capitol Hill and in the country at large still view foreign aid as a purely "government-to-government" program. This image is false.

I want to give you the evidence that today's foreign aid is a creative public-private partnership.

Ten—or even five—years ago a report like this would not have been possible. Foreign aid has changed.

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 pointed the way—it tells us what to do.

U.S. private community leaders on our advisory committees tell us how to do it.

We are doing it.

Over the years we have learned that development does not get rolling until the energies of private citizens are fully engaged. This requires:

A sound governmental framework of laws and policies—commercial, fiscal, monetary, export-import, price and wage—which support private initiative.

Diverse, democratic and independent private organizations—labor union, cooperatives, business firms, foundations and voluntary groups. Groups—like yours—you know that their own actions can help make a better future for themselves.

Skilled and motivated managers, workers and technicians.

Means to accumulate private savings and to give private citizens access to medium and long-term credit.

These requirements can be met in a developing country to the extent that four forces of change work together. Three of these forces are permanent—the local government, the local private sector and the foreign private sector. The fourth—official foreign aid—has a more limited role. In the early stages of development A.I.D. brings a missing margin of needed goods and talent to bear on critical bottlenecks and helps build up the relationships between the other three forces to the point where we can—and do—drop out of the picture.

During the time we are on the scene we do have "government-to-government" programs. But let's go behind the label and see what goes into them.

AID TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE BUILDS PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

We use our technial assistance funds to call on the experience and talents of private U.S. organizations to build up private institutions in the developing countries because American non-government institutions can best do the job.

Private organizations representing the whole spectrum of American society—the professions, business, education, labor and cooperatives—hold about 1,400 technical assistance contracts totaling more than $500 million. Since 1962, the value of these contracts has increased fourfold in Latin America and in Africa. American experts are at work in technology and science, education and agriculture, industry and family planning.

AID DEVELOPMENT LOANS SPUR PRIVATE SECTOR GROWTH

Development loans are essential to A.I.D.'s development assistance efforts. They provide goods and services from American private enterprise and they result in faster private sector growth.

We use the process of negotiations for program and sector loans to help bring about changes in government policies—fiscal, monetary, export-import, price and wage—so that they support rather than inhibit private investment and intrepreneurship. Moreover, program loans directly support private enterprise and initiative by getting U.S. capital equipment, fertilizer, spare parts and raw materials into the hands of private businessmen and farmers.

These goods are paid for in local currency. The local currency received by the government is used for long term investment in fields such as education, agriculture and transportation. The government in turn repays A.I.D. in dollars.

A.I.D.'s project loans also help build the country's infrastructure and increase national productivity. Without power, roads and communications, no sector of a nation's economy can advance.

Here at home A.I.D. financing directly benefits the U.S. economy. Machinery, fertilizer and people leave our ports—not dollars. And these exports open up long term commercial markets for U.S. business.

So far, I have been talking about projects funded 100 percent by A.I.D., using private organizations as contractors to the government. I would like to turn now to a growing part of our program—the use of appropriated funds and guaranty authorities to generate an increased flow of private resources, both capital and technical assistance, to privately managed programs.

AID PROVIDES INCENTIVES FOR PRIVATE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND PRIVATE INVESTMENT

In its landmark report of 1965, the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid said: "Public resources wisely used can attract private resources in even greater quantities."

We fully accept this and have done something about it. Our new Office of Private Resources strengthens our partnership with private U.S. organizations, profit and nonprofit, and is working out new ways to multiply private investment and technical assistance.

Private technical assistance

Private organizations registered by our Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid represent millions of Americans: Church World Service is supported by 26 Protestant denominations; Catholic Relief Services by the Catholic Bishops' overseas aid fund; the Jewish organizations by the United Jewish Appeal; Lutheran World Relief by Lutheran constituencies. Other organizations such as CARE are supported by direct appeals and individual contributions.

Altogether there are some 500 nonprofit organizations at work in these fields. A.I.D. supports the Technical Assistance Information Clearing House which serves these groups.

For some time, A.I.D. has used incentives to increase private investment. The same approach makes sense for private technical assistance. We are expanding the use of incentive grants to provide partial funding of private technical assistance programs. The key to our approach is that, within broad policy limits agreed with A.I.D., the private organization raises substantial funds, uses its own people, selects its projects and carries full responsibility for achieving results. We hope—and believe—that we can adapt this approach in certain aspects of working with the cooperatives in the U.S., particularly in giving management assistance on a short term basis to operating co-ops.

Some current examples:

Business management: The International Executive Service Corps was created by a group of American business executives, with A.I.D.'s help, to furnish U.S. business know-how to developing countries. Drawing on a roster of U.S. volunteers now approaching 4,000, it completed 400 projects in 38 countries in its first three years. IESC has shown such promise that the Japanese and Canadians have created their own versions and Germany is planning to follow.

Community-based programs: The potentials of setting up direct links between U.S. communities and the developing countries have been convincingly demonstrated by the Partners of the Alliance which now involves 33 States. *By the end of FY 1967 the $825,000 A.I.D. invested multiplied tenfold in privately contributed supplies.*

Technology: Volunteers for International Technical Assistance (VITA), Inc. draws on the contributed talents of 4,500 specialists from 800 corporations and 200 universities in *technical problem-solving through a person-to-person mail inquiry and counseling service.*

Private investment

American private investment helps speed growth in the less developed countries. Because of this important development role, the President's emergency balance of payments program permits private investment in less developed countries at 110 percent of previous levels.

Although U.S. investment to less developed countries is not increasing as rapidly as we would like, it is becoming more diversified. In fields other than petroleum, annual U.S. direct capital flows to less developed countries increased from about $180 million in 1960 to $380 million in 1966. Over the same period, the amount of these investments assisted by A.I.D. guaranties increased from about $30 million to about $325 million.

Since management of the Cooley loan program was transferred from the Export-Import Bank to A.I.D. on January 1, 1962, we have loaned local currencies with a dollar value of $258 million to private firms.

THE OTHER END OF THE PIPELINE

I have pointed out the ways in which foreign aid today is a partnership between the U.S. Government and private U.S. organizations.

Turning to the other end of the pipeline, we see that development programs are a four-way partnership between the local government, the local private sector, the U.S. private sector and the U.S. Government. A project now being put together in India illustrates the process.

The project is for a 450,000 nutrient tons per year fertilizer plant to be eventually owned and operated by Indian farm cooperatives. Let's look at what had to happen, what each partner had to do.

A series of policy changes by the *Indian Government* created the necessary climate:

Under the 1965–66 economic reforms, absolute priority was given to increasing food grain production.

Producer rather than consumer oriented farm price policies were adopted to provide incentives to farmers to increase productivity.

Fertilizer production and distribution were opened up to the private sector.

These policy changes were strongly urged by A.I.D., the World Bank and other donors, backed up by long term loans to finance fertilizer, capital goods and spare parts needed by Indian farmers and businessmen.

Indian farm cooperatives have not yet expanded their activities into ownership and management of factories producing farm supplies. As you know far better than I, this has been an outstanding feature of U.S. farm cooperatives for many years.

In 1966, a team of U.S. farm co-op experts, organized by the Cooperative League of the USA and the International Cooperative Development Association, suggested to Indian co-op leaders that a joint effort be launched to set up a fertilizer plant for the Indian co-ops. The fine relations built up between the Indian and U.S. cooperatives through an office in New Delhi operated for many years by the Cooperative League, largely at its own expense, provided the necessary foundation of mutual confidence. The Indian co-ops reacted enthusiastically.

With strong encouragement from the Indian Government and A.I.D., the project is taking shape.

Over 20 U.S. farm supply co-ops have together pledged $1 million in cash which will provide executive talent to manage the project during construction and start-up and train Indian management to take over.

Market surveys and technical studies are being carried out by Indian and American consulting firms.

Much of the construction will probably be carried out under a contract with an American engineering construction firm.

The fertilizer produced by the plant will be sold to the farmers through their own co-ops.

The Indian Government will help finance rupee construction costs of the plan.

Long term dollar financing for the U.S. capital goods going into the plant will be provided by private U.S. banks and insurance companies. These private credits would not be possible without A.I.D., Extended Risk Guaranties.

This project is by no means wrapped up. It does look promising. But, the point is this: five years ago this kind of integrated effort would have been impossible. It shows what it takes to get development rolling.

I am not satisfied with the progress we have made—here at home, in India or anywhere else—towards strengthening the public-private partnerships on which successful development depends. Far from it. I doubt that any of us are fully satisfied and we probably never will be. But we have come a long way. If this is recognized and if we—the Congress, the Executive Branch and the American people—stick to it, I am confident that we can go a lot further.

CONGRESSMAN PEPPER'S BILL TO LOWER VOTING AGE STRONGLY ENDORSED BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S RECENT MESSAGE TO ALLOW 18-YEAR-OLDS TO VOTE

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have for several Congresses urged the adoption of legislation to amend the Constitution to permit 18-year-olds to vote. I am pleased that the President now is lending his strong voice to this legislation.

I feel that this legislation is needed now because of the stimulus it would add to the youth of this country in increasing their interest in this Nation's democratic processes. Recent years have seen a liberalization of both State and Federal laws dealing with the right to vote. I strongly believe that we should take this major step to assure that our young people will be committed to our democratic processes for generations to come.

The several States have almost uniformly acted to make their rules for absentee registration and voting more responsive to the needs of military and civilian voters away from home. Similar progress has been made in reducing lengthy residency requirements which, in the past, have disenfranchised millions of voters.

Federal legislation in the area of voting rights has included the 1965 Voting Rights Act, which had the effect of extending the franchise to thousands of additional Americans.

Action on the President's proposal to amend the Constitution to permit 18-year-olds to vote will be another important step in the effort to assure that every qualified citizen has a hand in molding the Nation's political future.

Young Americans, just beginning to accept the responsibilities of holding a job and raising a family, are eminently qualified to be voters. It is important that they be enrolled as full-fledged citizens at an age when their interest in political affairs has very recently been stimulated by education. There is no valid reason to require a young man or woman who has completed high school education, or who has begun a college career, to wait until the age of 21 before having the opportunity to influence the political affairs of his city or his country. I wholeheartedly support the proposed constitutional amendment.

I include the President's message on this subject at this point in the RECORD:

TO VOTE AT 18: DEMOCRACY FULFILLED AND ENRICHED

To the Congress of the United States:

The ballot box is the great anvil of democracy, where government is shaped by the will of the people. It is through the ballot that democracy draws its strength, renews its processes, and assures its survival.

Throughout the life of our republic, no single, enduring question has so engaged generation after generation of Americans as this: Who among our citizens shall be eligible to participate as voters in determining the course of our public affairs?

On four occasions we have amended our Constitution to enlarge or to protect that participation. In recent years, Congress itself has been attentive to sheltering and assuring the free exercise of the right to vote.

Such a concern is altogether fitting. Under a government of, by and for the people, the right to vote is the most basic right of all. It is the right on which all others finally stand.

Such a right is not to be idly conferred or blindly withheld. But the stability of our Republic from the beginning has been served—well and faithfully—by the willingness of Americans to lay aside the constraints of custom and tradition and heed the appeals of reason and reality to welcome into the American electorate those of our citizens fitted by the precepts of our society's values to participate in the exercise of the ultimate right of citizenship.

At the inception of the Republic, the promise of the new Nation was strengthened because our forefathers cast aside tests of religion and property.

At midpassage, America's moral strength was fortified when the test of color was removed by the Fifteenth Amendment. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 has reinforced this principle for all time.

At the beginning of the modern era in this twentieth century, reason and reality wisely prevailed when the women of America—through the Nineteenth Amendment to the Constitution—were granted the equality of citizenship so long denied them.

In 1961, the Twenty-Third Amendment to the Constitution gave citizens of the Nation's capital the right to vote for President and Vice President.

Four years ago, the Twenty-Fourth Amendment struck down the tests of the poll tax which had for almost a century disenfranchised thousands of Americans.

ENLARGING THE AMERICAN FRANCHISE

In all these instances time has affirmed the wisdom and the right of these decisions to enlarge participation in the Nation's affairs. Time, too, has already affirmed the wisdom and justice of our continuing efforts in the last decade to perfect, protect and shelter the right of all citizens to vote and to put an end to the unconscionable techniques of studied discrimination.

Today, I believe it is time once more for Americans to measure the constraints of custom and tradition against the compelling force of reason and reality in regard to the test of age. The hour has come to take the next great step in the march of democracy. We should now extend the right to vote to more than ten million citizens unjustly denied that right. They are the young men and women of America between the ages of 18 and 21.

The practice of admitting young Americans to the electorate at the age of twenty-one has its roots in the dim and distant mists of medieval England—but it is a practice and limitation without roots in the American experience.

Throughout our history as a young Nation, young people have been called upon by the age of eighteen to shoulder family responsibilities and civic duties identical with their elders.

At the age of eighteen, young Americans are called upon to bear arms.

At the age of eighteen, young Americans are treated as adults before many courts of law and are held responsible for their acts.

The age of eighteen, far more than the age of twenty-one, has been and is the age of maturity in America—and never more than now.

Reason does not permit us to ignore any longer the reality that eighteen year old young Americans are prepared—by education, by experience, by exposure to public affairs of their own land and all the world—to assume and exercise the privilege of voting.

The essential stability of our system is not

served, the moral integrity of our cause is not strengthened, the value we place on the worth of the individual is not honored by denying to more than ten million citizens—solely because of their age—the right to full participation in determining our country's course.

This denial of the right to vote limits our democracy. It diminishes every modern concept of citizenship.

The young people of America in this decade are far more ready, far better qualified, far more able to discharge the highest duty of citizenship than any generations of the past.

We know—and the young men and women know also—that this is so.

They are better educated than their counterparts of a generation ago. They graduate from high school and enter college in greater proportions. Already this group—although many have not yet completed their schooling—have a higher education level than the general electorate.

Mass communication and greater opportunities for travel expose them earlier and more frequently to the issues of the day than the young men and women of the 1940's, or even the 1950's.

The young men of today serve their Nation in uniform with the same devotion as their fathers and brothers of earlier days showed. But duties unknown a decade ago have summoned the devotion of young men and women alike, by the tens of thousands. Their participation in the Peace Corps, in VISTA, and in other community ventures has elevated our national life and brought new meaning to the concept of service.

For myself, I deeply believe that America can only prosper from the infusion of youthful energy, initiative, vigor and intelligence into our political processes.

We live in a world that is young and growing younger each year. Of all nations, none has more generously invested in preparing its young people for constructive citizenship and none has been more faithfully served by its young than has America.

Today, the young people of America are asking the opportunity to give of their talents and abilities, their energies and enthusiasms, to the greater tasks of their times. I believe their proper request can and must be properly answered by a national affirmation of our faith in them. For a nation without faith in its sons and daughters is a nation without faith in itself.

WHAT I PROPOSE

I accordingly propose that the Congress of the United States approve and submit for ratification of the legislatures of three-fourths of the States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide, as follows:

"The right of any citizen of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age if a citizen is eighteen years of of age or older."

In proposing submission of such an amendment I am mindful that:

The State of Georgia since 1943, and the State of Kentucky, since 1955, have permitted eighteen year old residents to vote.

The two new States of Alaska and Hawaii have permitted nineteen and twenty year old residents, respectively, to vote.

The first proposal for such an amendment was advanced in 1942 by Senator Arthur Vandenberg.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his 1954 State of the Union Address, urged an Amendment to lower the voting age to eighteen.

In the 90th Congress, more than fifty proposed Constitutional Amendments to extend voting rights to eighteen year old citizens have been introduced, and many of these measures have broad bi-partisan support.

