

community, expanding opportunity, stability, and self-determination, and making their maximum contribution to the strength and well-being of the Nation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 18716. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to authorize the collection of user charges, to permit any charges for customs services to be collected on a fixed rate of charge basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 18717. A bill to provide for a flat fee for services performed in connection with the arrival in, or departure from, the United States of a private aircraft or private vessel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POFF (for himself, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. ERLBORN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. WYMAN):

H.R. 18718. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to establish extended terms of imprisonment for certain offenders convicted of felonies in Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 18719. 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. ROTH (for himself, Mr. BELL, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. GUDE, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. McCLURE, Mr. MICHEL, and Mr. FIRNIE):

H.R. 18720. A bill to create a catalog of Federal assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 18721. A bill to provide that the highway use tax shall be payable on a quarterly basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 18722. A bill to establish the Commission for the Improvement of Government Management and Organization; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 18723. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that no reduction shall be made in old-age insurance benefit amounts to which a woman is entitled if she has 120 quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 18724. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to partially

suspend the duty on certain aircraft components; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. MAYNE, Mrs. MAY, Mr. BELL, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. McDADE, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. KUPPERMAN, and Mr. GOODELL):

H.R. 18725. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the assignment of a member of an armed force to combat area duty if any of certain relatives of such member dies, is captured, is missing in action, or is totally disabled as a result of service in the Armed Forces in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GALIFIANAKIS:

H.R. 18726. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

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

370. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the illegal operation of foreign motor carriers, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 18727. A bill for the relief of Hyung Sook Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18728. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Orlando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 18729. A bill for the relief of Doris M. Brinkman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18730. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ramesh Chandra Sardana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 18731. A bill for the relief of Maria Bulcao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18732. A bill for the relief of Vincenza DeLuca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18733. A bill for the relief of Stavroula C. Kolocotronis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18734. A bill for the relief of Caterina Leto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18735. A bill for the relief of Franseco Spadaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18736. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Taranto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 18737. A bill for the relief of Jaim Rolsman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 18738. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Occhipinti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 18739. A bill for the relief of Renee Aljean (Hogarth) Ballesteros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 18740. A bill for the relief of Raymond P. Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 18741. A bill for the relief of Dr. Loyola Jose Mascarenhas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 18742. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pedro J. Obregon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 18743. A bill for the relief of Santo Saplenza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 18744. A bill for the relief of Mathilda M. Guanso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 18745. A bill for the relief of Mr. Guido Barone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 18746. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clara Louise Carey Neita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROTH:

H.R. 18747. A bill for the relief of Augusto A. Amurao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 18748. A bill for the relief of Rosa da Gloria Vargas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 18749. A bill for the relief of Menita Remoran Agriam; 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:

378. Mr. DANIELS presented a petition of the town of Guttenberg, N.J., relative to the regulation of firearms, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMMUNITY COLLEGES HAVE AN IMPORTANT ROLE IN NATIONAL EDUCATION

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasant opportunity to introduce Kermit C. Morrissey, president of our community college of Allegheny County in western Pennsylvania, as representative of the American Association of Junior Colleges before the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development of the House Science and

Astronautics Committee. Because I feel that his statement on the national institutional grants bill, H.R. 875, is an excellent one and represents well the viewpoint of our fine new community colleges, I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to assure a wide distribution.

In Allegheny County since 1966 our system of community colleges has expanded to three campuses, for the north, south, and east regions of the county. These publicly supported colleges provide high-quality, low-cost education through two types of programs: college transfer courses leading to the associate in arts degree; and career courses leading to the associate in science degree.

In his position, Mr. Morrissey is responsible to the college's governing board

of trustees and the public for policies, procedures, and growth of the entire college system, including decisions on faculty, quality and type of education, and financial arrangements. He maintains liaison with all other educational institutions in the region, including the offices of the county superintendent of schools, the superintendent of schools of the city of Pittsburgh, the Catholic Archdiocese, and all public and private colleges, universities, and technical schools.

Prior to his present appointment, Mr. Morrissey helped to develop the Massachusetts community college network of 11 institutions, acting as chairman of the State's board of regional community colleges for 6 years. During this period

he was at Brandeis University, as executive assistant to the president and later as dean of students. While at Brandeis he was in the department of politics, and served as director of the Florina Lasker program in civil liberties and civil rights, and as director of the Wien international scholarship program. Formerly, he served more than a year as Massachusetts State budget commissioner and for 3 years as research director and fiscal and educational adviser to the Governor of Massachusetts.

Mr. Morrissey also spent 4 years as department director for the joint center of political studies with Mount Holyoke and Amherst College, and 2 years as research assistant at the Harvard Center for Field Studies. He holds A.A. and B.A. degrees from Boston University, did graduate work at Brown University, and is presently completing his thesis for a Ph.D. from Harvard University.

Mr. Morrissey is currently acting as chairman of the Subcommittee on Fiscal and Other Taxing Devices of the Advisory Committee on Higher Education for the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He is Chairman of the President's Council of Pennsylvania Community Colleges; a member of the Commission on Legislation for the American Association of Junior Colleges and is on the planning coordinating committee of the new Education Professions Development Act. He has authored numerous articles on education and politics for magazines, journals, and newspapers. The statement follows:

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE AND THE NATIONAL INSTITUTIONAL GRANTS BILL (H.R. 875)

I. THE JUNIOR COLLEGE INTEREST IN H.R. 875

1. *The junior college in the American higher educational system.*—The American Association of Junior Colleges and its member institutions have a strong and active interest in H.R. 875, the "Miller bill," and other proposals for increasing federal aid to higher education.

Junior colleges are one of the most rapidly growing sectors of American higher education in almost every state. Any major new programs for federal aid to education will affect these institutions, and, more importantly, the growing number of students who attend them. To put it another way, because of the increasing number of students attending junior colleges, the future supply of trained manpower in the sciences and other fields is closely related to the kind of support, from federal, state, local, and private sources, which goes to junior colleges as well as to other colleges and universities.

To cite a few statistics, the latest *Directory of the American Association of Junior Colleges* lists 912 institutions, which enrolled in the fall of 1967 about 1,671,000 students. About 50 to 70 new junior colleges open each year. About 200 additional institutions are now in the planning stage and are expected to open in the next one to three years. Enrollments are rising by some 170,000 to 200,000 students a year, so that there will probably be at least 3,000,000 junior college students by 1972.

State master planning in many parts of the country is encouraging state-wide networks of junior colleges, bringing higher education within commuting distances of a large part of the American people. Almost all of the more populous states—for example, California, New York, Pennsylvania, Florida, Texas, Illinois, Massachusetts, Connecticut—as well as most smaller states are mov-

ing rapidly toward state-wide junior college systems.

Many state master plans are strongly encouraging a growing proportion of students to attend junior colleges in their freshman and sophomore years, while four-year colleges and universities are concentrating to an increasing extent on upper-division and graduate education. The rising costs of residential four-year college education, changes in admission policies, and other factors also encourage an increasing number and proportion of students to attend junior colleges.

2. *The importance of the first two years in scientific education.*—H.R. 875 is concerned with improving education in the sciences and other specialized areas. The growth of junior college education means that a growing proportion of all scientists and many other kinds of specialists and scholars will begin their education in two-year colleges.

The decision to major in a specialized field, especially in the sciences and engineering, is often made no later than the freshman or sophomore years. Students who do not make this decision by this time are less likely to do so at all, and in any case may not have adequate preparation for a scientific major. Thus the courses offered, the training and ability of the instructor, the availability of adequate laboratory and library facilities, and similar factors may be critical in determining whether many young people enter upon a career in the sciences and similar specialized fields.

Other witnesses before this Subcommittee have cited studies which show that many outstanding scientists and scholars began their education at small undergraduate colleges with a strong emphasis on liberal arts and general education as well as on the sciences. These witnesses have stressed that the program proposed in H.R. 875 may fail to give enough assistance to undergraduate education, and to non-scientific courses, to attract and retain the best and most creative students to the sciences.

II. SOME CRITICISMS OF H.R. 875

1. H.R. 875 would provide relatively little support for undergraduate education either at junior colleges or at predominantly undergraduate colleges.

2. H.R. 875 is weighted not only toward graduate education, but toward additional federal aid for a relatively small number of large universities and graduate schools which already receive very substantial federal research funds not only from the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and to a lesser extent the Office of Education, but from many other federal agencies.

3. Most funds would go to the sciences, health-related fields, and other fields which already receive substantial federal support. The inclusion of the social sciences is a partial exception, but the exclusion of the arts and humanities and other important fields, which now receive very little federal support, would add to the present imbalance in federal aid programs which favors certain disciplines at a few large universities.

4. The formula would do little to redress the geographic imbalance in federal research and graduate education support. This means not only the flow of funds to a small number of institutions in a few areas, but also a flow of the most talented faculty and graduate students to the same institutions. While most universities and colleges wish to be service institutions for their states and their areas, the concentration of funds and talent at a few large universities tends to draw such resources away from other parts of the United States which also have pressing social needs.

5. None of the funds received under any part of H.R. 875 need be used for undergraduate instruction or for instruction at any level. All funds, even those granted under the

second part of the formula could be applied to research, possibly with the hope of obtaining more NSF, NIH, or USOE research grants and thus more H.R. 875 support in a later year.

6. A question may be raised as to whether the National Science Foundation is the best agency to administer such a program. This is especially true if it is assumed, as many supporters of the bill do, that the program will expand in time beyond the scientific fields to include support for the arts and humanities and probably all other fields of study.

NSF has had and should have a traditional concern for support of scientific research and graduate education, for maintaining and expanding our scientific capacity. It will continue to have primary responsibilities in this area. This is one reason why a good part of its support has gone to a relatively small number of top-level institutions in a few geographic areas.

NSF has moved rather slowly toward assistance to undergraduate education; only a small part of its budget in recent years has gone for this purpose. The deep cuts made recently in the NSF budget by the House may lead, unfortunately, to a reduction or elimination even of the present modest programs. Our own association has expressed the hope that NSF will do more to aid undergraduate education, especially through faculty development programs for junior college science teachers and other appropriate means.

Similarly, many NSF spokesmen have believed that the nation's top-level scientific capacity can best be expanded in a highly selective fashion rather than by the scatter-shot distribution of small grants to a large number of institutions. The testimony given before this Subcommittee by Leland Haworth, Director of NSF, and Donald Hornig, Director of the Office of Science and Technology, stress their belief that a concentrated effort to work with a few selected institutions which have potential for growth is a better way to produce top-level scientific capacity, both in research and in graduate education, than spreading small grants "one molecule thin" across all of higher education.

Given the strong commitment of NSF to selective aid to a smaller number of colleges, it appears that this agency, in terms both of its mission and its personnel, is not as well equipped as the Office of Education to deal with the broader problems which face all of higher education.

The Office of Education already has major responsibilities for undergraduate and graduate education in almost all fields—student aid, graduate fellowships, library aid, facilities, the developing colleges program, the disadvantaged, and so on. It would seem much more appropriate for USOE to assume the responsibility for a major new program of institutional support, with the assistance of an advisory or coordinating agency which would include other relevant federal agencies such as NSF, NIH, the Public Health Service (which has major responsibilities for health-related education), and other agencies. The Federal Inter-Agency Committee on Education might serve as a useful model for a new coordinating agency.

III. DOES H.R. 875 PROVIDE ADEQUATELY FOR FACULTY, STUDENTS, AND THE DISADVANTAGED?

1. *Faculty development needs.*—H.R. 875 makes no reference to the need for improved and expanded faculty development programs at any level, although the money could be used for this purpose as for any other purpose. Most observers of American higher education feel that there is an especially great need for new faculty development programs. This is particularly true in undergraduate education and at the junior college and lower-division level.

Two recent studies under the aegis of the American Association of Junior Colleges, both by Roger H. Garrison, emphasize the need for junior college faculty development.¹ Many junior college teachers have heavy work loads, meet large numbers of students, and have little time for research, reading, or even summer study. Many, for financial reasons, cannot afford to take off summers or academic years for advanced training and refresher programs. This problem is especially acute in science teaching and in other specialized disciplines, where advanced and refresher training is absolutely necessary to keep up with new developments. This problem is very well discussed in the recent report made by this Subcommittee on junior college science teaching.²

It is difficult for junior colleges and for most predominantly undergraduate colleges to recruit and keep good science teachers because so many other opportunities are open to them. H.R. 875, with its orientation toward research, graduate schools, and a smaller number of universities, would do nothing *per se* to correct this imbalance, and thus would make an already bad situation worse.

2. *Aid to the students: educational opportunity.*—H.R. 875 has been criticized because most support would go to a relatively small number of universities. The effect of this policy on the students is even more fundamental. Most young men and women in America do not and will not begin their college education at the handful of outstanding institutions which would benefit most from H.R. 875.

The future leaders of America in all fields, like the leaders of our past history, will come from every walk of life and every part of the United States. They will come from small towns and rural areas, from sparsely populated states, and increasingly from the depressed areas in our large cities. Very few of them will attend the more prestigious institutions in their first years of college. Most of them, again like most leaders in the past, will attend the smaller and less well-known undergraduate colleges and junior colleges in their own states and cities.

H.R. 875, by further encouraging the flight of talent away from the smaller colleges and the less favored states to the handful of larger research-oriented universities, would further disadvantage the higher education of these young people.

3. *The higher education of the disadvantaged.*—Both the federal government and most educators have now made a firm commitment to aid the seriously disadvantaged to continue their education, through student aid, Talent Search, Upward Bound, and other programs both federal and non-federal. There is general agreement that Negroes and other members of minority and lower-income groups should be encouraged and assisted to continue their education and to prepare for leadership positions in our society.

However, most members of these disadvantaged groups, because of income, racial discrimination, poor high school preparation, and other factors, will not attend the more prestigious institutions which will benefit most from H.R. 875. To some extent, disadvantaged students now attend disadvantaged colleges, or at least colleges which are hard pressed for the funds, the teachers, and the auxiliary services such as counseling, guid-

ance, and remedial education necessary to recruit and hold the disadvantaged students.

Disadvantaged students are likely to attend lower-cost colleges close to home—Southern Negro colleges in some cases, lower-cost urban colleges and to a growing extent junior colleges. According to HEW data, junior colleges already enroll a high proportion of all Negro and non-white students not attending Negro colleges. In New York City, for example, it is estimated that only 8 per cent of the students at public four-year colleges are Negro or Puerto Rican, compared to 25 per cent of the students at public two-year colleges. The same pattern can be found in many urban areas and in some rural areas. For example, the Southern Regional Education Board is now making special efforts to attract and hold Negro students at public junior colleges in the South. H.R. 875 does relatively little to help undergraduate education in general. It does even less, proportionately, for those colleges, four-year and two-year, which are making a special effort to help the disadvantaged.

To give only one example: the entire appropriation for the nation for all colleges under H.R. 875, Section 2 (c), support based on undergraduate enrollments is only \$50 million. On the other hand, the Higher Education Amendments Act of 1968 (H.R. 15067 as reported by the House Committee on Education and Labor) recommends an authorization of \$41,680,000 in FY 1969 and \$56,680,000 in FY 1970 just for programs for the higher education of the disadvantaged. Even these sums would meet only a fraction of the need.

IV. ALTERNATIVES TO H.R. 875

1. *General comments.*—Commissioner Harold Howe and Dr. Alice Rivlin of HEW have pointed out that there are literally dozens of possible alternatives to H.R. 875. The alternatives selected depend entirely on the goals or policies to be given priority for example, the extent to which one gives further support to increasing our research effort and scientific capacity at the major universities and those approaching "major" status; the extent to which one supports faculty development and instruction at the undergraduate (or graduate) levels, whether in the sciences or in all fields; the extent to which one emphasizes educational opportunity for everyone qualified and interested in continuing his education; the extent to which one emphasizes the education of the disadvantaged; and so on.

A major new federal aid program will not start out *de novo*. It will be added to the many existing programs for aid to research, graduate education, construction, student aid, and so on, programs administered by many different agencies, for the most part not by NSF. It is most unlikely that any major federal aid program now in existence will be eliminated. Therefore, H.R. 875 or any alternative proposal should be weighed against the entire federal aid to higher education program. It must also be weighed in terms of the budget and what appear to be the nation's most pressing needs, as well as the effort being made today by state and local governments and by private sources.

The HEW study which Dr. Rivlin described may make available, within a few months, some analysis of many alternative proposals, their effects in terms of institutions, students, and American society, and their estimated costs. Other groups, such as the Association of American Universities, the Association of American Colleges, the American Council on Education, and the American Association of Junior Colleges, are also considering and developing alternative proposals to H.R. 875.

President Robert Goheen of Princeton University, speaking before this Subcommittee for the Association of American Universities, discussed the recent AAU report, *The Federal Financing of Higher Education*. While AAJC cannot speak for all of higher education, it

is likely that the more balanced approach taken in this report, calling for institutional support for all of higher education, graduate and undergraduate, aid to research through an institutional grant system, and other forms of assistance, would win more general support from higher education as a whole than H.R. 875.

2. *Recommendations.*—It is likely that most junior college educators and many other educators, especially those deeply concerned about the education of undergraduates and the disadvantaged, could unite around a program which included the following:

(a) More adequate funding of many existing aid programs, especially construction grants and loans, aid to students, and faculty development programs at both the pre-service and in-service levels.

(b) Special attention to the problems of higher education of the disadvantaged, through student aid programs, special recruiting and counseling procedures, and auxiliary services for disadvantaged students who are admitted to college. An institutional support program would be especially important here, because of the additional cost to the college of special teaching, counseling, and other services, and the limited number of faculty and staff who now have the appropriate training, experience, and qualifications.

(c) An institutional support program, to be used for undergraduate and graduate instruction, not for research. It would probably be best to support undergraduate and graduate education as separate line items in terms of authorization and appropriations in order to assure adequate support for undergraduate needs. Aid should go to all regionally accredited institutions, for all fields of study, and should probably be based on a formula which would recognize the different cost levels for lower-division education, upper-division education, and for master's and doctor's programs treated separately. The program should be administered by the Office of Education, with the assistance of an advisory committee representing all relevant federal agencies. High-level coordination of all federal aid to higher education programs, possibly through the Office of the President, would probably be very desirable.

(d) It is probable that research needs should be dealt with separately from needs in undergraduate and graduate instruction. We understand that there is ample authority in the present law for the National Science Foundation and other scientific agencies to expand their institutional support programs and to develop additional scientific capacity either in research or graduate education. It appears that this Committee and the executive branch should review the problem of whether adequate support now goes to institutional support programs, and the desirability of continuing a selective policy of aiding a small number of institutions which appear to have potential for growth, as opposed to across-the-board institutional support for many or most institutions. Congress has the power, through legislation and appropriations, to require a change in present research grant policies if this seems desirable and if the NSF and other agencies will not change of their own accord.

Combining a research grants program with an aid to instruction program, as in H.R. 875, and permitting funds to be used for either purpose whether they are obtained in relation to research or instruction, appears to us a poor approach, making it difficult to determine the efforts of the legislation in terms either of research needs or instructional needs.

In conclusion, the American Association of Junior Colleges has appreciated the opportunity to appear before this Committee and to express our concerns about H.R. 875. We stand ready to help the Committee in any way we can.

¹ *Faculty: Issues and Problems*. (American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C., 1967) and *Teaching in a Junior College: A Brief Professional Orientation*. (American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C., 1968).

² U.S. 90th Congress, 1st Session, Report of the National Science Foundation to the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, *The Junior College and Education in the Sciences*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967. 103 pp.

**J. E. B. STUART HIGH SCHOOL
CREW WINS ROYAL REGATTA**

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, all of Virginia is proud of the J. E. B. Stuart High School crew which won the Royal Regatta at Henley, England.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an article on the subject by David Hafner, as told to Denny McAuliffe, and published in the Washington Daily News of July 17, 1968.

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

J. E. B. STUART HIGH SCHOOL CREW WINS ROYAL REGATTA

(By David Hafner as told to Denny McAuliffe)

(NOTE.—David Hafner is the coxswain of the Stuart High School crew. He's the smallest member of the crew and the only one who really gets to see the races. Here's his account of the victories at Henley, England.)

No one was really nervous before our first race. Someone in Henley told us that Oundle Grammar School didn't have a good crew, so our victory—by three and a half lengths—just wasn't that important.

But the next day against Ealing, by far our worst race even tho we won, was important. In fact, the most important of all.

During the Ealing race we weren't together. The guys weren't thinking. They were talking back and forth during the race and you can't pull your weight when you talk. I just let them pound it out because I felt it was something that coach Mike Gasch had to handle.

I've never seen him madder. After the race he told us we were going to blow the whole thing; that if we didn't shape up we were going to lose.

If we hadn't rowed the Ealing race like we did, if Gasch hadn't gotten on us like he did, we never would have won the Princess Elizabeth Cup.

Actually, the problem began during the month between the nationals and the flight to Henley. We got tired of each other, it's that simple. High school guys can't be together that long without getting on each others' nerves.

We changed, tho, thanks to Gasch. We had been so wound up in the fund raising drive and the practices that we hadn't realized what Henley was all about. It's the world championship of schoolboy rowing. We couldn't believe that's what we could win—until Gasch's speech after Ealing.

Then we knew.

We arrived nine days before the races began. We rowed twice a day for about five miles a practice. In our spare time, a lot of the guys went shopping and exploring. We also went on tours to get our minds off the race.

To lose weight I went to the Henley brewery in my spare time. The last three days before the regatta began. I had to shovel malt into a furnace and sometimes it got as hot as 200 degrees in there. But I had a good time and lost nine pounds in the brewery.

There were other coxswains from other crews there, and I "messed their minds," as Gasch says. I told them lies about how we rowed; that we were a high stroking crew; that we got off to a slow start; that we rowed a poor middle race.

Otherwise, our off-times relatively boring. There was never one outstanding event that made the whole day for us. All we did was eat, sleep and row. We played croquet every

night before we went to bed. That was the big event of our evenings. Gasch always lost.

I think that even the first two races were boring for the guys until Gasch let them have it. After the Ealing race, we finally became serious. We were out to win it and we were mad.

After we beat Shrewsbury on Friday, we were out to kill. We had signs hanging all over our rooms saying "kill," "kill," "kill". We weren't to much worried about our Saturday morning semi-final against Nautical College. Eton was the school we were thinking about. We knew we would beat Nautical.

We rowed Eton like scared rabbits. And the closer we got to the finish line, the more scared we were.

After the mile, I looked back at Eton and began calculating how we would finish with our sprint against theirs. They were sprinting pretty fast and were walking on us. I was terrified.

I kept thinking about that \$11,500 and all the time and effort it took to raise it, and the people back home who had put their faith and money in us. We were going to do it for the folks back home who did it for us. That's why we won.

What can you say after winning a race you had always dreamed of; something which is the dream of all schoolboy rowers. All I have to say, really, is that it drew the community a little closer together than it was before and that it shows that a community, working together, can do anything it wants to.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1968

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I reviewed a brief letter of support for the Foreign Assistance Act of 1968 from a leading businessman, Mr. Hal Dean, president of Ralston Purina Co. Mr. Dean specifically expressed grave concern over efforts in the House of Representatives to impose a moratorium on foreign aid. He observed that such a moratorium would hurt American business.

Mr. Speaker, attached to Mr. Dean's letter was an article from the July 12 edition of the Journal of Commerce. This article succinctly pointed out that a moratorium would spell corporate trouble for many companies inasmuch as the aid program first, finances well over \$1 billion a year in American exports; second, helps underwrite corporate investments abroad through such programs as the investment guarantees and investment surveys; and, third, provides technical assistance funds for projects.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the American business community directly benefits from the foreign aid program. I include the text of this Journal of Commerce article in the RECORD. I know my colleagues will find it timely as we prepare tomorrow to complete consideration of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1968:

WHITE HOUSE ASKS DELAY FOR AID BILL

WASHINGTON, July 11.—The White House has asked the House leadership to delay action on the foreign aid bill, in the fear that the bill would be defeated if a floor vote were taken today.

The House now is scheduled to take up the \$2.1 billion economic and military assistance bill next Tuesday.

House leaders reportedly are unable to control a "grass roots" drive in the chamber aimed at fixing a one-year moratorium on U.S. foreign aid authorizations.

CORPORATE TROUBLE

For U.S. business, a moratorium would spell corporate trouble. Not only does the foreign aid program finance well over \$1 billion a year in American exports, but it helps underwrite corporate investments abroad and provides technical assistance funds for private projects.

The aid program has had progressively stiffer going the last few years in Congress, but officials call this year the worst ever in the program's 21-year history.

A large part of the House "revolt" is laid to the notion of many urban district congressmen that the government should cut out foreign aid, before domestic welfare programs get whittled away.

Not only will a strong effort be made for a moratorium, but, falling that, the House will almost certainly slash the foreign assistance request to under \$2 billion. President Johnson originally asked \$2.9 billion—all but \$400 million for economic development purposes.

Refusing a new authorization for one year, say moratorium advocates, will not stop foreign aid, because there are billions of dollars in "the pipeline"—authorized but not disbursed.

But administration aides insist that a fiscal 1969 authorization is essential to keep funds flowing as they should. Otherwise, foreign aid will drop off, they argue, and the moratorium might well signal the start of the end for the aid program, at a time when so many poorer nations need more, not less, help.

But the needy countries won't be the only to suffer. U.S. private investors will be set back. A moratorium would cancel Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) local currency loans for foreign market development, halt government financing of investment surveys as well as A.I.D.'s program of supplementing U.S. industry "agribusiness" initiatives in the less advanced nations.

The moratorium also would force the aid agency to either reduce sharply the number and size of its private investment guarantees for U.S. firms operating in poorer lands or to stop this program entirely by next spring.

SALUTE TO CITIZEN-SOLDIER B. T. BARNES, JR.

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an article in the February 1968 issue of the Golden Griffon entitled "Attendance and Travel Records Being Set" calls attention to an example of our citizen-soldiers who have helped this country maintain a strong Defense Establishment.

The Golden Griffon is an authorized military publication of the 108th Training Division, USAR, and the article calls attention to the perfect attendance record of Sgt. Maj. Burr T. Barnes, Jr., of Aiken, S.C. Sergeant Major Barnes travels 144 miles every month to meet his Reserve meetings and has not missed a session since joining the 321st Regiment in 1951.

In addition to his superior Army Reserve record, Sergeant Major Barnes has an outstanding civic and church record as do so many of our reservists who give freely of their time for the betterment of their communities.

A member of St. Paul's Lutheran Church in Aiken, Barnes is a supervisor of the Lutheran League, member of the church council and chairman of the youth activity and usher programs.

In the American Legion he has held about every office in local post No. 26 in addition to serving as district commander and vice commander as well as State department sergeant-at-arms and on State and National committees.

He has served as American Cancer Society crusade chairman in Aiken County and has been active in the United Fund, 40 & 8 Voiture No. 177, Aiken Chamber of Commerce, Aiken USO, South Carolina Law Enforcement Officers Association, and other civic groups.

Mr. President, it is a pleasure to salute this fine citizen-soldier of my hometown, and I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing the Golden Grifon be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

SERGEANT MAJOR BARNES, 321ST VET: ATTENDANCE AND TRAVEL RECORDS BEING SET

SGM Burr T. Barnes Jr., of Aiken, S.C., travels 144 miles to Columbia every month to attend Reserve meetings—and he hasn't missed a drill since joining the 321st Regiment (formerly the 518th) in 1951.

As if 25 years of unbroken service weren't enough for the record books of the regiment, Barnes has traveled more than 65,000 miles to drills over the 17 years he has been in the Reserve.

A veteran of two wars (World War II and Korean) the personable sergeant major of the 2nd Battalion of the 321st joined the Army as a draftee in 1942. During a three and one-half years World War II tour of duty, the 47-year-old South Carolinian spent 31 months in chilly Iceland as a clerk in charge of keeping records on all signal corps property on the island. His section was awarded a Presidential Unit Citation.

He has been in the Reserve since released from active duty, except for one year when he was called to active duty during the Korean conflict. During that war he was based at Ft. Jackson as an instructor in the Army Supply School.

Barnes is a busy man, both in the Reserve and in civilian life where he is a field auditor for the South Carolina Tax Commission, sales tax division. His field is Aiken County, where he is in charge of auditing sales tax reports from some 2,000 businesses.

He is active in youth work in his community American Legion Post, where he is chairman of Boys' State for that post, and in his church, St. Paul's Lutheran.