The concept has been tried and tested. Its merit has been established. Its rightness is now beyond dispute.

FULL PARTICIPATION IN OUR AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

The time has come to grant our youth what we ask of them but still deny to them—full and responsible participation in our American democracy.

In this year of national decision, as Americans in every State prepare to choose their leadership for the decisive and fateful years before us, the Congress has a rare opportunity through the submission of this amendment to signify to our young people that they are respected, that they are trusted, that their commitment to America is honored and that the day is soon to come when they are to be participants, not spectators, in the adventure of self-government.

Every time before, when America has extended the vote to citizens whose hour has come, new vitality has been infused into the lifestream of the Nation, and America has emerged the richer.

Now the hour has come again to take another step in Democracy's great journey.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 27, 1968.*

SUPREME COURT RECONFIRMATION

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing an amendment to the Constitution to require Supreme Court Justices to be subject to reconfirmation by the U.S. Senate every 6 years. In other words, the appointment of a Supreme Court Justice would be for 6 years, unless prior to the end of the 6-year period, the U.S. Senate took specific action to reconfirm the appointment for another 6-year term.

The present law governing the terms of Supreme Court Justices makes their appointment a lifetime appointment, or until they voluntarily resign themselves. This is entirely too long for any man to serve unchecked in any kind of a job. Under this system, a Supreme Court Justice is, indeed, a law unto himself, and there is absolutely no check and balance on his decisions as a member of the Court.

Increasingly, our Supreme Court decisions are changing the entire course of the political, economic, and social life of this Nation. In the eyes of many the decisions of the Court are invading the legislative field, and many of their actions are not interpretations but actual law making, legislating, invasion of the area reserved under our Constitution for the Congress of the United States.

This Government of ours is a representative kind of a government. It was designed by our Founding Fathers to be one of checks and balances, with three coequal branches of Government, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. However, for three decades, an activist Court has been putting itself above the legislative and executive branches. It is time that this situation be corrected.

No person should be placed in a lifetime office where he is completely beyond the reach of anyone. It seems to me then we defeat the whole purpose of our society, to be a nation of law instead of men. We then become a nation of men, instead of laws.

This bill which requires the Justices to be reconfirmed every 6 years would permit the Senate of the United States, elected by the people, to take a look at a justice whose record was entirely out of step with the pace of the Nation. It would permit something to be done about his situation in a new appointment.

I think the time is long overdue that the Congress take positive steps to make the Court once against a coequal branch rather than an all-powerful branch of Government.

It occurs to me that the recent action taken by the President in the Supreme Court appointments subsequent to the Warren resignation points out the need to take action by the Congress on the Supreme Court.

This revision I propose would tend to remind the Supreme Court that it is indeed a part of this Government of the people, by the people, and for the people; that the Court is not completely a law unto itself.

STUDENT REPORTERS IN VIETNAM—XI

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, precisely because the tragic war in Vietnam has been placed on the back burner by events here at home, we should take special pains to keep abreast of what is now happening in Asia.

We are still engaged in a war whose high casualty rates are unabated, and in which nothing has really changed during the last few months. Our groping, halting efforts to find peace in Vietnam must not distract us from the enormity of the morass that persists throughout that land.

Throughout this year, my own impressions of the war in Vietnam have been influenced by the observant reports of two students from Queens College currently in Vietnam. The field reports of Lee Dembart and Ralph Paladino have been of great help to me in my efforts comprehending what is going on in Vietnam. Mr. Dembart's latest dispatch discusses some aspects of the current political scene in North Vietnam. I feel that his analysis of the North Vietnamese political scene merits careful study by all of us who seek knowledge about this war.

The article follows:

ARTICLES FROM PHOENIX—QUEENS COLLEGE

(By Lee Dembart)

SAIGON.—North Vietnam's announcement last week that it is seeking to loosen the ties that bind it to both Russia and China should come as no surprise to anyone familiar with the history of the Hanoi regime over the past ten years.

It is a history that has been marked, if Western observers are to be believed, more by infighting than by progress, more by a reflection of the Sino-Soviet split than by the

creation of a unique element which could be called North Vietnamese Communism.

At a time when the United States is on the verge of embarking on discussions with the North Vietnamese leaders, it is well to consider who they are, where they came from, what they believe, and what their own problems are.

For Ho Chi Minh has been trying for the past ten years to hold together two rival factions within his own government. And though he has achieved moderate success to date, the pressure of negotiations, coupled with Ho's advancing age, may finally have provided the wedge that will split the leadership in two.

In a speech more than eight years ago commemorating the 30th Anniversary of the Indochinese Communist Party, Ho said: "In the great international proletarian family under the Marxist-Leninist banner, our Party has such great elder brothers as the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Chinese Communist Party, the French Communist Party, and other brother parties embracing 35 million vanguard fighters of the working class."

Setting aside for a moment the French Communists and the 35 million vanguard fighters of the working class, the real and continuing problem for Ho has been the Soviet Communists and the Chinese Communists and their split. Powerful and important factions within the Hanoi government have established themselves as followers of each of the two Communist giants.

Much of North Vietnamese policy today can be understood as an attempt by Ho to bridge the gap between the two conflicting camps. North Vietnam has never publicly acknowledged its men-and-materiel support of the Vietcong efforts in the South. As such it has publicly endorsed the Soviet attitude towards wars of national liberation: They should receive verbal blessings, but not much more than that.

But at the same time it publicly claims the Vietcong-NLF forces are independent of it, it is a hardly debated fact that North Vietnam heavily supplies the South Vietnamese guerrillas.

As P. J. Honey, noted North Vietnam watcher, observed in 1962, "The Democratic Republic of Vietnam continues to pour guerrilla fighters and military supplies into South Vietnam, but does so secretly. In this way, Ho Chi Minh would appear to be satisfying Russia by his public statements and China by his covert actions."

Honey notes that at the beginning of 1962, strong pressure from the Soviet Union urged Ho to seek "a negotiated settlement of the reunification problem with an interim period of neutralism in South Vietnam, if this should prove necessary."

At the same time, the Chinese pressured Ho to launch a war aimed at overthrowing the government of Ngo Dinh Diem and reunifying the country by force.

It was the latter policy that was eventually adopted, although neither the Chinese nor the North Vietnamese foresaw the massive intervention of American troops which would block the forced reunification under Hanoi's control.

And there the matter stands today, except that at the moment, the pro-Russian faction, still favoring a negotiated settlement to the dispute, has at least for the time being gained the upper hand in Hanoi.

It is interesting that the leader of the pro-Soviet clique is none other than Vo Nguyen Giap, architect of the French defeat at Dien Bien Phu, and currently Minister of National Defense and Commander-in-Chief of the North Vietnamese Army, as well as a deputy premier.

A well-known but often forgotten fact is that Giap was installed as head of the Army because of his pro-Soviet, or rather, anti-Chinese sentiments.

When the Democratic Republic of Vietnam consolidated its position and gained firm control over the area north of the 17th parallel—which happened in 1955—the only military threat to the nation was posed by China. Thailand, Laos, and South Vietnam were all too weak to present any serious problem, but the Hanoi government seriously feared the Chinese, and as it inched into the Soviet sphere, it had even greater reason to fear its neighbors to the north.

Giap, whose anti-Chinese sentiments were no secret, was put in charge of the army, and accompanying his ascendancy, there occurred a purge of pro-Chinese officers in the armed forces.

Among those who lost considerable power in the purge was General Nguyen Chi Thanh, who remains one of the two senior North Vietnamese generals and a member of the National Defense Council, but who is effectively without influence.

Giap, meanwhile, who had been a member of the Indochinese Communist Party since 1933 (after having been arrested for political agitation in 1930), visited Moscow in April 1965, just after the beginning of massive U.S. intervention, and he solidified his ties with the Soviets at that time.

Why Giap sides with Moscow is a mystery, although various explanations have been offered. Official U.S. government documents say Giap was impressed with Russia's advanced military science, and was anxious to follow the Soviet lead in domestic and foreign affairs. This explanation seems as fitting as any other.

Further evidence of the split between Giap and the Chinese came just after the Tet offensive, when Peking was openly hostile to the military action that had been launched over the Lunar New Year.

"The Chinese Communist response to the Tet offensive was formal to the point of coldness," noted Douglas Pike, who also observed, "Only Giap, among all North or South Vietnamese communists, could have supervised the elaborate synchronization not only of the Tet offensive but of the broader Winter-Spring campaign of which it is a part."

Another important official in the pro-Soviet camp in Hanoi is Premier Pham Van Dong, a man who many consider the heir apparent to Ho Chi Minh.

The way the North Vietnamese government works, the Premier is the second most powerful man in the country, as he presides over the Council of Ministers, a group which is directly responsible only to the President (Ho) and the National Assembly, which rarely meets.

Dong is 60, comes from a family of government officials, was educated in Hue and later in Hanoi where, in 1925, he led a student strike. In 1942–43, when Ho was imprisoned by the Chinese, Dong became the effective leader of the newly formed Viet Minh.

He has led the North Vietnamese delegation at two important international conferences, the Fontainebleau Conference of 1946 (which sought unsuccessfully to settle the disputes between France and the Indochinese), and the Geneva Conference of 1954 (which ended French occupation of Indochina).

United States Government documents call him a "fervent Marxist and revolutionary," and add, "he is pro-Soviet rather than pro-Chinese. He is also an active promoter of the reunification of North and South Vietnam—on Communist terms."

Leading the pro-Chinese faction in Hanoi is Truong Chinh, who is chairman of the Standing Committee of the National Assembly. The Standing Committee assumes the executive responsibilities for the National Assembly when the legislative body is not in session.

Chinh's role as chairman of the Committee actually gives him less power than one might think. Though he nominally controls the committee, actual control rests with the Politburo of the Lao Dong (Communist) Party. To be sure, Chinh is a member of the Politburo, but so are Giap and Dong and seven other leading officials including Ho.

But Chinh is not to be discounted or his influence minimized. American officials here say he is the chief party ideologist in Hanoi, and they also point out that his adopted name, Truong Chinh, which means "Long March," should give some idea of his dedication to the dialectical interpretation of history.

Along with Ho, Chinh was a founding member of the Indochinese Communist Party in 1930, and was arrested by the French and convicted of subversion shortly thereafter.

When the Communist Party was banned in 1939, Chinh fled to China, where he spent the Second World War under the tutelage of Mao Tse-tung. Hence his pro-Chinese sentiments.

Current American documents say this of Chinh:

"Essentially a behind-the-scenes planner, austere and an extremist in outlook and temperament, Truong Chinh's is the inflexible mind of the fanatic to whom only the world of party doctrine has any meaning.

"Of all the top-ranking leaders in North Vietnam he is possibly the best-versed in Communist ideology and certainly the most hated. He has gone on record as saying: 'In the work of leadership it is necessary to make firm use of the army and the security forces'."

The second important member of the pro-Chinese bloc is Foreign Minister Nguyen Duy Trinh, who, until being named foreign minister in 1965, spearheaded North Vietnam's plans for rapid industrialization.

After serving 18 months in prison on political charges, Trinh joined the newly formed Indochinese Communists in 1930, but was again arrested in 1932 and was not released until 1945.

By 1955 he was in a position to accompany Ho on trips to both the Soviet Union and China in order to study their economic planning systems. In 1958 Trinh was named head of the State Planning Commission and made a member of the Party's Politburo.

U.S. documents describe him this way: "He tends toward an extreme Left-wing interpretation of Communism and is believed to be pro-Chinese in ideological inclination. His speech at the Albanian Party Congress in February, 1961, where he represented the DRV, was favorably disposed toward the Chinese. His co-operation with Truong Chinh has become closer over the years."

In addition to the pro-Soviet and pro-Chinese cliques in Hanoi, there is at least one important official in the government whose position, observers say, changes depending on the issue. His name is Le Duan, and he is the first secretary of the Lao Dong Party.

Along with Pham Van Dong he is rated the best bet to succeed Ho, but his future rests heavily on the success of the military effort in South Vietnam.

For in the debate between a negotiated and a military settlement of the war, Duan has aligned himself with the militarists, that is, with the Chinese.

Little is known of Le Duan himself, but observers feel certain that it will be a serious blow to his prestige and standing if a negotiated settlement to the war is achieved. It would also be an almost insurmountable setback to his career if there were to be a serious military defeat of the North Vietnamese forces or the Vietcong guerrillas.

Much of Duan's future, therefore, rests on a successful military outcome of the war, and he knows it.

Ho's attitude to date, as best as can be determined, has been to try to reconcile the

opposing factions and to adopt policies that take a middle course through the divergent views. Not only political considerations at home, but also the continuing need for both Soviet and Chinese support in the war has dictated the policy.

But if Hanoi's announced intention of moving away from both the Russians and the Chinese is to be taken seriously, the situation may have already gotten out of hand in Hanoi. Observers here believe it is more than a coincidence that the North Vietnamese are starting to chart an independent course at the same time they are talking about negotiating an end to the war.

There is no doubt that North Vietnam has had to travel a careful path between the two major Communist powers. In a speech delivered in December, 1963, Le Duan spoke openly of disunity within the party, and talked of "different, deviationist tendencies, mainly rightist deviations."

And the following year the Party's monthly magazine, *Hoc Tap*, made critical remarks about both "modern revisionism" (the Soviets) and "ultramilitant tactics of violence" (the Chinese).

Other considerations may also be forcing a reassessment of policies in Hanoi.

Observers speculate that pressure from dissident elements within North Vietnam may be reaching a level that can no longer be ignored. Nor can the critics, who have increased in numbers, be suppressed with ease.

Late last month the North Vietnamese daily newspaper *Nhan Dan* published an editorial on new government decrees against "counterrevolutionary activities."

Under the terms of the new regulations, which, according to *Nhan Dan*, were enacted by the National Assembly Standing Committee last October 30 and put into effect November 10, fifteen new crimes were detailed. But the crimes were so vaguely worded, observers say, that they could be applied against almost anyone under almost any circumstances.

And the punishments listed for the new counter-revolutionary crimes range from long prison sentences to death.

Commented P. J. Honey: "Since 1954 . . . security forces always had absolute powers of arrest and punishment. Citizens disappeared from their houses and places of work, and it was dangerous to evince any curiosity over their fate.

"In these circumstances there was no need either for a governmental decree on security or its public disclosure. That such a decree was passed by the National Assembly, signed by the President, and publicized in press and radio was certainly not due to any inadequacies in the authority of the security forces. . . .

"The publication of the vaguely worded decree carrying such dire punishments would serve warning on the regime's opponents and perhaps discourage any form of overt opposition. . . .

"Moreover, even inside North Vietnam's Communist Party doubts have been expressed over the feasibility of continuing the war indefinitely, and the decree will discourage wavering among the less committed party members.

"But the promulgation of the decree and its publication are the visible outward symptoms of a deep-seated unease inside North Vietnam."

Clearly, there is more going on in North Vietnam, both in government circles and in the country at large, than the occasional Western journalist is able to report.

Unfortunately, though, only American or at least anti-Communist sources can be tapped to get a picture of what is going on. And these sources are likely to be as distorting in their own way as are the North Vietnamese themselves.

While Hanoi all but conceals dissension and party infighting from the rest of the world, Western observers tend to pounce on even the most ambiguous evidence as proof of the weakened position of the Communist regime.

There is no reason to believe that the government in Hanoi is about to fall, but there is considerable evidence, scattered though it is, that all is not going well north of the 17th parallel.

And it may be that this domestic trouble is causing the North Vietnamese to re-examine how long and how hard they can continue waging a war in the South.