In addition, he is advisor for a retarded children's Cub Scout unit, is on the board of directors for the Aiken County Cancer Society and the Aiken County USO, and is a member of the Aiken Camellia Club and the South Carolina Camellia Club.

In his spare time, Barnes bowls on the Church Bowling League where he has an average of 181. His highest game score was a 287 in a 647 series.

He is married to the former Mary Munz of Milwaukee, Wis. They have no children.

LAW AS THE FOUNDATION OF CIVILIZATION

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in these days when it is too easy to shake one's head over the present state of our society and wonder about the future of this world of nations, it is a valuable document indeed which puts the situation into perspective.

In his commencement address at the University of San Fernando Valley, Calif., this June, the Honorable Dr. Pur-nendu Kumar Banerjee, Ambassador of India to Costa Rica and Minister of India, Embassy of India, Washington, D.C., offered such a presentation. The speech, titled "Law as the Foundation of Civilization" provides a historical analysis of the central role of law in man's social, political, and economic development. It confirms the importance of the rule of law and demonstrates the continuity of its evolution and the necessity of its expansion.

Dr. Banerjee's commentary bears the closest attention and I present it here for my colleagues' consideration:

LAW AS THE FOUNDATION OF CIVILIZATION

(Commencement address by Hon. Dr. Pur-nendu Kumar Banerjee, Ambassador of India to Costa Rica, and Minister of India, Embassy of India, Washington, D.C., at University of San Fernando Valley, Calif., June 15, 1968)

I consider it a great privilege to be invited to join the new graduates and to participate on this auspicious occasion—the Commencement Ceremony of this dynamic institution. I am greatly honored to receive the honorary degree of Doctor of Sciences and I am proud to call myself an alumnus.

Down through the ages, history has been the favourite plaything of thinkers and philosophers, politicians and statesmen, moral reformers and poets, as well as plain intellectual dilettantes like me. There have been more theories about history than about any other subject that I can think of. The theories include the simplest and perhaps the most commonly held view of history; the documentation of the achievements and follies of mankind. Goethe affirmed that "History is only a complexus of nonsense." On the other hand, the determinist version of the History of Hegel and Marx interprets it as a movement in which dialectical idealism and dialectical materialism respectively advance it with almost scientific precision from one stage to another. To these theories about history, I have added my own, and you are my "chosen people" for receiving an expatiation thereof! My theory of History is motivated and fashioned by my partiality for the science of Law, which for me is the basis of order and civilization and thus the gateway to culture. For me Law is also the crystallisation of a community's fundamental ideas of proper conduct, of political rights and responsibilities, of social organisation, and therefore a good index for judging the quality and the character of a community's civilization and culture. As I view history and all the civilizations that have come and gone, I am struck by the fact that every great civilization has been inextricably governed by a legal code. The better and more progressive the legal code, and the degree of respect the people have, then the greater the civilization. And from each great civiliza-

tion has been distilled the fund of legal knowledge and practice that is our heritage today. For me human history and human progress—and very fortunately I see a steady progress in human history—carry the slow but sure signs of evolution "from barbarism to civilisation." In this process Law has played a pre-eminent role.

What is Law? And why and how does it come to have such a close and vital relationship with human evolution and progress? The great Cicero answered this question appropriately in the first century before Christ when he said: "Law was the right reason in accord with nature" adding that "Nature has inclined us to love men and this is the foundation of Law." In other words, what he was saying was that man is by nature not only a rational but also a gregarious animal. St. Thomas Aquinas later reiterated this by declaring man to be a "Social animal who is irresistibly drawn towards living in a group. Life in a group, however, is not possible unless each of its members adapt themselves to each other and curb their predatory instincts. Each group, not very long after it comes into being, develops a code of conduct which by general acceptance becomes binding and constitutes its "Law." This is a result of the experience of its members as to what is and what is not conducive to harmonious living within the group. To many of us, so used to associating law with legislation, it is simply the legislature that makes law and the executive that enforces it. But, however, when one analyses Law in its wider sense it embraces custom as well.

The genesis of Law is in the rational and social nature of man. Its growth and evolution is fashioned by the experience and genius of the group upon which it is binding. Will Durant, in his monumental work "The Story of Civilisation" perceives four main stages in the evolution of Law. In the first stage human relations within the group are based primarily on the principle of retaliation or personal revenge, which Cicero described as the "Lex Tallionis". It was the "eye for an eye" doctrine. As the heavy and sordid cost of this practice became clear in time, the idea of restitution or "damages" grew up. This led to the second stage when scores were settled by payment in goods rather than in blood. As the practice of "damages" became established, the need was felt for a system whereby the amount of damages acceptable to both sides could be fixed. This was the genesis of the judicial system, and was the third stage in the evolution of Law.

The fourth stage was reached when the governing body realised that over and above settling disputes and punishing offences, some effort had to be made to prevent them. At this stage the governing authority, besides being the judge, also becomes a law maker and positive law was added to the general body of "common law" derived from the customs of the group. Besides these four stages, Will Durant also perceived two other characteristics in the evolution of Law. As law develops it tends progressively to become more humane, and secondly it provides wider and more numerous liberties and rights.

Let us now examine the role of law and the manner of its development in history. The most obvious thing that strikes us is the fact that every great civilisation has had a legal code which it held in great respect and reverence, as its fundamental attribute. In the ancient civilisation of Babylon it was the code of Hammurabi; for ancient Persia, it was "The book of the Law" of Zoroaster; the Holy Land lived by the "Mosaic Code"; India had the code of Manu; China the code of Chou; Sparta the code of Lycurgus; Athens the code of Solon; and Rome of course its famous Twelve Tables.

During the middle ages the Canon Law of the Catholic Church ruled supreme all over the Christian world. Even in the modern day,

we find great nations being built or transformed on a foundation of law. The French Revolution ushered in the new age in France and Napoleon set about consolidating it by framing a great new legal code which even today bears his name.

The modernisation of Japan, Turkey, and the Soviet Union were made possible by a drastic revision of their respective legal systems. One of the first acts of the new born American nation was the drafting of a constitution. I have no doubt that America's greatness is in no small measure due to the excellence of its constitution which has not only been a source of great inspiration to all its people but has also served as a stabilising factor keeping the enormous federation together. In India too, one of the first acts of the nation after independence was to set about drafting a constitution. This democratic constitution came into effect on January 26, 1950, under which India held her fourth general election—the largest the world has ever seen, based on adult franchise, involving 250 million voters.

Our examination of history also reveals the slow upward evolution of law on the basis of the contributions, some small some large, made by the various earlier civilisations. Primitive law, as I pointed out earlier, was harsh and arbitrary. Not only were the punishments inflicted inhumane and out of all proportion to the crime committed but the ruler or chief had unlimited powers of life and death over his subjects, and as did a householder over members of his family. Besides, primitive laws tended to be unequal—being biased in favour of men as against women, children, and slaves in the tribe. These laws were also openly oppressive tending towards controlling every aspect of a man's life and activity. However, with the passage of time the harsher aspects of primitive law gave way to more progressive concepts.

One of the earliest influences was that of Lord Buddha. Buddha in the 6th century B.C. introduced the concept of compassion towards all living beings and deeply influenced contemporary thought in India and the neighboring countries of Asia. Thus, the laws of Emperor Ashoka in 273–232 B.C. were indeed unique in that age for their humaneness. In western thought, the Stoics were perhaps the first to plead for the removal of excessive harshness in law. We notice some evidence of this under Roman law. We also find original contributions in terms of two important principles of civilised law, first that a man should be held innocent until proved guilty and second, the benefit of the doubt should favour the accused.

In the matter of arbitrariness of law, the Mosaic Law and the Code of Manu were perhaps the first to strike out against it. Both these systems taught that rulers and ruled alike were the creatures of God and bound equally by his laws, and that the relationship between the ruler and his subjects was similar to that of the householder towards the members of his family. The removal of arbitrariness was carried forward under the Greeks and the Romans, who adopted the practice of written law—a fundamental safeguard against arbitrariness and permanent judicial tribunals to interpret and apply them. To the Greeks we owe the concept of liberty but there was little real progress towards achieving this principle until the Reformation and the Renaissance.

Only after the advent of these two historic movements did it become apparent that unless man has a modicum of liberty he could not develop to his full potential. By the time of the French and the American revolutions this concept had taken on the character of a self-evident truth. The concept of equality also came to be accepted slowly. Despite the philosophic enlightenment of the Greeks, they could not conceive of a woman as

legally equal to man. And as for a slave, he was by definition an item of property.

Christianity no doubt preached the fatherhood of God and the equality in his eyes of all his children, but in actual fact the clergy enjoyed a preeminent position vis-a-vis the people at large. In India and China the Brahmins and Mandarins respectively enjoyed privileged status. It was the reformation, with its then revolutionary concept of the "priesthood of all the faithful", that really made a significant contribution to this concept. Another idea which grew rapidly at the time of the American and French revolutions was the thought that all men are equal in the service of God then why not in the affairs of state?

A beginning had been made in the field of International Law, before the Christian era, by the non-European countries like India, Egypt and China. The ancient Indians, as pointed out in 1920 by my father in his book "International Law and Customs in Ancient India", had a definite knowledge of the rules of International Law according to which they regulated their inter-statal relation and international conduct both in war and in peace. Among the historical documents available, Kautilya's "Arthashastra" is the most important and well-known evidence in this regard.

In Egypt, the discovery and the interpretation of Tel-el-Amarna and Boghazkoy inscriptions are the positive evidence of Egypt's knowledge and practice in International Law. In China, equally conclusive evidences are available, in particular, in inter-statal relationships and protection of diplomatic agencies. Thus the Orient made substantial contributions to the development of International Law which never was the monopoly of the Western civilisation alone.

In ancient Europe the Greeks and the Romans made, through their distinctive civilisation, valuable and lasting contribution in the development of International Law. In the middle ages when Europe was ruled by Canon Law, the feeling grew that it was possible for all nations to live under one law. However, with the coming of the reformation and the subsequent birth of the nation this hopeful trend was sharply arrested.

Hugo Grotious in the 17th Century had to make an impassioned appeal for International Law as the basis for a sane world order, and he came to be known therefore as the father of International Law in the west. Opposing the Machiavellian doctrine that States cannot be preserved unless they are absolved from obeying the moral code laid upon their citizens, Grotious declared that States must respect both natural law and Jusgentium defined natural law as "the dictate of right reason showing the moral turpitude, or the moral necessity of any act from its agreement or disagreement with a rational nature." By Jusgentium he meant the accumulation of rules and restraints customarily accepted by the most developed nations in their mutual contacts.

He distinguished between just wars—(fought in defence against an aggressor) and unjust wars (fought for conquest and plunder). He laid down further that wars must be declared before being waged, that non-combatants must be saved, and that though prisoners may be enslaved they should not be killed. Many of the ideas Grotious propounded is common practice today. The U.N. symbolizes his dream of International peace and order.

The International Court at the Hague is a very distinct and important step forward in the field of International Law marking the beginning of the voluntary surrender of national sovereignty to an international judicial tribunal. The jurisdiction of the Court is completely voluntary. The fact that sovereign States may not be too many, have been bringing their disputes to it and abiding by

its decision, is indeed very significant and very hopeful.

History reveals much progress in the field of domestic and international law, but there is a long way to go. In some countries of the world liberty and equality are still a distant dream, and laws are harsh and arbitrary. South Africa and Southern Rhodesia are two of the most glaring examples of inequality, lack of freedom, and injustice. In numerous other countries, in varying measure, discrimination is practised on grounds of colour, race, religion, and fundamental freedoms are denied. In the international field, the concept of national sovereignty is still a great stumbling block. Big power ambitions, rivalries, political manipulations and militant forces are all elements which endanger world peace. Selfishness is more apparent than cooperation in international relations. We, as responsible and modern citizens of the world, have to strive our utmost to eliminate these vestiges of darkness and these obstacles to progress.

Denials of fundamental rights and discrimination in all its forms, wherever they exist, are a blot on our civilization. We have to strive, by all means at our disposal, to stamp them out. In the international field we must eradicate wars and usher in international justice and cooperation. Harold Stassen once said, "A single squadron of modern bombers in one flight can pack a destructive power greater than all the bombs carried by all the airplanes in all of their flights on both sides in World War II." That was said some time ago. To-day this could very likely be said of one single plane rather than of a whole squadron.

Nuclear war in the modern day amounts to suicide. Man, for the sake of his self-preservation, submits himself to the laws that make society possible. So also has it become absolutely necessary for the nations of the world to subject themselves to a code of conduct which makes life in the international community workable. A certain curtailment of national sovereignty is inescapable, since the choice is between a curtailment of sovereignty or world chaos and destruction, the former is a small price to pay for the latter. The concept of community has grown from a narrow tribal basis to that of the nation state. It has become necessary that we endure to live peacefully in larger and larger units. There is no stopping short of a world community. We have to replace anarchy by order, arrogance by understanding and aggression by cooperation in the international community.

The basic minimum in an international code of conduct for a sane world order is enshrined in the U.N. Charter. This was further strengthened by the principles of Panch Shila adopted by the newly independent countries who met in 1954. In essence, the five principles of Panch Shila laid down that States can and must co-exist peacefully, and co-operate with each other for individual, mutual and general benefit.

As war is the climax of international intolerance and opportunism, so is peace the outcome of proper understanding and cooperation among nations. We must achieve international accord by cooperating in solving problems of economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian character by promoting and encouraging respect for the human rights of all, without regard for race, sex, language or religion.

The discovery of atomic energy has radically changed the international milieu. The nuclear age, coupled with revolution in mass media, has brought the territorially divided world technologically together. The interdependence of the world is inescapable. This technological imperative of international cooperation is both a challenge and an opportunity. Whereas the inhabitants of some areas of the world today live in the most magnificent luxury, others live in unimaginable poverty and distress. Mankind today has the

technological knowledge and the means to make poverty, hunger and disease a thing of the past; to provide to all its members a full and dignified life; and to make this the most glorious age in all of history. It is a tragic irony that today the world is spending over 600 million dollars a day on arms and defense, when for just about 10 million dollars a day, the whole of the underdeveloped world could be raised to a full and dignified life within a decade. There cannot be a truly world half rich and half poor. Existence of a slum in a prosperous community, if not taken care of and remedied in time, is bound to spread and infect the very prosperity of the community and turn it into an extended slum. Similarly the world cannot subsist in peace for long, if one part remains enslaved in poverty while the other enjoys prosperity in isolation.

Of course, the prime responsibility for improvement through hard work and self-help, lies with the developing countries themselves. There is concrete evidence that this determination exists. For instance, India in the past two decades has almost doubled the agricultural production; created 30 million jobs; put 45 million children in schools; added 20 years to the life of an average Indian; more than trebled installed electrical power capacity; increased industrial output by at least 150 per cent; and broken into the nuclear age by installing three atomic reactors and undertaking the building of three atomic power stations. In 20 years, India has risen from one of the most economically backward countries to the seventh most industrialized nation in the world. She is one of the top eight in the field of atomic energy. Eighty per cent of all the expenditure incurred on this enormous development programme and almost the entire manpower has been contributed by India itself. India's food production has risen from 55 m. tons in 1947 to 100 m. tons in 1968. However, the capital equipment and the foreign exchange to buy the equipment came from abroad and this is where assistance from the industrially advanced nations like your great country, played a very important role.

Scientific development and technology has broken down the barriers and limitations of past ages and opened the doors for Man's life in world community. How man adjusts himself to the new situation will determine the crucial issues of war and peace and even that of his very survival. If he fails to respond to the challenges posed by this age, he might bring about total destruction of himself and the edifice he has built. Being an optimist myself, and having a great faith in human ability to rise to the occasion, I feel confident that mankind will accept the challenge and succeed in making the dream a reality. There will no doubt be difficulties. We will slip and fall, but we will rise and carry on as we have done before till we reach the stage where peoples of the world will love and respect one another; where instead of confrontation there will be co-operation; where the strong and rich will help the poor and the weak; and where, enlightened universalism will replace narrow nationalism and the only pre-eminent authority will be International Law.

THE "PUEBLO": HOW LONG, MR. PRESIDENT?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 177th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

NO BLANK CHECK FOR UNLIMITED MILITARY SPENDING

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1968

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as we approach legislative action on the current Defense Department's requested budget in the amount of \$77,074,000,000 I hope and urge that the legislative mood, action, and accomplishment will be founded firmly upon an immovable and unyielding "bare bones" policy, in the public interest.

I would even more hope and urge that any anticipated adjournment haste would not be permitted to lessen or weaken our absolute duty and determination to effect substantial reductions, and sensible savings to the taxpayers, in this requested budget, even if we have to stay here morning and night and even if we have to come back here after the conventions to fulfill our common obligation.

I am extremely pleased to learn that the dedicated chairman, and distinguished members, of the House Appropriations Committee are reviewing the Department's appropriations request, the largest appropriations item that comes before the Congress, with diligent and determined resolution to eliminate the expenditure of every nonessential dollar. I would encourage the committee to apply the most intense, diagnostic examination of and major surgery removal, if necessary, on each and every item and division of requested expenditure that cannot be clearly and fully justified; every vestige of fat and extravagance must be eliminated.

Adequate national defense and absolute, full support of our fighting men is vital but the people of this country are confounded and demoralized at the continuing revelations and allegations of apparently widespread, wasteful, and lavish spending and unnecessary projection of expenditure beyond the proper scope of the military mission. Such military profligacy can and must and will be stopped in strict and stern regard of the fact that each and every penny comes out of the hard-earned pay and legitimate profit of the average American workingman and business.

I would hope that frugality can be made one of the high marks of military efficiency as it is of any responsibly operated enterprise.

I would observe that experience proves that loose purse strings are a temptation to careless excesses.

I consider it merely our common congressional obligation to the taxpayer to hold those purse strings as sensibly tight as human prudence and diligence can accomplish.

It is widely reported that defense experts both in and outside the Government have publicly proclaimed that huge cuts can be made in this Defense Department budget while retaining or, even in some cases, improving the level of combat effectiveness. The same experts have stated their belief that none of these cuts would

harmfully affect military combat capabilities and support.

Mr. Speaker, today more than any other time in modern history, this Congress and the people face a challenge of establishing priority spending standards and the most prudent spending procedures in order to maintain and improve the financial stability of this country.

Let us resolutely do this in our legislative action on this Department of Defense budget request and every other budget request that comes before us. For any hesitants let us give calm and reflecting assurance that authorizations can be readily given to any executive department in the case of sudden emergency need. That is what the Congress is for and these are the procedures I hope and urge this House and the Congress to follow in the public interest.

STEEL IMPORTS: A NATIONAL PROBLEM

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address before the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh on May 21, 1968, by my good long-time friend, Herbert Johnson, vice president of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.

Mr. Johnson states well the problem of steel imports and their effect on the U.S. economy.

As I believe this address will be of interest to the Members of Congress, as well as the American people I am placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to give it broader circulation:

STEEL IMPORTS: A NATIONAL PROBLEM

(An address by Herbert Johnson, vice president, general services, Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., before the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh, breakfast club meeting, May 21, 1968)

I consider it a privilege to be able to talk with the members of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh about a problem which is mine, and yours, and the Nation's. That problem is imported steel and the attendant dangers raised by these imports.

Just to set the stage, let me remind you that, in 1967, there were 11,500,000 tons of steel imported into this country. That is equivalent to 12 per cent of the total domestic supply of steel. It happens also to be as much steel as was shipped last year by J&L plus National Steel plus Allegheny Ludlum. That amount of steel production represents the employment of about 85,000 people. To make matters worse, the volume of imports in the first quarter of 1968 increased 42 per cent over the first quarter of 1967. If imports continue at this rate, the total volume in 1968 may reach 15 to 17 million tons, or as much as 15 per cent of the market.

From a national standpoint, the unfavorable balance of steel trade represents almost \$1 billion in this Nation's unfavorable balance of payments.

The facts with respect to steel imports are not in question. The causes and solutions, however, are disputed. There are a number of causes which contribute to the problem. In 1948, there were 32 countries which had steel

industries. In 1968, there are 66. The growth in this number is not related only to increased steel consumption. As a result, the excess of free-world steel capacity versus demand is now about 55 million tons and will grow to 75 million tons by 1970. Many of the countries have no real economic justification for having a steel industry in terms of raw materials, skills, capital resources, or markets. In many cases, steel plants were established more for reasons of international status than on a legitimate economic basis. Nevertheless, the plants are there, with the newest, most efficient equipment available in the world.

The existence of all this excess capacity exerts tremendous economic pressure. Furthermore, since the markets for steel are primarily in countries with "hard currencies," there is a further incentive to sell steel in these markets. Since the "hard currency" exchange is desirable and necessary from the standpoint of the national policy of the foreign country, foreign governments provide incentives for exports.

In addition to these causes of exports, a major contributor to the problem is the tremendous disparity in labor costs between the United States and foreign producers. Steel-industry labor costs in Europe are about one-half the costs in the United States. In Japan, they are about one-fourth our labor costs.

The net result of expansion of foreign steel capacity, foreign government inducements to steel producers to export, foreign government incentives, tax rebates, etc., and low labor costs which translate into low steel product costs is a 572 per cent increase in net steel imports to the United States in ten years.

The consequences of major steel imports will be serious to the United States. The loss of jobs, of tax revenues, and of steel industry capital investments is obvious. Beyond this is the serious problem of national security if we reach the point of dependence on foreign steel for national defense.

American steel producers are seriously concerned that imports are reaching a proportion which will have an adverse impact upon the operations and employment in the industry. This is very important to us businessmen because, of course, we are interested in earning a rate of return which will attract stockholders and provide sufficient capital for expansion, development, and research. Steel has become virtually a universal and international industry. Therefore, it is important for American steel producers to be in a financial and economic position not only to keep pace with the developments in this industry but also to be a pacesetter for these changes.

However, there is a broader social responsibility which must be considered, and that is the responsibility of American steel producers to try to maintain a stable and healthy industry which is responsive to the industrial needs of the economy and which is capable of meeting the steel requirements of the Nation—both civilian and military—in peacetime as well as in a national emergency. Think how different the entire course of economic growth and development would have been for this Nation and others or how different the political and military order of the world today might have been if the United States had not had an indispensable resource in its domestic steel industry. Think how very different our world will be by the year 2000, which is only 32 years away. We cannot expect the industry to meet the future steel requirements of the United States with our current technological base. Nor can we guarantee that the United States will remain the world's leading industrial, military, and political power without the ability to provide an adequate materials base in metals and without the power of an industrial base to produce. Steel is essential to the economy.

You are surely properly asking why does not the steel industry do something about

it? Why don't we meet the foreign prices and prevent the loss of our markets? You are all businessmen (or women) and like you are in business to make a profit. I hope you make more profit than we do, because this is a part of our problem. In 1967, the average profit per ton of steel was \$10.60. The price of imported steel is frequently \$20 or even \$40 per ton below domestic prices. Hence, even if we sold at cost, we would be undersold in many cases. Furthermore, where we have reduced prices to meet foreign competition, we frequently find that the price of foreign steel was reduced concurrently, so our price disadvantage remained.

We have reluctantly concluded that the problem of imported steel cannot be solved by the industry or individual companies. The solution, unfortunately, must be at the level of Government. A Government solution might take any of several directions. We prefer quotas, since we believe they are equitable, nonpunitive, and easily administered.

Legislation, known as "The Iron and Steel Products Orderly Trade Act," has been introduced in both Houses of Congress. In the Senate, hearings were held in 1967. In the House, hearings are to be held before the Ways and Means Committee starting June 4. I hope these hearings will give the problem a thorough airing so that Congressmen and their constituents may have all the facts.

Let me say that quotas are much maligned. Newspapers tend to make ogres of quotas and those who sponsor them. In the case of the steel quota bill, I wonder if many of its critics are aware that this bill does not propose an embargo which would exclude steel imports. On the contrary, it provides for steel imports a permanent 10 per cent share of the American steel market. In terms of tons, this would rise and fall with the domestic market since the share is established in percentage terms. I should add that this quota legislation is actively supported by the United Steel Workers as well as by the steel industry.

The quota is intended only as a temporary measure; and the large volume of allowable imports, in addition to competitive materials, will continue to provide healthy competition in all forms for American steel producers.

You are, perhaps, also aware that, at the State level, legislation has been introduced to restrict the use of imported steel and aluminum in public contracts if the imported steel or aluminum comes from countries which practice trade discrimination against the United States. We are hopeful that this legislation, which passed the Senate in Harrisburg by a vote of 44-5, will soon be passed by the Assembly and signed by the Governor.

I could go on endlessly on this subject, but I want to spare you—and anyway I know that George Hetzel would ring the gong. I have, of course, only scratched the surface of the subject. If time permitted, there is a great deal which could be said about the economic fallacies of the free-trade argument applied to the steel case, where international trade is neither free nor fair. Much could be said to refute the spectre of trade retaliation. We could also consider the very real dangers inherent in allowing foreign countries to continue their steel capacity increases unabated on the assumption that unlimited quantities can always be sold in the U.S. market. Many things could be said, and information on all of these points is readily available to anyone who would like to have more information. Booklets will be available at the door as you leave.

I hope, however, that you, as Pittsburgh businessmen and U.S. citizens, may be sufficiently concerned over this national problem to communicate your concern to your Congressmen and Senators and State representatives. I believe we owe it to ourselves, to Pittsburgh, and to our Country to see proper

steps taken to protect one of our most vital industries from this foreign invasion.

Thank you.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1968

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, soon after the outbreak of World War II, free men were in jeopardy in Eastern Europe. And as the area was overrun, individual liberty disappeared. All the Baltic peoples, the Poles, Czechoslovaks, Hungarians, Bulgarians, and Rumanians were engulfed in a war to overcome tyranny. All these peoples, numbering some 100,000,000 participated as our allies throughout the war relying on our promise that with victory would come peace and freedom, and they would again control their nations.

As the war ended and the promise of peace appeared at last a reality, the onrushing Communist tide of the Bolshevik engulfed the entire region. Men who had fought for victory were still denied freedom by yet another form of tyranny, called by some "collectivism."

The Western democracies, who had fought so long for peace, awakened to find that the power-hungry Soviet dictatorship had undertaken to escalate its pogroms in colonizing the land areas of our proud allies.

Not only was their dream of self-government and determination denied but freedom was abolished.

Since the end of the war in 1945 the peoples in these countries have been exploited as captives in their own homelands—prisoners of a foreign, undesirable, power system. They are the captive nations of Europe. Efforts by leaders of the West to promote any productive dialog or negotiate for their release from Communist captivity have accomplished little or naught. At most we have succeeded in keeping alive the hope of freedom in the hearts and minds of the peoples by public opinion throwing shame and distrust on the oppressive Communists.

For this specific purpose Congress in 1959 enacted a joint resolution designating the third week of July of each year as Captive Nations Week. In that same resolution the President of the United States is requested to annually proclaim that week of July as Captive Nations Week, to be observed with fitting and appropriate ceremonies.

In observing the 10th anniversary of Captive Nations Week we not only carry on the American tradition of showing our sympathy for the captive nations and their enslaved peoples but as free men we also endeavor to keep alive their cause—the promise of fellow Christians who believe in individual liberty under God.

We shall remember and they shall be free.

Mr. Speaker, I include the manifesto for Captive Nations Week, 1968, as prepared by the Conference of Americans of

Central and Eastern European Descent—CACEED—29 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10019, following my comments:

MANIFESTO FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1968
TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE!

As in previous years, the Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent (CACEED) calls attention to Public Law 86-90, unanimously adopted on July 17, 1959 by the Congress of the United States, by which the third week of July each year was designated as Captive Nations Week.

CACEED is an organization of American citizens of Central and Eastern European descent. Their countries of origin—Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and Ukraine—are presently under Communist domination and are denied the most elementary human rights.

In supporting all the captive nations in their unending struggle and aspirations for freedom and national independence, CACEED calls on all Americans to manifest their public support of the captive nations in their quest for national self-determination and the enjoyment of their human and national rights.

The observance of Captive Nations Week from July 14-21, 1968 is especially significant and meaningful, as this year of 1968 the entire civilized world is observing "International Human Rights Year" in commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted and proclaimed on December 10, 1948 by the U.N. General Assembly. Only a few weeks ago the International Conference on Human Rights took place in Teheran, at which over 80 governments and representatives from various non-governmental organizations held lengthy discussions on the application of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in various parts of the world.

The U.S.S.R. and its puppets: violators of human rights

The Soviet Union and its subservient Communist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe are signatories to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Yet it is the Soviet Union and the communist regimes of Central and Eastern Europe which are the most consistent violators of the principles of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. Their persecution of dissident writers, especially in Russia proper and in Ukraine, the Russification of the non-Russian nations in the USSR, the brutal suppression and persecution of all religions—Catholicism, Orthodoxy, Protestantism, Judaism and Islamism—are on record, for all to see.

But despite these crass violations of basic human rights on the part of the Soviet government and those of its satellites, many U.N. members, particularly the African and Asian states, remain in complete ignorance of what is going on in the Communist-orbit countries as regards violations of the Human Rights Convention.

This was amply demonstrated at the U.N. Human Rights Commission on March 15, 1968, when a number of U.N. members voted along with the Soviet Union to delete from the official minutes a statement by former U.S. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, criticizing the suppression of freedom of speech in the USSR. The statement in question said, in part:

Recently, in Poland, the USSR, and the Ukrainian SSR certain writers and other persons had been tried in camera and sentenced for having expressed or published views contrary to those held by those governments. . . .

Developments which are occurring daily in Central and Eastern Europe, and in the USSR itself, clearly demonstrate that the

captive nations continue to struggle for their freedom. In Poland and Czechoslovakia, students and the intellectual elite protest constantly against repressive censorship and the violation of basic human rights. In Poland, the Communist government, seeking a scapegoat, has hastily introduced a policy of official anti-Semitism to divert public attention from the rising tides of freedom. In Czechoslovakia, the new non-Stalinist Communist leadership has been compelled to respond to popular pressures and demands by intellectuals and students by granting more freedom of expression. The people of Czechoslovakia, stunned by revelations of the murder of Jan Masaryk twenty years ago, have been the powerful driving force behind the change which is taking place now in the country. Attempts by the people of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania to wrest more freedom from the Communist regimes are being stubbornly opposed by the dictatorial Communist governments, despite ever-increasing demands for more freedom on the part of the people.

In Ukraine, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, however, Russian Communist imperialism continues to exercise its oppressive and destructive policy. An official course of Russification is in full swing in these countries, whereby the Russian language and culture are being systematically imposed on the peoples of these countries at the expense of their national languages and cultures. Deportations and "voluntary resettlement" of the youth and skilled and technical personnel from native countries into the interior of the USSR, are still the official policy of Moscow. Despite persistent claims by Brezhnev and Kosygin that slave labor and prison camps have been liquidated, there are at least 36 prison camps in the Potma area of the Moldavian ASSR alone, comprising at least 100,000 political prisoners, overwhelmingly from Ukraine, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and other non-Russian countries of the USSR.

It is imperative that the American people know at this time of the annual observance of Captive Nations Week that the USSR has violated every article of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights also is continuing its relentless policy of genocide, cultural and ethnic suppression with regard to the captive nations it holds in political bondage.

Therefore, in commemorating Captive Nations Week 1968, we:

(1) Demand that the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights be applied to all captive nations in Europe and Asia, and that the Soviet Russian policy of genocide and persecution with respect to the captive nations be officially denounced and condemned in the international forum of the United Nations;

(2) Fully support U.S. policy in Vietnam and elsewhere in resisting Communist aggression and attempts at world domination. In supporting the U.S. policy of resisting Communism in Southeast Asia, we also insist that the U.S. Government adopt a firm policy with respect to the USSR and the communist governments of Central and Eastern Europe in challenging their persecution of the captive nations;

(3) We accuse the USSR of violating its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nations made captive during and after World War II: Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Romania;

(4) We condemn the Soviet government for depriving the non-Russian nations in the USSR of the right of self-determination and for the destruction of the independence of Ukraine and other non-Russian nations inside the USSR;

(5) We assail the Communist enslavement of mainland China, North Korea, North Vietnam, Tibet and Cuba;

(6) We urge the U.S. Government and the governments of all other free nations to prevail upon the United Nations to establish

a Special U.N. Committee to Investigate the Violations of the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights in all non-Russian countries of the USSR and the countries under Communist domination in Central and Eastern Europe and Asia;

(7) We appeal to the U.S. Government to undertake measures in the United Nations that the declaration adopted in 1952, "The Right of Peoples and Nations to Self-Determination" and the "Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries," adopted by the U.N. on October 14, 1960, be applied to all the captive nations as enumerated in the U.S. Captive Nations Week Resolution of July 17, 1959;

(8) Finally, we call on the people of the United States of America to take part in the Captive Nations Week observances, July 14-21, 1968, and to manifest their meaningful support and sympathy for the just aspirations of all captive nations of Europe and Asia, and to pledge their moral and material aid to the long and unequal struggle of the captive nations for freedom and national independence, to which they all are rightly entitled.

CONFERENCE OF AMERICANS OF CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPEAN DESCENT (CACEED).
July 1968.

MARYLAND MARINE DIES IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Robert B. Horton, a fine young marine from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

TIMONIUM MARINE DIES IN VIETNAM—Pfc. ROBERT B. HORTON, 19, SHOT IN ACTION JULY 7

A Timonium marine who arrived in Vietnam less than a month ago was one of 24 war casualties reported yesterday by the Defense Department.

The youth was Pfc. Robert B. Horton, 19, a June, 1967, graduate of Calvert Hall and a pre-engineering student until last December at the University of Baltimore.

Private Horton was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Bernard H. Horton, of the 100 block Hollow Brook road, Timonium. They were notified of the youth's death in action by telegram Monday.

IN COMBAT LESS THAN THREE DAYS

Mr. Horton said the terse official message attributed the young marine's death to hostile rifle fire while he was on a "search and destroy" mission in Quang Tri province July 7.

"He hadn't been in combat three days when this happened," Mr. Horton said yesterday.

ALSO A LETTER YESTERDAY

Mr. Horton said that his son, a rifleman with Company C, 1st Battalion, of the 1st Marine Division, left California on June 15 for Vietnam, where he joined units covering the evacuation of Khe Sanh.

His only comment about the war, contained in a letter the family received yesterday, was that his hill overlooking the abandoned marine base at Khe Sanh was "a very beautiful place."

A native of Baltimore, Private Horton planned to return to college after completing

a four-year enlistment. He wanted to be an engineer, his father said.

Surviving besides the parents is a sister, Mrs. Kathlenn Thompson, who also resides in Timonium.

WISCONSIN POWER & LIGHT CO. LAUNCHES ANTIPOLLUTION DRIVE

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin Power & Light Co. has launched an anti-air-pollution drive which will ultimately cost the company some \$1,656,000. The president of the organization, Mr. J. Don Howard, pointed out the objectives and some of the pitfalls in a speech at Sheboygan, Wis., on June 21. His remarks are just as applicable to the other 49 States as they are to Wisconsin, and I include them in the RECORD at this point for the benefit of the entire membership of the House and the Senate:

CLEAN AIR

(A new antipollution program announced by J. Don Howard, president, Wisconsin Power & Light Co., Sheboygan, Wis., June 21, 1968)

If you drove to this meeting this noon, you polluted the air. If you charcoal brats for supper tonight, you will again be a polluter. In fact the daily activities of all of us leave behind a trail of air pollution.

It happens not only when driving and cooking, but also when we burn trash or leaves, relax before the glowing logs of the fireplace, shake out a dust mop, when the city disposes of sewage and garbage, or when we simply enjoy a warm house on a cold day. Air pollution also results from many industrial operations and business activities, and, it is a part of the operations that generate electric power.

To a large measure, the pollution problem lies in our growing population and its concentration in relatively small areas. In a way, air pollution is a price of our success as a nation. A highly industrialized society that provides so many of its citizens with an abundance of automobiles, foods, goods, luxury items and services,—belches forth large quantities of smoke, chemicals, gases and wastes in its daily operations.

Now, of course, one possible solution to our air pollution problem would be a return to more primitive times. We could close down all industries, stop the cars and other forms of transportation, put out the fires, shut off the generators of the nation's electric power industries, and bring the vast machine of America to a halt. I don't care to buy this radical solution.

There are a number of things we can do and Wisconsin Power and Light Company today is announcing a broad plan which will help assure clean air for Wisconsin. Now it is true,—much of the blame of air pollution has fallen on industry. Everyone naturally seeks a culprit at which to point the finger of guilt. Industrial complexes and electric generating plants with their towering stacks offer a highly visible and convenient target. Smoke has become the symbol of air pollution in the average mind and yet smoke is not the most critical problem. Chimneys, trash, and dump fires contain tiny particles of ash, carbon, gases, and other matter. Scientists call these particulates. Many particulates are relatively heavy and fall quickly to earth. Lighter ones may remain suspended

until wind or rain moves them. These particulates produce about 10% of our air pollution. The remaining 90% comes from gases—many of them invisible and odorless. Carbon monoxide for example, is colorless and without odor, yet it accounts for over half of our air contamination. Most of this carbon monoxide comes from the inconspicuous exhaust pipes of automobiles.

According to some estimates, automobiles and other forms of transportation account for well over half of air pollution. Electric utilities and manufacturers are often considered major contributors, but this is untrue. According to U.S. Government estimates, the generation of electricity produces only about 11% of total air pollution, and manufacturing plants—about 17%.

In Wisconsin, where population and industry are dispersed, air pollution is not a serious problem. Our company for example, has only four power plants which use fuel: at Edgewater in Sheboygan, Rock River north of Beloit, Blackhawk, in Beloit, and our Nelson Dewey Plant at Cassville.

Our company has worked in a variety of ways to control air pollution for some years. One of the Blackhawk units operates on natural gas, which nearly eliminates air polluting agents. The other is equipped with a mechanical type dust collector. Units 1 and 2 at Edgewater already are equipped with precipitators to remove soot and fly ash. The stack at Nelson Dewey was built to an especially tall height to disburse material more quickly into the upper atmosphere. A new peaking unit installed in 1967 operates on natural gas. Gas fuel will also be used at a second recently announced peaking unit to be installed this fall.

Our boiler operators at these plants have made important contributions, and through training, have become knowledgeable about what they can do to minimize smoke. And because they understand our concern, they are motivated to take corrective action to make our power plants as efficient and clean as possible.

Today, in announcing this new program, we reflect our basic feeling and commitment to the proposition that "clean air is the breath of life." It includes the following activities:

Installation of the latest model electronic precipitator on the new unit No. 4 at Edgewater at a cost of \$526,000.

Installation of the same type of equipment on existing unit 3 at Edgewater at a cost of \$245,000. This equipment, which will remove 99.5% of all flyash and soot, will be installed this year and next. With the \$253,000 investment in the precipitators for units 1 and 2, this represents a \$1 million commitment to clean air for Sheboygan.

Installation of similar equipment for our Rock River plant units is estimated to cost \$385,000.

Installation of such equipment at Nelson Dewey plant will cost \$500,000. All of this adds up to a \$1,900,000 fight against air pollution.

In addition to this, our next major generating facility, which we will own in partnership with Wisconsin Public Service Corporation and Madison Gas and Electric Company, is under construction now near Kewaunee, Wisconsin. It will be nuclear fueled. The clean energy from the atom results in little air pollution.

For a number of years we have also been participating in research on electric automobiles. Thus we are trying to do something about the major source of pollution—the transportation field. Many of you have probably seen our experimental electric car, the Mars II. In addition, we are participating with other utility companies in a \$3,000,000 battery research program conducted by the Edison Electric Institute and the Gulf Atomic Corporation. This involves basic research aimed at the development of a

practical new power system for electric automobiles.

All of this activity means just one thing—Wisconsin Power and Light Company cares about pollution and is doing something about it. We are constantly in search of ways to improve our own situation and will activity support the communities we serve in any of their efforts. I think it is pertinent here to comment that even the very nature of our service assists in combating pollution. Electricity is the major non-polluting source of power in the world and new applications of electric power along with growth of the present ones in home heating and manufacturing processes can aid our nation's growth and development without increasing air pollution.

Now, I shall comment very briefly about the thermal effect that large generating units have on bodies of water on which they are located. As you perhaps know, large quantities of circulating water are needed in the generating process to condense steam that has been used to spin the turbine. This is a non-consumptive use and adds no pollutants to the water. This water is taken from the lake or river, run through the steam condenser and then put back into the source from which it came, unchanged, except for being a few degrees warmer. Some persons have wondered whether the growing concentration of generating plants on Lake Michigan will present problems. It would take hundreds and hundreds of similar power plants to raise the temperature of Lake Michigan enough so it would be comfortable to swim in. Some people feel that the addition of generating facilities on the Lake results in "thermal benefaction". Tests indicate that modern recording devices are not capable of registering a change in water temperature only one-quarter mile away from the power plant discharge. Some fish do notice the difference near the discharge pipes and they seem to like it—they swim toward the warmer area.

Additional testimony along this line comes from Great Britain where nuclear plants have been generating power for several years. At these sites, biologists have been keeping close tabs on the thermal effect; after nine years of study, they feel the term "thermal pollution" is a misnomer and that there is no evidence of an ecological deterioration of any kind caused by the power stations.

This is our program, and we invite all of you here and all segments of society to join with us. The modern threat of air pollution is serious and urgent. It is a challenge for government bodies, private industries and each individual citizen. Our commercial and industrial consultants are equipped to assist our customers in obtaining information on the latest form of pollution control techniques and equipment.

As the battle against pollution continues, we will search out and discover additional directions to take. We expect to maintain our leadership in the movement for quality air. A movement which will continue to be a high priority item on the list of responsibilities we feel to the customers we serve. It will take the sincere dedication of all of us to keep this problem under adequate control.

SATURDAY ELECTIONS

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the general trend to apply our

modern-day technology to improve Government operation and efficiency, and the possibility that the coming presidential elections will be thrown into the House of Representatives for lack of the necessary electoral votes have both served to stimulate new thinking on the state of our election system.

There have been a number of suggestions recently on reforming the electoral college, and a national primary has been proposed. The Lowell Sun, Lowell, Mass., on July 5 editorialized on another possible reform in election day practice: Changing the customary election day from Tuesday to Saturday in order to make it easier for the voting population which works to get to the polls.

As the editorial notes, Saturday voting is no substitute for citizen spirit, but it might aid our efforts to secure the most representative expression of the electorate possible, and I am including the article here for the consideration of my colleagues in the House:

SATURDAY ELECTIONS

Congress has put holiday fun on a more orderly schedule by shifting Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Veterans Day and Columbus Day to a premanent Monday arrival. Workers get a long weekend; bosses avoid the disruption of mid-week holidays and hangovers.

The change won't go into effect until January 1, 1971, to give state legislatures and calendar makers time to conform to the new Federal arrangement.

This sensible break with tradition suggests another. Why not change the customary election day from Tuesday to Saturday? A large part of the working population has Saturday off—it might be easier to get them to the polls then. Schoolhouses also would be available for polling places.

Recent elections in many states have drawn a disgracefully poor turnout. A Saturday voting day is no substitute for citizen spirit—but it might help assure a more representative expression of the electorate.

AN AMERICAN'S CREED

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the discord on the campuses of the Nation and the troubles prevalent in the streets of our cities, I believe the words of the following two creeds will be of interest and inspiration to other Members of Congress and to all patriotic Americans:

AN AMERICAN'S CREED

I do not choose to be a "common" man. It is my right to be uncommon—if I can. I seek opportunity—not security.

I do not wish to be a "kept" citizen, humbled and dulled by having the state look after me.

I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build; to fall and to succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole.

I prefer the challenges of life to the guaranteed existence, the thrill of fulfillment to the stale calm of Utopia.

I will not trade freedom for beneficence nor my dignity for a handout.

I will never cower before any master nor bend to any threat.

It is my heritage to stand erect, proud and unafraid; to think and act for myself; to enjoy the benefit of my creations and to face the world boldly and say, "This I have done, with the help of God!"

All this is what it means to be an American.

Presented to _____ with congratulations upon graduation from High School. May the highest ideals of American citizenship guide you in a life of success, happiness, and achievement.

WILLIAM L. DICKINSON.

THE AMERICAN'S CREED

(By William Tyler Page)

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a Republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my Country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

Presented to _____ with congratulations upon graduation from High School. May the highest ideals of American citizenship guide you in a life of success, happiness, and achievement.

WILLIAM L. DICKINSON.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY ACT

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, technological developments in our industrial society have given rise to at least one undesirable byproduct—excessive noise. Job situations have become noisier as the result of heavier and more powerful mechanized equipment being used in plants and offices.

Indeed, not too long ago, a noise survey of 200 working places in 40 different plants found 50 percent of the machines in use producing noise levels intense enough to damage the hearing of the exposed workers. Subsequent surveys by the Public Health Service and other groups have found noise conditions unsafe to hearing in glass bottle manufacturing, heavy construction work, wood products, metal products and heavy machine fabrication, textiles, papermaking, and transportation.

As a result, at least 7.5 million workers in the industries are exposed to excessive noise on the job, and the number would probably be much higher if we counted others where there are strong suspicions that there are noise problems. These include mechanized farming, printing, and furniture manufacturing. Nearly 1 million more workers could also be added to this estimate if tabulating and data processing operations are included, where levels are not necessarily damaging to hearing but can interfere with speech and disrupt work.

Excessive noise may never have killed any worker; but, on the other hand, noise can have fatal or disabling effect as a contributory cause—like drowning

out warning signals—or by aggravating preexisting disorders.

According to the best estimates there are today 4.5 million men with hearing losses which would qualify them for compensation in several States. If only 10 percent of these workers received an award, the cost could run as high as \$900 million. Obviously, then, we are then talking about an occupational health problem of serious magnitude, both in numbers and dollars.

And this is only one of a long list of occupational hazards which American workers face. The only way we can assure them the kind of protection they deserve and need is through a national program in occupational safety and health. That is why I am supporting H.R. 17748, I ask that you join me.

U.S. JOURNAL: RESURRECTION CITY METAPHORS

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and much more has been written concerning the Poor People's Campaign and their vigil in Resurrection City. I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues this most thoughtful article which appeared in the New Yorker magazine of June 15:

U.S. JOURNAL: RESURRECTION CITY METAPHORS

Martin Luther King, Jr., was a great man for metaphors. Among Southern Negro ministers in general, of course, the metaphor has always been indispensable to human communication, but King used it with unique effectiveness. In the early sixties, the civil-rights movement in the South included almost nightly mass meetings in Negro churches, and sometimes, as I sat listening to King explain how the long, dark night of discrimination was going to give way to the great dawn of emancipation, bringing a bright new day of equality and freedom, it occurred to me that the easiest way for white Southerners to cripple the movement would be to pass city ordinances against the use of metaphors in public. Their lawyers would argue solemnly that the ban was strictly non-racial in character, although everyone would know that white-segregationist orators would be unaffected, since their indispensable figure of speech was the simile ("Why, that ole boy was just as happy as a turkey on the day after Thanksgiving"). I was reminded of all that a few days ago when a reporter asked Ralph Abernathy if members of the Poor People's Campaign were responsible for throwing rocks through some windows in the Supreme Court building and he said that the only rocks his people were concerned with were "the rocks of injustice that we are banging against until they come crumbling down." For anyone who sat through those church meetings in the South, Resurrection City, the encampment that the Poor People's Campaign has strung along the parkland between the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument, sometimes seems like not only the implementation of a Martin Luther King idea but the materialization of a Martin Luther King metaphor—some elaborate, resonant, five- or six-sentence construction about the community of the impoverished being a crumbling eyesore

among the shiny monuments to American democracy.

One of the problems of making a metaphor visible is that it becomes an issue itself. When the mud in Resurrection City became so thick that overshoes were sucked right off people's feet, I half expected to hear something about the poor people slogging along through the thick mud of despair and desperation while the affluent whisked by them on the broad thoroughways of indifference; instead, most of the talk in Washington was about how muddy it was in Resurrection City. Andrew Young, the executive vice-president of King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference, tried to tell reporters that the important point about the mud was that the poor people in America—at least, the poor people in small towns and rural areas—live in mud all of their lives, but the news stories were about whether or not Resurrection City had become a health hazard. Young told me that the S.C.L.C. had taken a medical survey of the four hundred people who came to Washington from Memphis and had found that a hundred of them were sick. "Everybody said that there were sick people on the march," he said. "The point is that on any given day a quarter of the poor people in this country are sick." Abernathy tried to redirect attention one day when reporters were asking about some stress between the Negroes and the Mexican-Americans in the campaign. "The issue is not Resurrection City," he said at a press conference. "The issue is not any kind of dissension or strife that might arise in Resurrection City. The issue is poverty." But Washington has not accepted Resurrection City as a metaphor. Having agreed that Congress is unlikely to be affected by the sight of a few thousand poor people, commentators tend to blame the Poor People's Campaign for a futile demonstration rather than blame Congress for being unresponsive to the needs of the poor. The poor in Resurrection City have come to Washington to show that the poor in America are sick, dirty, disorganized, and powerless—and they are criticized daily for being sick, dirty, disorganized, and powerless.

Around Resurrection City, everyone is addressed as Brother or Sister. The habit is so widespread that I even heard one of the Indian spokesmen referred to as Brother Mad Bear. When Jesse Jackson, the first city manager of Resurrection City, began leading demonstrators to the Department of Agriculture every day, the man chosen to handle the situation for the Department was the Assistant Secretary for Administration, an erect, businesslike, tight-lipped man named Joseph M. Robertson; Jackson merrily greeted him as Brother Joe or Brother Roberts. The Secretary of Agriculture himself is referred to as Brother Freeman. Members of one of a variety of peace-keeping organizations in Resurrection City are identified by stenciled letters on the back of their jackets as Peace Brothers, "Brother" and "Sister" are used more or less in the black-ghetto sense of "Soul Brother" and "Soul Sister"—in fact, "Soul" is another popular word in Resurrection City, and the most prominent chant of the movement is "Soul Power"—but there are echoes of the "Brother" and "Sister" heard in Southern Negro churches. The S.C.L.C. is still dominated by ministers, and when one of them begins to speak an invisible pulpit often seems to slide into place in front of him, melting a news conference or a private conversation into a mass meeting. The demonstrations are another reminder of the days when Negro ministers led boycotts and sit-ins and marches. At one point, the issue between the Poor People's Campaign and the Department of Agriculture was—in addition to how the program for feeding the poor was being administered—whether or not the demonstrators could eat in the Department of Agriculture cafeteria

that day. When negotiations had been carried past two o'clock and the Department could report that the cafeteria had closed, Abernathy told the demonstrators that the Department had turned them away in the rain, that the rejection showed how difficult their task would be, and that they therefore must all attend a meeting the next night at the John Wesley A.M.E. Zion Church. After the poor people had gone back to Resurrection City, the Department of Agriculture held a press conference so that Joseph M. Robertson could tell reporters, "This cafeteria is not a public cafeteria and is run primarily for the benefit of the employees of the Department of Agriculture." It might have been a scene from the South in the early sixties—a businesslike white manager carefully explaining why normal business practices happened to preclude serving Negro demonstrators, and the demonstrators planning to retaliate with a mass meeting at a Negro church.

In using the same techniques to demonstrate in Washington for an end to poverty as they used in the South to demonstrate for an end to segregation, S.C.L.C. leaders have to get along without some useful old enemies, such as Bull Connor and Jim Clark, and have to get along with some independent new friends, such as Appalachian whites, Mexican-Americans, and Indians. Resurrection City was overcrowded when the first large contingent of Mexican-Americans and Indians arrived, and, in what later turned out to be a matter of ideological as well as physical convenience, the Mexican-Americans settled in at a private school in Southwest Washington and the Indians moved into a nearby church—giving everyone a principal-ity from which to dispatch emissaries. No one really thought that an instant New Populism was going to spring from the participation of the various groups; Young sees a certain amount of friction as part of the nature of the poor ("You have to get used to the fact that poor folks are fussy") and the nature of the country ("I think the relationship is good, considering that we've been brainwashed for two hundred years by racism"). It is also true that, despite the ritualistic reconciliations, the specific needs of the Negro poor and the Mexican-American poor and the Indian poor do not necessarily coincide. The most prominent Spanish-speaking leader in the Poor People's Campaign is Reyes Lopez Tijerina, who has been leading a group of people in New Mexico in a bitter and occasionally violent effort to regain what they claim is land stolen from their ancestors. In style and rhetoric, Tijerina is closer to Stokely Carmichael than to Ralph Abernathy, and he is interested not in jobs and housing but in land—specifically, the land in New Mexico that was dealt with in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo of 1848. There is no subject from which Tijerina cannot make his way logically to the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo within two or three minutes. He is not interested in seeing Brother Freeman; he wants to see Brother Rusk. The urban Mexican-Americans, of course, have problems that have nothing to do with land, and the Indians are interested in treaties the Mexicans never heard of. When a priest at the church where the Indians were staying told me one rainy day that most of them had gone to the Smithsonian Institution, I asked if a tour had been arranged so that they could pass the time by seeing some of the sights of the capital. "No," he said. "They arranged this themselves. They say there are some relics there that belong to them."

The various groups of poor people have what rich people call communications problems. At a public meeting in the Resurrection City "cultural tent" one day, a young white man with hair down to his shoulders—a member of the California delegation—listened to plans for forming a city council,

rose to say that "we don't want to play the white man's game," and suggested, to the horror of the organization-minded Negroes present, that Resurrection City might better be run on some tribal arrangement borrowed from the wonderfully sophisticated governmental structure of one of the great Indian nations. Another day, I saw Abernathy at a meeting in which Negro leaders joined with Mexicans in supporting a cause of the Indians—or, as Abernathy would say, "joined with our brown brothers in supporting our red brothers." The issue was a Supreme Court decision against some Nisqually and Puyallup Indians who were in a fishing-rights dispute with the State of Washington. Abernathy told the audience—largely Mexican—that denying fishing rights in Washington was the same as denying food to poor people in Mississippi, and he reminded everyone about the mass meeting at the John Wesley A.M.E. Zion Church. "That's easy to remember," he told the Mexicans. "John Wesley, the famous Methodist preacher. Then African Methodist Episcopal Zion."

The next day, Abernathy was marching arm in arm with Indian and Mexican leaders to demonstrate against the decision—undoubtedly the first Negro civil-rights leader to be in the front line of a demonstration against the Supreme Court. At demonstrations, the issues—the fishing rights of Indians, the size of the delegation allowed in—become less important than the mood of militancy. At the end of the day, Tijerina, standing on the steps of the court, orated against "this criminal conspiracy called the Supreme Court of the United States," and a Negro in the audience shouted, "Preach, brother, preach!"

A few days after the Supreme Court demonstration, a group of Indians went to the National Press Building to protest the coverage—most of which was concerned more with the broken windows than with the fishing rights of Indians. The demonstration was, in fact, a good illustration of how difficult it is for Indians to make their grievances known by public protest. The cameramen present descend on somebody in Indian regalia, the reporters hunt down some Indian with a strange name, somebody makes a joke about the Indians being on the warpath again—and that is usually that.

The Poor People's Campaign in general has a problem with the press. In a way, it exists for the press—the press is the means of making the metaphor visible all over the country—and at a Senate-subcommittee hearing Abernathy was told by Senator Gaylord Nelson, of Wisconsin, that the Campaign had already been a success by inspiring so much coverage of poverty by magazines and television. But relations with the press have been complicated. Neither the press nor the residents of Resurrection City are ever quite certain if a picture of a little boy standing in mud is going to be considered a matter of showing the nation the plight of the poor or exploiting a child's misery. When organizations like the S.C.L.C. were demonstrating in the South, reporters who didn't come from overtly racist papers often seemed to feel that they deserved a bit of special consideration for taking the trouble to be there, and those who come to Resurrection City with that attitude are quickly offended. Perhaps because the opportunities to display militancy are limited in a non-violent campaign of poor folks asking for food, there is a kind of territorial ferocity in Resurrection City. White reporters who are curious about what it must be like to be a young Negro constantly harassed by the police learn more than they want to know about the subject after a couple of days of being harassed by young Negro marshals in Resurrection City. Although almost everybody seems to assume the role of a marshal occasionally, the best-organized group is called the Tent City Rangers. Its members wear blue-jean outfits,

work boots, and the kind of hat identified with Stewart Granger in African movies—with a leopardskin band and the brim snapped up on one side. To visitors—who are usually reporters—they sometimes take on the appearance of a kind of Wild West *ton-ton macoute*.