It just might be that domestic difficulties, and not the losses taken during the Tet offensive, have convinced Ho that now is the time to seek an end to the conflict.

Reports from Hanoi now say the Russian influence is the one that is being felt predominantly in the capital.

And the Russians have long favored a settlement at the bargaining table.

THE GARNISHMENT RACKET

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, testifying before a subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee some months ago, Sidney Margolius, a columnist for the Machinist and an expert on consumer economics, commented:

> Consumer exploitation has replaced labor exploitation as the real problem of our times.

One of the notable exceptions to the disappointing legislative record of the 90th Congress is its enactment of the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968. By this action, the Congress has made its stand on behalf of the American consumer.

Among the act's more controversial provisions is one which imposes limitations on the fraction of an employee's salary which a creditor can seize to satisfy the employee's debts. Placing this practice of salary seizure—known as garnishment—in historical perspective, a reporter for the Baltimore Sun remarks:

> In ancient times the man who couldn't or wouldn't pay his debts became a slave. In a later period he went to prison. The modern way is to garnish his pay—to withhold a part for the creditor.

I believe that garnishment is a particularly unfair way to satisfy a consumer's obligation to a merchant. If it were purely a collection device, I would have little objection to its proper use. Garnishment, however, calls into play the consumer's relationship to his employer. Although State law may prohibit an employer from firing an employee subject to garnishment, as it does in New York, the law cannot require the employer to enjoy making the troublesome bookkeeping adjustments that garnishment entails. Nor can it prohibit the employer from reflecting on the financial irresponsibility of his employee when promotion may be in the offing.

Furthermore, garnishment has an unsavory effect on the economy as a whole. At the House hearings, the four referees in bankruptcy asked to testify were of the opinion that the threat of garnishment is one of the leading causes of voluntary bankruptcy. Vern Countryman, a distinguished professor at the Harvard Law School, introduced statistics which showed that: First, those States with the lowest per capita bankruptcy filings are those that either prohibit garnishments or severely restrict their use, and second, the highest filings in relation to population tend to occur in States where garnishment is easily available to the creditor.

For example, Pennsylvania has a 100-percent wage exemption and had only 4 personal bankruptcies per 100,000 population in 1962, while California, which allows for seizure of 50 percent of wages had 145 personal bankruptcies per 100,000 population. In this regard, it should be noted that one out every six persons who files bankruptcy in the country does so in California.

And then there are the human costs. Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, testified before the committee that more people explain their unemployment on the basis of garnishment than on the basis of their police records. Vern Countryman estimates that the typical bankrupt has three or four dependents, so that the human distress is felt not merely by the 176,000 personal bankrupts, but by families whose members may number 880,000. My own investigation has shown that a thoroughly respectable citizen in New York cannot get credit in a leading department store because his wages were garnished—improperly—13 years ago. Small wonder that in the riots sweeping the cities of America, the installment, records in local credit stores were systematically destroyed.

In its deliberations, however, Congress has seen fit to limit, rather than to eliminate, garnishment. When the House was considering its version of the bill, I rose to voice my reservations about legislation which would alleviate, but not remove, one of the most pressing problems of the debtor. In light of the fact, however, that there are several States in which garnishment laws subject debtors to virtual peonage, I supported the bill.

The bill which came out of the conference committee and was subsequently enacted offers the consumer considerably less protection than the House bill. Whereas the House bill would have exempted the first $30 of earnings, and 90 percent of earnings beyond that, the Consumer Credit Protection Act exempts only 75 percent of disposable earnings—with a floor of $48.

In practical terms, if a married man with two children earns $80, the House-passed bill would have exempted $75 from garnishment, while the Consumer Credit Protection Act exempts only about $62.50. It takes little imagination to see the consequences of this legislative back-stepping on those working men who do not have the good fortune to live and work in States with more liberal laws than the one we have passed.

The major problem with garnishment, however, is not weak legislation. In my own State of New York, for example, we have one of the most liberal laws on the subject. The law exempts 90 percent

of a man's weekly wage from garnishment. It prohibits an employer from firing an employee whose wages are garnished only once in any 12-month period. In theory, this law is just and equitable for the creditor and debtor.

As I said on the floor of the House on January 31, however, "when not properly enforced, New York's statute can be as harsh, unjust, and unyielding as laws which even in theory give only minimum protection to the debtors."

And the New York law is not properly enforced. How could it be if 27,500 out of 28,000 New York City garnishment cases in 1965 resulted in default judgments? How could it be if one collection attorney who handles one-fourth of all garnishment cases in Brooklyn boasts of 100 percent default judgments? How could it be if this attorney tries better than three out of every five cases in the wrong court? How could it be if professional process servers sign sworn affidavits of personal delivery on 70 persons in the same day? How could it be if a process server swears that he sued one person on East 13th Street in Manhattan at 12 noon and another person on West 180th Street at 12:03 of the same day? And, how could it be if collection lawyers use the threat of garnishment to shake down consumers even before a judgment is rendered?

New York City, in short, has become the haven for unscrupulous merchants, finance companies, collection attorneys, process servers and city marshals, who victimize those people least prepared to defend themselves. It is nothing less than the garnishment capital of the country. Florida finance companies institute legal proceedings in New York, although their debtors reside in Florida and work for Ohio corporations. New Jersey residents working for New Jersey corporations find that their wages have been garnished by order of the New York courts. Clearly, the word is out: If you want to collect quickly, use the well-oiled garnishment machine operating out of New York City.

A constituent of mine recently was one of the victims of this machine. Using the Brooklyn civil court as its unwitting agent, this callous outfit conjured up a fictitious debt, conspired to violate the civil law of New York, committed perjury, obtained a default judgment from a court that had no jurisdiction over the debtor, and improperly garnished his wages.

I think it would be instructive for my colleagues to see the nature of this operation in some detail. By setting forth the facts of this case, I do not propose to convert the Congress into the administrator of the law it has passed, nor the guarantor of due process. These are matters better left to the local authorities and the courts. I merely mean to disabuse those Members who feel that their action in passing the bill—eliminates the garnishment problem. In short, I mean to impress upon my colleagues the need for stern local enforcement of the bill that we have passed.

My constituent, Mr. Floyd Boland, of Shandaken, N.Y., an employee of Consolidated Laundries, bought and paid for a food-freezer plan from Natpac, Inc., in Poughkeepsie, N.Y. In August 1967, Food Financiers, the collection agent for Natpac, began legal proceedings for an alleged debt of $91.46 by hiring Milton Kostroff, the Brooklyn attorney referred to above. Kostroff used William F. Niles to serve the summons and complaint on Boland. Niles, swearing in an affidavit filed in the Brooklyn civil court that personal delivery could not be made, served the papers by mail on August 21.

On October 30, the clerk of the Brooklyn civil court, relying on papers filed by Niles and Kostroff, entered a default judgment against Boland. The following day, Kostroff served an income execution—demand for garnishment—on Max Grabel, a New York City marshal who works in Kostroff's office.

Grabel served the execution on Boland by mail on November 3. On November 22, Grabel served the execution on Boland's employer, Consolidated Laundries. From November 25 until January 6, Boland's wages were garnished.

New York State garnishment law proscribes the action taken by Kostroff and others at every stage of this proceeding. In the interests of brevity, I shall limit my remarks to the highlights of their flaunting of the law.

Before wages can be garnished in New York, a court must enter a valid judgment. Before a court can enter a judgment, it must have jurisdiction over the defendant. In New York State, jurisdiction over the defendant requires proper service of a summons and a complaint. Proper service is by personal delivery, except when the server, after "due diligence" cannot find the defendant. Then the server may resort to delivery by mail but only if he affixes a copy of the summons and complaint to the defendant's home.

In the Boland case, the court that rendered the judgment—the Brooklyn civil court—had no jurisdiction over the defendant. The process server employed by Milton Kostroff, William F. Niles, made no effort to personally deliver the complaint and summons to Mr. Boland at his home or at any other place. That is, without a "diligent" effort to find Boland, Niles resorted to delivery by mail without affixing a copy of the summons and complaint to Boland's house, as the law clearly requires.

In addition to this jurisdictional defect, I should emphasize that the judgment was rendered by the Brooklyn civil court. The New York City Civil Court Act explicitly provides that civil courts have jurisdiction over cases only when the summons and complaint are served within the confines of the five boroughs. Since process server Niles resorted to delivery by mail, and since Boland resides in Ulster County, some 150 miles from the borders of New York City, the Brooklyn civil court had no jurisdiction to render the verdict.

I do not mean to imply, however, that the civil court was a conscious accomplice in this conspiracy. We have seen that the court had no jurisdiction to render the judgment. We are entitled to ask, therefore, If the Brooklyn civil court had no jurisdiction, why did it entertain the case and enter a judgment against Boland?

The answer is that the court was led to believe it had jurisdiction because of two perjured statements—one by Niles and one by Kostroff. New York law requires that if service is made by mail, the process server must file with the clerk of the court an affidavit that he resorted to this mode of service only after making a "diligent" effort to personally deliver the summons and complaint to the defendant. Niles filed such an affidavit, alleging that he had spoken to a "housekeeper" in Shandaken, N.Y., on 3 separate days in August.

By filing such an affidavit, Niles committed perjury. Look at the indisputable evidence. First, the Bolands have never had a housekeeper. On the days Niles alleged that he visited the Boland residence, Mrs. Boland was at home with her four young children and had no visitors.

Second, Niles' business is serving papers. His income is dependent upon the number of papers he alleges that he serves. He has no fixed salary. The going rate for serving a summons and complaint is $2.50. Who among us believes that Niles would drive 150 miles from Kostroff's office to Shandaken, N.Y., a trip which takes some 3 hours, to collect a fee of $2.50?

New York City process servers are viewed by both friends and enemies as ingenious entrepreneurs. Six hours of driving for $2.50 would not make Niles a leading candidate "for process server of the year."

Perhaps it is Kostroff who should be the process server. Although he is only an attorney—and an officer of the court, I might add—the perjured statement he filed with the clerk of the court could hardly be emulated by the professional process servers.

I mentioned above that the Brooklyn civil court has jurisdiction only if the summons and complaint are served in New York City. There is one exception to this limitation on the court's jurisdiction. If the transaction sued upon arose in New York City, the Brooklyn civil court has jurisdiction over the defendant even if the summons is served outside of New York City.

Kostroff took advantage of this exception to lead the clerk of the court to believe that the civil court had jurisdiction. Shortly after Boland had defaulted Kostroff appeared before the clerk and swore by written affidavit that the "transaction arose within the city of New York," even though he knew full well that the food freezer plan was negotiated in Poughkeepsie, N.Y.

With the jurisdictional facts of the case now made out on the face of the pleadings, the clerk of the court entered a default judgment against Boland. It is instructive to note, at this point, that not one judge had ever looked at the papers. Not one judge can be held accountable for this travesty of justice. Our court system which should encourage the confidence of our citizens in the honest, efficient administration of our laws, had become the unwitting agent of this cruel machine.

The New York law provides that a clerk of the court may enter default judgments. In light of this case and many others like it, I believe that this

provision must be reviewed. We cannot allow a clerk of the court, no matter how efficient he may be, to be the only court official we can hold responsible for this racket.

With the rendering of a judgment, the racket added a new protagonist, Max Grabel, a city marshal who grossed over $100,000 last year. Operating out of Kostroff's office, Grabel served the income execution—garnishment notice—on Boland and Consolidated. In their actions, both Kostroff and Grabel violated the clear requirements of State law.

New York law provides that after a judgment is rendered, the plaintiff's attorney should serve the income execution on the sheriff in the county where the defendant resides. Despite this perfectly clear statute, Kostroff served the execution on City Marshal Grabel and not on the Ulster County sheriff, even though he was fully aware of the fact that Boland resides in Ulster County. On the face of the execution, Kostroff used the brilliant ruse of identifying Boland as a resident of "R.D. Shandaken, New York, N.Y." By this device, Shandaken becomes a street in New York City and Grabel is given jurisdiction to serve Boland.

After receipt of the execution, the sheriff is required to serve it on the defendant "in the same manner as a summons." That is, by mail only if the execution cannot be personally delivered, and only if a copy of the execution is affixed to defendant's door. Needless to say, Grabel failed to comply with these requirements. One of the most inconceivable of images is poor Max Grabel, a marshal with an income of over $100,000 per year, walking the streets of New York City to find "R.D. Shandaken, New York, N.Y." so he could personally serve Boland and make his $2.50 marshal's fee. After "due diligence" to personally deliver, of course, Grabel resorted to delivery by mail, but just happened to neglect to affix a copy of the execution to the door of Boland's house in upstate New York.

If this act were not enough to mark Grabel's role in the conspiracy, he gives us even more evidence of his doings. New York law requires a sheriff to give the defendant 20 days to pay the debt before serving the execution on the defendant's employer. This entirely salutary provision is one last inducement to an employee to pay his debt and to avoid the embarrassment attendant to garnishment.

Grabel, however, did not see fit to wait the 20 days. The income execution was served on Boland on November 3. Therefore, the law gave Boland until midnight of November 23 to pay his debt before resort was made to Consolidated. In its morning mail of November 22, however, Consolidated found the execution from Grabel. In his eagerness to get his share, Grabel had violated one more provision of State law.

This is how the garnishment racket operates in New York City. Ensnaring innocent victims, distorting the legal process, using the courts as its ally. This group of human vultures subjects thousands of New Yorkers to its tyranny every year.

I am not the first to discover this horrible racket. The New York Legal Aid Society, Mobilization for Youth, and the Congress of Racial Equality—CORE—have done what they could to expose men like Kostroff, Grabel, and Niles. In its hearings several months ago, by colleagues on the Banking and Currency Subcommittee heard testimony of people familiar with "sewer service" in New York City. Attorney General Louis Lefkowitz held 4 hours of hearings on the abuse of New York State garnishment law 2 years ago.

Yet the abuses go on. Despite his investigations and despite his support of legislation designed to protect the consumer, Attorney General Lefkowitz must take his share of the blame, because, as of this date, his office has begun not one criminal prosecution in cases like this one.

Do investigations merely lead to more investigations? Will no one take the trouble to eliminate this racket which preys on law-abiding citizens like Mr. Boland? I have requested Mr. Lefkowitz and other authorities in New York to investigate this racket once again. I will do what I can to persuade these authorities that their investigations must be followed by criminal proceedings. Let us remember that law and order is a two-way street; we cannot expect private citizens to respect the law when they see these flagrant abuses of the law go unchallenged.

As Mary B. Tarcher, assistant attorney in chief of the New York Legal Aid Society wrote to me:

The problem has been studied to death. It is now time for action.

THE FDA: CHANCE FOR A CHANGE

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years the Food and Drug Administration has wielded a heavy hand in its evaluation of new drug applications. In its apparent concern for the welfare of the public it has assumed the combined powers of policeman, judge, and jury over the entire pharmaceutical industry.

In some cases the FDA's new found zeal for the protection of the public was long overdue. But, as in all cases where power is wielded, there is a potential, even a temptation, for overzealousness, for overdoing a good thing.

In this Government, based on a system of checks and balances, moderation is the key to successful exercise of power. When a Government agency such as the FDA relaxes too much the people of this country may be endangered by uncorrected abuses.

On the other hand, however, when an agency wields its power in the extreme, as has the Food and Drug Administration, the public is also endangered. Specifically, FDA overregulation of drugs has kept important remedies from the people.

The Food and Drug Administration has gone beyond all bounds of moderation and good sense in recent years in its handling of new drugs. It has lost sight of the public's welfare in its assumption of power. Where abuses are found, where problems are uncovered in drug control, they should be corrected. But public welfare must remain the prime goal of FDA operations.