The S.C.L.C. has sent some of the more hostile young Negroes back to Chicago and Detroit, and on the steps of the Supreme Court both Abernathy and Young spent some time trying to persuade the Mexican marshals to leave cameramen alone. Both of them hold frequent press briefings. But the real problem cannot be solved by better relations with reporters. The S.C.L.C. has found that the advantage of having the huge Washington press corps on hand is also a disadvantage. Something has to be written about or photographed every day, and the more visible the metaphor gets the more vulnerable it becomes. Young talks about how everyone in America is on some kind of welfare except the poor, and reporters ask him if Abernathy has been sleeping in Resurrection City. Abernathy talks about current policies toward the poor being genocide, and reporters ask him why his demands to Congress are not more specific. Reporters are assigned to examine the phenomenon—to find out how well it's working and what it might accomplish. And the ministers of the S.C.L.C. will never be able to persuade them that a minute examination of Resurrection City is like a minute examination of one of the Martin Luther King metaphors that was not made visible—as if a press conference had been held and reporters had asked, "Which mountaintop did you say you've been to, Dr. King?" or, "Tell us, Dr. King, exactly what night was it that you first started having this dream?"

CALVIN TRILLIN

CAPTIVE NATIONS

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1968

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, since July 17, 1959, the third week of July has been designated Captive Nations Week. Those of us fortunate enough to have the freedom to speak out against tyranny and oppression thus have not only the opportunity but also the obligation to do so.

We are obligated to denounce the Communist oppression of the captive nations because silence gives consent; and we do not consent to this subjugation of peoples who are free in spirit, and yearn to be free in fact. We do not accept the fiction that these peoples voluntarily accept Russian domination.

We lend our full moral support to the courageous peoples of the captive nations in their struggle for self-determination; and we call to the attention of the world the existence of this struggle, which some would gloss over.

The cause of peace is not served by sacrificing the liberty of even the smallest country. Rather it is harmed; for true peace cannot exist in the absence of true freedom. The United States values peace highly; but it values freedom more. Let us continue to work in the cause of liberty for the Eastern European nations, and in the hope of peace throughout the world.

YOUTH PROBLEM IN UNEMPLOYMENT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, child labor laws, intended to prevent exploitation of youth, have become a prevention not only of employment but also of self-reliance and industry.

Today industry and the private sector are unable to hire youth; yet the taxpayers are paying for a myriad of menagerie to keep them busy and off the streets—in many instances without minimum wage guarantees.

I insert a recent column by Samuel Sharkey on the youth unemployment problem in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEMS IN FINDING JOBS FOR YOUTHS TOLD
(By Samuel Sharkey Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Summer is at hand and unemployment among youth, almost triple that of all workers, is moving even higher.

At the same time, employer resistance to hiring youths also is going up—due mostly to the newly increased federal minimum wage, business groups say.

This combination lends credence to President Johnson's assertion that this country has "always paid lip-service" to the theory that all Americans willing to work are entitled to a job. This has not been true for many Americans, the President added in his annual Manpower Message to Congress last January, and mentioned:

"... The boy who becomes a man without developing the ability to earn a living... the boy or girl from the slums whose summers are empty because there is nothing to do..."

DRIVES FELL SHORT

In the District of Columbia, for example, some 20,000 applied for summer youth jobs but latest official statistics show only about 2,000 found work. This picture is generally the same throughout the country.

For the last two years two cabinet departments—Labor and Commerce—have carried on jointly a highly publicized Vice-President's Youth Opportunities Campaign seeking pledges of one million jobs each summer.

The campaign fell short in both years. When sharply increased employer resistance became evident in early probings this year, the administration quietly dropped the campaign. It has been trying since through other channels to put youths to work but without notable success.

The latest Bureau of Labor Statistics figures show the youth unemployment rate climbed from 11.9 per cent in April, to 12.6 per cent in May—at the same time the overall national jobless level has remained at 3.5 per cent.

PROBLEMS NOTED

A new analysis by the AFL-CIO Department of Research comments "It is not at all unusual to hear statement to the effect that today, 'anybody who really wants to work can get a job...'"

"What is overlooked is that reported job vacancies are in professional and highly skilled occupations—for which young workers, neither white nor Negro, are qualified; or the vacancies are in establishments remote from where the unemployed live," or in such low-wage and dead-end work they are not worth filling.

An important factor in today's affluent society is reluctance by some youths to take low-pay jobs. Equally important is reluctance

by employers to pay the new \$1.60 an hour minimum wage.

A survey of some 120,000 establishments by the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., says 32 per cent reported that the new minimum was the reason for dismissals. The federation projects this to mean "an apparent annual rate of 742,600 jobs lost due to the new law."

"Many employers," the federation asserts, "have dismissed marginal and submarginal workers whose productivity is not worth \$1.60 an hour. Most of the job attrition affects teenagers, elderly persons, partially handicapped and the unskilled."

WAGE-SCALE ISSUE

Employers have not filled the resulting gaps with youths, resorting to automation, or dividing up segments of these small jobs among other workers.

Many businessmen have urged a separate wage-scale for youths. Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz raised this issue in his annual Manpower Report to the President. "As productivity and wages rise," Wirtz said, "routine or low productivity jobs—some of them held by youth—are often eliminated."

He urged a study of whether adjustments in youth wage levels would have an appreciable effect on youth jobs, and whether additional special incentives for employers would be needed.

Wirtz pointed to Europe, where "differentials between youth and adult wages are common"—notably Belgium, France, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom. These countries have a variety of scales for young workers, and the "youth wages," he says, "are generally well accepted by employers, unions, parents and workers."

JAMES C. GARDNER, CANDIDATE FOR GOVERNOR

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, there probably will be many changes in this body as a result of the elections this fall.

One of the most pleasant changes probably could be one of our colleagues leaving the House voluntarily for a position of greater responsibility in his own area.

That sage and prognosticator of political events, Willard Edwards, of the Chicago Tribune, in an article appended herewith, discusses the possibilities of JAMES C. GARDNER, our colleague from North Carolina, and his chances to become the first Republican Governor of that State in this century.

JIM GARDNER is one of those bright new stars on the political horizon south of the Mason-Dixon line. Our party is fortunate to have a young, aggressive, and knowledgeable candidate for such a high office in such a great State as North Carolina.

He has made a great reputation for himself in the House which will stand him in good stead for experience as the Governor of a State.

If there is anyone likely to pull off an upset of this magnitude, it would be JIM GARDNER. Not in my time in the House have I seen a young man with more

political savvy and knowledge than young JIM GARDNER. He has a way about him very similar to that of Jack Kennedy when he was of the same age. He has a rare political phenomenon in getting people to see issues through his eyes. In the past he has come up against almost impossible odds, and he prevailed. He has that political instinct of independence together with intelligence which always stands him well not only in his own party but among independents and the fringe areas of the opposing party.

This young man is going to be heard of in the future because he stands for something, and he has that knack of selling this image to everyone.

The article by Willard Edwards follows:

CAPITAL VIEWS

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, July 15.—“My heart bleeds for you newspaper people come election night Nov. 5,” said a Senate leader. “You’ll soon wear out the word ‘upset’ in headlines reporting the results all over the country and be frantic for a substitute. It’s going to be a night of stunning surprises.”

It was only one man’s opinion but it came from a veteran politician, rich in years and guile, who was voicing an uneasy suspicion growing among professionals—that the usual rules for judging voter trends must be abandoned in 1968.

Something’s going on in the minds of the voters that’s difficult to pinpoint, they agree.

The same uncertainty, it is reported on Capitol Hill, has spread to those prophets who make a lucrative living out of election predictions—the pollsters. While they bravely continue to publish fluctuating percentages, purporting to show the rise and fall in fortunes of major candidates for high office, they have been shaken by humiliating bloopers in the primaries and are worried about the long and treacherous road ahead.

PREDICTS GOP SWEEP AT TOP OF TICKET

The speaker above, a southern Democrat and a power in Congress, foresaw “a Republican sweep” at the top of the ticket in November. He thanked the fates that he was not a candidate this year. But he was quick to add that he glimpsed the possibility of many Republican stalwarts being toppled from office in state and local elections.

“It’s going to be a bad year for those in power in many states,” he said. “The demands for a change will hit both parties. Republicans too long in office will be just as vulnerable as Democrats in the same situation. Some famous names will be missing when Congress meets again in January.”

Asked to cite a specific example of an upset, the senator said he would stick to the deep South with which he was familiar and predicted:

“You will see a Republican governor of North Carolina for the first time in this century. Jim Gardner is the underdog, according to all the experts, but he has what is called ‘style’ in this period of our history and he will also profit from voter dissatisfaction with the ‘ins’ who, in this case, are the Democrats.”

This forecast was checked with others. Not surprisingly, it was rejected by many observers of the southern political scene. Some gave it respectful consideration, however, noting that Rep. James C. Gardner, a freshman congressman now seeking the governor’s chair of his native state, is adept in surprising the experts.

Gardner, now 35, was brushed off as an upstart when he challenged the veteran, Harold Cooley, for a seat in Congress in 1964, but he almost won and rolled to a smashing victory over the prestigious Cooley in 1966.

There simply were not enough Republican votes to elect him and Democratic leaders faced a disturbing reality—that he had established a Democratic following.

UNFRIENDLY CRITIC CALLS HIM SUAVE

An unfriendly critic snorted that Gardner was “suave, very charming, smooth as glass,” but conceded that he had “an uncanny ability to gauge the public temper.” He added that Lt. Gov. Robert W. Scott, the Democratic nominee for governor, had “managed to bore the electorate in the primary.”

“I was on the platform with Gardner at a rally in Asheville,” said another observer, “and it was easy to see that he and Republican voters are carrying on a love affair. About 800 people had come in from the mountains and paid \$2 apiece to hear him. They were glassy-eyed with rapture. They weren’t interested in issues. He was their boy.”

“It wasn’t just a Republican phenomenon. Everywhere I went in the state, I found Democrats just waiting to vote for Gardner. They won’t switch parties but they’ll vote for him.”

Gardner, the essence of confidence [the opposition calls him cocky], did not quarrel with the prediction. He is accustomed to beating the professionals, the pollsters, and the odds. Opposed in the May primary by the state’s old guard G. O. P. leadership, he astonished everyone by piling up a 74 percent majority over a respected opponent. He expects to repeat the surprise in November by stressing a campaign theme that “It is time for a change in North Carolina.”

All over the nation this fall, in close to 500 gubernatorial, senatorial and congressional contests, young candidates like Gardner, both Democratic and Republican, will be pounding that “time for a change” slogan. Their opponents will be, for the most part, oldsters forced to defend a record which has left the electorate restless and resentful. This year of political surprises may, indeed, be climaxed by an election night when upsets are common.

CONSTITUENT PRAISES PROMPT, COURTEOUS, AND EFFICIENT SERVICE OF ST. PAUL OFFICE OF SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are privileged to serve as Congressmen are constantly bombarded by constituents with complaints about the shortcomings of the social security system.

The other day, however, I was most pleasantly surprised to receive a letter from a business leader who has several wonderful comments to make about medicare and the prompt, courteous, and efficient service of the St. Paul Social Security Administration.

I would like to share with readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this letter from Mr. Dan M. Gephart who serves so ably as manager of the St. Paul Chapter of the National Electrical Contractor’s Association and as trustee of the Electrical Industry Board of St. Paul:

ELECTRICAL INDUSTRY BOARD OF ST. PAUL,
HON. JOSEPH KARTH,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: Knowing the trend of Americans to protest, criticize, and dissent, I thought it

might be enlightening for you to know of one American who has a kind word to say about our Government and one of its programs.

I recently applied for Social Security and was given courteous and considerate treatment by the employees of the Government with whom I came in contact. Checks from Kansas City have arrived on schedule.

Recently Mrs. Gephart had an operation and out of a total bill of over \$2,500, Medicare covered all but several hundred dollars. Within a matter of a few days after the bills were submitted to the Traveler’s Insurance Company, reimbursement was made with an itemized list of charges, the amount covered by Medicare, and the reimbursement to which I was entitled.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Traveler’s Insurance Company, who it has selected in Minnesota to handle Medicare claims, are both to be complimented on their efficiency and courtesy which was so apparent in my recent experience.

The Social Security Administration of that Department, located as you know, in the same building where you have your office in St. Paul, is likewise to be complimented on the efficiency and courtesy demonstrated by their employees.

There are many in our Country who have contended that “senior citizens” are not receiving the attention due them by our Federal Government. You have at least one “senior citizen constituent” who has nothing but respect for the Government and this “bureaucracy” of ours for its humane understanding of the problems of its senior citizens.

My respect extends also to those legislators, such as yourself, who have made this “bureaucracy” work.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Yours very truly,

DAN M. GEPHART.

S. 2658—GRAVE MISTAKE IN PUBLIC ECONOMIC POLICY

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, one of the least worthwhile items of legislation currently before the House is S. 2658, which would permit an increase in truck sizes and weights on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

There have been charges and countercharges regarding the economic implications of this legislation. I am happy, however, to offer some definitive analysis of these factors in the form of a doctoral dissertation entitled “Current Issues in the Regulation of Motor Vehicle Sizes and Weights.”

Prepared by Dr. John W. Fuller III, at Washington State University, Pullman, Wash., the dissertation looks into the claims of the trucking industry relative to the estimated cost and projected benefits of S. 2658.

Dr. Fuller’s background is in the field of economics. He received his A.B. degree from San Diego State College in California in 1962. He spent the summers of 1966 and 1967 as a transport economist for the Western Highway Institute, an arm of the American Trucking Association, and he can be considered an ex-

pert in the field of truck weights and widths.

Because the issues in S. 2658 are of such great importance, I insert the first of the seven chapters of Dr. Fuller's thesis at this point in the RECORD. Others of my colleagues will insert later chapters so that all of Dr. Fuller's research findings will be made known to the Members of this body.

Dr. Fuller's research led him to the following conclusion:

The very great excess of public and social costs over the private benefits discovered by this thesis suggests that any general motor vehicle size and weight increase at this time would be a grave mistake in public economic policy. The recent proposals for size and weight increases at the Federal level, and the numerous proposals at the state level that appear continuously, do not appear economically justifiable. Passage of a bill such as S. 2658 could result in a serious drain on U.S. resources. These economic resources could be used to far greater advantage elsewhere in the economy.

The first chapter of Dr. Fuller's thesis follows:

CURRENT ISSUES IN THE REGULATION OF MOTOR VEHICLE SIZES AND WEIGHTS

(By John Williams Fuller III)

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Certain physical characteristics of motor vehicles operated on public highways in the United States are regulated by Federal, State, and local governments. In normal operations, motor trucks, truck-tractor combinations, and buses are prohibited in the public interest from exceeding maximum dimensions of vehicle height, width, length, and weight. It is the purpose of this study to present the current issues involved in motor vehicle size and weight regulation and, utilizing the framework of economic analysis, to provide a critical evaluation in the public interest of widespread demands by commercial vehicle operators for substantial increases in maximum allowable vehicle dimensions.

The rationale for size and weight regulation

There would be no need for legislation prescribing maximum vehicle sizes and weights were motor vehicles of greater and of lesser dimensions to have equal performance characteristics, equal effects on highway construction and maintenance expenditures, and were highway carriers not in competition for passengers and freight with other transport modes. As it is, the common operation on public highways of motor vehicles with such vastly different acceleration and other performance characteristics as are typical of trucks, buses, and automobiles suggests the need for regulation to promote maximum safety and convenience for all vehicles operated on the public ways.

Long before the beginning of automotive travel, engineers were aware that heavier vehicles require stronger roads to support their weight without excessive stress, undue wear, and consequent need for repair and replacement. Wider vehicles, in comparison with the typical passenger automobile, require greater lane widths for safety and maneuverability. Public highways, as common carrier transport agencies, have traditionally been held responsible for meeting the needs of all comers without undue discrimination. In keeping with this obligation, no one class of vehicle can be allowed to adversely affect the operational freedom of another class of motor vehicle physically capable of using the same ways without being in opposition to the public interest in a sound transportation system. Logically, a vehicle which by reason of excess dimensions or poor operating characteristics does adversely affect the operation or safety of other motor vehicles can be prohibited from entering the

traffic stream or held to certain routes or conditions which minimize the adverse effects on other traffic.

The fact that highway and other transportation modes are in pervasive competition for passengers and freight in numerous transport markets means the public is vitally interested in an allocation of resources among modes that will best promote economic efficiency. If, for example, public investment in highways is more extensive than the market for highway freight transportation will support through a given set of cost-based user fees, and the difference is supplied through indirect subsidy to highway freight carriers, the traffic of other transport agencies which are lower-cost carriers may be adversely affected in a manner which is uneconomic to society.

Thus, the various purposes for which size and weight limitations have been enacted may be summarized, as was done by the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1941, to include one or more of the following:

"(1) protection of existing highways and bridges from destructive loads or loads considered to be destructive, and also protection of bridges from injury by vehicles of excessive dimensions; (2) conservation of the resources of a State by enabling the provision of roads and bridges of standards consistent with the needs of the State and with its economic ability to bear the attendant costs; (3) promotion of safety and the abatement of nuisances in road use; and (4) the advancement of a State's interest in other ways, as through the control of competition between different forms of transportation."

The history of motor vehicle size and weight regulation

For some 40 years prior to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, the dimensions and weights of motor vehicles were regulated solely by state and local law. State legislation continues to play the predominant role in size and weight regulation because the major portion of public highway mileage is owned and operated by the states. However, with respect to the granting of Federal funds, the 1956 Act stated that:

"No funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year . . . shall be apportioned to any State within the boundaries of which the Interstate System may lawfully be used be vehicles with weight in excess of eighteen thousand pounds carried on any one axle, or, with a tandem-axle weight in excess of thirty-two thousand pounds, or with an overall gross weight in excess of seventy-three thousand two hundred and eighty pounds, or with a width in excess of ninety-six inches, or the corresponding maximum weights or maximum widths permitted for vehicles using the public highways of such State under laws or regulations established by appropriate State authority in effect on July 1, 1956, whichever is the greater."

This is the sole Federal entry into size and weight regulation and the size and weight maxima specified apply only to motor vehicle operations on the Interstate System. The Federal limits are maxima. Except for dimensions allowed under "grandfather" rights, as stated in the Act, a state cannot lawfully permit vehicles operated on the Interstate System to exceed those maxima without risking loss of Federal funds.

Regulation by the states evolved as motor vehicle carrying capacities rose in relation to the ability of the highways to support larger and heavier vehicles. The first trucks manufactured, using automobile frames but featuring body shells built to hold freight, were designed to carry loads comparable to the usual ton or two carried in a horse-drawn

wagon. Progress was rapid though, and evidence is available which suggests that before 1906 gasoline-powered trucks of 5-ton load capacity were in common use and, in Great Britain at least, there were steam-powered trucks in existence of 14-ton capacity.³ In fact, there is evidence in Germany of a triples combination in 1905, a 6-axle truck plus two trailers, the total being of 20-ton carrying capacity.⁴ Doubles combinations of 12½-ton capacity were apparently common in the U.S. by 1912.⁵

The roads in the earliest period, about the turn of the century, were developed for and compatible with the safe passage of the usual ton or two carried in a wagon drawn by a team of horses. However, with the early and rapid growth of large vehicles traveling at relatively high speeds, regulations were adopted that limited axle and gross vehicle weights in order to safeguard travel and protect the highways from the deleterious effects of heavier vehicles. The state regulations which were instituted in the United States prescribed numerous limitations on the width, height, and length of trucks, buses, and truck-tractor combinations in addition to governing gross weights, axle weights, tires, and axle spacings. Simultaneously, road carrying capabilities were increased and by 1921 most major roads in the U.S. were planned for the carriage of 15-ton gross loads.

State regulations of the above sort, while obviously in the public interest where necessary to protect the public investment in highways and to ensure the safety and convenience of travelers, resulted in weight and size restrictions which varied widely from state to state. It was a difficult matter of engineering under new conditions to produce highways in accord with the new demand for automotive pleasure travel and truck freight transport. Equally difficult problems arose of equitable highway taxation and financing with untried sources. Certainly, regulatory differences were to be expected if only because highways of the several states came to be built to varying standards and encountered disparate climatic conditions. However, charges were also made that vehicle specifications were responsive to political pressures from old and new transport agencies.

Partly to throw additional light on such interstate variations in vehicle size and weight regulation, the Interstate Commerce Commission was directed by the Motor Carrier Act of 1935 and the Transportation Act of 1940 to investigate the need for Federal regulation of motor vehicle dimensions. While the resulting report suggested that the Commission should be authorized to remove unreasonable discriminations against interstate commerce, Federal regulation of sizes and weights was not to come in any form for another 15 years.⁶

When Congress authorized construction of

³ Ernest F. Mills, "The Commercial Motor Vehicle in Great Britain," *Cassier's Magazine*, XXX, No. 3 (July, 1906), 221-31.

⁴ J. F. Gairns, "Commercial Motor Vehicles, Part I," *Cassier's Magazine*, XXVIII, No. 3 (July, 1905), 193-212, and *idem*, "Commercial Motor Vehicles, Part II," *ibid.*, XXVIII, No. 4 (August, 1905), 284-99.

⁵ Louis Ruprecht, "Cost of Operating Motor Trucks," *Engineering Magazine*, XLIV, No. 1 (October, 1912), 118-20.

⁶ See U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Interstate Commerce, *Regulation of Sizes and Weights of Motor Vehicles*, Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, Senate, on S. 2015, A Bill to Amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as Amended, to Provide for the Regulation of the Sizes and Weights of Motor Vehicles Engaged in Transportation in Interstate or Foreign Commerce, Part I, 77th Cong., 1st sess., 1941, and Part II, 77th Cong., 2d sess., 1942.

¹ U.S., Congress, House, *Federal Regulation of the Sizes and Weight of Motor Vehicles*, H. Doc. 354, 77th Cong., 1st sess., 1944, pp. 4-5.

² *Highways* (Federal-Aid Highway Act), U.S. Code, Vol. V, sec. 127 (1956).

the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways in 1956, it endorsed the state limits placed on bus, truck, and truck-tractor combination single-axle weights, tandem-axle weights, gross weights, and widths.⁷ These are the only Federal standards governing motor vehicle dimensions and weights and apply solely to those vehicles permitted by a state to use the Interstate System within that state; no Federal limitations apply on vehicle size or weight for use on the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban systems.⁸

Currently, then, we have regulation by two levels of government. Both Federal and state limits apply to weight characteristics and vehicle widths. States alone regulate vehicle heights and lengths. Compliance with Federal limits is obtainable only through restricting Federal aid to states which permit the operation of over-weight or over-sized vehicles on the Interstate System. The states rely upon their police powers for enforcement.

Key current regulatory issues

Numerous attempts have been made during the past decade to change state size and weight limits. In fact, during the first half of 1967, bills to change vehicle length limitations were introduced in 16 state legislatures. Many proposals have been adopted in recent years, resulting in considerable changes in the restrictions on length, with 65-foot doubles operations now legal almost across the United States. Recently attempts have been made to pass legislation authorizing the operation of longer triples combinations and under certain specified conditions, which will be discussed in Chapter II, triples are legal today in Idaho, Nevada, and Oregon. In isolated cases, state height allowances have been raised, and in numerous instances, state maximum axle- and gross-weight allowances have been increased. State changes in vehicle dimensions will be further described in the next chapter.

Up to 1968, there has been no change in the 1956 Federal vehicle standards for application on the Interstate System. State standards for state highways in some instance have been raised above the limits applicable on Interstate highways and in other cases have been increased to the most commonly occurring limits in effect on the Interstate System of 18,000-pound single-axle loads, 32,000-pound tandem-axle loads, and 73,280-pound gross-weight maximums. However, on November 15, 1967, Senator Warren G. Magnuson, joined by 21 other Senators, introduced a bill, S. 2658, to amend

⁷ See page 3, *supra*. The National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, popularly known as the Interstate System, is a specifically designated 41,000-mile portion of the Federal-aid primary system connecting major population centers with high-level, limited access freeways. Under the law, construction is to be completed by 1972, although this completion date cannot be met and will likely be changed to 1975. The system is designed to accommodate traffic volumes anticipated 20 years from the date of construction.

⁸ In addition to the Interstate portion, the Federal-aid primary system is composed of major highways designated by the states to receive Federal highway grants-in-aid. The primary system was originally limited in each state to a maximum of 7% of the rural mileage existing at the time of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1921. The Federal-aid secondary system consists of principal secondary and feeder roads linking farms, markets, and smaller communities with the primary system. All Federal-aid systems are part of state and local highway systems and include (since 1944) urban portions of these systems. Whereas the Interstate System is financed 90% by Federal funds and 10% from state sources, the remaining Federal-aid mileage is financed on a 50-50 basis between the Federal government and the states.

weight and width limitations. On December 14, 1967, H.R. 14474, a companion bill to S. 2658, was introduced in the House by Representative John C. Kluczynski in conjunction with 10 other Representatives. H.R. 14474 is identical to the Senate bill; both seek increased maximums.

Now at issue before the Congress and the state legislatures is the question whether the relevant considerations of highway plant, public necessity and convenience, vehicle technology, and the needs of commerce lend support for significant increases in allowable motor vehicle size and weight limits. What is the public interest in size and weight limits? What set of limits will best protect the public interest? Have technical considerations, for example of motor vehicle motive power and braking, undergone sufficient evolution to compel modification of earlier standards? Is the highway plant equipped to handle larger and heavier vehicles? Is the present structure of highway taxation or user fees compatible with proposed standards? If not, what changes need be made in user fees in the interest of equity, economy, and a sound transportation system?

Scope and methodology of study

These issues present a challenge to all those interested in a sound public policy for transportation and a tax structure providing equity of consideration in public expenditure among competing alternatives. Improperly established size and weight standards can have repercussions not only on all highway users, but can strongly affect the viability of other transport modes as well. Unless user fees to recover taxpayer costs are carefully designed on the basis of adequate information, the result may be an undesirable allocation of public resources among transport modes and among competing demands for government investment.

This study attempts to ascertain the economic feasibility of increased size and weight standards of the magnitudes suggested in current legislative proposals and by concerned transportation interests. The study gives attention both to quantifiable and to nonquantifiable aspects of public (social) and private (shipper and carrier) costs. Chapter II sets forth the present status of maximum size and weight standards for motor vehicles in some detail. In that chapter, an attempt will be made to show the motor vehicles affected by maximum vehicle standards and the volume and types of traffic carried by them. Factors influencing the demand of motor vehicle operators for greater size and weight standards are then summarized and evaluated. Finally, the current proposals for changed standards are briefly described.

The economic and technological issues which clearly must be considered in order to determine the feasibility of higher size and weight standards are introduced in Chapter III within an economic framework of benefit-cost analysis. Chapter IV describes the arguments of both proponents and opponents of size and weight changes, as presented in the Senate Hearings on S. 2658. Chapter V reviews the available evidence on possible carrier benefits obtainable through increased sizes and weights. This chapter provides estimates of the probable private cost savings which could accrue to operators of the larger and heavier vehicles. Chapter VI examines the additional highway construction, maintenance, and operating costs, and the social costs to common users of the highways and non-highway users, that would be entailed if higher size and weight limitations came about. An effort will be made to quantify these costs as offsets to the private gains from higher size and weight restrictions to be estimated in Chapter V. The final chapter compares the probable private benefits with the public and social costs occasioned by higher size and weight limitations, and analyzes

whether the net social benefits justify larger and heavier motor vehicles on the public highways. Since there will be additional investment costs in highways to accommodate larger and heavier vehicles, suggestions will be made with respect to a desirable user fee program in case more liberal size and weight standards are authorized. Finally, an evaluation will be undertaken concerning whether, all factors considered, higher size and weight standards will promote an efficient division of traffic and resources.

Throughout the dissertation, emphasis will be placed on providing a clear analytical framework which takes into full account both the benefits and the costs which would predictably occur through imposition of revised motor vehicle size and weight standards. In this analysis, an incremental approach will be taken. There will be pragmatic attention to the marginal effects of specific marginal variations in vehicle dimensions. Each change under consideration will be carefully examined to determine its social desirability. The main concern of the study is with the overall social results of implementing an integrated program of size and weight liberalization. The question this study wishes to answer is whether increased size and weight standards will produce a net social gain in terms of efficient resource use in all transport modes throughout the economy.

CONGRESSMAN MINSHALL OPPOSES CENSUS BUREAU SNOOPING

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the proposed 1970 census questionnaire is outrageous.

The idea of the Census Bureau fining or locking up American citizens if they decline to answer intimate family questions is shocking and preposterous. I can conceive of no legitimate reason for the Government of a free people to poke and pry into the personal affairs of citizens under the guise of taking a population count.

Public indignation is rising as 1970 approaches. As one of my constituents so aptly put it in a recent letter:

This is certainly George Orwell's Big Brother appearing long before 1984.

It is not surprising that the present administration should seek to invade the sanctity of the American home in this matter. It has attempted in countless ways to intrude its will on private citizens, to turn the individual into a mere statistic, a part of a voting bloc, a captive of big government.

What does surprise me is the apathy of this Congress which should be responsive to the wishes of the people in correcting this matter. Our very able colleague and my good friend, Congressman BETTS, has done a heroic job of exposing the plans of the Census Bureau. He has taken the floor time and again to protest and he has introduced an excellent bill to limit the mandatory questions which the censustaker may ask.

There is tremendous public support for this legislation. Yet the Subcommittee on Census of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service accorded it only 1 day of hearings last October. No further action is scheduled.

Because I feel so strongly that this is an intolerable situation, I am today introducing an identical bill as an expression of my vehement objection to the proposed questionnaire. I urge the Post Office Committee to reconsider the measure, and to speed it to the floor so that we can act on it.

Our outstanding television-radio station in Cleveland, WJW, has done an excellent job of capsulizing the facts on this situation and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

TELLING ALL, OR ELSE

Some powerful people in Washington are getting set to ask you some nosy questions like these:

How much money do you make? Please include details on all sources, including alimony, welfare, investments and pensions. What's your property worth or how much rent do you pay? What do you own in the way of dishwashers, TV and radio sets, automobiles, or perhaps a second home? What are the facts on your marital, employment, educational, and military background? Where was everybody in your family, including your grandparents, born?

Unless Congress blows the whistle soon on eager Census Bureaucrats, that's the extent to which you'll have to tell all in 1970—or face a \$100 fine or 60 days in jail. And there are more than 100 other intimate questions in the \$200 million census project—including with whom do you share your bathroom?

Ohio Congressman Jackson Betts of Findlay is leading a fight to limit mandatory questions to name, address, age, sex, race, marital status, and who's visiting in your home at the time of census. Mr. Betts' bill would make the more obnoxious snooping strictly voluntary.

But the Congressman tells Television 8—this station—that Census Bureau pressure has his bill in trouble. That's where a short, angry note from you might help. If you agree that the census should be restored to its original purpose—counting people, not grilling them—let your Senator or Congressman know about it now, while there's still time.

COUNTY FIRE BUREAU INITIATES THREE INNOVATIONS

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the Times in Essex, Md., recently published a fine article about the Baltimore County Fire Department's new innovations. I would like to commend the Times for a fine article in the public interest and the fire department for a good job in service to the community, by including the following article in the RECORD:

COUNTY FIRE BUREAU INITIATES THREE INNOVATIONS

Three innovations designed to save money and earn the respect and good will of countians have been instituted within the county's Fire Bureau, according to Chief Winfield H. Wineholt.

According to the chief, they include "homemade" utility trucks (used as personnel carriers), a mobile filtered compressed air supply vehicle (to refill the compressed air bottles at sites of smoky fires), and water vacuum cleaners (for interior water removal after a fire is out).

The first of two utility trucks has been added to the fleet of fire fighting vehicles now assigned to the Catonsville station. A second, when completed, will be housed at Golden Ring.

These "homemade" units were former ambulances which had reached the "trade-in" age but, instead, were redesigned, overhauled and completely renovated by Fire Bureau personnel in the Towson repair shop.

In short, Chief Wineholt explained, "we rebuilt what amounted to a \$150 trade-in allowance into a vitally needed personnel carrier which will transport 12 firefighters to and from the scene of a fire. We've filled a need and saved some money doing it. And, we expect to continue to convert such vehicles as they are needed."

Additional savings also accrue in other areas, Chief Wineholt added. Before the introduction of the utility truck, he said, men who were to be relieved had to stay on the grounds on overtime pay or were shuttled back to their station in a battalion chief's car, while those coming on duty would drive their own car to the fire ground or also be shuttled there by a departmental car.

With the innovation of the utility truck, the entire shift change can be taken to the fire grounds at one time and the relieved shift brought back on the same trip.

Another money-saving idea soon to be introduced into the bureau is the air cascade truck, a unique vehicle which will have the capacity to refill filter compressed air bottles used by firefighters during smoky fires. It will also carry 12 chemical-type gas and smoke mask outfits.

Equipped with six cylinders of filtered compressed air, hooked up in a series along one wall of the truck and attached to an air compressor, the unit will enable used up bottles of filtered compressed air to be refilled at the scene and used over and over again. Cost for refilling each bottle is placed at 15 cents.

Chief Wineholt said that commercial cost for such refilling is approximately \$3.

Each bottle will last from 30 to 40 minutes. The chemical-type mask will serve for 60 to 75 minutes.

The third innovation, the water vacuum, has been instituted as a good will gesture and to prevent additional damage to floors, ceiling rugs and other household and interior furnishings. Firefighters employ this device to rid all interiors of buildings of excess water after conventional pumping procedures have been utilized. All ladder trucks in the county carry this new piece of equipment.

"This courtesy," Chief Wineholt enthused, "not only has practical value but greatly lessens the shock of the homeowner when he first views the interior of his house for the first time after the firefighters have finished their job."

PENETRATING ANALYSIS OF RURAL POVERTY

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, appended below is an address delivered by Mr. Howard Bertsch, administrator, Farmers Home Administration, before the Conference on Rural Poverty at New York State University in Delhi, on June 20, 1968.

This survey of the problem is not just a routine of platitudes. Mr. Bertsch gets into some of the deeper, more subjec-

tive considerations and expresses them very well. Along with his address, I submit a statement of my own that was read at the conference by Mrs. Dow who was present, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HOWARD BERTSCH, ADMINISTRATOR, FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE CONFERENCE ON RURAL POVERTY AT NEW YORK STATE UNIVERSITY, DELHI, N.Y., JUNE 20, 1968

Three and one-half years ago, President Johnson jarred the national conscience and shattered public complacency by declaring a war on poverty.

In so doing, he focused public attention on a national blight in the midst of an affluent society and he transformed our sense of guilt and uneasy concern into national purpose and commitment.

Elimination of poverty finally had become official public policy.

And for those of us who had long been troubled by watching the corrosive, deadening effects of poverty on our society, this was, indeed, a most happy moment.

And when a responsive 89th Congress enacted a series of unprecedented programs such as the Economic Opportunity Act, the new housing program, medicare, and new programs to revitalize rural America, many people believed that the millennium had come and that it would be only a matter of a few short years and poverty would be wiped forever from the face of this nation.

Well, it hasn't quite turned out that way. The poor we still have with us.

Some of them are camped in Washington desperately trying to dramatize their wretched lot.

Others are still in their ghettos and still others are to be found scattered throughout rural America—in all, some 30 million disadvantaged Americans.

To the questions: "Have we failed?"—I would say "no."

For two reasons:

First, we have made some very measurable gains during the last three and one-half years. Some are more apparent and visible than others to the public view. We have, for instance, established for the first time the semblance of a solid organizational structure to fight poverty which we have never had before. I refer to the Community Action groups throughout the country. I refer to the Technical Action Panels we have set up in all fifty states and in some 3,000 rural counties.

It has been a slow and arduous job setting up this organization and getting it to function effectively.

But three years ago we had nothing to work with on an organized basis. Our efforts then were experimental, tentative and largely haphazard. We made our share of mistakes in our fumbling efforts and, unfortunately, these mistakes were too often blown up all out of proportion by the press and the foes of this war. And since we are an impatient nation of people wanting instant results to complex problems, we not only have had to overcome our own mistakes but we had to do it under the cruel glare of public criticism, much of it unjustified.

In addition, we can be heartened by the many fine programs we have launched. We have worked out the bugs in these programs and they are now working effectively. I shall mention only a few:

Job Corps—Headstart—Upward Bound—Work Study—Teacher Corps—job retraining—housing—food stamp program—community facilities loan programs—and the rural outreach function.

All of these programs now have their own momentum and are, at last, starting to accomplish what we had hoped to do with them in the beginning.

Another thing we have now which we didn't have three years ago, is that we have a nationwide corps of trained people—trained troops, if you will—to fight the war on poverty. When we started we had to enlist thousands of men and women and young people to our cause who often had little else in their favor than enthusiasm, zeal and energy. But, thank God, they had that.

Now, today, these are trained, professional people.

This brings me to the second reason why I believe we have not failed.

It is this: we have learned much during these three and one-half years, and knowledge and know-how is as important as programs and money in this war on poverty.

We have learned that there are no quick and easy solutions to the problems of poverty—no shortcuts to grubbing out the root causes of poverty that are so deeply imbedded in our society. We have learned as we have in other wars—that war is not cheap.

But probably most important of all, we are beginning to learn what poverty really is, what causes it, what perpetuates it.

No other social problem in America is so little understood.

This was true of most of us when we started out some three years ago and it applies to most of the general public today.

They just do not understand how complex and elusive this problem is. And this gives rise to the surge of impatience from the public at large and from the poor themselves who somehow feel that the war on poverty is failing.

People fail to understand that poverty is much more than a matter of economics—a matter of inadequate incomes.

Ignorance, lack of education, poor health, hunger and malnutrition are all universal ingredients of poverty.

But poverty is also the lack of access to a respected position in society and the lack of power to do anything about it.

It is insecurity and unstable homes.

It is a way of life for those who live in it and it has a culture all its own.

These characteristics apply to poverty wherever you find it, but rural poverty, as we all know, has, in addition, its own unique and special problems.

In the first place, the environment in which rural poverty exists is a particularly forbidding one.

Much of rural poverty is invisible because it is scattered among a dispersed population and this makes communication and organization extremely difficult. The invisibility of rural poverty makes it difficult to convince the public, the Congress, and many others that poverty really *does exist* in the countryside. The facts are, that nearly half of all the nation's poverty is to be found in rural areas where less than a third of the nation's people reside.

There is also, in rural areas, an absence or deficiency of public facilities and services. We are gradually overcoming this, but the process is slow.

Local leadership and expertise are often lacking in rural areas.

And in many instances there is deep-seated resistance to change.

These are some of the complex and elusive dimensions of the total problem we have to deal with. And they are dimensions many of us did not really understand three years ago. But now we do—and that's progress.

But unfortunately this knowledge is not shared or understood by the public at large and widespread disenchantment has set in and it is being reflected in places where it hurts us the most—where budget, appropriations and program decisions are made.

It is this public disenchantment and our national impatience that can cause us to lose this war against poverty. It can ultimately

erode our national commitment to this cause.

And that would be a national tragedy.

And it would be an inexcusable national disaster which we cannot afford.

The irony of it is, is that we can afford to eliminate poverty and all of the other social problems of this nation. It isn't as if we weren't rich enough—as if we didn't have the wealth and the resources. We do. What we lack is awareness of the magnitude of the dangers facing us as a society and a lack of real purpose and commitment to solve them.

Reports of our nation's economic performance in the first quarter showed that the Gross National Product soared by \$20 billion—the largest advance in history. New records are being set with each succeeding month in production of goods and services and all-time highs in personal income and personal spending. However you want to measure it, our wealth and affluence is unmatched anywhere in any country, in any time.

And yet, last April we saw the heart of the inner city of our Nation's Capital go up in flames and torn by violence. We saw machine guns set up in the shadow of the Capitol Dome. We, who live there, had to walk by armed guards and troops. The same thing was happening in Chicago at the same time. It will happen again elsewhere or be tragically repeated in the same cities.

It was a time of somber, sober reflection for all of us. One could not help but think how confused we are about the kind of nation we live in, and how little time there is to make decisions about the kind of nation we want to be. One wonders what keeps us from confronting the question of our goals and our capacities, what the problems are and what really needs to be done.

The economic problem of today is no longer how to create wealth. We have demonstrated that. The real problem is how to use our wealth—not how to add to our treasure but how to invest our resources to build the kind of nation we want to live in.

What we need today—it seems to me—is nothing short of a complete reappraisal of our basic priorities as a people and as a nation.

While there are no single answers, there is one condition that can no longer be neglected. That is the nation's economic schizophrenia—our rising private affluence amid appalling public need.

We have urgent and public needs that must be met if we are to survive. And in our dynamic economy we have the means to meet them if we want to.

Each year the United States creates as much new extra wealth as the entire GNP of Sweden and Switzerland combined.

We must use a higher proportion of this new wealth each year for investment in public needs. Such investment is essential to our economic growth, for each year we are finding our most important capital is human capital; our greatest economic as well as humanitarian return is on our investment in people.

For instance, it is estimated by experts that about half the growth in output in the last 50 years has come from our investment in education, training and health.

We now know beyond doubt that a dollar spent now on a deprived youngster, for pre-kindergarten training, remedial reading, or vocational skill—will be returned many fold in just a few years.

The economic cost of crime is becoming a staggering burden—to say nothing of the human cost. Yet every school dropout becomes a potential candidate for the society of the violent.

As the Undersecretary of Commerce, Howard Samuels, a distinguished native of Candaigua, New York, said recently: "Somehow we have got to get over the idea that

private spending is good and public spending is bad. We seem to accept only grudgingly the need to spend money for water systems or projects like Head Start or Upward Bound—while hardly questioning the need to air condition our convertibles.

"These luxuries are certainly desirable," he went on to say, "and may our blessing continue to flow. But let's make sure we do not neglect the investments that enhance the quality of our lives—investments in parks, and in the minds of the ghetto children and in the slums of rural America."

We have not learned how to allocate our wealth and our resources between private spending and public need.

Let's look at it.

We spend as much for chewing gum as for model cities. We spend as much on hair dye as for grants for rural communities. We spend as much on pet food as on food stamps for the poor. We spend more on tobacco than government, at all levels, spends on higher education. We spend \$300 million for costume jewelry and quarrel over whether we should spend \$10 million for a rural manpower training program.

Can we afford to really fight poverty? Can we afford to revitalize rural America. Of course we can! Excluding defense, we spend only 12 percent of our Gross National Product in the public interest, at all levels of government.

What we cannot afford is to continue to neglect our critical social needs. When it takes Federal troops to keep order in our cities because people are hungry, illhoused, jobless and desperate then it is not hard to see that the future of our freedoms depends upon resolving and solving these social ills.

"I saw the world around me," said the English writer Daniel Defoe, "one part laboring for bread, the other part squandering in vile excess or empty pleasures—both equally miserable because the end they proposed fled from them."

The end we propose—the just an enduring society—still flees from us. But it is within our means to achieve. When I look at the job waiting to be done, the fantastic resources we have at our command, I feel like Pogo when he said we are faced with "insurmountable opportunity." We need only the commitment and a great deal of national patience.

MESSAGE TO DELHI CONVENTION ON RURAL POVERTY BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN G. DOW

It is a great regret to me that I can't attend your conference on rural poverty, but I am happy to know that Mrs. Dow can represent me.

I am sure the problems are known better to all of you than to me, however, I have one or two points that I should like to mention which have struck me about rural poverty.

For one thing, people in rural areas suffering from this trouble have fewer resources to draw upon. They are not physically near institutions and agencies where they can find opportunities for work or help. Being out of touch with society generally, they don't have the city stimulus that reaches people in the ghetto. Besides, the rural poor are barely visible to public officials and others who might help them.

One of the most noteworthy drawbacks that I sense among rural poor is their reluctance or inhibition about asking or demanding attention. Possibly they feel inferior. They are also bound to a Puritan ethic which condemns seeking outside help.

This attitude contrasts very sharply with people involved in poverty in the city. In a city environment, the poor themselves are seldom modest about asking for help. Not only that, public agencies and groups which

look after them are constantly demanding the help also. They are applying to city, state, and Federal governments for grants. They engineer applications for rural aid far in advance of the time when it is expected. In fact, city people take as much glee in a successful negotiation for Federal funds as a businessman who has made a business coup.

This, you see, is so different from the modesty, restraint, and local pride that obtains in the poorer segments of rural society.

I hope that your conference will assure these rural people that it is no disgrace to seek help for themselves. If their living conditions are improved, then the rural areas and our whole society will be the better for it.

OPINION SURVEY

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as with others Members of the House, I have followed the custom of districting to the people of the Third Congressional District of Indiana, at my cost, an opinion survey on some of the major issues facing the Nation. The tabulations resulting from this poll will be sent to the President, the press, radio and television and will be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I submit this opinion survey for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRIEND: At this writing Congress is debating some of the most crucial issues facing the nation. Your opinion on some of these issues will be very helpful to me as your Congressman.

To record your opinion, simply take a sharp pencil and push out the "yes", "no" or "undecided" block next to each question on the reverse side of this card. (Be sure to remove punched tabs from the back of card.) Then enclose the card in a stamped envelope and mail to: Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS (Opinion Survey), 2134 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C., 20515.

The tabulations resulting from this poll will be sent to the President, the newspapers and will be printed in the Congressional Record. Your personal answers will, of course, be confidential.

Thank you for giving me your views. If you wish to comment on these or any other issues, I hope you will write me a letter.

Cordially,

JOHN BRADEMAS,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS' OPINION SURVEY

Do you favor—

1. Legislation prohibiting mail order gun sales and requiring registration of guns? Yes ; No ; Undecided .
2. A negotiated settlement of the Viet Nam War? Yes ; No ; Undecided .
3. Remaining in Viet Nam until a complete military victory has been achieved? Yes ; No ; Undecided .
4. Lowering the retirement age for Social Security benefits below 65? Yes ; No ; Undecided .
5. Lowering the voting age to 18? Yes ; No ; Undecided .
6. Electing the President by popular vote

instead of through the present electoral college system? Yes ; No ; Undecided .

7. Legislation to provide jobs in private industry or needed public service for unemployed persons? Yes ; No ; Undecided .

8. Limiting the amount an individual farmer or farm corporation can receive in Federal subsidies to \$10,000 a year? Yes ; No ; Undecided .

9. Reducing substantially the 27½% income tax depletion allowance permitted oil and natural gas producers? Yes ; No ; Undecided .

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Your answers will be more helpful if you complete this portion of the card.

1. Sex: Male ; Female .
2. Age: —24 ; 25–39 ; 40–64 ; +65 .
3. Party Preference: Dem. ; Rep. ; Indep. .
4. Registered to vote? Yes ; No .
5. Educational Level Completed: Elem. ; High School ; Some Coll. ; Coll. .

JOHN BRADEMAS,
Third District, Indiana.

LOSING A LEADER

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the final test of a leader is whether he leaves behind him in others the conviction and will to carry on. I believe the departing superintendent of schools in Pittsburgh, Dr. Sidney Marland, will meet that test, and Pittsburgh will be the better for having the benefit of his vision and planning.

KDKA radio-TV, Pittsburgh, carried an excellent editorial recently which summarized Dr. Marland's tenure—the magnitude of his undertaking—and the mark his administration has left on the whole community. We are grateful to him, and wish him well.

Under unanimous consent I submit the editorial for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

LOSING A LEADER

It's too bad that Dr. Sidney Marland decided to leave Pittsburgh in favor of a less strenuous position in New York City. We say that because we are losing one of the nation's most prominent public school administrators.

Consider for a moment some of the things that blossomed in the city schools under the Marland administration.

The nationally-acclaimed plan for the great high schools, a plan which called for the rebuilding of the entire city school system.

The city's first middle school which, as an important side effect, brought racial integration to ten schools on the north side.

The so-called Pittsburgh Scholars Program, a sophisticated curriculum for very able and ambitious high school students.

The occupational-vocational-technical program, better known as OVT, which strengthened vocational training, and tied it more closely to academic studies.

The nation's first pre-school orientation program for underprivileged children. This was the model for the federal program now known as Head Start.

And the nation's first program for motivating underprivileged high school students to go on to college. This has become the federal program now known as Upward Bound.

We are aware that these projects had to have the backing and support of the board of education. We are also aware that Dr. Marland has many critics. Some people say his administration has not been responsive to the demands of teachers and parents groups. But the fact remains that Dr. Marland is a most progressive thinker. He set very high goals for public education in Pittsburgh, and worked hard to achieve them. We hope the city schools can maintain the same high standard of dedication, and the same striving for excellence after he is gone.

THE REPORT SHOWS CALIFORNIA CRUDE OIL PRICES TOO LOW

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, California heavy crudes are undervalued, in comparison with light crudes, by as much as 65 cents per barrel and because of strong inflationary pressures and the pressing need to maintain adequate domestic reserves, general crude price increases may be long overdue.

These are the two basic conclusions in a report prepared for Independent Oil and Gas Producers of California by the Ben Holt Co., consulting engineers.

The purpose of the report was to determine the relative value of heavy California crude compared with light. Eight crudes ranging in gravity from 34.1° to 8.6° from five fields in all three—Los Angeles Basin, San Joaquin Valley, and the coast—major producing areas were evaluated.

The report notes that because of the steady decline in the market for heavy fuel oil in California, together with the increasing production of heavy California crudes, all of the California major refiners have installed facilities to process low-gravity, high-sulfur crudes and to convert such crudes largely to gasoline and high quality middle distillates. It is, in fact, possible to eliminate entirely the production of heavy fuel oil, although none of the refiners has done so as yet.

The evaluation of the crudes was based upon an analysis of yields from such refining facilities. The analysis found that gasoline accounts for from 79 to 85 percent of total income.

The contribution to sales of fuel gas and fuel oil increases as gravity decreases. This results from increased cracking and coking required to convert heavier crudes to gasoline. On a combined basis, fuel gas and fuel oil contribute from a low of 3.4 percent of total realization to a high of 9.3 percent of total realization.

Isobutane is produced in excess of that needed for alkylation and gasoline blending. The income from isobutane sales varies from 0.0 to 3.2 percent of the total. The JP-5 jet fuel—or stove oil—yield declines as gravity decreases. The income derived from sales of this cut declines even faster, since the cut from lower gravity crudes cannot meet JP-5 specifications and is sold at 8 cents per

gallon instead of 11.5 cents per gallon. The range is 12.4 percent of sales down to nothing.

Coke yields vary almost tenfold, from 49 tons per day to 455 tons per day as gravity decreases. The income from coke sales varies from 0.8 to 5 percent of total realization.

Sulfur yields are determined by the sulfur content of the crude and by the extent of cracking and desulfurization. The contribution of sulfur sales to total income is small, varying from a low of 0.3 percent to a high of 2.3 percent.

Overall product realization declines from a high of \$5.47 per barrel to a low of \$4.54 per barrel.

Operating costs of vacuum distillation and coking generally increase with decreasing gravity, reflecting the corresponding increase in yield of residuum.

The cost of catalytic cracking tends to decrease with crude gravity, reflecting the corresponding decrease in yield of vacuum gas oil.

The charge to hydrocracking tends to increase with decreasing gravity, since a large part of the charge is made up of light coker gas oil, the production of which increases with decreasing gravity. Since most of the hydrogen is consumed in hydrocracking, hydrogen costs form a similar trend.

The cost of reforming tends to decline with decreasing gravity reflecting the reduction in heavy naphtha, in part compensated for by increasing production of heavy hydrocrackate.

The cost of alkylation is proportional to the cost of catalytic cracking, since most of the feed to alkylation is produced from the cat cracker.

Tetraethyl lead costs vary with gasoline quality as well as quantity. There is no consistent pattern of lead costs.

Overall operating costs increase with decrease in gravity, but then decline again for the lowest gravity crude oils. The range is from a high of \$1.59 per barrel to a low of \$1.22 per barrel.

With 34.1 gravity Belridge crude at posted prices used as a base, the report finds that Wilmington 21.3 gravity is underpriced 28 cents per barrel; Belridge 18.1 gravity by 36 cents per barrel; Wilmington 14.8 gravity by 65 cents per barrel; Kern River 13.7 gravity by the same 65 cents per barrel; San Ardo 12.7 gravity by 44 cents per barrel; and San Ardo 8.6 gravity by 50 cents per barrel.

These values were arrived at by determining the refining margin realized from Belridge 34.1 gravity crude at posted prices and then comparing that margin with the margin realized from other crudes at their posted prices. For the purpose of the report, it was assumed that the Belridge light crude margin at \$1.03 per barrel is "normal." On that assumption, Wilmington 21.3 gravity crude, for example, is underpriced by 28 cents per barrel because its refining margin is \$1.31 per barrel, 28 cents more than that of Belridge 34.1 gravity. The same procedure was followed for the other crudes noted above, with the results as indicated.

Independent Oil and Gas Producers of California has made many studies of the crude price situation in California since

the drastic cuts of 1958 and 1959. All of these studies have clearly demonstrated that crude prices here are unrealistically low in terms of product realization enjoyed by the refining industry. The report made by the Ben Holt Co., in much greater detail and with engineering precision, more than substantiates the assertions made by the association.

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, the National Collegiate Athletic Association has been a leader in the development of amateur athletics throughout the country. The extent of their contribution was amply illustrated by their recent report, and I would like to call the attention of the Members to their accomplishments:

REPORT ON THE INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATIONAL PROGRAMS

The colleges and universities of the NCAA have emerged as a most significant coordinated, national force in providing broad sports leadership, competent athletic instruction and training, and competitive opportunities. When the efforts of the NCAA membership are coupled with those of the high schools and junior colleges of the United States, it becomes dramatically clear that this nation's educational system is the dominant force which provides the major motivation, education, training, coaching and facilities in those sports and recreational pursuits which are most meaningful and popular in America today.

It is a unique system according to the sports patterns of most of the other nations of the world. It also is an envied system according to other nations—envied because it is successful and because thousands of young people are introduced each year to physical preparation and sports competition under competent and trained leadership.

The NCAA membership can be justifiably proud of the scope and impact of their programs. To illustrate in summary form, based upon 1966-67 activities:

154,179 student-athletes (men) participated in intercollegiate competition in 30 different sports.

81,694 contests in all sports were conducted on varsity, junior varsity and freshman levels.

15,727 women participated in intercollegiate and extramural competition.

1,438,989 men and women engaged in intramural competition in 52 different sports.

937,162 men and women were enrolled in NCAA members' required physical education programs.

1,539,943 individuals participated in physical education activities.

54,205 men were members of 862 recreational clubs; 22,635 women held membership in 686 similar clubs.

894,224 persons, college and community, took advantage of the opportunity to engage in 54 different informal recreational or play activities. Also, colleges and universities made their facilities available to 29 different community organizations which sponsored a variety of programs.

\$2,240,413,500 is the dollar investment. The valuation of the facilities and the amounts

of money spent to operate them, purchase equipment and sponsor these well-rounded programs is irrefutable proof of the sustained effort about which we speak.

On the intercollegiate level, basketball remains No. 1 in regard to institutional sponsorship, with only one 1966-67 NCAA member not supporting an intercollegiate team. Baseball moved into the No. 2 position with 527 institutions sponsoring the sport. The increase in both the number of institutions sponsoring intercollegiate football and the number of student-athletes participating is most impressive; it also is important to note that soccer continues to be the most rapidly growing intercollegiate sport in both sponsorship and participation.

Encouraging progress has been made in reversing the trend away from required physical activity for all. In 1961-62, 24.6 per cent of NCAA member institutions did not require physical education; by 1966-67, this negative factor had dropped to 21.5 per cent. Increased effort should be exerted to reduce this percentage.

Finally, we congratulate our colleagues and our sister institutions for their continued dedication to broad and expanded physical preparedness, recreational and sports programs for undergraduate and graduate students, faculty and qualified community groups.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT IMAGE AS WILDLIFE PROTECTION DAMAGED

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks, the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, of which I am a member, has held hearings on the circumstances involved in the granting of a permit by the Corps of Engineers to provide for a high rise development at the mouth of Hunting Creek, a tributary of the Potomac in Alexandria, Va.

The role of the top leadership of the Department of the Interior in the approval of this project is no less than shocking. This is particularly true when evidence presented at our hearings firmly demonstrates that Interior's professional staff has consistently opposed the granting of this permit as an act detrimental to wildlife and open space assets of the Potomac River. The image of the Department as a protector of wildlife and open space has been sadly hurt.

Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin; Congressman JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania; and Congressman JOHN E. MOSS, of California, are to be highly commended for their diligence and perseverance in bringing to light the facts concerning both the Interior Department's and the Corps of Engineers' role in this affair.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress, an article from American Forests magazine for June 1968 by Columnist Mike Frome:

(By Mike Frome)

I found myself one day enjoying the most delightful daydream, in which I was privileged to spend my career writing about the natural and intellectual glory of America,

evoking the love that all must feel for forest, river, prairie, wildlife and humankind, the diverse land forms and life forms. In this luxurious reverie I was free of issues, crises and conflicts, and of entangling occupation with the ways of politicians, bureaucrats and special economic interests.

Then the telephone rang. The dream was done.