Dr. James Goddard, FDA Commissioner, retires from his post at the end of this month. His place will be filled by the present director of the Bureau of Medicine, Dr. Herbert L. Ley, Jr.

Dr. Goddard infused much new life into the FDA. However, his often well-intentioned edicts ultimately lost consideration of the public's welfare. In the field of new drug evaluation and regulation Dr. Goddard and the FDA threw moderation to the winds, and embarked upon a voyage whose destination was simply persecution of the pharmaceutical industry, public welfare be damned.

Under the new leadership of Dr. Ley, the Food and Drug Administration has a chance to retain its new vigor in many areas. But, more important, it has a chance to relinquish its role of persecutor, of master of the inquisition, which it assumed under Dr. Goddard. There will never be a better time for the FDA to regain its sense of moderation, and to rededicate itself to the welfare of this Nation's public.

Bureaucracy lends itself to abuse and profligate self-indulgence in the wielding of power. Dr. Ley has a chance to avoid these shoals, and to set the course of the FDA on the seas of moderation.

It is my firm hope that Dr. Ley retain the vigor developed under Dr. Goddard, but that, strengthened by his new leadership, vigor be channeled not into persecution of the pharmaceutical industry, but back into protection of the public welfare.

At this point, I would like to insert in the RECORD a recent article by columnist James Kilpatrick in which he details recent abuses by the FDA:

DR. GODDARD ENDING HIGH-HANDED FDA REIGN

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Dr. James L. Goddard will be retiring in a few days as commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration. He will leave behind him, after less than two-and-a-half years in office, a record of high-handed arrogance unmatched since the heady days of Harold Ickes.

The gentleman rushed upon the Washington scene in January of 1966, a basket of chips on each shoulder. A divine providence had endowed him with vast energy, but alas, with small judgment. Dr. Goddard began by denouncing the pharmaceutical manufacturers: They were afflicted with "the disease of irresponsibility." He raced off in 52 directions all at once, bringing suits, making speeches, ousting respected members of the staff, reorganizing his department. He made pronouncements on everything in sight—drug advertising, new drug applications, old drugs, Zen foods, bio-flavonoids, vitamins, marijuana, the corner drug store.

Yet it may be that the performance of the FDA under Dr. Goddard in the matter of dimethyl sulfoxide provides the best single memorial to the commissioner's imperial career. Congressman Wendell Wyatt of Oregon has summed up the record in one word: Persecution. The word is aptly chosen.

Dimethyl sulfoxide, known as DMSO, first

appeared as a commercial solvent derived from wood manufacturing processes. Its nearly miraculous properties in the treatment of certain diseases began to be explored five years ago by Dr. Stanley W. Jacob, of the University of Oregon Medical School, and by other respected researchers in the field.

By the summer of 1964, six American pharmaceutical firms had started careful investigations. A European symposium on DMSO was held in Berlin in 1965. Japanese physicians undertook successful experiments with DMSO in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. Around the world, evidence began to accumulate of DMSO's amazing value as a therapeutic agent against bursitis, scleroderma, shingles, and other painful conditions.

The evidence was overwhelming. In one case history after another, as Dr. Jacob has observed, physicians were able to see improvement within minutes after the drug had been applied. A typical patient with acute bursitis, unable to move his shoulder in any direction, would achieve "dramatic increase in range of motion at the end of a half hour."

It is important to emphasize that DMSO's value apparently is greatest in treatment of some of the most painful conditions known to the human body—conditions for which no drug nearly so effective ever has been found. Those who have experienced scleroderma, in person or in a family, will understand what relief from this suffering can mean.

This is important, too: The investigations made it clear that DMSO has a remarkably low toxicity. It is as safe, says Dr. Jacob, "as any drug I ever have used or seen in medicine."

But one experiment on laboratory animals, in which massive doses of DMSO were administered—doses far beyond anything that ever would be prescribed for humans—turned up damage to the lenses of the animals' eyes. On Nov. 11, 1965, the FDA suspended clinical testing.

This was the situation when Dr. Goddard took over. At once he knew all about it. The investigations were "half-baked." They were "completely out of hand." They were "illegal." It was immaterial to him that further symposia (in New York in March of 1966 and in Vienna the following November) confirmed the impressive findings. Petitions, evidence, professional papers left Dr. Goddard unmoved.

One year ago this month, DMSO was licensed for prescription use in Germany and Austria. But as Dr. Goddard leaves office, the drug remains virtually unavailable to sufferers in the United States. He has imposed such Draconian restrictions on clinical testing that only a handful of individual patients have benefited. Running through the record is a sense of lese majeste. His supreme authority, and his supreme ego, were not to be challenged.

One thinks back to Dr. Goddard's speech to the drug manufacturers in Florida two years ago. They were "irresponsible," he said. If that particular shoe fits, perhaps Dr. Goddard would like to put it on as he walks out of office next week.

NONVIOLENT THREAT TO UNITED STATES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people are threatened with being nonviolently overcome—without a shot being fired. The threat is from emotional words and masqueraded ideas to disarm the will of our people to defend themselves from the fury of the international criminals.

The use of collective guilt is ageless—it is having been used to justify punishment in many instances by such as Communists, Castro, and Hitler. Surprising is that intelligent, freedom-loving Americans would fall for the "sickness gag" to be hoodwinked from seeing what is really taking place and who is to blame. Or mayhaps some fear a few are now able to see what is taking place in our country and who is to blame—and that is the reason for wanting gun laws.

Mr. Don Maclean, columnist for the Washington Daily News in his June 26 column carries the "disarmament by words" to a possible conclusion.

Strange that we have never heard the disarmament lobbyists such as Sears, Roebuck & Co., and the Lindsay-Brooke-Clark trio call for enforcement of the laws that now exist.

I place Mr. Maclean's column and other interesting articles on the frantic efforts of a few to punish the many at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Daily News, June 26, 1968]

(By Don Maclean)

The public seems somewhat confused on the subject of guns and violence. This is a situation tailor-made for this column, which specializes in lighting the path so that each may find his own way. (A nifty phrase, that; I suggest you clip it and use it as a bookmark.) On a recent Barry Farber show—he of the 50,000 watts, radio WOR, New York—a guest advanced the theory that the best way to end violence is to take guns away from people and close the National Rifle Association forever, if not longer. It was his opinion that violence and guns go hand in hand (or handgun in handgun, as it were).

Another expert pointed out that in England, even the police do not have guns and it has worked out just fine, because the criminals, being good sports, generally do not use guns either. At this point I should like to explore the gun-removal theory and see where it leads us. First of all, we take the guns away from all the good citizens trusting enough to give them up. This will leave the guns in the hands of the police, the military and the hoodlums.

At this point the honest man will have no means of protecting his home or store and will be forced to rely on Governmental agencies to do it for him. (As for street attacks on his person, he will have no chance whatsoever.) The next move will be to take the guns away from the police, who are constantly accused of using them wrongfully anyhow. Hopefully, our criminals suddenly will start co-operating as English criminals do with unarmed bobbies. Unfortunately, at this point, we might not have any policemen, because nobody in his right mind would want to be one.

Since this "de-escalation of violence" is the basic philosophy of international disarmanent, the next step would be to disarm the Armed Services, on the assumption that other countries, friendly and unfriendly, would do likewise. If we are wrong about civilian disarmanent, we will lose our property; if we're wrong about disarming the Army, we will lose our country. But in either or both cases, there will be no violence, since violence seldom occurs when the victim simply surrenders without fighting back. Those of you who have guns can now make up your own minds about surrending them. As for me, I must go now—I'm due at the range for practice.

[From the Washington Daily News, June 25, 1968]

GUN LAW NO PANACEA, COUNCIL TOLD

P. N. Davison Jr., head of a private detective agency, arrived at a public hearing before the District City Council yesterday with a crossbow in his arms.

He passed it up to the Council members as an "exhibit" for his argument that gun control laws won't stop crimes and killing: if guns go, "there are still weapons left," he said.

He mentioned, as an example, the suburban woman who recently drowned her children in a bucket and remarked "You can't legislate against buckets."

He was among three dozen speakers at an emotional, daylong hearing yesterday on a proposed law requiring registration of all guns, including rifles and shotguns, plus a waiting period on gun sales of up to 30 days to allow police checks on purchasers.

OPPONENTS

Speakers were almost evenly divided—for and against.

Opponents argued criminals won't register their guns; that the law would simply be an expensive nuisance for law-abiding citizens; that more judges and prosecutors to speed up trials and stiff penalties for criminals who use guns would do more to solve the city crime problem.

Proponents spoke of domestic quarrels erupting into shootings when guns are handy and quoted statistics about the drop-off in crimes with guns in New York after that city adopted a gun-control law.

Massachusetts State Police Sgt. E. J. Higgins, consulted by the Council as a national expert on firearms control, warned that passing a gun control law isn't as simple as it seems.

He said enough "long" guns (rifles and shotguns) are sold in Massachusetts every year to "equip three brigades" and "it would take a whole building" to file registration data on them.

WISDOM

He questioned the wisdom of a proposal that "long" gun owners in the District bring their weapons into police for a ballistics test with the results to be kept on file. He said this not only would keep a complete police unit "doing nothing else," and added that the rifling marks change with use so that the test results would not serve as permanent identification.

Council President John Hechinger said the ordinance might come up for a vote on Thursday, with some changes based on the advice citizens gave yesterday.

[From the Washington Daily News, June 26, 1968]

TOY GUNS LARGELY A PLAYTHING OF THE PAST

Sears, Roebuck and Co. has announced that its 1968 Christmas catalog will not list toy guns and what the giant mechandiser terms, other "toys of violence."

Meanwhile, a Sears official said yesterday, the company will not promote toys of this type.

And in Chicago, an officer of Montgomery Ward said his company "is about to make a similar decision" and will probably do away with toy guns and war and related toys.

Recently, both firms, leaders in the mail order business as well as in retail stores, restricted their sale of real rifles and ammunition. Neither firm has sold hand guns for several years.

NEGLIGIBLE SALES

However, most toy store owners and managers believe that guns and war toys constitute a small part of sales—a diminishing part—and there isn't much interest in these playthings anymore.

"Sears has made a marvelous gesture but toy guns and war toys are a negligible part

of our business," commented an executive of Children's Supermarts, which has five stores in the D.C. area and three more being built.

"Each of our stores," he said, "has 25,000 square feet with only 100 square feet for war toys. Compare this to 1200 to 1500 square feet for dolls, 1000 for housekeeping toys and several thousand for games."

"Our line of our gun toys," he noted, is mostly in cowboy and Indian toys, and our biggest seller in the war line is probably G.I. Joe. I surmise that children, many of whom have fathers or other relatives in the service, identify with them thru G.I. Joe or other military toys."

HOW ABOUT KNIVES?

An owner of a downtown hobby and toy store pointed out that toy knives may be as dangerous or more so than toy guns. "After all," he said, many murders and injuries are caused by knives."

He said that at least one of the large toy makers, Mattel, is giving thought to discontinuing its toy gun line. He added that many toy stores may softpeddle their sale of fighting and war toys.

He conceded that neither he nor other toy store owners know whether toy weapons are dangerous to children's training.

Several other toy store officials said they think the sale of toy guns and similar toys can be stopped with no financial loss to stores, but they remain unsure as to whether there should be a cessation of such sales.

[From the Washington Daily News, June 27, 1968]

LINDSAY, CLARK: STIFF GUN CONTROL IS ESSENTIAL

WASHINGTON, June 26.—Mayor Lindsay joined Attorney-General Ramsey Clark today in calling for strict federal gun controls. He said: "No state or local government can protect its residents adequately" without such regulations.

"The indiscriminate distribution of firearms throughout our society increases the chance of escalation when trouble breaks out in the cities," Lindsay told the Senate Juvenile Delinquency subcommittee.

CALLS FOR UNIFORMITY

"The most stringent regulations in our core cities will be ineffective as long as nearby states have less stringent or nonexistent controls."

The mayor, Clark, and others appeared at a jam-packed hearing conducted by Sen. Thomas Dodd (D-Conn.). Dodd's subcommittee is considering the strongest federal gun-control legislation in the nation's history, including President Johnson's proposal that all guns be registered and licensed.

GLENN, BROOKE TESTIFY

Both Lindsay and the attorney general, as well as former astronaut John Glenn and Sen. Edward Brooke (D-Mass.) strongly backed gun curbs like those proposed by the President.

"How long will we permit guns in the hands of the assassin to threaten our political system?" Clark asked, in obvious reference to the violent deaths of Robert and John Kennedy. "How many summers will we risk sniper fire which can terrorize whole sections of great cities? When will we act?"

Dodd read a letter from Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) endorsing the administration bill. Kennedy is a member of the subcommittee, but has not attended any Senate sessions or committee meetings since his brother, Robert, was assassinated.

Today's hearings were held in the huge caucus room of the old Senate Office Building, ironically, the same place where both Robert and John Kennedy announced their presidential candidacies.

CAUTIOUS COLLEAGUES

Although proposals for nationwide gun registration has widespread support in the Dodd subcommittee, as well as the parent Senate Judiciary Committee, Sen. Roman Hruska (R-Neb.) cautioned his colleagues not to rush action "just to do something."

Formerly a staunch foe of stiff gun controls, Hrsuka said: "In the haste of doing something good, the subcommittee should not adopt a policy of 'expediency and speed' while ignoring the value—or lack of value—of the bill."

Sen. Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.), a subcommittee member, came out against a federal registration act, maintaining that "the people in Massachusetts or South Carolina know better what legislation is needed by their states than does Congress."

[From the New York Times, June 27, 1968]

RAMSEY CLARK URGES SENATORS TO SUPPORT THE REGISTRATION OF FIREARMS

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, June 26.—Attorney General Ramsey Clark told a Senate subcommittee today that Congress would be failing in its responsibility to check crime if it did not include registration and licensing of firearms in a gun control bill.

Testifying before the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, he provided the most emphatic statement yet from the Administration on the need to include these two controls in the gun legislation being considered by Congress.

The National Rifle Association, meanwhile, registered with Congress its emphatic opposition to the new gun controls being proposed by the Administration.

Harold W. Glassen, president of the association, told the subcommittee that a campaign was under way "to foist upon an unsuspecting and aroused public a law that would, through its operation, sound the death knell for the shooting sport and eventually disarm the American public."

The Administration, following the assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy, initially proposed legislation banning interstate mail order sales of rifles and shotguns.

On Monday, the White House proposed even more stringent controls, by requesting legislation requiring Federal registration of all firearms and licensing by either the States or the Federal Government of all gun owners.

The White House, however, has left somewhat unclear whether it wants Congress to include the registration and licensing controls in a package gun control bill or whether it would prefer that Congress act first and squarely on the mail order legislation.

But Mr. Clark left no doubt that he personally believed registration and licensing controls should be included in any gun bill.

The Attorney General's basic argument was that while the ban on interstate mail orders would help stem the trafficking in firearms, it would not inhibit the criminal use of firearms or help directly in crime prevention.

A similar argument was presented to the subcommittee by Mayor Lindsay of New York and the former astronaut, John H. Glenn Jr. The latter testified as chairman of the newly formed Emergency Committee for Gun Control.

Testifying before an overflow audience in the Senate's large Caucus Room, Mr. Clark said registration and licensing of firearms were "essential to comprehensive control."

The advantage of a Federal ban on interstate mail order sales, as described by Mr. Clark, is that this would provide a framework for states to adopt their own effective controls over the purchase or possession of firearms.

But registration, he said, would provide "a tremendous aid to law enforcement" in checking on guns in crimes and in "smoking out" criminals who possess guns illegally.

With licensing, he said, it would be easier to keep guns out of the hands of criminals, drug addicts, mental incompetents and alcoholics.

COMMITTEE TO MEET

Under the Administration's proposal, no person would be able to purchase or possess a gun or ammunition without a license, which could be obtained only after a police department and a physician had attested that the person was qualified to possess a gun.

The question of whether to add registration and licensing controls to the Administration's bill will be taken up tomorrow when the full Senate Judiciary Committee meets. At that point, Senator Joseph D. Tydings, Democrat of Maryland, will offer registration and licensing amendments.

So closely divided is the judiciary committee that the outcome may depend upon whether Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Democrat of Massachusetts, ends the mourning over the death of his brother and appears at the meeting to vote.

In his first public statement in the Senate since the death of his brother June 6, Senator Kennedy, in a letter to Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat of Connecticut, the subcommittee chairman, said that passage of a strong and effective Federal gun law is "long overdue."

He made clear that he supported both registration and licensing of firearms.

DELAY IS SOUGHT

As the showdown approached, the opposition resorted to delaying tactics, contending that there had been insufficient hearings on registration and licensing controls for the committee to consider such legislation.

At one point, Senator Strom Thurmond, Republican of South Carolina, cut off the subcommittee hearings, which had been scheduled to run throughout the day, by objecting to a meeting while the Senate was in session.

Under the rules of the Senate, his objection forced a recess in the hearing, with several witnesses unheard.

Senator Roman L. Hruska, Republican of Nebraska, leader of the opposition to stronger controls, complained that the Senate committee was being forced to make "a snap judgment overnight" on legislation submitted only yesterday by the Administration and warned against "sacrificing the merit and propriety of legislation to the expediency of speed."

Sheldon S. Cohen, director of the Internal Revenue Service, estimated that it would require $25-million to establish the registration system, with its planned computers, and about $22-million a year to operate.

In arguing for stronger controls, Colonel Glenn, a friend of Senator Kennedy's, recalled how it had been his "awful duty" to tell six children of the Senator that their father had been killed.

"We simply cannot permit such senseless killing to continue," he said. "We must do all we can to prevent those who should not have guns from getting them."

Colonel Glenn said that the Emergency Committee, composed of prominent citizens, took the position that at the minimum an "effective" bill must contain registration and licensing as well as a ban on interstate sales.

Without these three key provisions, he said, any legislation "would fail to provide the American people with the safeguards so badly needed to control the unchecked flow and the irresponsible use of guns."

He twitted the National Rifle Association for opposing stronger gun controls. Noting that as a teen-ager he had taken one of the association's courses in marksmanship, which stressed responsibility and safety in the use of guns, he said he was "surprised that the N.R.A. would not be as insistent in fostering controls that would make guns less of a menace in this country."

Mayor Lindsay argued that Federal regulations were necessary to make effective state and local gun controls.

"As long as the escaped criminal or mental

patient or addict can obtain a firearm by crossing a bridge or mailing an order, no state or local government can protect its residents adequately," he said.

In response to a question by Senator Tydings, the Mayor said that if Congress failed to enact registration and licensing controls, this would make New York City's job of controlling guns "immensely" more difficult."

BOY WITH KNIFE AT AIRPORT

LANSING, MICH., June 26.—The police briefly detained today a 16-year-old Negro boy who was standing with a knife stuffed up his sleeve a few feet from Mrs. Richard M. Nixon as she watched at the airport to meet her husband. About 300 people were on hand. The airport lobby was decked with masses of helium balloons, which exploded constantly with loud popping noises and caused Secret Service agents to flinch visibly.

[From the Washington Daily News, June 25]

FBI REPORTS CRIME JUMP HERE, NATIONWIDE

Serious crime in the country rose 17 per cent during the first three months of this year compared to the same period last year, the FBI reported yesterday.

The increase shown in the first quarter of 1967 had been 20 per cent greater than the same period in 1966, which had been 6 per cent greater than in 1965.

All classifications in the national crime index showed substantial increases and FBI director J. Edgar Hoover called particular attention to increases in crimes of violence and to robberies, a traditional index to the general crime level.

The figures showed the District had 41 murders the first quarter of this year compared to 44 during the same period last year; Baltimore had 58 compared to 53; Richmond, 7 compared to 8; Alexandria, 3 compared to 2 and Arlington 2 compared to 1.

The District reported 1777 armed robberies to 1333 for the same period in 1967; Baltimore, 2043 and 1178; Richmond, 136 and 100; Alexandria, 76 and 40 and Arlington, 40 and 24.

Nationally, violent crimes of murder, rape, assault and robbery rose 18 per cent and property crimes, such as burglary, auto theft and larceny showed a 16 per cent increase.

NORTHEAST THE WORST

The report showed crime up 16 per cent in suburban areas and 10 percent in rural areas, with the Northeastern region of the country showing a 21 per cent rise, the North Central and Southern States each registering a 15 per cent increase and the Western states an overall 16 per cent increase.

Armed robbery nationwide rose 26 per cent and aggravated assaults with a firearm increased 23 per cent during the first quarter of this year over the same period last year.

Aggravated assault in the District showed a slight downturn—705 cases compared to 717 in 1967—while burglary jumped sharply from 3636 cases reported in the first quarter of 1967 to 4007 cases in the corresponding period in 1968. Auto theft also showed a dramatic increase: 1948 cases compared to 1688 cases last year.

LET US HAVE AN EFFECTIVE GUN CONTROL LAW

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, continued debate in Congress on a national, effective gun control law borders on the obscene and the scatological. There is no way for Congress to avoid an affirmative response to the growing demand for such legislation. Nor is there any way for Congress to evade its responsibility for putting an end to the carnage which has become so pervasive a factor in the American way of life.

The question is no longer whether Congress will pass an effective gun control law. It will certainly do so some day. The only question remains whether we do so now, or whether we wait until we bury more of our dead, until we have more maimed, crippled, and wounded taking up urgently needed hospital beds and other medical resources.

Just this past Thursday the President signed into law a bill dealing ineffectively with gun controls that we had enacted just 10 days earlier. Yet here we are, embroiled once again in needless controversy over action which we should have taken years ago. And should we be misguided once again, and attempt to foist upon the American people a travesty of a gun control bill, the issue will return to us, to haunt us once again, until our action encompasses the totality of the problem before us. There is for us no escape hatch from doing what we should and must do.

The facts justify the insistent demand by the American people for action now. In 1967, 7,700 murders were committed with guns in the United States, an increase of 1,200 over the number in 1966. In 1967, 55,000 aggravated assaults with guns were committed in the United States, an increase of 12,000 over the number in 1966. In 1967, 71,000 armed robberies were committed in the United States, an increase of 11,000 over the number in 1966.

According to the Associated Press, during the few short days between Sunday midnight, June 16, and Wednesday midnight, June 19, 79 American lives were lost through guns: 41 homicides, 28 suicides, and 10 accidental deaths. According to Coroner Andrew J. Toman, of Cook County, Ill., more persons died from gun wounds in Chicago during 1967 than died in automobile accidents. His statistics show that 607 firearms deaths were reported compared to 591 traffic fatalities.

The statistics clearly reflect the gruesome fact that death and destruction from guns in the United States keeps pace with our horrible losses in the war in Vietnam. It is indeed time that Congress respond to the voice of the people instead of the ravings and rantings of Harold W. Glassen, the phalloid spokesman of the National Rifle Association.

As Senator Barry Goldwater might put it: Rigidity in defense of a position is no virtue; if the National Rifle Association will not bend, it will simply have to be broken. In that event, Harold W. Glassen will have to fall back on his sole redeeming feature: a sense of humor. He insists that the untrammeled right of Americans to arm themselves to the teeth is vital to our national security, so that an armed citizenry can repel invading hordes. Unfortunately, so many of Mr. Glassen's armed citizens are so blind that they could not possibly distinguish between a redcoat and a continental.

The simple truth is that gun control legislation can be effective, if firmly grounded on a national level. On the other hand, the States and the municipalities are powerless to act in this area without constructive Federal action. For example, a study in 1965 by the commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Public Safety revealed that only six guns out of 4,500 recovered from criminals in that State during the previous 8 years had been stolen, and that almost 87 percent of the weapons were obtained not in Massachusetts, which enforces strict gun control laws, but in other New England States, which have lenient laws.

According to the police department in Newark, N.J., 80 percent of the guns confiscated from criminals in recent years were purchased outside the State of New Jersey, which enforces strict gun control legislation.

In 1965, when Nicholas Katzenbach was the Attorney General, he reported that in Dallas, Tex., and in Phoenix, Ariz., where firearms regulations are virtually nonexistent, the percentage of homicides committed by guns was 72 percent in Dallas, and 65.9 percent in Phoenix. In contrast, in cities which have effective gun control laws, the rates were: Chicago, 46.4 percent; Los Angeles, 43.5 percent; Detroit, 40 percent; and in New York City, 25 percent.

The need for effective gun legislation, is persuasively established by the facts. What needs to be done is equally clear and persuasive. I submit that the people will accept nothing less than the following:

First. Establishment of a Federal register, under the supervision of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which will contain the name and address of every private owner of guns and weapons, including a description of the weapon and its serial number.

Second. The establishment of a Federal licensing procedure and the issuance of Federal permits only to persons of sound physical, moral and mental condition, who pass prescribed eye and marksmanship tests, and a written examination on safety procedures in the handling of weapons.

Third. Prohibition of the interstate sale and shipment of guns and ammunition to any person not holding such a Federal gun permit.

Fourth. The establishment of a Federal ballistics, fingerprint system for all privately owned weapons, under the supervision of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This would involve a requirement that every licensed manufacturer and importer of guns fire two bullets from each gun before making it available for public distribution. These bullets, properly identified by name and serial number of the weapon from which they were fired would be filed in a national fingerprint of privately owned guns and will make simpler identification of any weapons illegally used.

The message sent to Congress on Monday by President Johnson goes a long way toward meeting these guidelines. In the interest of the people of our Nation,

we should move expeditiously to implement the President's proposals.

CALENDAR OF EVENTS AT THE NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following calendar of events at the National Gallery of Art:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—CALENDAR OF EVENTS, JULY 1968

Recent acquisition

A portrait by John Singleton Copley will be placed on view in Lobby D later this month. The three-quarter length portrait of *Mrs. Metcalf Bowler* (c. 1763) was bequeathed to the National Gallery of Art last winter by the late Louise Alida Livingston, a great-great-grandaughter of the sitter.

Mrs. Metcalf Bowler is the tenth painting by this artist to enter the collection and one which adds substantially to the National Gallery's representation of his American period. It was painted in the early 1760's, a significant time for Copley according to Professor Jules David Prown, who states that in portraits such as that of *Mrs. Metcalf Bowler* "Copley achieved a more convincing representation of three-demensional forms than anything previously produced by an American painter."

Mrs. Bowler, born Anne Fairchild in 1732, was the daughter of a successful Rhode Island merchant. Her husband served as Rhode Island's delegate to the New York Convention of 1765 and was a Superior Court Justice of his state. Copley is thought to have painted at least two other Bowler portraits, an earlier version of Mrs. Bowler, about 1758, and a lost portrait of Judge Bowler.

Special exhibition

Paintings from the Albright-Knox Art Gallery, Buffalo, New York continues on view through July 21 in the ground floor galleries. A catalogue of the exhibition is available with 21 color plates and 121 black and white illustrations. $4.00 postpaid.

Sunday film lectures

Art of Today, four auditorium programs combining films with lectures, will be given each Sunday at 4 p.m. this month as background for the contemporary American paintings in the Albright-Knox exhibition. Among the films to be shown are documentaries produced for the National Educational Television network.

Daily films

Two recent films dealing with art in the collections of the National Gallery are shown in the auditorium on a daily schedule.

Recorded tours

The Director's Tour: A 45-minute tour of 20 National Gallery masterpieces selected and described by John Walker, Director. The portable tape units rent for 25¢ for one person, 35¢ for two. Available in English, French, Spanish, and German.

Tour of Selected Galleries: A discussion of works of art in 28 galleries. Talks in each room, which may be taken in any order, last approximately 15 minutes. The small radio receiving sets rent for 25¢.

Albright-Knox Tour: A 42-minute taped discourse highlighting the special exhibition from Buffalo, New York. Portable tape units rent for 25¢ and 35¢ at the exhibition entrance.

New slides

2" x 2" Color Slides: Master of Saint Gilles, *The Conversion of an Arian by Saint Rémy* and *The Baptism of Clovis;* Morisot, *The Mother and Sister of the Artist;* Moroni, *A Gentleman in Adoration before the Madonna* and *Gian Federico Madruzzo;* Nattier, *Madame de Caumartin as Heber;* Rembrandt Peale, *George Washington;* Rembrandt, *Self-Portrait* (dated 1650); Roberti, *Ginevra Bentivoglio* and *The Wife of Hasdrubal and Her Children;* Rubens, *Isabella Brant, Decius Mus Addressing the Legions, Tiberius and Agrippina,* and *Daniel in the Lions' Den;* Jacob van Ruisdael, *Landscape*. 35¢ each postpaid.

Gallery hours

Weekdays and Sundays, 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Admission is free to the Gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Cafeteria hours

Weekdays, Luncheon 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.; Snack Service 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.; Sundays, Dinner 11:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

MONDAY, JULY 1, THROUGH SUNDAY, JULY 7

Painting of the week:* Constable. *A View of Salisbury Cathedral.* (Andrew Mellon Collection) Gallery 59; Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday, 12:00 and 2:00; Sunday, 1:00 and 3:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*, Rotunda. Monday through Saturday 11:00, 1:00, and 3:00; Sunday 12:00 and 2:30.

Sunday film lecture: *Art of Today: Pop. Speaker:* John Brooks, Staff Lecturer, National Gallery of Art. Lecture Hall, 4:00.

Sunday film: *The National Gallery of Art*, 1:00.

Weekday films: *The National Gallery of Art*, 2:00; *The American Vision*, 4:00.

MONDAY, JULY 8, THROUGH SUNDAY, JULY 14

Painting of the week:* Raphael. *The Small Cowper Madonna.* (Widener Collection) Gallery 10; Tuesday through Saturday 12:00 and 2:00; Sunday 1:00 and 3:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*, Rotunda. Monday through Saturday 11:00, 1:00, and 3:00; Sunday 12:00 and 2:30.

Sunday film lecture: *Art of Today: Junk Assemblages. Speaker:* Margaret Bouton, Curator in Charge of Educational Work, National Gallery of Art; Lecture Hall, 4:00.

Sunday film: *The National Gallery of Art*, 1:00.

Weekday films: *The National Gallery of Art*, 2:00; *The American Vision*, 4:00.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office or telephoned to 737-4215, ext. 272.

MONDAY, JULY 15, THROUGH SUNDAY, JULY 21

Painting of the week: Corot. *The Artist's Studio.* (Widener Collection) Gallery 83; Tuesday through Saturday, 12:00 and 2:00; Sunday, 1:00 and 3:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11:00 1:00, and 3:00; Sunday, 12:00 and 2:30.

Sunday film lecture: *Art of Today: Op. Speaker: Ann W. Kaiser*, Staff Lecturer, National Gallery of Art; Lecture Hall, 4:00.

Sunday film: *The National Gallery of Art*, 1:00.

Weekday films: *The National Gallery of Art*, 2:00; *The American Vision*, 4:00.

MONDAY, JULY 22, THROUGH SUNDAY, JULY 28

Painting of the week: Saenredam. *Cathedral of Saint John at 's-Hertogenbosch.* (Samuel H. Kress Collection) Gallery 49. Tuesday through Saturday, 12:00 and 2:00; Sunday, 1:00 and 3:30.