It was a little old lady in tennis shoes. I could tell by the tone in her voice—blessed with idealism and honesty, hurt and anger, determination, confusion and uncertainty about the weakness and corruption in the world around her.

"I have read your article in Southern Living about the Everglades," said she, "but you do not fully impress me. It is one thing to advocate protection of endangered birds a thousand miles away, but why have you been silent about endangered birds at Hunting Creek on the Potomac River, close to your home? Are you, indeed, like the Department of the Interior, which screams like a bold hawk but behaves more like a frightened chicken?"

The lady left me no alternative but to pursue the issue. The details I subsequently discovered are sordid and stench. They reach far beyond the local setting of a potential land fill threatening a resting ground of diving ducks in their involvements and implications. But let us pick up the trail at the start and follow the smells where they may lead.

Hunting Creek empties into the Potomac at the southern border of Alexandria, Virginia, a dozen or so miles downstream from the heart of the Nation's Capital. It is an historic stream associated with the comings and goings of the master of Mount Vernon, the great shrine that lies about six miles south. The stream is crossed near its mouth by the George Washington Memorial Parkway, an eminently worthy component of the National Park System.

For thousands of years, or longer, the shallow waters at the mouth of Hunting Creek, touched by tidal inflow from the sea, have provided fertile feeding and resting areas for large numbers of gulls, terns and diving ducks. In recent years the inner tidelands of the Creek have been badly damaged by construction of an Interstate Highway interchange and by unsightly and smoking dumps, part of a landfill awaiting high-rise development by the Marriott motel, hotel and restaurant family and others. These latter projects were bitterly and bravely protested by the Valley View Citizens Association before the Supervisors of Fairfax County. Their protests were in vain, alas, but then several of the supervisors were later indicted, along with the county planning director and assistant planning director, for complicity in a wide range of real estate adventures.

Despite these intrusions into the estuary, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife reported in 1964 that between 3,000 and 5,000 scaup and ruddy ducks winter in the vicinity. "Because of the importance as a diving-duck feeding ground of this shallow, open-water section in the embayment at the mouth of Big Hunting Creek, every effort should be made to protect this feeding area against destruction by either filling or dredging," the Bureau declared. "These shallow open waters, together with adjacent marshes, compose an unsurpassed opportunity for the conservation, enjoyment, and study of aquatic life in the vicinity of our Nation's Capital."

This testimony, offered by the finest wildlife professionals, echoed and supported fully by the park professionals, was later to be shamefully disavowed and discounted, for reasons that in due course will become clear.

For the present, the statement was occasioned by the introduction and passage of a bill, H.B. 591, in the Virginia legislature authorizing the sale of 36 acres of estuarine streambed at Hunting Creek, owned by the

Commonwealth, to an individual and a private firm. The individual, as it developed, is associated with the pension fund of a large labor organization. No quarrel there—unions have as much right to invest in real estate as anybody else—but the sole sponsor of H.B. 591, Delegate James M. Thomson, a lawyer of Alexandria, is known far better as a stalwart of good old free enterprise and states' rights than of public land rights, civil rights or labor's rights. Strange bedfellows!

The National Park Service felt so strongly about the Hunting Creek issue that it protested and appealed to Virginia authorities. For one thing, high-rise apartments would mar the view of the Potomac. For another, they would overload and commercialize traffic on the Parkway. Further, any development at this estuary would have demonstrable effect on the recently acquired Jones Point Park, which juts into the Potomac nearby. The safest and shortest access to the new park, assuring maximum public benefit, logically should be directly from the Parkway. But this would become impossible with high-rise development.

The Commonwealth turned its back on the Park Service and on the broad needs of its own people. However, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has the jurisdiction over navigable waters and must issue permits for dredging, filling and excavation. Thus the views of public agencies and citizen groups in Alexandria and Fairfax County were presented to the Corps. "The obstruction resulting from bulkheading and filling will alter natural silting processes at the mouth of Hunting Creek," declared the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. "Ensuing development on the proposed fills will constitute a disturbance factor which will adversely affect waterfowl and shore bird utilization in the general area and seriously obstruct public observation and enjoyment from the National Park Service's access area at Jones Point." This position was buttressed by expressions of interest and support by several members of Congress, including Representatives John Moss, of California; Henry Reuss, of Wisconsin; and others—all good men, concerned with the welfare of the national river as well as with affairs in their home districts.

Consequently the permit was denied and apparently lay dead for over three years. "We thought it over and done with," John Gottschalk, Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries, told me a couple of months ago. "Gosh, but we were asleep!" It was not, however, so much a case of protectors of public interest being caught off guard as of skillful persistence by the developers, who apparently comprise a national group of investors with elaborate connections.

They are represented, for instance, by the law firm of McCormack and Bregman—the former being the nephew of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable John McCormack. Contacts were made by the law firm with members of Congress. At least one or two Congressmen were induced, for one reason or another, to back away from the issues at Hunting Creek. Contacts were made with the Secretary of the Interior, a man who, among his many achievements, has charted a whole course for safeguarding the Potomac shoreline as a model for the treatment of many rivers. But in this case the Secretary was brought to his knees and surrendered, ordering Assistant Secretary Stanley Cain to withdraw previous objections.

On February 21 the Corps of Engineers conducted a public hearing in Alexandria. The National Park Service and Bureau of Sport Fisheries were not permitted by their Department leadership to testify and provide professional judgment. "The applicants were able to find someone in the Department who could give them a green light," Representative Reuss, appearing in behalf of Representative Moss and himself, declared during the hearing. He quoted a personal

letter from an Interior Department biologist, Francis Uhler, who refused to be silenced but insisted on following his own pathway of conscience and conviction with a statement that the mouth of Hunting Creek should be preserved as "the most important feeding grounds for diving ducks along the fresh tidal waters of the Potomac."

On March 8 the President issued his proposal for a Potomac National River, warning (in words drafted at the Interior Department) that "failure to act now will make us the shame of generations to come." This led me to feel the hour had come for the Secretary of the Interior to stand up in defense of Hunting Creek, and of the integrity of his own Department.

First, however, I wanted to reassure myself that the cause was just.

I phoned Director Gottschalk, who said, "Our report of 1964 is still valid. The marshes below will deteriorate. But the effect of this fill in itself is not our primary concern. We must choose: either we make the Potomac a model river or we make it a ditch."

Then I called Director George R. Hartzog, Jr., of the National Park Service, who said, "I am deeply disturbed. I agree completely with Mr. Gottschalk. I am worried about the process of decision-making and where it may lead."

These two comments were good enough for me, even though apologists at the political level in the Department kept saying, "We can't win them all, you know, and we don't always exercise control. Besides, the damage has been done to most of the estuary. The rest isn't worth saving."

But Joseph Penfold, Conservation Director of the Izaak Walton League, who has been fighting the battle of Hunting Creek, said, "Sure, this bit of stream and tidal estuary have been badly damaged, though not beyond restoration. We could complete the destruction by granting the subject permit, and then the next one to the north, and then Jones Point would be just about worthless as a piece of green shoreline for the public—so that could be turned over for development, too. Then we can follow with Dyke Marsh to the south, and another hundred miles of estuary down the Potomac. The point is that vast estuarine areas, the 67 percent of California's, the 50 percent of Long Island's south shore, have been lost—lost by attrition, small piece by small piece."

I talked to the Secretary of the Interior and then wrote him a letter asking for a recapitulation of the professional judgment of the National Park Service and Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and for an expression of his own personal views. The response came to me in the Secretary's behalf from David S. Black, Under Secretary of the Interior, who provided a long letter with many words and little substance.

What substance there was amounted to a denial of professional competence in the Park Service and Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, a disavowal of the best judgment of these two agencies, which I find disturbing and utterly frightening. For what happens along the banks of the Potomac today can happen anywhere tomorrow in our parks, forests and wildlife refuges, wherever the land developers and land despoilers decide to press the button, hire the right attorneys and apply the squeeze to the political leadership.

Thus, victory in the battle of Hunting Creek, which is still not beyond reach, would be a form of public honor and encouragement to professionals who devote their careers to public service. It would strengthen the muscle of legislators who want to do what is right, and forewarn those willing to do what is wrong. Under Secretary Black reminded me in his letter of the need to recognize private property rights. Surely, a victory at Hunting Creek would remind him and his associates that they must stand up and be strong in defense of public property rights.

STRANGE JUSTICE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, news releases are sometimes most revealing.

In Ohio, a National Guardsman, who refused to bear arms to defend life and property, received a 21-day jail sentence.

Adam Clayton Powell, on a charge of criminal contempt, was sentenced to 30 days in jail.

Doc Abernathy, for all his disturbances, received 20 days in jail.

Elsewhere in Washington, D.C., looters go acquitted.

But, in Boston, Mlot Mroz, described as a Polish "freedom fighter," was sentenced to 6 months for being a "common raller and brawler." His serious crime—he counterpicked Dr. Spock, a convicted antidraft conspirator.

Strange justice, considering that the U.S. Attorney General breaks the laws of Congress by refusing to use wiretaps to fight syndicated crime, and in rejection of enforcing the laws of his country prefers to use his office to abolish laws, such as capital punishment. For his breaches—a taxpayers' salary.

I include several news clippings as follows:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal, July 12, 1968]

OHIO GUARDSMAN GETS JAIL TERM FOR OBJECTING

CLEVELAND.—Refusal to bear arms during April racial disorders in Youngstown, Ohio, has resulted in a 21-day jail sentence for John M. Lenehan, 24, a student at the Cleveland Art Institute.

Lenehan, a National Guardsman who said he was a conscientious objector, was sentenced and reduced in rank from private first class to private.

About 600 National Guardsmen were ordered into Youngstown by Gov. James A. Rhodes when racial disorders erupted. Lenehan reported for duty, but refused to don his uniform or carry a weapon, according to Col. Danna L. Stewart, regimental commander and president of the court martial.

Lenehan's sentence was 21 days at "hard labor," but Stewart said it actually meant confinement in the county jail or workhouse.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal, July 12, 1968]

COURT UPHOLDS POWELL CONVICTION

NEW YORK.—The 1966 conviction of former Rep. Adam Clayton Powell on a charge of criminal contempt of court, which led to a 30-day jail sentence and a \$500 fine, has been upheld by a three-to-two vote of the Appellate Division of the State Supreme Court.

The ousted congressman's lawyer, Henry R. Williams, said after the ruling Thursday that no decision had been made yet on whether to take the case to the Court of Appeals, New York State's highest tribunal.

The 59-year-old Powell, who has been elected as a Democratic congressman from Harlem for more than 20 years, was reported to be on Bimini, his favorite island retreat in the Bahamas.

Thursday's ruling came after eight years of litigation over Powell's failure to pay a defamation judgment won by a 71-year-old Harlem widow who Powell called a "bag woman"—collector of graft for policemen—on a 1960 television program. It apparently

made Powell subject to arrest if he came into New York State without making a further appeal and obtaining a parole from a judge of the Court of Appeals.

The amount of the defamation judgment to Esther James went up and down drastically over the years as more than a dozen state judges issued opinions on Powell's conduct in the case. Some time ago, Powell cleared himself of a civil complaint conviction by paying more than \$56,000 to Mrs. James.

Thursday's court decision did not specify at what point contempt of court in a civil case becomes serious enough to be considered criminal contempt.

The criminal contempt citation was made before the House of Representatives barred Powell from taking his seat at the start of the 90th Congress in 1967. The grounds were misuse of House committee funds and his embroilment with New York courts. Later that year, Powell was reelected to Congress in a special election but he never claimed his seat. In the primary last June 18, he won the Democratic nomination to run again in November.

In the criminal contempt case, a jury convicted Powell of deliberately violating court orders to appear for a financial examination in connection with the defamation judgment. State Supreme Court Justice Arthur Markewich imposed the jail sentence and fine.

Last March 22, Powell appeared late at night at Markewich's apartment here. Markewich paroled Powell—lifting the danger of arrest—on condition that he appeal immediately to the Appellate Division, which he did. He later visited the city, and has preached at the Abyssinian Baptist church of which he is pastor. But Thursday's decision nullified his parole.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 12, 1968]

MARCHERS ACQUITTED OF DISORDERLY CONDUCT

Five young women from Memphis who were arrested Tuesday during a Poor People's Campaign demonstration at the Capitol were acquitted of disorderly conduct charges yesterday by Judge Charles W. Halleck of the Court of General Sessions.

The Government, he ruled, had charged them under the wrong statute in an attempt to avoid a jury trial in the case. Judge Halleck said the women should have been charged with unlawful assembly on the Capitol grounds—a more serious offense for which a jury trial may be demanded—but not with the crime with which they were charged.

The Judge said there was "no evidence" that anyone had been disturbed by the marchers' actions. "If these had been kids from some high school singing the school fight song instead of 'We Shall Overcome,' we would never have had this case," he said. "You only charged them with disorderly conduct because you knew you couldn't get a jury to convict them under the other statute," he told Assistant U.S. Attorney Oliver Houck.

The only persons ever tried under the unlawful assembly statute were acquitted by a jury. The maximum penalty for disorderly conduct is 90 days in jail or a fine of \$250 or both. Unlawful assembly on the Capitol grounds can bring a jail term of up to six months.

Five men arrested in the same demonstration made the same legal argument in their trial before Judge William C. Pryor yesterday, but were returned to jail for the night when the Judge reserved a ruling.

Judge Halleck warned the five women—Joyce Reid, Henri Sanders, Elsie Green, Gwendolyn Porter and Melberta Meadows—that if they repeat the offense they will be charged with the more serious crime.

A sixth woman, Margaret Katrosick, 21, of Detroit, pleaded no contest and was ad-

judged guilty. Judge Halleck gave her the maximum sentence but suspended it on the condition that she return to Detroit.

On a related matter, Judge Milton S. Kronheim yesterday withdrew his threat to hold Assistant U.S. Attorney Daniel Harris in contempt of court for an argument that developed over a demonstration case on Wednesday. They reached an amicable understanding in chambers, Harris said.

In another development, SCLC officials announced that their all-night vigil outside D.C. Jail will begin at 9 o'clock tonight and continue until the Rev. Ralph David Abernathy, the Campaign's leader, is released Saturday morning.

The Poor People's mule train is scheduled to meet Mr. Abernathy, who is completing a 20-day sentence, at the jail at 11 a.m. and carry him to the Campaign's "action center" at Mount Carmel Baptist Church, 3rd and I streets nw.

A spokesman for the Department of Corrections said yesterday that Mr. Abernathy would be released "at the usual time" of between 8 and 9:30 a.m. The SCLC president was arrested with 200 other demonstrators on an unlawful assembly charge in a Capitol demonstration June 24.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal, July 12, 1968]

SPOCK FOE GETS BOND FOR APPEAL

BOSTON.—A familiar figure at antiwar and civil rights demonstrations is free on bail pending his appeal of a six-month jail sentence for his counterdemonstration after the sentencing of Dr. Benjamin Spock on antidraft conspiracy charges.

Josef Mlot-Mroz, 47, of Salem was arrested Wednesday when he became involved in a scuffle with supporters of Spock while he carried a sign outside the federal building denouncing them.

He was sentenced Thursday on the seldom used charge of being "a common raller and brawler," and was freed in \$1,000 bail when he appealed.

Mlot-Mroz, who describes himself as a former Polish "freedom fighter," was stabbed during a scuffle near the start of the Poor People's Campaign in Boston recently. He had been carrying a sign reading: "I fight poverty—I work."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 3, 1968]

NO WIRETAPS FOR CLARK

If there is such a thing as a blue ribbon for inconsistency and nonsense in the field of law enforcement it should be pinned on the lapel of Attorney General Ramsey Clark. Or perhaps he should share the award with his superior, Lyndon B. Johnson.

The attorney general last month told a Senate subcommittee that the federal government would refuse to use the wiretap authority recently granted by Congress in the omnibus crime bill "except in national security cases." He had said much the same thing in the past. In taking this position, Clark, although he doubtfully believes in it himself, was undoubtedly acting in accordance with the President's command.

But how does this make sense? If wiretaps, which have been approved for some years by the President without any authority except his own say-so, are essential in national security investigations, what possible justification is there for refusing to use them against, for example, organized crime? The attorney general has never answered this, except to repeat that they are necessary in national security cases and not necessary otherwise. This simply doesn't stand up—not if the government is really serious in its "war on crime."

New York's District Attorney Frank S. Hogan has testified to his belief that wiretaps must be used if the higher-ups in organized crime are ever to be caught and

punished. Hogan now has completed an investigation of corruption in the New York City police department. For six years the district attorney has been tracking down bribery by organized racketeers, principally gamblers, of officers in the department, some of them highly placed. They are said to have been warning the racketeers when honest police were preparing raids or arrests.

This form of corruption by organized crime, though it is only one of many, threatens to undermine the whole fabric of our society and its law-enforcement efforts. Yet President Johnson and his attorney general wouldn't think of tapping a wire to break up the racket.

What about District Attorney Hogan? Wiretaps were extensively used in the corruption probe. Thirty-seven suspects, including 19 policemen, have been indicted. One of the latter held a key post in the chief inspector's office. Why the wiretaps? Because Hogan knew, Ramsey Clark notwithstanding, that this case couldn't be broken without them.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 2, 1968]

CLARK URGES ABOLITION OF DEATH PENALTY

Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark, quoting George Bernard Shaw that "murder and capital punishment are not opposites that cancel one another but similars that breed their kind," urged Congress today to abolish the death penalty for federal crimes.

Clark thus put the Johnson administration squarely behind a bill by Sen. Philip A. Hart, D-Mich., which asks that the death sentence not be imposed for any offense punishable under federal law.

Clark said he favors abolition of capital punishment for all crimes—including assassination of the president or vice president. He conceded, in answer to questioning by Hart, that he had testified in favor of the death penalty for such offenses when the bill was submitted three years ago after the slaying of President John F. Kennedy in Dallas.

Hart's bill also provides that anyone under death sentence for a federal crime at time of enactment of the bill would have his sentence reduced to life imprisonment.

Clark, testifying before a Senate Judiciary subcommittee said:

"In the midst of anxiety and fear, complexity and doubt, perhaps our greatest need is reverence for life, mere life: Our lives, the lives of others, all life...."

"A humane and generous concern for every individual, for his safety, his health and his fulfillment will do more to soothe the savage heart than the fear of state-inflicted death which chiefly serves to remind us how close we remain to the jungle."

Clark said extensive studies have showed that the death penalty does not deter crime.

Most states still have capital punishment for some crimes, but Clark said it has been rarely used in recent years. In 1935 there were 199 executions while there was only one in 1966 and two in 1967.

GUARANTEED INCOME NOT POPULAR IDEA

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, as I have often said, a guaranteed income creates nothing but a false image in the minds of millions of Americans. It certainly is not a proper idea creating the impression that an individual does not have to work

to earn a livelihood, rather than building himself up from his own bootstraps.

Such ideas are not good—they only bring this country closer to a welfare state.

An interesting opinion on a guaranteed income is set forth in an editorial in the Bristol Herald-Courier on Wednesday, July 10, 1968, which I pass along to the readers of the RECORD:

GUARANTEED INCOME NOT POPULAR IDEA

One of the reasons often cited for the current wave of strife and discontent in the United States is that people have been led to expect too much, too soon in the way of material gains. Day and night they see a fantastic array of the good things of life spread before them.

The situation, it is said, is further aggravated by political promises that cannot be kept—promises of government spending on all manner of programs that a debt-burdened country obviously cannot undertake.

Whatever the reasons, a great many people, as typified by the Poor People's March on Washington, are bluntly demanding a larger cut of the economic pie without too much regard for how they get it.

Responsible business leaders, high government officials and economists, far from turning their backs on these demands, are seeking workable means of providing a measure of economic well-being to everyone, whether they add to the productivity of the nation or not.

This is a tall order, but some believe it can be accomplished within the framework of a capitalistic, free enterprise system. They believe it can be done without destroying the incentives that have produced the great abundance of the U.S. which, under our existing system, has produced a higher standard of living for more people than was ever achieved before in recorded history.

Conservative economist, Dr. Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago, has long advocated what he calls a negative income tax under which the government would supplement the incomes of persons when their earnings fell below a certain point rather than subject them to an income tax. Mr. Friedman believes this form of guaranteed income would eliminate the need for costly welfare programs.

The most dramatic support for some form of a guaranteed income came recently when more than 1,000 academic economists endorsed the idea in a public statement. Many other economists declined to support the statement, because it made no attempt to appraise the dollars and cents cost to taxpayers. Estimates of the cost of the various income supplement or guaranteed income plans that have been proposed range from \$11 billion a year to \$26 billion a year.

Any guaranteed income plan, no matter how well thought out, and regardless of the degree of political and economic statesmanship behind its advocacy, will very likely encounter an uncertain reception where it counts most. A majority of the electorate may not accept it.

A recent Gallup Poll shows that, nationally, a majority of Americans oppose the idea of a guaranteed minimum income with only 36 percent in favor and 58 percent against such a plan. It is especially significant that 77 percent of the white and 86 percent of the nonwhite population would support a plan guaranteeing everyone enough work to earn a minimum income.

As one competent observer has said of a universal guaranteed income, "The only ones really against it are the people."

A high official of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations says, "Support for this kind of plan just doesn't exist and couldn't exist in a work-oriented culture."

A liberal Democratic member of Congress corroborates the labor leader's opinion in these words, with reference to his constituency: a "... great majority of my people, as of now, are against it. They think of it as just another handout, another way of avoiding work."

The American people have always been noted for their generosity. But there is no getting around the fact that, today, the American family, the wage earner, the businessman, the working housewife, all of us are highly aware of the burdensome and growing costs of government. Whether the people of the U.S. will accept the added tax burden which guaranteed income plans would require appears highly debatable, to say the least.

ELMER WINTER'S "YOUTHPower" CONCEPT HELPS YOUNG JOB-SEEKERS

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1968

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, nearly every section of the country is faced with the problem of finding worthwhile summer employment for its young people. In that connection, Youthpower, Inc., the idea of Elmer L. Winter of Milwaukee, has shown and is showing that this problem can be solved. The concept is explained in this article from the July 6 issue of Business Week:

YOUNG JOBSEEKERS FIND A FRIEND

Blonde Gail Majjala, 16, is one of 12 young people working this summer at Polly Prim Cleaners on Milwaukee's South Side. Downtown, at Northwestern National Insurance Co., Curtis Monk, a 16-year-old-Negro, scurries about as a supply clerk. Kathleen Biraecree, 18, is one of four girls cleaning windshields at a new Shell station in Glendale, a Milwaukee suburb.

These youngsters—and thousands like them in 28 cities in 16 states and Canada—have found summer jobs through Youthpower, Inc., a nonprofit organization sponsored by Milwaukee-based Manpower, Inc. Youthpower acts as a job clearing house for youths 15 to 21 years old and is privately financed mostly by Manpower, an international temporary help and business service company.

Youthpower offices open only for the summer months and are staffed by high school and college student volunteers, who interview applicants and match them to jobs at no charge to them or their employers.

Catching on, Youthpower's first office opened in Milwaukee on a test basis in the summer of 1964 and placed 1,300 youths. This year, an estimated 12,000 to 15,000 will be placed in jobs.

The idea for Youthpower came out of a meeting called five years ago by Irwin Maier, chairman of Journal Co., publisher of the Milwaukee Journal and the Milwaukee Sentinel. Maier was concerned about the great number of youths who wanted summer jobs but were unable to find any. At the meeting was Elmer L. Winter, Manpower's president. Winter felt that his company, with its experience in the employment field, would be able to help.

So far, Manpower has spent \$135,000 on the project, mainly providing office space (separate from its own offices), equipment, telephones, stationery, and the salaries of the adult supervisors—usually college students trained by Manpower.

Pitching in. In nine cities, local service

clubs and businesses have lent a hand as co-sponsors, supplying financial and other help. Among the co-sponsors: Cleveland's Higbee Co. department stores and the St. Louis Cardinals football team.

This year, Youthpower put greater emphasis on getting Negro radio stations and newspapers to devote more time and space to spreading the Youthpower message. Job recruiting stations were set up in ghetto sections of some cities, including St. Louis, Birmingham, and Milwaukee. "We are making a greater effort to place minority group members," Winter says. "We're not discriminating in reverse, but we do want a better balance than in the past."

Youthpower also has a special office in the predominantly Negro Lawndale section of Chicago. Unlike the other offices, it operates all year.

Other agencies. Youthpower, of course, has a lot of friendly competition in the various government agencies and programs concerned with putting youths to work. Major cities have Youth Opportunity Centers as offshoots of their state employment agencies. These, in turn, may have Youth Employment Services.

Functioning the year round, Youth Opportunity Centers seek long-term—not just summer—employment for people under 22.

Youth Employment Services generally work with service clubs in higher income suburban areas to place high school students in such jobs as babysitting and lawn mowing.

But even with the other programs, Winter sees a spot for Youthpower. "The state agencies," he says, "are better geared to the 18-and-over group. The difficult problem is getting jobs for the 15 to 17-year-olds. That's the gap we fill."

Staffing Youthpower office with young volunteers has several advantages. Says Winter: "It's good training. They're working with a cross section of the people and you can see the serious side of these kids as they participate constructively in the community." The applicants also like to deal with others their own age.

The volunteers also arrange for gas stations, department stores, and other businesses to conduct quickie training clinics on a variety of jobs.

NO LEGISLATION CAN PREVENT CRIMINALS FROM SECURING AND USING GUNS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the time of decision by Members of the House on the question of firearms legislation is near at hand. The June 26, 1968, issue of the Erie, Pa., Morning News carried a most interesting statement on the question of firearms registration from the Erie County Council of Sportsman Clubs. So that my colleagues may have the benefit of the council's views, I submit the text of its statement for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HYSTERIA VERSUS COMMON SENSE: WILL FIREARMS REGISTRATION STOP ARMED CRIME?

These troubled times weigh heavily on all responsible, concerned citizens. The problems within and without our country are too numerous and complex for any one man to fully comprehend. Unfortunately many people confuse the symptoms of our ills with their causes. There is great danger in this if we take action on such a false basis. You and I empower government with the au-

thority to act on our behalf. But we must give them the right direction if we are to survive as a free nation. In recent years we seem to have developed an inclination to try and eliminate problems by passing laws, especially laws prohibiting people from doing things by which a minority seemingly cause trouble.

Much of the current sentiment against citizens owning and using firearms is based very largely on a notion that if guns were more strictly regulated, there would not be so many murders and robberies and such. But most proposed firearms legislation is pointed in the wrong direction. It disarms the honest, law-abiding citizen, while it falls miserably in its avowed purpose of disarming the criminal. It is aimed at outlawing the gun rather than punishing the criminal who uses the gun for illegal purposes. No legislation can prevent criminals from securing and using guns.

Overly restrictive and ineffective gun laws affect not only the sportsmen, but every citizen in this country. Some people, enraged and appalled by the assassinations of national figures cry for the abolition of guns. They believe this is the answer to our troubles. Even the popular press, led by such people, has taken up the cause. We can understand their fervor but we fear the consequences of their well intentioned but uninformed call for "gun laws". They reinforce the aims of anti-gun legislators who have publicly vowed their purpose is, "the ultimate confiscation of all privately owned firearm in this country."

We contend that such a drastic measure infringes the rights of citizens and will prove ineffective in curbing crime and violence.

In trying to prevent the use of firearms in crime, too many people forget that the right to keep and bear arms is critically significant to a free people. It is not by accident or merely because of the temper and conditions of the times that such a guarantee was the second item in the Bill of Rights. Like other protections of the individual in the constitution, as originally amended, this was a product of a knowledge and understanding of history . . . the kind of history which those fail to understand are doomed to repeat. As we strive to solve the problem of increasing crime in some areas, our efforts must be based on reason and knowledge, not emotions or misinformation.

Existing laws must be strictly enforced with severe additional penalties for individuals who use a firearm in the commission of a crime.

Firearms registration is the first step toward the ultimate confiscation of all privately owned firearms. Fees (taxes) are necessarily part of such a plan. They serve two purposes. First, it costs a great deal to build and maintain a bureaucracy of sufficient size to conduct such activities in a country with as many shooters and guns as ours, second, the fees can easily be increased when such laws are on the books to indirectly reduce private firearms ownership. Taxation has long been an effective method for control of the "public's" activities.

As fees increase the number of citizens able to afford the "luxury" of shooting sports will diminish.

With increasingly less opposition, gun laws will be easier and easier to tighten up as time goes on, and the anti-gun faction will have achieved its goals completely. Privately owned firearms will be gone.