*11" x 14" reproductions with texts for sale this week—15c each. (If mailed, 25c each.)

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda. Monday through Saturday, 11:00, 1:00, and 3:00; Sunday, 12:00 and 2:30.

Sunday film lecture: *Art of Today: Abstract Expressionism. Speaker:* John Hand, Staff Lecturer, National Gallery of Art; Lecture Hall, 4:00.

Sunday film: *The National Gallery of Art*, 1:00.

Weekday films: *The National Gallery of Art*, 2:00; *The American Vision*, 4:00.

FINANCING OF THE POOR PEOPLE'S MARCH

HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Poor People's March on Washington has been a dismal failure, and I am thankful that it is over. The Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, has passed out a bill which will prevent another one when it is adopted by this Congress.

I am still besieged with letters from my constituents as to where the money came from to pay for this invasion of Washington. I regret that many citizens feel that the Government paid the bill, despite the fact that the news media have had many stories to the contrary.

The Washington Star carried one copyrighted story by Casper Nannes on this matter which has been quoted many times in the RECORD by my colleagues, and which shows where some of the support came from.

The article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 20, 1968]

PRESBYTERIANS VOTE $50,000 FOR SCLC

(By Casper Nannes)

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—The 180th General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. today approved an advance of $50,000 to the Southern Christian Leadership Conference for its development fund.

The check for this amount will be presented to leaders of the SCLC on May 30 in Washington as "the first evidence of the desire of the United Presbyterian Church to participate in its development fund."

In addition, the General Assembly also had a motion authorizing either today or tomorrow a special offering to be sent immediately to the Poor People's Campaign.

The special offering in addition to proposals before the 820 ministerial and elder commissioners (delegates) amounting to $200,000 for the denomination's Fund for Freedom.

Financial and staff support for the Poor People's Campaign already has been given by the United Presbyterian Board of National Missions, which has supplied $6,500 for food and medical expenses.

In an address to the assembly last week, SCLC's head, the Rev. Ralph David Abernathy, called upon the 3.3-million-member church to establish a $10 million Martin Luther King Poor People's Development Fund.

He later explained the major part of the fund "would be used by the SCLC to foster the development of ghetto-owned businesses, low-cost housing, self-help industries, and cooperatives in economically deprived areas of our nation."

The assembly passed a resolution Friday freeing $12.6 million of the church's investment funds for housing and business ventures in low and middle income areas. The move made the money available through boards, agencies and seminaries.

Among moves taken by other churches, the Episcopal Church General Convention last fall passed a measure earmarking $9 million over a three-year period for urban needs. Last month, U.S. Catholic bishops approved a statement calling for "substantial" contributions to the fight against poverty, and the United Methodist Church General Conference passed a motion urging the denomination to invest $20 million in this cause. Other denominations have set varying sums in the fight against poverty.

Among the other actions to come before the General Assembly before its week-long meeting ends Wednesday is a statement on the church's position on the Vietnam war. The closely guarded report of a special committee on Vietnam was scheduled for presentation today.

The church's newly elected moderator, Dr. John Conventry Smith, yesterday warned the General Assembly that riots in America, apartheid in South Africa and the war in Vietnam are "symptoms of the same worldwide disease."

"You cannot be a foreign missionary and ignore Mississippi and Harlem," Dr. Smith declared. "And you cannot concentrate on Puerto Ricans in the ghetto and Mexican Americans in Texas, and ignore Latin America. For the Christian, it is all of a piece."

A Lutheran theologian, Prof. Edmund A. Steimle of Union Theological Seminary in New York, called for a radical change in Christianity and religious bodies.

"Abolish the residential parish or shake the dust of it from our feet and experiment with other forms of ministries. Away with the old forms of worship. Down with the bureaucracy of the church. God is no longer to be found in churches, but in streets and ghettos. God's name is . . . change."

The churches, he contended, have played "the waiting game of business as usual. Churchmen reflect massive indifference to the problems of race and poverty, getting drunk on the peace of a Sunday morning in church where the entirely proper comfort of the Gospel becomes cheap grace in our hands."

As a result, Steimle said, young people have turned aside "disenchanted or in disgust." The present need, he said, is to "grasp the future in your bare hands and bring it into the present tense."

Statements on the church and government relations as well as the church and the ecumenical movement are among those to be presented to the commissioners before the session ends.

Mr. Speaker, my own Methodist Church has vehemently criticized me from the pulpit and in the news media. A special news story was sent to the newspapers covering my district which, as the story said, "Takes the hide off of me."

Mr. Speaker, not one of these critics attempted to get the Evening Star to change the story, they just wanted to hang me for publishing it. I have received a letter of condemnation "from 70 Methodist ministers in convention assembled" with no heading on the letter, no signature, and no return address. I have requested two groups of ministers to write me a letter setting forth wherein the article and newsletter were in error so I could correct any misstatement.

The following denunciation was received from Dr. Thomas Graves, pastor, Key Memorial Methodist Church, Sherman, Tex.

KEY MEMORIAL METHODIST CHURCH,
Sherman, Tex., June 10, 1968.

Congressman RAY ROBERTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROBERTS: In your May-June newsletter, 1968, you answer the query concerning the support of the Poor People's March on Washington by quoting from an article in the Washington Star. This article enumerates several denominational groups which have earmarked amounts during the coming three or four years for urban needs.

The last statement in that paragraph explaining the financing of the Poor People's March is "and the Methodist Church General Conference passed a motion urging that $20 million be devoted to this cause." This statement clearly infers that the Methodist Church is giving $20 million to the Poor People's March on Washington. This is not the case, and as a member of the United Methodist Church, you should know that the public press is a poor source of information about the programs of the church.

From the Daily Christian Advocate of the Uniting General Conference, April 29, 1968, I quote: "Delegates Thursday night approved a wide-ranging $20 million four-year response to the nation's racial and poverty crisis." The Quadrennial emphasis theme is "A New Church for a New World."

The annual conferences of the church will retain half of all they raise for this fund to be used in their local areas to alleviate poverty and racial tension. The other half will be administered by the Council of Bishops in meeting emergency needs on the domestic front, as well as work related to missions overseas, and relief and reconstruction in war ravaged areas.

One program feature will be the formation of the United Methodist Voluntary Service Corps, persons from age 18 to 30 in task forces for specialized assignments of "reconciliation or reconstruction."

The quadrennial program involves all United Methodists in a focus on three basic segments of American society: (1) The Black community, the Spanish-speaking communities and the American Indians; (2) the poor of every ethnic group, both in the rural and urban sectors of society; (3) the teenagers and youth of the church, and of no church, who feel there is no way to bridge the gap between the generations, and between themselves and the church.

It was the opinion of the General Conference that the church should either get involved constructively in solving the problems of our society, or give up its right to speak about them. Perhaps you feel we should not be involved in such problems at all, and many Methodists do, but to infer that we are giving $20 million to the current Poor People's March is simply a confession of ignorance concerning the proposed program of the church.

Respectively,

J. THOMAS GRAVES,
Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I am willing to accept Dr. Graves' explanation for the $20 million future pledge, but I do wish he would explain where the money came from that has already been spent.

I applaud the efforts of all churches to relieve suffering, spiritual, and physical, but I believe the Congress is providing some $26 billion for national welfare programs, which is more than we can afford in my opinion. I hope our churches will attack poverty and suffering at the local level. After all, every area is local to some church.

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE CONTROL ACT OF 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1968

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, now that the conference report on the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 has been approved, I hope that the President will facilitate presentation of his proposals for a comprehensive reform of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 required by section 20 to be submitted not later than December 31, 1968. The Treasury Department has been working on a program of tax revision for some 2 years and the whole problem has been before Congress for over a decade, so there appears no reason why the administration's report cannot be promptly furnished. It has been far too long delayed. It is deplorable that tax reform has not received the priority commensurate with its vital importance. The approval of the 10-percent surtax makes imperative a thorough reform of our tax policy so that it will truly serve the Nation's well-being and will restore the confidence of our citizens in the fairness of the Federal tax system.

Most amendments adopted over the years since enactment of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code have served to open up and enlarge all types of loopholes that benefit the wealthy at the expense of low- and moderate-income families. Now we are adding a 10-percent surtax to the burden of the average taxpayer while the privileged groups continue to enjoy the rewards of grossly unjust tax loopholes.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I could not support the conference report, since in my considered judgment the tax increase will not only fail to achieve its stated objectives but will compound the injustices and inequities in our tax structure.

The case for specific tax reforms has been thoroughly documented. Measures sponsored by me and other concerned Members of Congress are aimed at closing some of the numerous loopholes, the most glaring of which is the oil depletion allowance of 27¼ percent. It is really beyond comprehension why the worker in the oil fields will be called upon to pay a 10 percent increase in his already burdensome tax—14 percent of his net income in the lowest tax bracket—when his and the 19 other largest oil companies paid an average of 6.3 percent of their net incomes in Federal taxes in 1965. Compare, too, the ludicrously inadequate $600 personal exemption allowed him for a dependent with the appalling fact that various loopholes allow a good number of millionaires to pay no taxes at all or to pay at a ridiculously low rate.

In almost 3 decades the personal exemption rate, which was originally designed to relate to the cost of living and the expense of rearing a family, has been raised only once and then by only $100. The exemption was set at $600 in 1947

which gave a tax-free income of $2,400 to the average family of four. The exemption was too low then, and now, when the cost of living has risen about 50 percent, it is patently absurd. This frozen exemption, which means practically nothing to the wealthy, has a direct impact upon the average family. My measure to increase personal income tax exemption from $600 to $1,000 would provide a tax-free base of $4,000 for a family of four, still a modest exemption for wage earners who cannot benefit from the numerous concessions available to the wealthy. Plugging a few of the loopholes written into the law while the exemption has remained frozen would more than offset any loss in revenue resulting from raising the exemption to a more realistic level.

The increasing costs of local government in my area, caused in part by migration from other sections of the Nation, coupled with heavy Federal taxes, are placing the great majority of taxpayers, even those in better than average circumstances, in a real financial bind. I hear daily from constituents in all walks of life and economic brackets as to the ever-mounting problem of managing on incomes that are chiefly, if not wholly, derived from wages, salaries, or pensions. A couple living on a modest retirement income; a father struggling to pay college costs and maintain a satisfactory standard of living for his family; a single person whose taxes take an exorbitant share of a hard-earned salary; a couple with young children and a big mortgage who are allowed the same $600 exemption for dependents that their parents received a generation ago; a laborer who gets taxed every paycheck he is fortunate enough to earn; and so on. How can we in good conscience impose heavier taxes upon these people and at the same time permit others to escape paying their fair share?

The fact that the act does attack the abuses of industrial development bonds is most gratifying to me since I have sponsored legislation on this subject in the three Congresses in which it has been my privilege to serve. Nonetheless this action would suggest that some other urgently needed reforms could have been similarly included in the measure.

Congress has the responsibility for insuring the fairness and equity of the tax system. The vitality of a democratic society rests upon the people's sense of common justice and morality, and the defects in our tax structure cause deep resentment among those who must thereby shoulder an undue share of the burden. Tightening these loopholes would bring substantial revenue to the Treasury, ease the burden on the average taxpayer, and strengthen the national will and resolve to meet the critical challenges at home and abroad.

I have today written to the President, urging that his proposals be submitted without delay so that they may have the consideration of the Members and candidates for election to the next Congress. The voters must insist that those who seek national office declare themselves on the vital issue of tax policy and offer specifics on how best to distribute the burden of meeting our commitments at home and abroad. The groundwork must be laid without delay so that tax reform can be given the highest priority by the Congress and the administration that will be elected this November. I hope that our colleagues will join in letting the President know of their strong interest in prompt transmission to the Congress of his tax policy recommendations.

My letter to the President follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington D.C., June 27, 1968.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Now that the Conference Report on the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 has been approved by the Congress, may I respectfully urge that your proposals for a comprehensive reform of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as required by Section 20 be submitted at the earliest possible date.

Inasmuch as this problem has engaged the attention of the Treasury Department for some two years, I assume that its study must be nearing completion and that your recommendations can be in final form well prior to the deadline date of December 31. Early availability of your findings seems highly desirable so that they may be considered by those seeking election to serve in the next Congress. This vital question of tax reform will undoubtedly engender extensive debate and controversy next year and it is important that the groundwork be laid as early as possible and that the voters have an expression of the specific views of candidates in the November election.

I am sure you will agree the already overburdened general taxpayer who is now called upon to assume a 10% surtax has the right to demand that tax reform and revision be pressed with the utmost vigor and dispatch. The American people have the will and fortitude to assume any sacrifice required of them, but they must insist that their sacrifice be no greater proportionately than that incurred by other individuals and corporations. Unfortunately this is not the case under our existing tax policy which wrings the last cent of tax from salary and wages while privileged groups deprive the Treasury of some $40 billion a year in the credits, deductions and exemptions written into the laws. I would repectfully suggest, Mr. President, that a notable achievement of your Administration would be the sponsorship of a truly comprehensive tax reform program based upon the democratic principle that those who enjoy the most bountiful share of our tremendous national wealth must pay their proportionate share of preserving the society in which they are so blessed.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

JOSEPH G. MINISH,
Member of Congress.

ROCKEFELLERS: ANOTHER TAX-FREE FOUNDATION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, while the sweating working class of the United States will shortly be compelled to pay increased taxes, the Rockefellers continue to use the loopholes in the tax law to evade taxes with another tax-free foundation.

Certainly no one item, besides Federal waste and deficit spending, generated the recent tax increase more than the "gifts" of tax-free foundations to promote raising the taxes of the working productive citizens.

Like wise the international tax dodging giants are more responsible for our balance-of-payments crisis than the the individual spending of tourists.

Foreign aid is foreign aid; but the Rockefellers want a foreign aid program of their own to prevent the U.S. Government's being acknowledged for the aid. These tax-free foreign aid programs are wealth earned by our people leaving our shores—and without paying their fair share in revenue.

I ask that a report from the New York Times for June 27 on the latest of many tax evasion movements follow:

ROCKEFELLERS SET UP A NEW FUND

(By Kathleen Teltsch)

The Rockefellers have set up a new charitable corporation that will give the family's upcoming fourth generation a greater share in its traditional philanthropic activities.

The new Rockefeller Family Fund will begin with modest gift-giving—between $300,000 and $400,000 for the first year—and concentrate on projects of special interest to the younger members of the family.

One grant, for example, will go to a social center in White Plains known as The Cage, is a meeting place for teen-age youths. Another gift will help young Negro teachers study at the University of Ghana.

The new corporation was set up expressly to involve the family's younger members—there are 23 fourth-generation Rockefellers—in the philanthropy begun more than a hundred years ago by John D. Rockefeller Sr.

The tradition was continued by John D. Rockefeller Jr., who died eight years ago, and now it is carried on by his five sons—Nelson, John D. 3d, Laurance, David and Winthrop—and one daughter, Mrs. Abby Rockefeller Mauzé.

They, along with Mrs. Martha B. Rockefeller, the widow of John D. Jr., are trustees of the new fund.

Younger members of the family or their spouses will have five places on the board, but others will serve in rotation; David Rockefeller's son and daughter, David Jr. and Mrs. Neva R. Kaiser; John D. Rockefeller 4th; William J. Strawbridge Jr., son-in-law of Nelson, and John Spencer, son-in-law of John D. Rockefeller 3d.

David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, will be president of the new corporation, and Mr. Spencer, a writer, will be vice president. Dana S. Creel, a director of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, will be director of the new Family Fund.

Mrs. Kaiser, 24 years old, is the youngest of the Rockefeller children on the board. Mr. Strawbridge, who lives in Westchester, dropped in at the teen-age club to talk to its director, Leslie Fernandez.

"But he didn't know at the time that we were applying for any financial help," said Mr. Fernandez.

A RANGE OF CHARITIES

Initially, the new fund will take over much of the family's general program of giving to charities in Westchester County and on Mount Desert Island, off the Maine coast. These contributions made by the Sealantic Fund, set up 30 years ago by the late John D. Rockefeller Jr.

Sealantic is a word coined from Pocantico, where the family maintains its 3,500-acre Westchester estate, and Seal Island, where they maintain summer homes.

The range of charities includes gifts to hospitals and welfare and youth organizations. The Sealantic Fund will continue its work.

The new Family Fund has no endowment, but members of the family will make contributions on a regular basis, and these resources will be distributed annually.

The corporation is not expected to rival in scope either the Rockefeller Foundation—which was set up in 1913 and last year appropriated $39-million, much of it for work in the fields of agriculture, civil rights, university development and cultural affairs—or the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, which last year spent $7,299,855, partly for projects concerned with international relations, conservation and population.

The new corporation will be extended to included race relations and urban problems.

In addition to Mr. Creel, the director, the officers will be Robert W. Scrivner, secretary, and David G. Fernald, treasurer.

A SPEECH BY JUDGE KENNETH E. SHAW

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a recent speech of a New Hampshire judge, Kenneth E. Shaw. Judge Shaw made his remarks while speaking to the New Hampshire Conservative Union earlier this month. While I do not agree with all his statements, I believe that they show a deep, underlying dissatisfaction with the way things are going in this country today. This dissatisfaction I do share, and I therefore commend his speech to the attention of my colleagues:

Mr. Chairman and members of this Conservative Union: I wish to extend to each of you my deep appreciation for allowing me to speak here tonight at this hour of great national peril.

Just prior to the last presidential election I was privileged to talk to your group. The issue at that time, as it is now, is whether we shall continue down the road to national disintegration or whether we shall begin to chart a course for national survival.

Regardless of our efforts of four years ago, the people of this nation chose once again to embrace the socialistic policies which have been the hallmark of national leadership during most of the past thirty-six years of our national existence. These years have now brought us to the brink of civil war.

Across the face of America can be seen the gathering storm. The dry rot which has infected the roots of freedom through years of socialistic disease, has now surfaced. Tonight the camera of history can clearly record the carnage wrought by the New Deal, Fair Deal, the New Frontier and the Great Society. Historians may now trace the pathology of the millions of cancerous cells which have been injected into the blood stream of American liberty by these so-called liberalistic guardians of the public welfare.

Flight from responsibility has now become a refuge for our national leadership. The President is fleeing the chaos resulting from his policies and is abandoning the remnants of the Great Society. He has good cause to do so. The mirror of history reflects American leadership at its lowest level and the state of our Nation at its darkest hour.

Uncontrolled riots tear great gaps in our cities. Arson and murder are condoned in the name of civil rights. Students imprison college presidents, demand the right to supervise their own education and demand amnesty for themselves. The streets of our cities are paths of death for honest citizens. Women carry arms or purchase dogs to protect themselves at nightfall. Crime, in every category, is soaring. Smoke shrouds our national capital, while demonstrators roam at will with fire bombs and rifles. Police are ridiculed by press and television, accused of brutality and tried in our courts as common criminals. Soldiers are warned not to interfere with thieves and looters. Fire insurance companies face ruin as entire city blocks go up in flames from coast to coast. Business men are pillaged and robbed without recourse. Thousands of innocent families are homeless and their possessions destroyed.

Honor has gone out of fashion in America. Encouraged by civic and cleric leaders, young men burn their draft cards with open contempt for American laws and their country's safety. Leadership of the Great Society can no longer utter the truth. Each day the credibility gap grows wider and wider. Respect for the American flag and our fallen heroes is almost non-existent.

Decency has been written off as not symbolic of Americans. Morality has fallen casualty to the new philosophy of the Great Society. Hippies, flower girls, acid addicts and beatniks swarm through the streets of our cities. Colleges from one end of the Nation to the other practice immorality under the blessing of their instructors. Text books have been introduced in our schools advocating an end to family life. Billions have been poured into our educational system and standards of student conduct steadily decrease.

Over the world American prestige has withered almost to the point of no return. Our currency and credit are suspect in every Nation on earth. Foreign creditors are demanding that they be paid, not in dollars, but in francs and reichmarks. Our own citizens have no faith in the promises of their government. Series E bonds are cashed as fast as they are sold. Foreign nations have served notice on America that it must start to economize or it will be written off as a nation unworthy and unsafe for world leadership.

The national debt, published and unpublished, rises toward a trillion dollars. Interest rates are the highest in history and the dollar value is the lowest. Hordes of Negroes, goaded on by liberalists, roam the highways of the Nation demanding a free, unearned income, guaranteed for life by the Federal Government. Hundreds of shacks are erected in our Capital city in an attempt to intimidate our leadership. The entire economic system of free enterprise threatens to explode and the fuse is burning shorter every hour.

The relentless waves of inflation, powered by years of national extravagance, are striking our States, cities and towns with relentless fury. All are burdened with debt and the eternal cry is for more and more taxation. Economy as a policy for public institutions and private individuals has been ridiculed by liberalistic dreamers as an outworn and discarded policy of the dark ages. Every reputable financial publication in the Nation is warning of fiscal chaos.

So weak, impotent and unworthy of respect have American leaders so become that warships of this Nation are seized on the high seas and their officers and crew held for ransom by the pirates. No American is safe, even in the military services of the Nation.

Our armies have been crippled in Vietnam by a national policy which dares not advocate victory but is willing to settle for an endless no win blood bath for our Nation's sons.

The people of this country are restless, the Army is restless, the Navy is restless and men of our Armed Services are sending home weapons to protect their loved ones from a hurricane of violence which is bearing down on every citizen.

These conditions in America, unparalled in history since the French revolution, have laid this Nation wide open to communism. Karl Marx, in his wildest dreams, never envisaged such a situation could ever exist for Communists in this once land of the free and home of the brave. We are tonight witnessing the end product of the most insane and unrealistic political philosophy ever adopted by any nation in the history of mankind.

The hour has struck to declare war on the policies of these wastrel national leaders whose whole aim has been, not to promote the public good, but rather their own political fortunes through the institution of socialistic ideas.

I am suspicious of national leaders whose personal fortunes rise to many millions of dollars solely through inheritance or political manipulation of Government franchises while in pubic office. I am suspicous of these demagogues who tearfully declare war on poverty at public expense while possessing the personal means to substantially abolish poverty themselves. Men of full character, possessing uncounted millions and solicitous of the poor, should be the first to lay the bulk of their personal fortune in the lap of poverty, before seeking a position of national leadership at more than $100,000.00 annually.

No, my friends, their enormous wealth is not for the poor but for buying elections. Rose Kennedy, mother of the Democratic beatnik candidate, Robert Kennedy, recently confirmed this fact in an interview with Women's Wear Daily. When asked about the enormous amount of money being spent by Bobby to win an election she said, "Its our money and we're free to spend it any way we please. Its part of this campaign business. If you have money—you spend it to win. And the more you can afford the more you'll spend. The Rockefellers are like us—we both have lots of money to spend on our campaigns."

This statement by Rose Kennedy is the most frank confession of political chicanery in all of recorded history. Let Robert Kennedy explain this statement to the workingman who has no meat for dinner. Let him explain this statement against the background of his own wife starting off the poverty marchers to Washington with nothing but a milk and cracker diet. Let him explain why he chooses to buy elections rather than donate these millions to the relief of the poor. Let Mr. Kennedy add this statement to his March 1968 statement when he said, "The more riots that come on college campuses, the better the world of tomorrow."

A great nation dies slowly, even under corrupt leadership, but it will die. Our Republic has no patent on immortality. We shall not long exist when leaders serve not the public welfare but only seek power and glory for themselves.

The road of the past three decades of American history has been marked, not with freedom for the common man, but rather with the destruction of high principles which are indispensable to freedom.

During the past presidential elections you have heard treacherous liberalistic demagogues, seeking public office, inflame the populace with declarations of absolute intellectual, social and political equality.

My friends, nature itself has stamped every human being on earth with a graduated scale of value. No two people contain exactly the same attributes. Few of us are born with the capacity of a Daniel Webster, an Albert Einstein or an Abraham Lincoln. Few of us can be a Thomas Carlyle, a John Marshall or a Thomas Jefferson. Few of us can shake the world with our artistic achievements. There has been only one Michaelangelo, only one Titian and only one Goya. None of these men were legislated into greatness. All found their fame by hard work and diligent application of the capacity God has given them to be great.

The true glory of any great people is the glory that comes from service. Never the glory from being served by a national pater-

nalism. The master passion in America must be to preserve a burning belief in the divine right of the individual, in his inherent ability to improve himself, his social, his political and his economic lot. America has been a symbol of opportunity for the individual. The only equality worth having to a free people is the equality of opportunity.

Socialism has always resulted in a centralization which will destroy the individualism lying at the basis of all human progress. Take from one man the fruits of his labor and give it to another and you destroy both the donor and donee—for those who labor lose their courage and those who receive lose their initiative.

Every responsible conservative wishes nothing but the best for those, who by cruel misfortune or accident of birth, are condemned to poverty. It is these people who must be helped with all the resources of our society.

But the so-called war on poverty has bypassed the deserving poor. It has been nothing more than a political gimmick for the past three decades. It was inaugurated by Franklin D. Roosevelt for the purpose of buying votes. It is an execuse for the massive expenditure of public funds. The funds have been channeled into the pockets of scores of thousands of broken down politicians who spend most of their time campaigning for the administration who pays them lush salaries for doing nothing. The end result is that we have not abolished but are proliferating poverty.

This war on poverty has been carried on by deficit financing and inflation of the currency. Every time the Government inflates the currency or resorts to deficit financing, and it happens daily, the lights burn lower in a hundred thousand cottages of the poor and the specter of poverty looms larger to millions of others. Under this inflationary impact, savings rapidly disappear and the great middle class of this Nation will shortly be unable to exist as free and independent Americans.

Throughout these dark years conservatives have stood alone against the relentless tide of liberalism which has swept across the Nation washing away the solid foundations of our American democracy.

With ridicule and disdain the liberal commentators of press, radio and television drone their old cry that conservatives give only simple answers to complex questions. One does not grasp the significance of this liberalistic conception to a conservative answer until he realizes that any problem, no matter how simple, is a complex problem to the shrunken intellect of a liberal. In fact, the answer to a simple question, when answered by a liberal is as complex an answer as his twisted intellect can produce.

A classic example of a complex answer to a simple question is contained in an answer given by Gov. George Romney to the press. Alleged to have made a statement that he was brainwashed, Gov. Romney was questioned by the press as to whether he made the statement. Here is his answer: "I didn't say that I didn't say it, I said that I didn't say I said it. I want to make that perfectly clear."

But if this answer of Gov. Romney to a simple question complexes simplicity, it pales into insignificance when compared to the complexity created by the Johnson Administration just after the warship Pueblo was seized by North Korea.

The simple question at that time was whether the ship was in national or international waters. The answer could be yes or no or it cannot be determined.

Two days after the incident and after a thorough briefing by President Johnson, Arthur Goldberg, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, mounted the rostrum at the U.N. pounding a mass of documents before him, Ambassador Goldberg stated flatly that the Pueblo was in international waters and he had the proof. This man was an ex-Justice of the Supreme Court and presumably knew proof when he saw it. Yet, three weeks later, Secretary of State Rusk and Secretary of Defense McNamara went before television cameras of the Nation to declare there was no proof as to where the Pueblo was when it was taken. A few days later President Johnson stated that he was studying the problem. No one came forward to Goldberg's defense. His honor was abandoned with the Pueblo. Mr. Goldberg then resigned. Thus a simple answer became complex and its unresolved complexity carried to the grave the honor of the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations as a man who perverts the truth in this present administration.

It may indeed be true that simple answers are no longer possible in this liberalistic maze of contradictions. Certainly no one, not even a liberal, can tell whether the Federal debt is 400 billion dollars or two trillion dollars. The truth has been hidden by a liberalistic set of books which confound research and allocate Federal debt to countless divisions of Government which do not presume to include their debt items as a Federal deficit.

No one can be sure anymore as to the situation in Vietnam or anywhere else because the Government itself does not know and if it did it would lie about it. Only a short time ago, Vice-President Hubert Humphrey stated in Augusta, Maine that we would consider the Viet Cong in a new government. The same day this was denied by the State Department, where is the truth in this present administration? Economists, in Government employ, dispute each other, divisions of the Government contradict each other, a shroud of secrecy has been thrown over the executive department, Congress knows little of what is going on and the American people are blacked out from knowing anything.

Through a process of liberalistic osmosis, proud Americans have been taught to beg, to shun creative labor, to seek a false security at the expense of their liberties, to obediently wear a number marking the wearer as a possession of national paternalism, to question their priceless heritage, to be contemptuous of civil authority and disrespectful of their country's honor.

Liberalism has drifted far off the course of true democracy. Under liberal leadership we have coddled our enemies and kicked our friends. We have adopted dishonor as a national policy. We have paid ransom and crawled on our knees to our adversaries. We have tolerated disrespect for the American flag and cast out religion in our schools. We permit Communists to teach our children. We have been zealous to protect the criminal and too eager to punish the policeman. We have become too soft and too impotent to uphold our national prestige.

The redemption of America lies in a conservative movement, in a policy of demanding that law and order be restored, in a policy calling for a balanced budget, in a policy which places the future of America foremost among the nations of the world, in a policy which calls for a restoration of national dignity and respect, in a policy which in wartime calls for victory and not national dishonor, in a policy which places two hundred million Americans behind each soldier on the field, each sailor on the seas and each airman in the skies; in a policy which calls for swift punishment for those who desecrate our flag and our country's honor, in a policy which compels leadership to tell the truth, in a policy which recognizes morality and decency as anchor rocks of our republic, in a policy which demands economy to be a virtue, in a policy which demands that the government be the servant and not the master of the people, in a policy which permits every man to order his own destiny free and independent of unwarranted restrictions and servitude. When these policies have been inaugurated America once again will march in the forefront of the nations of the world, symbolic of a people who hold that honesty, honor, justice, morality and equality of opportunity are the finest foundation stones ever quarried for a republic from the mountain of eternal truth.

TAKE IT EASY, MR. PRESIDENT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Trenton Times, an excellent weekly newspaper published at Trenton, Mich., in its issue of Wednesday, June 12, 1968, carried a well-reasoned editorial on the subject of firearms legislation. The editorial convincingly makes the point that "no significant parallel can be drawn between restrictive gun laws and homicide," and, therefore, "gun laws are not the answer to curbing homicidal shootings."

In order to provide my colleagues with an opportunity to read the Trenton Times editorial, under unanimous consent, I place it at this point in the RECORD:

TAKE IT EASY, MR. PRESIDENT

President Johnson has taken the occasion of the death of Senator Kennedy to beat the drums for anti-gun legislation he wants the Congress to pass.

The President has been given some information that is in error and does hunters and citizens who wish to possess firearms an injustice.

The President cites as fact, a statement that three quarters of a million Americans have died by firearms since the turn of the Century.

This is not a true statement, it has no foundation in fact, there are no records anywhere that will support this statement. The statement has, in fact, been traced to a New York publicist hired by anti-gun interests.

Here, however, is a factual situation to consider: In New York City, only 18,000 out of eight million people possess firearms. In the State of California, there are no restrictive firearms laws. Guess where the rate of gun deaths per 1,000 population is higher: New York!