If shooting sports become another thing of the past, wildlife and natural outdoor habitat will suffer greatly. Hunters and fishermen pay for the support of all fifty state Fish and Game Departments through license purchases. The money does not come from general revenue as most people believe.

These Fish and Game Departments are charged by law with the protection of all wildlife. Hunters' money pays for law enforcement personnel to protect hundreds of

nonhunted species such as shore birds, song birds, certain hawks and owls, and many mammals which everyone enjoys. Refugees bought and paid for by hunters' money support more species of non-hunted wildlife than game. In most cases, the refuges are opened to the general public which pays nothing. The nature lover is seldom aware that the preservation and increase of wildlife he enjoys is made possible only through funds supplied by hunters.

The entire spectrum of natural resources benefits from the hunting, permit moneys. Wildlife management enhances water shed valves, increases the fertility of the land, prevents erosion, makes the landscape more attractive, and provides for other benefits to the land and water resources.

During the past sixty years the economic contribution of the hunter to the conservation movement has been immeasurable.

Some may scoff but firearms in the hands of citizens are a significant deterrent to the take over of our country. Witness the history of Germany, Czechoslovakia and Norway. Above all, the communists and other militant groups know that, by and large, they are dealing with a peaceable and disarmed population. In frontier days, every man, woman, and child could shoot a rifle and was ready to do so as required. In the intervening years of industrial growth and urbanization, our citizens have become psychologically unprepared for the twentieth century equivalent of an Indian Raid or to the use of weapons that are necessary to defend themselves.

The only way terror or take-over can ever succeed, is if the population is not prepared for it and if it is unarmed and, therefore, helpless.

We believe that responsible citizens will join with sportsmen to quell the hysteria for firearms registration, at any cost. The urgency for level-headed thinking on the question of more and tighter firearms controls has never been so great.

YOU NEVER SEE SIGNS OF A DESIRE FOR A CHANGE

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, pressures are being exerted on the Congress to try to get additional moneys appropriated to help the needy throughout the land. I agree that many of our citizens do need help and need it desperately. But an editorial in the Journal and the Nable County Leader, published at Caldwell, Ohio on July 11, 1968, makes a good point. The editorial is entitled "Brooms Are Cheap." It is not the complete answer to all of the problems of today, but self-help is certainly a necessity for the success of any such programs.

Under unanimous consent I submit this editorial for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

BROOMS ARE CHEAP

Those graphic presentations of the conditions some of our less fortunate citizens live under are appearing thick and fast these days. There are TV specials, and picture spreads in magazines and newspapers. They vary little, if at all. There are photos of debris-filled lots unfit for children to use for the games that we used to play in our springtime years. There may even be a deserted hulk that was once an automobile. Sometimes there is a refrigerator without

doors and more often than not a mattress with its entrails of cotton bulging forth.

The buildings are the highlights of the photo-tour, however. There's never much variation here, either. The buildings have more than capacity of tenants; they are in sore shape as far as maintenance is concerned, the paint is peeling, the light bulbs in the halls are bare if there are bulbs in the sockets at all, the steps are broken, the plaster is falling and the walls have writing on them. Name a building flaw and these pictorial essays will include it.

Then there are the pictures of the plumbing—buckets under the sinks, the cracked pipes in the bathroom, the cracked porcelain, repulsive filth.

There is just one ingredient missing in these human interest sagas.

You never see anyone with a mop or a broom. You never see signs of a desire for a change—active desire. Certainly no one in his right mind would lack for desire to make haste from these slum dwellings, but there are different kinds of desire. A man may have a passive desire for most anything, but that isn't going to help him achieve it. It is active desire that goads him to act towards achieving his ambitions. A broom, a mop and a bucket of soapy water would be a manifestation of that active desire.

This all comes to mind because of a big quarter-page picture which appeared in *The Harvey Herald*, Harvey, North Dakota. It shows a group of teenaged girls hard at work painting a dark railroad underpass. The city provided the paint. The power company supplied some new light fixtures. But the girls, Future Homemakers of America, supplied the elbow-grease, under supervision of the local home economics instructor.

They have demonstrated a practice that will work in neighborhoods in large cities or small, and brooms are not expensive.

Maybe a TV network or a slick magazine should stage a reenactment. Some folks might follow their example.

LSD CONTROL ACT PROTECTS YOUTH

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, there are many pressing problems in the world, but now is no time to "freak out." Instead, the younger generation of Americans needs to come to grips with reality and perhaps do a better job of running things than their parents did.

To help our young people avoid the dangers of drug use and the feeling of hallucination that some of the newer forms provide, it is up to us to provide the controls which are necessary to prevent such use or misuse of the new drugs. Therefore, I have supported the legislation increasing penalties for unlawful acts involving LSD and other depressant and stimulant drugs.

Congress passed legislation in 1951 prohibiting the dispensing without a prescription by a licensed practitioner of drugs which require supervision by a practitioner of their use. At the time there was relatively little illicit traffic in certain drugs which now have found widespread use among students and other youths.

In the early 1960's the unusual effects of LSD on the central nervous system began to attract the attention of many young people, and its use was advocated and sensationalized by persons stating that the increased insights into one's personality derived through these drugs would enable users to live fuller and more complete lives by "dropping out" of society. The messages to "turn on, tune in, and drop out" has reached all too many of the young, and the abuse of hallucinogenic drugs has increased steadily since that time.

This bill is intended to curb the illicit traffic in these drugs through providing increased penalties and by providing, as a tool to aid in the enforcement of the prohibitions against trafficking, penalties for illicit possession of drugs subject to the act.

The measure attempts to strike a balance between the conflicting viewpoints on the question of whether possession of dangerous drugs obtained illicitly should be made a prohibited act. The bill makes possession a misdemeanor with penalty of fine or imprisonment, but it provides also that where an individual is charged with simple possession of dangerous drugs obtained without a doctor's prescription, and he has not previously been convicted of a violation of the law with respect to dangerous drugs, the court may place him on probation for up to a year. I applaud this compromise which will enable the courts to exercise judgment in handling of individual cases while enabling law enforcement authorities to punish the real offenders.

In my own area parents have been shocked to learn that their youngsters had been associated with LSD users or had even taken a "trip" of their own. All over the Nation, the people are demanding that Congress act to protect the country's youth from those who would exploit their naivete and desire for excitement into this dangerous activity. I strongly support the necessary measures to curtail the use of these drugs and protect our young people.

Mr. Speaker, the great majority of American young people have already rejected the false siren song of these drugs. Those who have already used LSD or other drugs may see the error of their ways when new penalties take effect, and those who might try it will be encouraged not to.

By enacting this legislation we are telling young America: "Wake up and live. This is your world and you can change it if it does not suit you. Do not be a dropout from society but instead be faithful to your parents, your schools, your churches, and your country."

This Nation cannot afford to allow the precious resources of its youthful talents, ideals, and energy to be wasted on the false allure of drugged slumber. We can do without LSD; we cannot do without the new generation.

A big step forward has been taken by the passage of this legislation, but we must remember to remain vigilant to this type of danger and always be prepared to protect our country's greatest resource—its youth.

JUST WHAT IS DEESCALATION?

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the history of our failure to recognize and respond to legitimate peace overtures by North Vietnam is well documented. From all appearances, another chapter is being written by our administration's attitude toward the current lull in hostilities in Vietnam. Despite the withdrawal of enemy forces from within Saigon, despite a suspension of mortar and artillery attacks on the city, and despite a stabilization of enemy troop strength, spokesmen for the United States deny that North Vietnam is exercising the sort of restraint which would justify a halt in our bombing.

And so, U.S. troop strength in Vietnam increases—by 19,000, to a total of 535,000—since the President's peace overture in March. And the bombing of North Vietnam continues, even escalating to 3,792 missions during the month of June, more than 1,200 more than the total for March. And the Paris talks continue—stalemated.

What sort of restraint do we demand of North Vietnam for the bombing halt that could bring meaningful negotiations and eventual peace to that war-torn nation? Is there, in fact, any gesture the other side could make that we would not brand either as insufficient or a direct response to American military pressure?

For too long, our policies in Vietnam have been the products of State Department antennae. It is about time that they were replaced with commonsense and new initiative. We can hardly expect North Vietnam to undertake an act of deescalation while publicly advertising it as such to the whole world, including her Communist allies, for to do so would involve a loss of face so important to Asians.

In my view, the sum total of enemy activities in recent weeks may well be a sign of restraint and an invitation for mutual deescalation. If we do not attempt a bombing halt, we may never know.

I present for inclusion in the RECORD, a New York Times editorial and article dealing with these issues and events:

STRAWS IN THE WIND?

The Paris peace talks have been virtually stalemated for two months because Hanoi continues to insist on a complete halt to the bombing of North Vietnam before moving to substantive discussions. Repeating a theme that has been voiced by American spokesmen since President Johnson announced a partial limitation on the area of bombing last March 31, Ambassador Averell Harriman said in Paris this week that the bombing would be stopped as soon as North Vietnam gives some sign of reciprocal "restraint." Mr. Harriman accused the North Vietnamese of "continuing escalation and expanding aggression."

There is no question that Hanoi has openly boasted of its intention to "fight while talking" and that it has engaged in aggressive actions, most notably the guerrilla and rocket

attacks on Saigon, since the peace talks began. But it is not clear that the United States has really "reduced the level of hostilities," as American Government spokesmen claim. And it is possible that the other side is making gestures of restraint that have so far been ignored by the United States. These are the latest Pentagon figures:

The number of United States air missions against North Vietnam increased from a total of 2,654 in March, before the President's peace overture, to 3,593 in May and 3,792 in June. Is this reducing the level of hostilities?

The number of United States troops in South Vietnam has increased by 19,000—to 535,000—since Mr. Johnson first invited North Vietnam to match American restraint. During the same period the Pentagon's estimate of enemy troop strength has remained unchanged—between 207,000 and 222,000—despite repeated charges of heavy enemy infiltration. Is it reasonable to object to a level of infiltration that merely maintains enemy force levels when the allies are continuing to expand their own forces?

Last week the number of American casualties dropped to the lowest level in six months; estimated enemy deaths fell to the lowest figure in eighteen months. A dispatch from Saigon observed: "The weekly casualty report reflected a prolonged lull in the ground war which senior U.S. officers blamed on refusal of the enemy to be drawn into combat." American officials have said the allies are pursuing a "fight hard" strategy, but the enemy "does not want to fight."

This fighting lull has continued for more than a month. The enemy has even stopped, at least temporarily, his rocket attacks on Saigon which some American officials have said were impossible to prevent. Are these not possibly signs of the restraint the United States has been calling for—"straws in the wind" that have been largely overlooked?

The only way to find out is to stop the bombing of North Vietnam, which is of marginal value anyway, and to call on Hanoi's negotiators to get down to substantive business at least in Paris. If the foe is merely regrouping for fresh assaults, allied ground forces—aided by the massive air support they will continue to enjoy in the South—should be able to throw back any challenge. But the possibility that these are serious signals, opening the way to peace should not be allowed to go untested.

SHELLING HALT A GOOD SIGN

(By Hedrick Smith)

PARIS, July 13.—W. Averell Harriman said today that the current lull in the war could not be considered the "sort of restraint" by enemy forces demanded by President Johnson in return for a halt in the bombing of North Vietnam.

Mr. Harriman, chief American negotiator at the Vietnam talks here, turned aside the suggestion of a television interviewer that the reduced level of combat might be connected with the negotiations between the United States and North Vietnam.

"They haven't shelled Saigon for a couple of weeks and that's a good sign," he said, referring to the absence of enemy rocket and mortar attacks since mid-June.

At that time he told the North Vietnamese that the rocket attacks could have serious consequences for the talks. They tapered off, giving rise to speculation in Western diplomatic circles that the lull might have diplomatic significance.

Mr. Harriman, an Ambassador at Large, contended that the lull in fighting marked only a return to normal operations after intensification of the war by enemy forces in May and early June.

"I wouldn't say that the reduction of the escalation which they have been engaged in since March 31 could be considered some sort

of restraint," he said. Later, he added more specifically that there had been no indication of deliberate restraint by the enemy.

In an interview with Dr. Hugo Portisch of Austrian Television, taped yesterday and made public today by the American delegation, Mr. Harriman did not signal any changes in the United States position.

He said that as soon as the question of mutual military deescalation of the war was resolved, the next step would be for the South Vietnamese to join the talks. The United States wants to have the Government of South Vietnam represented in the next phase of talks dealing with political issues, he added.

DISAPPOINTMENT VOICED

Mr. Harriman said he was disappointed that the peace talks had made no progress in two months, but he predicted that once North Vietnamese negotiators "get through the propaganda, they will be willing to talk hard sense."

The North Vietnamese accused the United States on Wednesday of "spreading rumors" of forward movement in the talks.

However, the American envoy insisted that in informal recess talks American delegates had been able to "touch on serious matters" of substance and had gained "a little bit more of an idea of what's important" to the North Vietnamese.

The ambassador said President Johnson was "very flexible" on his requirement for matching restraint from North Vietnam in return for a bombing halt. This meant that the North Vietnamese "wouldn't have to state" directly what measures they were taking "as long as they did so or agreed to do so," Mr. Harriman said.

American suggestions for restoration of the demilitarized status of the zone between North and South Vietnam, reduction of infiltration into South Vietnam or a decrease in artillery fire across the DMZ are "the sorts of things we have in mind" but are not presented as "musts," Mr. Harriman said.

STRAWS IN WIND SEEN

More specifically than before, the United States representative listed what he described as favorable "straws in the wind." He cited the reduction of shelling of Saigon, the willingness of North Vietnamese delegates to discuss matters of substance in private, Hanoi's decision to release three more captured American fliers, the return to Hanoi of Le Duc Tho, the most important member of the North Vietnamese delegation for a high-level review and the impression that North Vietnam has "practically admitted" that its troops are fighting in South Vietnam.

In the early negotiating sessions, Mr. Harriman made a major point of asserting that Hanoi had to make such an admission to provide the basis for a mutual withdrawal of forces.

"Well," he said today, "at least we smoked them out and they don't deny any more that there are Northerners in the South."

Actually, North Vietnam has not made such an admission directly. It asserts that all Vietnamese have the right to fight foreign forces anywhere in the country and that "our people" or "our compatriots" have undertaken this national struggle.

HAYDEN CRITICAL OF UNITED STATES

Thomas E. Hayden, national coordinator of the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, said yesterday that United States insistence that prisoners freed by Hanoi travel on official government planes might jeopardize future releases.

Mr. Hayden, just back from Paris, where he took part in discussions that are expected to result in the release of three more United States airmen, said in an interview that the American attitude, which he said had been expressed by W. Averell Harriman, the chief

United States negotiator, and other United States officials in Paris, might sabotage North Vietnam's "small but concrete act of goodwill."

According to Mr. Hayden, the American envoy insisted that the airmen be flown back to the United States in an official plane after their arrival in Vientiane, Laos, and Hanoi. Mr. Hayden said the released prisoners should have a choice of flying by official plane or a regular commercial airliner.

Three members of the antiwar group arrived in Hanoi on Friday to receive the three airmen, whose names have not yet been made public. The three committee members are: Mrs. Anne Scheer of Berkeley, Calif.; Stewart Meacham of Philadelphia, and Vernon Grizzard of Cambridge, Mass.

It is the second time that North Vietnam has announced the release of three airmen. The first group, freed in February, was turned over in Hanoi to two pacifists, Howard Zinn, a Boston University professor, and the Rev. Daniel Berrigan, a Jesuit priest at Cornell University.

That first group of airmen was taken over by the United States authorities on their arrival in Vientiane and flown by military plane to the United States.

DENIAL BY HARRIMAN AIDE

PARIS, July 13.—Asked about the charges made by Thomas Hayden, a source close to the American delegation at the talks here denied today that Ambassador Harriman had insisted that the released prisoners return to the United States by Government aircraft.

According to the source, Mr. Harriman told Mr. Hayden that he hoped that the freeing of the Americans would not be used by the peace group for propaganda purposes and that the wishes of the men themselves should be the governing factor in deciding how they would go home.

THANT URGES BOMBING HALT

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Secretary General Thant said today that he was confident that if the United States stopped all bombing of North Vietnam, the North Vietnamese would make "a definite move towards peace."

He spoke with reporters on his first day back at headquarters from a two-week trip to Europe where he conferred with both the North Vietnamese and United States sides in the Paris peace talks. He said his conferences had confirmed his long-standing view that stopping all the bombing would produce results.

THE BIAFRA POGROM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as more information leaks through to the American people, they are aghast at the indifference of our leadership toward the wholesale slaughter and starvation of the Ibo tribesmen of Biafra.

Can it be because of the State Department's fear of upsetting the extremist leftwing OAU—Organization of African Unity—that facts have not been properly reported to our people? And all this while the OAU soul brothers in the United States claim starvation and malnutrition in our country as they and the Red fronts massacre hundreds of thousands of Africans?

Where is the cry of the Red-black power dominated U.N. humanitarians?

The ultraliberal communications media, who are so ready to pounce on anything American?

Or could it be that the terrorists had felt by now they should have "overcome" the Biafrans and the sordid news would never reach the conscience of the free world.

These people need help. Communism and its many allies must be exposed for what they are—a mob of power-hungry murderers who cloak themselves with fancy titles as they seek to justify murder and slavery in the name of peace and progress. "Peace" which, of course, means to the Communist removal of any opposition to their pogroms.

Mr. Speaker, I include recent news releases from the Biafran Republic and an interpretative report of Andrew Borowiec from the July 16 Evening Star, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS

BIAFRA, July 8, 1968.—The British Government has made capital of Biafra's inability to allow relief supplies through enemy territory by means of the so-called sea and land corridors. That the British Government should insist on this, in spite of the practical difficulties, betrays their real intentions of helping Nigeria to achieve its military and political objectives. The British Government knows that bridges in the areas occupied or menaced by the enemy have been broken in order to impede enemy advance just as the channels have been blocked for the same reason. To facilitate relief supplies by land or sea corridors would entail restoring the bridges and clearing the channel—in other words, all obstacles to rapid enemy advance would be removed.

By supporting Nigeria's stand that all relief supplies for Biafra should either be channelled through Lagos or sent only with the approval or permission of Nigerian authorities, the British Government is clearly trying to promote Nigeria's political and diplomatic aims. This is further underlined by the British Government's current attempts to induce even private donors in Britain to channel their aid through Lagos rather than direct to Biafra.

All considerations apart, Nigerians have been known to poison food coming into Biafra—a fact recently confirmed by a correspondent of a leading British newspaper, as well as European missionaries.

The representatives of Oxfam and the International Red Cross, after an on-the-spot study of the problems involved, have confirmed that massive airlift offers the best hope of prompt relief to the suffering people of Biafra. It is, therefore, curious that the British Government officials, sitting 4,000 miles away in Whitehall, should pretend to know better.

The Government of Biafra reiterates its position regarding aid to refugees as follows:

(1) The most effective means of saving the appalling situation now prickling the conscience of the world is an immediate ceasefire and the creation of conditions which would enable the refugees to return to their homes. In this connection, Biafra is ready and willing to co-operate with any international organisation, including the O.A.U., to bring about a ceasefire.

(2) The Government of Biafra welcomes, indeed urges, direct massive aid to the refugees of Biafra.

(3) Even if the objections already set out about the use of land or sea corridor had not existed, it would take weeks to restore broken bridges or clear blocked channels before any relief could reach those concerned, by which time thousands of people would have died. Hence the case for massive air lifts.

(4) The people of Biafra will not welcome relief supplies from the British Government as long as that Government continues to supply arms to the enemy, thus increasing and intensifying the very conditions it pretends to relieve.

BIAFRA, July 9, 1968.—The Biafran Commissioner for Health and Provincial Administrator for Uyo Province, Mr. James Udo-Afia, has disclosed that more than a hundred people die daily from food poisoning in some areas of Uyo, Annang and Eket provinces occupied by Nigerian troops.

The food is part of relief supplies which have been sent through Lagos for distribution to the needy in Biafra. In a statement today, the Commissioner said it is in order to continue the genocide that the Wilson's Administration has insisted that all relief supplies to Biafra should pass through Lagos.

He declared "there is incontrovertible evidence to show that the Nigerians forced the people to consume poisoned salt and Britain, with all the intelligence at its disposal cannot be exonerated for condoning this wicked plot against the Biafran population."

BIAFRA, July 9, 1968.—Nigerian war planes have been raiding small Biafran villages in the past two weeks. The planes circle the villages for several minutes, pick their targets leisurely, drop the bombs and leave the area.

A Nigerian war plane yesterday flew over Umuahia, in Biafra strafing traffic on the Umuahia-Aba road. There were no casualties.

Last week roads in the north of Biafra were strafed three times by Nigerian planes.

A Nigerian airforce plane today bombed Imo River village. A total of nine bombs were dropped. Several houses were destroyed, four civilians killed and fifteen others seriously wounded.

DOES PALMER'S THEORY OF SELF-DETERMINATION REPRESENT AMERICAN POLICY

BIAFRA, June 22, 1968.—During his visit to the Republic of Cameroon, Mr. Joseph Palmer Jr., United States Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, was quoted by the Voice of America as saying "when I speak about self-determination, I am talking about those areas of Africa that still remain under foreign control. I think it will be an unfortunate precedent for the rest of Africa if groups no matter how legitimate their grievances are will try to fractionalize the continent any further."

We should like to remind Mr. Palmer that the cause of declaration of independence by Biafra is Nigeria's relentless campaign of genocide and other atrocities perpetrated on Biafrans by the oppressive Nigerian regime.

Mr. Palmer would approve the breakaway of a people under colonial oppression, but not from an "independent" African state. It did not seem to have occurred to him that even an "independent" African state can be oppressively "colonial".

Having seen the "humanitarian considerations" involved in the Nigeria/Biafra struggle, President Julius Nyerere of Tanzania, President Houphouet-Boigny of the Ivory Coast, President Albert Bongo of Gabon, President Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia, have come out openly to condemn genocide and to support Biafra's sovereignty as the only way to stop the senseless extermination of a people. In the face of this decisive action by undisputed leaders of Africa, Mr. Palmer continues to insist, without caring to study and understand the issues at stake, that the legitimate claim of Biafra to self-determination cannot be respected by his Government.

The United States is being misled by Mr. Palmer into giving help to the Hausa-Fulani oligarchy in order to maintain at an intolerable cost to human life and against the wishes of the people, the arbitrary boundaries established by colonial Britain for her own selfish ends.

If Mr. Palmer is to be believed American policy in the Biafra/Nigeria conflict will be seen not to be dictated by her much advertised love for Africa but by the necessity to preserve a rigid image of what Africa should be, even at the cost of millions of innocent African lives.

While many European countries have banned the supply of arms to Nigeria and others are striking out against the genocidal policy of the British backed Nigerian aggression and are planning rescue operations to save Biafran victims of genocide it is most regrettable that Mr. Palmer is besmirching America's name by supporting Nigeria's genocide."

WHY ARE THE NIGERIANS FIGHTING?

The following reasons motivate the Nigerians as heard from the horse's mouth: On June 2, 1967 Mallam Abdul Attah, Permanent Secretary, Nigeria's Ministry of Finance, Lagos, dispatched a secret but very frank letter to his northern counterpart, Mallam Ahmed Talib, stressing the need for their country, Nigeria, grabbing Biafra's wealth.

The letter makes it abundantly clear why Nigeria decided to go to war against Biafra which declared her independence on May 30, 1967. Abdul Attah's letter to Ahmed Talib read as follows:

"MALLAM AHMED TALIB,
"Ministry of Finance,
"Kaduna.

"DEAR AHMED: I am aware that a number of you people in the North have been arguing against attacking Biafra. This view is based on the assumption which has yet to be proved that their military might is superior to ours and that in the event of conflict we might be the worst for it. I agree that our soldiers have been deserting in considerable number. There is also the point that soldiers who boarded our barges to proceed to the East have now refused to do so and these barges full of them are still at Ap-apa.

"But in spite of all these do we ever stop to ponder over what the North and its people will lose by permitting East to go? Being in the Ministry of Finance I know the full implications and here are a few:

"(a) The Federal government borrowed 80 million pounds from foreign governments and international institutions all of which were used in developing the North. This money has to be repaid: for goodness sake will the North find the money to do this without the East?

"(b) The per capita income in the East has been in the region of £75 and in the North below £15; when the average is taken it brings the per capita income in Nigeria to £35. Should the East go and with it the main source of wealth we shall be one of the poorest countries in Africa.

"(c) The Federal Government made available to the East in the past only 21 million pounds and that government raised 18 million pounds of its own for its services. I know that from customs duty alone the East can raise 30 million pounds and from oil revenue almost 65 million pounds. To all these add the revenue they can raise internally. I have no doubt that in a short time every one of the 20 provinces will have more revenue than the whole of the North put together. How can you in the face of all these advocate that the East having now proclaimed its independence should be left unmolested? I shall never subscribe to this point of view for what is the point living without a chance of developing?

"The only thing that deters me is the political regrouping now taking place. I am now convinced and this supported by the report I received from Dikibo in Port Harcourt that the so-called minorities have now seen through our propaganda. They know that if the wealth of the East is shared among 14 million people instead of amongst 50 million

they as individuals will get a bigger share than hitherto and their provinces are certainly going to be better developed. Those of them who support us are those on our payroll. There is also the more telling point that in spite of our bragging we cannot enforce our will against Ojukwu. Does not the instinct of self-preservation dictate that one has to support the strong man?

"I have been very frank in this letter as you can see. But in spite of our weaknesses listed above I still feel we should do something. Please try in your own way to persuade the hesitant military chaps to see our point of view.

"Best regards to your family.

"Yours sincerely,

"ABDUL ATTAH."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 16, 1968]

BIAFRA GETS LATE REACTION

(By Andrew Borowiec)

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA.—Belated pangs of conscience are beginning to stir Africa from its indifference toward the Biafran tragedy.

Until now an embarrassed silence has been the reaction in most of the 39 capitals of the native-ruled African states toward the carnage and starvation in Nigeria's secessionist province.

Faced with worldwide outcries and plans to rush aid to starving and massacred Ibo tribesmen, independent Africa has decided that the problem should be solved "within the African context."

The next step will be taken today in the dusty sun-scorched city of Niamey, capital of the French-speaking Republic of Niger. It is there that the six members of the Consultative Committee on Nigeria formed by the Organization of African Unity will once again try to come up with a compromise.

Seen from Addis Ababa, headquarters of the OUA, the chances of any solution are slim.

BIAFRA HOPES DOOMED

The Consultative Committee, consisting of Ethiopia, Cameroon, Ghana, Liberia, Niger and Congo (Kinshasa) has a strictly defined mandate dating from 1967 African summit meeting.

This mandate specifies that any recommendation should maintain Nigeria's territorial integrity, thus dooming Biafra's hopes of Africa's approval of its independence.

The summit's resolution stressed that the Biafra war "is an internal affair, the solution of which is principally the responsibility of the Nigerians themselves."

Ten months have elapsed since the resolution, ten months marked by piles of bodies in the worst carnage of Africa's modern history.

The OAU so far has been unable to influence the course of events. Efforts of Arnold Smith, secretary general of the British Commonwealth, have failed. Brief peace talks held in Kampala last May collapsed.

FOUR GIVE RECOGNITION

Only four African nations—Ivory Coast, Gabon, Tanzania and Zambia—have recognized Biafra. Others have remained mute to the mass murder of resisting Ibos while being quite vocal about individual executions of Africans carried out in South Africa and Rhodesia.

African reasoning is ominous and clear in its simplicity. Recognition of Biafra's right to independence could set an extremely dangerous precedent on the shaky continent.

Once this right is given to one tribe, even one as populous as Biafra's Ibos, the artificial creations of colonizers might start to fall apart.

The Niamey meeting will most likely try once again to bring Biafra and Nigeria together. The Nigerian delegation has already arrived, but there has been no sign of the Biafrans.

RELIEF CONSIDERED

The secessionists have been bitter about the OAU, which they consider a tool of the Federal Nigerian government.

The meeting also will consider ways of bringing relief to the besieged province and this may be its most important accomplishment.

A new element dominating the session will be Africa's growing embarrassment.

In OAU headquarters it is repeated that the problem should be solved "by Africans and within the African context."

But at the same time OAU officials point out the limitations of the mandate of the six committee countries—at least until the next summit set for September in Algiers.