In studies across the nation, comparing cities and states, no significant parallel can be drawn between restrictive gun laws and homicide. Gun laws are not the answer to curbing homicidal shootings.

No case, resting in reason, can be made for restrictive gun legislation of the sort sought by President Johnson or Senator Dodd.

It seems, however, to be worthwhile to consider the nature of these crimes. First, they are nothing new. Since President Lincoln's assassination 100 years ago, we've established a record of shooting nearly one third of our presidents while they were in office.

By the nature of their office, American Presidents cannot be successful if they "hole up" and remain aloof from the people, they need public contact in order to be able to understand the temper of the times.

This puts them in a most vulnerable posi-

tion. Our Secret Service has said, there's simply no way to protect a President from a single-minded, determined killer.

So what's the answer, we admittedly don't know, but we do feel it's wrong for all the pundits to label the American people as a sick race. It's probably in the second case that a lot of the problem lies. Anyone who expects to see the French and German, English and Irish, Arab and Jew, White and Black, to mention a few mixtures, get together without considerable trouble, just isn't being realistic.

It's here where the trouble lies; in such a vast melting pot as this nation represents, we're bound to have trouble.

But, we can hope that someday, we'll all get along better than we do now, herein lies a partial solution.

A CRASH PROGRAM FOR RIGHT TO DRIVE

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, in a recent speech before this body I noted that while the Government requires the registration of motor vehicles and the licensing of automobile operators, the same requirement is not true in our handling of lethal firearms; at the time, I asked, "Do we believe that a car is more dangerous than a gun?"

Nevertheless, there are still many people who either fail or refuse to see the obvious absurdity in arguing that the registration of firearms will prevent decent citizens from obtaining these weapons. When was the last time that the required registration of cars prevented a good driver from obtaining and operating an automobile?

Mr. Speaker, Art Buchwald, whose syndicated column appears regularly in the Washington Post, has given us an extremely effective critique on the arguments against gun registration and licensing. In his usual witty, satirical manner, Mr. Buchwald comments on the formation of a mythical "Committee To Abolish the Registration of Automobiles and the Licensing of Drivers." Before we are tempted to drive down the road of irrationality and accept the false arguments of those who oppose meaningful gun control, it would be wise to take cognizance of Mr. Buchwald's editorial. Hopefully, his words will help us to see the necessity of extending equal treatment to cars and carbines.

I insert Art Buchwald's column at this point in the RECORD:

A CRASH PROGRAM FOR RIGHT TO DRIVE

"The Committee to Abolish the Registration of Automobiles and the Licensing of Drivers" has just opened up a lobby in Washington and I was happy to visit with Roger Crash, their spokesman.

Mr. Crash said, "We have formed this organization because the constitutional rights of all automobile drivers are at stake. There is no reason why anybody should not be allowed to own and drive an automobile in this country without his rights being infringed by local, state and Federal authorities."

"Obviously you're against registration of vehicles, then?"

"We certainly are. Most people who drive should not be inconvenienced by some bureaucrat who wants to know what they intend to use a car for. There is a conspiracy in this country to get everyone to register their automobiles, so they eventually can be taken away from them."

"Who is behind the conspiracy?"

"The Communists. They know that America would collapse overnight if their automobiles were confiscated. This country is going through an hysterical period right now. They blame all the automobile deaths and accidents on the drivers. But you're not going to prevent accidents by asking people to register their vehicles. If somebody wants a car to kill somebody, he'll find it, no matter how many laws you have."

"You're also against driver's tests, aren't you?"

"We certainly are. Why should you penalize the law-abiding average driver by making him take a driver's test just to catch a few nuts who are outside the law?

"By asking someone to take a driver's test, you are subjecting him to indignity and guilt by association. You can not punish the car-loving citizen who only uses his automobile for pleasure, in order to prevent accidents caused by lawless elements of our society."

"Mr. Crash, one of the arguments for registering automobiles and making people take driver's tests is that it prevents the vehicles from getting into the hands of children, criminals, and unstable people who might cause accidents."

"The bleeding hearts and do-gooders use this argument all the time. But the automobile is part of our American birthright. Has it ever occurred to you that in every police state the dictators make their people register their automobiles and take driver's tests?"

"Is your society for doing away with traffic laws as well?"

"We are against anything that would inconvenience a driver in any way. People must be free to do what they want with their automobiles. Our economy depends on motor vehicles. Every time you pass a traffic law you discourage someone from buying a car. Traffic laws do not prevent accidents, people prevent accidents."

"How do you propose to repeal the registration and driving test laws that are now on the books?"

"By launching a mammoth letter campaign. We're going to ask everyone who owns a car to write his Congressman and Senator demanding the repeal of all laws having to do with motor vehicles. This is an election year and I assure you, our legislators are paying attention to their mail."

"I must admit you make a strong case against automobile controls. Do you think you have a chance?"

Mr. Crash replied, "there is now a big hue and cry about automobile accidents in this country, but it will die down soon. And then our lobby will really be able to go into action. We're tax-free, you know."

INTERNATIONAL CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOLS ENROLLMENT MILESTONE WILL BE REACHED THIS SUMMER

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, if there is any one distinction which America can demonstrate before the world, it is surely our love of education, and our enthusiasm to bring education to all. We have an unbelievably large number of elementary and secondary schools, as well as an astonishing compilation of colleges and universities. But by far, the school which easily counts its former students and present students overwhelmingly above all others is a great institution in my own congressional district, International Correspondence Schools of Scranton, Pa.

In July of this year, ICS expects to register its 8 millionth student.

To put this in a somewhat realistic perspective, if in the year 1 A.D. a university had opened its doors to admit 4,000 freshmen, and if it had admitted 4,000 freshmen a year until the present, it would still not have enrolled as many students by 1968 as I.C.S. has enrolled since 1890.

The men and women who have enrolled at ICS represent all of America—the rich and poor, the lowly and mighty, the humble and the famous. They have learned everything from the very basic mathematics to the most complex engineering. They have learned everything from basic spelling to how to write an essay, a short story, a novel.

Above all, though, they have learned that ICS is an institution which could be a friend for life, where there was always new learning to be had, where old skills could be brought up to date by the simple use of the mails.

I know that many of my colleagues here in the Congress have taken courses from ICS I am certain that they would wish to join me in extending my warmest regards to this fine institution.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will here append a brief history of ICS:

I.C.S. ENROLLMENT MILESTONE WILL BE REACHED THIS SUMMER

International Correspondence Schools, the world's oldest and largest home-study educational institution, will attain a unique milestone in the field of education this summer by enrolling its eight millionth student.

I.C.S. forecasters predict the eight millionth student will be enrolled sometime in July or August.

"The importance of 'Mister 8 Million' is not the student himself," says Dr. John C. Villaume, I.C.S. President, "but what he represents. He will symbolize the 2.3 million adults today who are sacrificing leisure time to improve their career opportunities through home study.

"As the business of making a living becomes more competitive, the best opportunities will be grasped by people who have developed their skills and talents through special training in their fields."

I.C.S. students come from all over the world. I.C.S. World Limited throughout the free world, I.C.S. Canadian Limited, and I.C.S. of Latin America offer home-study courses written in English, Spanish, French and Portuguese and account for about half of I.C.S.'s more than 150,000 annual enrollments. Five percent of the I.C.S. student body in the United States are members of the U.S. Armed Forces.

Or "Mister 8" could be enrolled in a training program his company is conducting. I.C.S. has formal training arrangements with more than 8,000 U.S. companies, including 77 of the 100 largest in revenue.

After its founding in 1890, it took I.C.S. more than 15 years to reach 1,000,000 enrollments. But less than half that time will have elapsed between the enrollment of its seventh and eight millionth students. This acceler-

ated rate of growth can be attributed to more than just a numerical increase in population. Radical advances in technology and management techniques occur with such frequency in business and industry that even college-trained people must occasionally pause to take refresher courses to bring them abreast of new developments.

I.C.S.'s fifth millionth student was Air Force Staff Sgt. Joseph F. Webster of Connersville, Indiana. Somewhere in the Pacific in 1945, Sgt. Webster applied for an I.C.S. course in Practical Electricity. I.C.S. officials planned suitable recognition to mark the event. But before he could receive the news, Sgt. Webster was killed in action.

"Mister Six" is Robert E. Jones of Port Lavaca, Texas. He enrolled for the I.C.S. Mechanical Engineering course in 1953 while employed as a mechanic for the Aluminum Company of America. Currently he is Project Engineer for the Woodlands Division of Continental-Ensco Manufacturing Company, a division of Youngstown Sheet and Tube.

"Mister Seven" was enrolled in 1961. Then a machinist at General Electric Company's Large Lamp Equipment plant in Cleveland, Herbert H. Eggleston studied I.C.S. Drafting and Machine Design. He has since become a Designer with General Electric's Photo Lamp Division in Chesterland, Ohio.

To commemorate the event of the eight millionth student, "Mister 8" will be flown to the home office of I.C.S. in Scranton, for special ceremonies in his honor. He then will be escorted to New York City for a press luncheon, and an expense-paid vacation in that city. In addition, he will receive a lifetime scholarship for unlimited I.C.S. study.

The students that miss by one, "Mister, Miss or Missus 7,999,999" and "Mister, Miss or Missus 8,000,001," will not be neglected. Each will receive a scholarship for the course in which he has registered.

COMMUNIST CONFESSIONS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, coming out of Czechoslovakia is firsthand testimony on how the Bolsheviks "persuade" their prisoners to "confess."

Some might call their methods torture, others would classify the operation as "environmental health."

I include a Scripps Howard release, by B. J. Cutler, from the Washington Daily News for June 26, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, June 26, 1968]

CZECH TELLS ALL: HOW THE REDS GET THOSE IN DISFAVOR TO CONFESS

PARIS, June 26.—One of the most remarkable results of the new Czech Regime's effort to "democratize" communism has been the disclosure of how Reds get high officials to confess to imaginary crimes and testify against themselves at communist show trials.

The man who is exposing the technique learned about it first-hand as a victim of the infamous Slansky trials of 1952 which were ordered by the late Soviet dictator Josef Stalin.

He is Evzen Loebl, who was deputy minister of foreign trade when Rudolph Slansky was purged as general secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party. As a result of the trials, Slansky and 10 other top party leaders were hanged. Loebl was lucky to get off with life imprisonment.

WRITING BOOK

In today's liberalized Czechoslovakia, he is writing a book on the trials, and two chapters have been published in the press.

Loebl was arrested without warning in 1949. He was taken to security headquarters, given "old rags" of prison garb to wear and thrown in a cell for four days. On the fifth day, he was taken to the investigating officer, a Capt. Kohoutek.

Loebl was told an official of his rank could only be arrested on orders of the Communist Party's Central Committee. "Altho a traitor, I should have faith" that the Central Committee had proof, and "if I made a sincere confession" and "revealed the names of my associates," the party would see "extenuating circumstances."

"I objected that I was not aware of being guilty of any criminal or anti-party activity . . . I asked them to tell me what I was actually accused of, and give me a chance to prove my innocence.

A TRICK

"They saw in this a typically Jewish trick. They said I only wanted to find out what they already knew about my criminal acts so that I could admit only that, and withhold what they did not know."

Loebl soon learned the investigators had nothing on him, not even a false denunciation. "Their only document was my own biography. All they needed to do was to change the biography into an indictment."

This was quite easy, he found. When Loebl said he had worked under Foreign Trade Minister Ripka, all he had to add was "that I was his agent and betrayed the party on his orders." Similarly, he had signed a trade agreement with Yugoslavia "as Tito's agent" and with Russia "to harm the Soviet Union."

Many people believe false confessions are extracted by drugs, physical torture or political pressure—communist officials being persuaded "that their confession would serve the party."

"In fact, the method is ingeniously simple," accordingly to Loebl. "Altho 'to sit' in Czech often means 'to be in prison,' sitting was the one thing I was not allowed to do. I had to stand during the examinations, and I was not allowed to sit down in the cell.

INTERROGATIONS

"The interrogations lasted on the average 16 hours a day . . . altogether I had to stand or march some 18 hours a day. About six hours were left to sleep . . . If one can talk of sleep at all. Every 10 minutes the warder pounded on the door, and I had to jump to attention and report: 'Detainee No. 1473 reports: Everything in order.'

"Sometimes when the loud bangs on the door did not wake me, the warder came into the cell and kicked me.

"Another instrument was hunger . . . one was always slightly hungry, but it was bearable. However, the interrogation almost always lasted a little longer—one day one missed lunch, another day dinner.

"The combination of lingering hunger, of constantly disturbed sleep, of standing up the whole day and walking in hard leather slippers—all this was unspeakable torture.

"After two or three weeks, my feet were swollen, every inch of my body ached at the slightest touch. Washing became a torture, every step was concentrated pain. The interrogation—three officials alternated—was a never-ending stream of abuse, humiliation, threats."

Loebl's cell was below the interrogation rooms, and he could hear "the crying of their victims" all night. Sometimes he would be taken blindfolded to the basement and told he was about to be executed without trial.

BRUTAL GUARDS

Even worse than brutal guards and the knowledge he was innocent was the fact "that I was the victim of my own party, for which I had lived and to which I gave all I possessed."

It was this that finally made Loebl confess.

"What was the sense in upholding human ideals and principles, since everything was defiled and nonsensical anyway if these Gestapo methods were possible in a social state."

There was a sudden change in Kohoutek, his interrogator. "So long as I denied the charges and insisted I was an upright citizen, he was very unpleasant. However, as soon as I had confessed that I was among the scum of mankind, he became very friendly and talkative."

Kohoutek disclosed he had learned tortures from his "teachers" (the Russian Secret Police who were really in charge) that could crack anyone in two days. But these were not used in preparing public trials because once the pain stopped the confession might be repudiated. That is why Loebl's will had been broken.

TEACHERS

His statements were translated into Russian and submitted to the "teachers." Then they were rewritten to comply with the latters' notes.

"When I learned the testimony by heart, I was given a test, twice a day," Loebl relates.

In preparation for the trial, Loebl was fattened up with good food and taken outside for exercise. Each defendant was accompanied by his own interrogator when he went to court to testify.

"As soon as we left the courtroom and entered the corridor, they treated us like national heroes. We were served black coffee, and . . . sausages, ham and lemonades. We were offered cigarets, and a doctor took care of us—he measured our blood pressure and paid us touching attention.

"After every testimony, there was a big discussion about the quality of the 'performance.' The official whose defendant's performance in the courtroom was good took it as his personal merit."

To prevent suicide attempts, prisoners were not allowed belts or suspenders. This turned out to be a mistake in the case of a defendant named Sling whose "fattening cure" had not restored him to size.

"It so happened that Sling's pants slid down in the midst of the court hearing, and he stood there in his white underpants. The session had to be interrupted, and it was suspected that Sling had done it on purpose to ridicule the court. Naturally, this cast a shadow on the official in charge of him."

REHABILITATION

Sent to jail for life, Loebl was released in 1960 after 11 years behind bars. He worked as a warehouse clerk until 1963, when he was "rehabilitated." He is now head of the Bratislava branch of the state bank, and is an important figure in the new Czech regime.

To this day, however, he cannot forgive himself for having co-operated with the purge trials.

"I feel guilty for not having been strong enough to resist these horrors and the terror," he says. "I had no right to act in a manner contrary to my ideals, and I believe I shall blame myself for this weakness to the end of my life."

After he confessed, he recalls, he was allowed to sit down, to read books—"even books my wife had sent." He was not badly treated in prison after the trial. He even wrote a book of his own, memorizing it and writing it down after his release.