RBC COMMENTARY, BROADCAST MARCH 5, 1968

In the newly built parliament buildings in Teheran, the United Nations Conference on Human Rights is nearing the end of its second week of debates. When it opened, the delegates were told by their host, the Shah of Persia, that the ever-widening gap between the rich and poor nations of the world poses the greatest threat to the advancement of human rights. Just how human rights can advance is difficult to understand; either they exist, or they don't. And, as for rich and poor nations—it is all too easy to use this expression as another way of saying, "white nations . . . and the rest", despite the fact that the palatial buildings in which the delegates are meeting must have been paid for largely through oil royalties accruing to Iran.

From the very beginning, the delegates seem to have confused the right to cadge or blackmail, with the right to live one's life in peace and freedom. The right of the richer nations to use the money they have saved as they wish, has been conveniently ignored.

For the opening ceremony, U Thant flew specially from Paris. He told the Conference that racial conflict is becoming a destructive monster. He lashed out at the white Governments of southern Africa, and his tune was, this week, taken up by the delegates. Representatives of West India—plus those of African and Middle East countries—called for the expulsion of South Africa from the World Body, and for total sanctions against her, Portugal and Rhodesia, plus the use of force against this country. The Nigerian delegate accused Rhodesia of crimes against humanity. He condemned Britain for cowardice and dishonesty; but neither he, nor any of the other delegates, mentioned the human rights of Asians born in Kenya. Many of their applications for citizenship are still mouldering in Government files: they are not citizens of the land of their birth, and they cannot get to Britain. And, what of the Europeans whose businesses have been nationalised in Tanzania and in Zambia?

While Malaysia says openly that Europeans are to be phased out during the next twelve years . . . what of their human rights? When Mr Enoch Powell suggests sending coloured immigrants home (at the British taxpayers' expense)—that is racialism. And, out from under the stones of the London School of Economics, crawl the latest batch of demonstrators. While the British Parliament presses on with legislation to force integration in every sense—by all and sundry. It wants to set up special courts to which the coloured communities can complain of discrimination, but it takes no action concerning the human rights of Britons who are white. It is high time that the woolly-minded liberals who parade around Trafalgar Square realised that human rights are universal, not a divine right for the dark-skinned to have it both ways.

If it is just for him to drive the European from the Congo or from Zambia, it is equally right for the British Government to repatriate coloured immigrants . . . and why should they pay their fares?

But, the Conference in Teheran will carry

on with its tirades against those who consider the basic human right is to live one's own life as one wishes.

Where Samson slew thousands, the Human Rights Conference will merely produce wordy resolutions, but they both seem to favour the same weapon—the jawbone of an ass.

THE PARIS PEACE TALKS

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, Dr. Edgar F. Puryear, Jr., of Madison, Va., is assistant professor of international relations at the University of Virginia and a longtime student of Communist negotiating techniques. His observations on the Paris peace talks are reported in an article entitled "Paris Peace Talks Have Familiar Ring," published in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of June 23, 1968.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA PROFESSOR'S ASSESSMENT: PARIS PEACE TALKS HAVE FAMILIAR RING

(By Tom Luce)

CHARLOTTESVILLE.—Each time the East and the West sit down to negotiate, the Communists leaf through a tattered 1918 scenario and stage one of the most successful shows in modern diplomacy.

During the current Paris peace talks, techniques dating back to World War I have been applied by the North Vietnamese.

Edgar F. Puryear Jr. of Madison, an authority on Communist negotiating techniques, made these observations in a recent interview.

Puryear, who wrote his Ph.D. dissertation at Princeton University in 1959 on "Communist Negotiating Techniques," is now an assistant professor of international relations at the University of Virginia.

Puryear, 38, also holds a law degree from the university and practices in Madison. Before he came to the university, he was assistant dean of the faculty at the Air Force Academy.

Discussing the current Paris peace conference, Puryear said North Vietnam is waging a propaganda battle to whip up worldwide pressure to force the United States to halt its bombing of North Vietnam and to brand the American position in South Vietnam as "morally wrong."

Meanwhile, he said, Hanoi is beefing up its military posture by infiltration and increasing the level of fighting in an attempt to weaken or topple President Nguyen Van Thieu's government in South Vietnam.

This same outline was used during the 1953 Korean truce talks, Puryear said.

"And we lost our rear ends in those talks." He said the Communists have used the same tactics since 1918, "yet the Western world keeps making the same mistakes over and over again."

In past negotiations, he said, the Communists have capitalized on "our impatience for peace, our willingness to compromise, our lack of knowledge of Communist negotiating tactics and our false notion that logical, legal or moral arguments can persuade the Communists to our point of view."

The State Department has learned from

past mistakes and "is now aware of the tactics" the Communists are using, he said.

The only way to "get results at the conference table is to maintain a position of strength—it's the only language the Communists understand.

"We cannot afford appeasement in Paris. When Hitler's troops marched into Munich before World War II, we learned that appeasement means war. And the place to stop appeasement and show strength is in Paris," Puryear said.

It may not be popular, but the United States must take a firm stand on communism, Puryear warned.

"Americans want peace and a way out of Vietnam, but we have a position of world leadership and although we may not like it, we must honor our commitments. If we don't, the Communists will fill the vacuum," he said.

Puryear predicts that North Vietnamese diplomats will chip away at the American stand through "diplomacy by exhaustion"—delaying tactics designed to test America's will and patience.

"The Communists think that the longer they can delay the talks, the more we will give—and they're right." He noted that "The Korean truce talks are still going on and they began 15 years ago."

Another reason for the delay and short sessions in the Paris talks, Puryear said, is that the Vietnamese delegates are bound by rigid instructions and must clear every move with Hanoi.

When U.S. Ambassador W. Averell Harriman confronts North Vietnam's Xuan Thuy across the bargaining table, Puryear said, he "is fighting a shadow, a voice, a facade. The real contender is safely entrenched in Hanoi, not Paris."

Although Harriman has certain policy guidelines, Puryear observed, "he speaks for the United States. He doesn't say, 'Look, I have to make a phone call to Washington to see if it's all right.' 'If he had to check every move with the President, we might just as well send Johnson over there,'" he explained.

Another factor involved in the peace talks, he said, is "how much control does Moscow or Peking have over Hanoi?"

"Both have invested a lot of arms and war supplies in North Vietnam. Will they permit Hanoi to reach any kind of settlement?"

By removing the decision-making process far from the conference room, Hanoi eliminates the possibility of the human weakness of friendliness from interfering with policy, Puryear said.

Meanwhile, Vietnamese negotiators probe for "any U.S. weak point, and once they find it, it will be exploited," he predicted.

Diplomacy is generally regarded as the "intelligent, tactful conduct of relations," he explained. "But the Communists will use anything—insults, rudeness, lies, inconsistencies—to accomplish their objectives."

Since Lenin, the Communists have held that the "trivial is the first line of defense on which to meet the enemy assault." Nothing is too trivial or detailed to be screened as possible weakness."

The Communists will use any tactic to unsettle or throw Western diplomats off guard, Puryear said. "During the Korean truce talks the Communists answered a U.S. proposal with two hours and 11 minutes of silence. This can make one feel uneasy."

Negotiating with the Communists "is like playing baseball," he said, "but the Communists want the game played at night, with their umpires and in their stadium."

Western diplomatic rules simply don't apply in the East. Orientals "think differently than we do."

"In western diplomacy, we assume that each nation pursues its national interests, and we realize when we negotiate with the British or French, for example, that everything won't go our way.

"There is a willingness to compromise and make certain concessions. There is an expectation of 'reasonable satisfaction' if there is to be continued relations between the affected nations," Puryear said.

In any Communist hierarchy, there is little room for bargaining except at the top, he said. This underscores one of the basic differences between the West and the East.

The process of negotiation is at the heart of American life, but alien to the Communist world, he said.

"Communists look at concessions and compromise as signs of weakness, not as a means of reaching a mutual adjustment. A Communist compromise is not an adjustment of difference, but a resting place on the way to their goal," he said.

Hanoi is now using this ploy in the current peace talks, Puryear said. Before there are formal negotiations with a full agenda, Hanoi contends that "we must call an unconditional halt to the bombing of the north. Now why should we stop our bombing if they aren't willing to make similar concessions?" he asked.

"They've blatantly taken advantage of the bombing restrictions in the north to bring in more men and supplies to create further unrest in Saigon and to divide the south and the United States," he added.

The Paris talks serve as a launching pad for North Vietnamese propaganda. "The primary objectives of the Communists is to embarrass the United States, to make us out as the 'bad guys.'"

Since East-West negotiations following World War II, Puryear said, "The United States has been forced to admit that Communist delegates are more interested in propaganda than in negotiating."

Throughout the history of East-West talks, he continued, "the Communists make a direct play for world public opinion, appealing over the heads of government."

When the Communists insist on open instead of private meetings "It's clear indication that the talks will be used as a forum for propaganda."

Although the talks have barely begun, Hanoi has already scored a couple of points, he said.

"Since the South Vietnamese government doesn't even get to sit down at the conference table and negotiate in its own behalf, the North's charge that the South is a 'funky government' sounds convincing," Puryear said.

He believes that this impression is somewhat offset by the exclusion of the National Liberation Front or Viet Cong from the talks.

He pointed out that Hanoi contends the United States' position in Vietnam is "immoral" and that the conflict is a "civil war or a war of nationalism." This argument is buttressed by the Communists with the public statements of American war critics such as Sens. Eugene J. McCarthy, J. William Fulbright and the late Robert F. Kennedy.

An attempt to persuade Hanoi with logic is doomed, he said. "They have an 'approved school solution' on everything," and this solution filters from the top down.

Another element in East-West talks is that both sides distrust each other, Puryear said.

"Stalin used to say that 'truth in diplomacy is like dry water and wooden iron.' It just doesn't exist." The Communist world assumes that the West is out to destroy it, Puryear added.

While Western diplomats have a "basic trust of each other," he said, "we have found that the Communists do not follow up or keep their commitments."

While many Americans may not view communism as a threat to freedom, the Communists "are out to dominate and conquer. By their own admission, they want to see the 'Red flag flying over the entire world,'" Puryear said.

In the East-West struggle there are few rules, he said, and even peace negotiations

"become an instruments of war to attain Communist objectives."

EXCLUSION FROM MILITARY DRAFT OF POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to defer from training and service under the Selective Service Act policemen and firemen who are employed on a regular full-time basis or who are engaged in educational or training programs which will lead to full-time employment.

Last month the FBI reported that serious crime in the United States for the first 3 months of this year rose 17 percent over the same period of 1967. Our police departments are working overtime to combat this serious crime wave. But they are hampered in their efforts because of the shortage of qualified law-enforcement personnel to fill vacancies on almost every major metropolitan police force in this country.

One of the major factors contributing to the lack of trained and qualified law-enforcement personnel and firemen is the fact that many young men who are interested in careers in these professions are drafted before they can receive the necessary training to fill positions in our police and fire departments. Already undermanned police departments are being further eroded by the drafting of men on duty.

Within the last few months the Armed Forces have begun to release servicemen 6 months ahead of their scheduled release dates if they accept employment with law-enforcement agencies. The District of Columbia Police Department has been active in recruiting policemen from the Armed Forces, and the same is true in many other cities, including Denver.

Like our troops in Vietnam who are engaged in a war to halt Communist aggression, our policemen and firemen at home are engaged in a war to halt crime. Police and fire duty in many of our cities has become almost as hazardous as fighting in the jungles of Vietnam. I recall, during the recent riots in Washington, I heard a young soldier who recently had returned from Vietnam and was then stationed on the Capitol Grounds, comment that the riot duty in Washington reminded him of the fighting in Saigon during the Tet offensive. And we all are familiar with the hazards faced by firemen called to fight fires in riot-torn areas. Many are subjected to abuse and assault at the hands of angry, uncontrolled mobs.

The war against crime which we are waging here at home is certainly as important as the war we are fighting in Southeast Asia—perhaps more so. Certainly we must be secure at home if we expect to win abroad.

The bill which I am introducing today would allow the retention of experienced,

qualified, and competent young men on the police and fire forces in our cities. It would reduce the turnover of men and the resulting cost of hiring and training new replacements. The bill would allow young men of draft age to pursue these occupations and fill vacancies as they exist. It would mean that our police and fire departments could maintain adequate manpower to do their jobs.

WILL THE UNITED STATES RUN OUT OF OIL?

HON. CLIFFORD P. HANSEN

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the Department of the Interior recently released a 92-page report on oil and gas availability through 1980. U.S. News & World Report of July 22 contains an article about Interior's study effort and emphasizes the need for improved technology for finding of new oil as well as the need for improved techniques for oil recovery. The article also pointed to oil shale and coal as sources of supply for the necessary production of synthetic fuels in the future.

An interesting technique for increased oil recovery has recently been brought to my attention. This "Paser technique," as it is called, was developed by Robert V. New of Houston, Tex. It consists of injecting heat radiation and high-temperature inert gas into oil-bearing formations. The technique, if it proves out in field tests, might represent a significant breakthrough in the extraction of heavy oils, and might have application in the production of synthetic fuels.

I believe that information on these developments put forward by Mr. New should be of interest to all who are concerned with the critical question of future energy supplies for our country.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from U.S. News & World Report, an article published in the June 10, 1968, issue of Oil and Gas Journal, and a news release issued by Robert New at the Petroleum Club of Houston on June 4 be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the U.S. News & World Report, July 22, 1968]

WILL UNITED STATES RUN OUT OF OIL?

Latest on the outlook for supplies of oil and gasoline in this country, long term—Demand to grow about 3 per cent a year. Step-up in exploration needed. Good prospects for new petroleum industries based on oil shale and coal.

These are some of the points made by a just-issued Government study of major interest to consumers, oilmen, Congress.

The search for oil in this country is slowing down. New discoveries of oil are at a level that worries many people in the industry, who predict shortages of gasoline and other products unless the current trend is reversed.

Now, however, there is a reassuring report on the problem from the U.S. Department of the Interior.

The report, 92 pages long and several years in preparation, arrives at these broad conclusions:

There is far more oil in the U.S. than has yet been tapped. Much of this oil lies in deep deposits below the producing fields of Texas and the Midcontinent, and in offshore areas of Louisiana, Texas, California and Alaska, just beginning to be probed.

New fields of recent years will almost certainly turn out to have much more oil than is claimed for them. To this extent, the fall-off in discoveries is probably not as serious as it appears.

Old fields will also be made to produce extra billions of barrels of petroleum as industry develops more-effective ways to stimulate and prolong the flow of oil in existing wells.

In addition, there are good prospects for extracting large amounts of oil from oil shales and tar sands in the West and for converting coal into oil and coke by chemical processes. Production of these "synthetic fuels" on a commercial scale may begin in the next few years, the report says, but will not be a major factor in the nation's fuel supply until after 1980.

The outlook for finding and producing plenty of natural gas is even better than the outlook for oil.

In short, the report suggests, there is no reason to fear that the U.S. will run out of oil or gas in the foreseeable future. How these fuels are obtained will depend on research and development and on economic factors.

Right now, the Department figures, the oil industry is finding it most economical to get additional oil by stimulating wells already in production and by concentrating much of its exploration in offshore areas where wells are fewer but more productive.

The report offers little or no support for any major changes in the Government's oil and gas policies.

The Government should continue to limit imports of foreign oil to about 20 per cent of the U.S. market, says the report, but should not cut back on imports as some oilmen and members of Congress are proposing. Imports are not to blame for the slowdown in drilling, according to this official view.

HOLDBACK ON SHALE

The report takes the position that technical problems and costs, not Government rules for leasing of public lands, are holding back development of productions of oil from shale.

In fact, the Department argues, private industry owns enough good deposits of shale to enable it to set up a new industry, if it felt the time was ripe and costs were reasonable.

A warning against tampering with present tax treatment of the oil industry, including the 27½ per cent depletion allowance, is also contained in the report.

Demand for U.S. oil is estimated to increase from 3.7 billion barrels in 1967 to 5.2 billion in 1980, assuming imports are limited to 20 per cent of the American market.

If the market grows at this rate—about 3 per cent a year—the U.S. will need to locate new oil deposits at a rate of 4.8 billion barrels a year, compared with 3.3 billion reported, on the average, since 1957.

In the face of this need for a more effective search for oil comes what the report calls "one of the more noteworthy *non sequiturs* in the annals of petroleum economics."

Drilling has dropped off sharply as the chart shows, at a time when prices of crude oil have been steady, even rising slightly, when demand for oil has grown along with revenues of oil producers, and when inventories of crude oil above the ground have been reduced.

WHY EXPLORATION LAGS

The experts point to a number of reasons for the drop in exploration:

It has become more expensive to find oil in many onshore areas. The big oil fields of Texas and Louisiana already have a great deal of excess capacity. The drop in the top-bracket rate of the federal income tax means that the Government is assuming 70 per cent of the loss in drilling a "dry hole" for a wealthy plunger, compared with 91 per cent before 1964.

Another factor: Heavy State and local taxes on property also tend to delay development work in some fields.

AWAITED: "A CLEAR SIGNAL"

The report discusses a number of new ideas, new methods that may help the industry to hold down drilling costs and improve its chances of finding oil. It concludes with this mild warning:

"There is still time to wait for a clear signal either of the efficacy of present industry efforts, or of a turnaround from the historic decline in activity which began in 1956. But it ought not to be too long in coming."

[From the Oil and Gas Journal,
June 10, 1968]

NEW THERMAL DEVICE WOULD USE LASER PRINCIPLE

A new thermal-recovery method for heavy oil was described in Houston last week by Robert V. New, Texas and California oilman.

New said he expects to build the first prototype in the next few months to show that the laser principle of radiation emission can heat inert gas downhole and transmit the heat into the reservoir rock.

If the theory proves practical, New believes it will provide a unique and effective methods for producing both heavy oil and tar sands.

Consulting with New on the project are Dr. Harold E. Rorschach, chairman of the physics department of Rice University, Houston, and H. J. Gruy & Associates, consulting engineering firm. Rorschach has worked with New on the physics involved in the technique, while Gruy has studied the recovery prospects in the event the method proves feasible as a heat-generating technique.

New said he has applied for patents on a downhole transducer, the heart of the system.

The surface equipment would consist primarily of an internal-combustion engine burning natural gas and air. The inert exhaust gas, after water is removed, would be compressed and moved through a conduit to the transducer a high-temperature steel tube in the producing zone.

The engine generating the gas also would drive a compressor and generator. Electricity fed to the transducer through a cable would be converted to radio-frequency energy at a frequency of about 1 million cps. Next it would move through a small radio-frequency step-up transformer and through electrodes on the transducer. The energy would heat the gas to high temperature in a fraction of a second. Radiation in the forms of photons would then be emitted in the infrared sector of the electromagnetic spectrum.

New said he is moving from Dallas to Houston this month to develop his technique. He has talked with major companies, he said, but has made no agreements. He said he has acquired some Texas acreage with heavy oil deposits and expects to conduct his first tests there in the months ahead.

New said his studies of the past 6 years have carried him "beyond the theoretical stage," although he has not yet built equipment to test the method in an oil reservoir. He offered no estimates of the amount and rate of sweep in a reservoir. This would depend on reservoir conditions.

Dr. Rorschach, who attended a news conference held by New, said New is "applying the gas-laser principle to the problems of petroleum production in a most imaginative way so as to use all of the excitation energy of the gas to facilitate the simultaneous introduction of the total radiation heat and the hot gas into an oil reservoir. There can be no doubt the desired heat can be obtained; I consider this concept a notable piece of work."

Rorschach said his studies do not include the effect of heat radiation and inert gas on an oil reservoir. They do include studies on the creation of a high degree of heat radiation.

New has coined the word "Paser" to describe his method. The letters stand for "Production and Amplification by Stimulated Emission of Radiation."

New, who is 64, claims more than 40 years' experience in the oil industry and says he was instrumental in developing oil reserves under the city of Long Beach, Calif., in the 1940's, when he was president of Continental Southern Corp. and Continental Northern Corp.

NEWS RELEASE ISSUED BY ROBERT V. NEW AT THE PETROLEUM CLUB OF HOUSTON ON JUNE 4, 1968

HOUSTON.—The awesome and apparently limitless energy of the atom is about to make available hundreds of billions of barrels of heavy oil. A method has been revealed which will utilize this same power in a laser-principle method to provide an abundance of the world's most widely-used energy source—oil.

Development of a laser technique for oil recovery which promises to make commercially available the great volumes of petroleum locked in heavy-oil reservoirs and tar sands was revealed today by Robert V. New, veteran successful innovator of oilfield advanced technology. Based on the principles of laser physics, the technique provides a method of generating inert gas and heating it to temperatures as high as 1000° F for injection into heavy-oil reservoirs at minimum cost. The hot gas heats and dilutes the heavy oil, reducing its viscosity and increasing its recoverability.

The announcement comes after some six years of work in which New was assisted by a group of eminent consultants including H. J. Gruy, Dallas petroleum engineering consultant and President of the Society of Petroleum Engineers of AIME, and Dr. Harold E. Rorschach, chairman of the Physics Department of Rice University at Houston. This work has paralleled development of commercial applications of the laser (Light Amplification by Stimulated Emission of Radiation). During development of the technique, the heavy-oil recovery method has become known informally as "Paser" (Production Amplification by Stimulated Emission of Radiation), and the parallel well-cleaning technique as "Chaser" (Cleaning Heat Amplification by Stimulated Emission of Radiation).

The laser-principle technique may be applied to recover the huge quantities of heavy, viscous oil which are known through the Western Hemisphere, most of it in relatively shallow reservoirs. The Canadian tar sands are the world's greatest unrecovered reservoir of oil and U.S. supplies are enormous.

The demand for oil in the U.S. continues its annual increase, but over the past decade, discoveries of new oil reserves have barely been able to keep pace with increasing demand. The independent oilman, who in the past has discovered much of the nation's oil reserves, has been largely pushed out of the exploration picture by enormous costs. The low costs of finding and acquiring heavy-oil properties, together with the relatively inexpensive initial and operating costs of the Paser process, should permit the inde-

pendent operator to resume his significant role in the oil industry.

The Paser technique consists of injecting heat radiation and high-temperature inert gas into the oil-bearing formation. Beneficial results are at least three-fold: (1) The infra-red radiation transfers heat and hot gas to the heavy oil, reducing its viscosity; (2) The oil absorbs part of the injected gas, resulting in dilution and thinning of the oil; (3) The injected gas assists in the flow of oil as it sweeps the reservoir to produce the residual oil.

Commenting on the Paser oil-recovery method, H. J. Gruy, S. P. E. President, stated, "The existence of enormous reserves of heavy oil in the Western Hemisphere is well known. It is also a fact that the introduction of sufficient heat into reservoirs of this oil can result in the mobility and recovery of much of the oil. Successful application of the Paser technique at very low costs could make this a most significant contribution to the technology of the petroleum industry. The application of heat radiation and inert gas is sound petroleum engineering; obtaining infra-red radiation in this process is a technique of quantum physics and a physicist is more qualified than I to pass on this aspect."

The Paser method of oil recovery is based in effect upon a translation of gas-laser theory to oilfield dimensions. The atomic physics of the gas laser is extremely complicated. In somewhat oversimplified terms, the laboratory gas laser consists of a long, narrow tube containing gas of suitable energy levels. Both ends of the tube are sealed with reflectors, one of which is partially transparent. Electrodes extending into the tube are connected to a radio-frequency generator so as to transmit its electromagnetic waves into the gas in the tube. The high-frequency electromagnetic waves excite the gas atoms and molecules to higher energy levels. The excited atoms spontaneously emit radiation at precise frequencies millions of times higher than the frequency of the original energizing waves. The resultant photon emissions escape from the apparatus through the partial reflector. Tremendous amounts of heat are generated and must be carried off as troublesome waste.

The gas laser is subject to very precise control and nearly all of its emitted energy can be concentrated in the range of infra-red (heat) energy frequencies. This is the explanation for the tremendous heat which can be generated by the laser. The gas laser is a continuously operating and thoroughly dependable device.

HEAVY-OIL RECOVERY BY PASER

The apparatus consists of a diesel engine that burns natural gas and air. The exhaust from the engine is inert gas (about 8 parts nitrogen and 1 part carbon dioxide) and a little water. The water is removed and the dry inert gas exhaust is conducted down a conduit in a well to a tubular transducer fitted with electrodes to which electromagnetic waves are fed through a cable. The engine generating the inert gas also drives, at no extra cost, an electrical generator that creates the electromagnetic waves that are then converted to radio frequency (about 1 million cycles per second). These high-frequency waves then go through a small radio-frequency set-up transformer and through the electrodes mentioned above which are mounted in a high-temperature steel tube that acts as a transducer. The high-frequency electromagnetic waves cause the excitation of atoms and molecules of the gas. The collisions of the particles against each other cause radiation to be emitted in the infra-red sector of the electromagnetic spectrum (on the order of 10 trillion electrical impulses each second). Crashing together at such velocity creates cascades of heat and the job is done!

New states that the process is far ahead of the steam thermal recovery process in efficiency and in initial apparatus and operating costs. He points out that a typical steam thermal unit must operate at pressures over 1500 psi in order to deliver steam near 600° F. Since this temperature is attained at the surface of the ground, it is considerably less at the bottom of the well due to heat loss in transit. The Paser process, New points out, can deliver heat radiation and inert gas of 1000° F at 50 psi at the bottom of the hole where the heat is actually generated. The cost of equipment and operations required to handle 1500 psi is much greater than such costs at 50 psi. Such low-pressure injection is technically very important in dealing with heavy-oil sands which are characteristically very shallow and very permeable and porous.

In addition, a steam thermal unit generating 12,000,000 BTU's (a BTU is a unit of heat) per hour dumps over 800 barrels of water into the formation each day. This water has to be bought and usually treated. After injection and condensation in the formation, it becomes additional fluid to absorb injected BTU's. Ultimately, it must be pumped again to the surface. All these characteristics of steam injection add up to considerable expense. Also, water injected into the formation is likely to cause water-blocking of the flow passages, whereas injected nitrogen is well known as a beneficial energy agent, New added.

Dr. Harold E. Rorschach, Chairman of the Physics Department at Rice University, Houston, commented, "The effect on an oil reservoir of heat radiation and inert gas is not in my province, but the basic physics of creating the high degree of heat radiation of the Paser method is indeed the province of the physicist. I am familiar with the theory involved and have acted as consulting physicist in relation to it."

Dr. Rorschach, who has been a professor of physics at Rice University for 16 years, received his doctorate at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Commenting further on the Paser method, he stated, "The laser principles involved have been the subject of immense amounts of research by many excellent physicists working in the field of quantum electronics. In gas lasers developed to this date, only a small fraction of the input energy goes into the generation of a coherent beam of radiation. However, Mr. New is applying these principles to the problems of petroleum production in a most imaginative way so as to use all of the excitation energy of the gas to facilitate the simultaneous introduction of the total radiation heat and the hot gas into an oil reservoir. There can be no doubt the desired heat can be obtained; I consider this concept a notable piece of work."

THE DEVELOPER

The developer of Paser, Robert V. New, has over forty years of experience connected with the petroleum industry. Among his more interesting activities was the technology which permitted development of the oil reserves under the city of Long Beach, California, in the 1940's. As president of Continental Companies, he directed the drilling of 80 wells on the surface of a strip of land 6200 ft. long by only 27 ft. wide along the Los Angeles river. In order to penetrate the oil-bearing formations beneath the city where surface drilling was prohibited, the wells were drilled directionally by close control at angles up to more than 60 degrees from vertical.

New was regarded as a "dreamer" by the industry when he first proposed the scheme but he made it work and it made him a millionaire by the time he was 40. Closely controlled directional drilling techniques pioneered in New's Long Beach operation are

now playing a vital role in the development of petroleum reserves in urban areas of California, notably to recover some 200 million barrels of oil from under the city of Los Angeles.

New has a number of both United States and foreign patents pending on the Paser process and related techniques.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 15, 1968, the annual Captive Nations Week observance was held at Soldiers Memorial in St. Louis. Captive Nations Week has been proclaimed under congressional law by each President since 1959. Its purpose is to remind the free world that over one-third of the world's population lives under the civil tyranny and oppression of atheistic communism. For the observance in St. Louis I prepared remarks which follow:

It is one of the tragedies of this century that the world has apparently come to accept without indignation or remedy the enslavement of more than one hundred million persons in the captive nations behind the iron curtain.

It appears almost diabolical that America with its turmoil and social problems, which are being resolved under our wonderful system of government, is unfavorably portrayed in the worldwide spotlight.

American and free world disorder are magnified, often extensively out of proportion, while in the shadow of the iron curtain, where families are enslaved without hope of solution to their captivity, there is no spotlight.

Is this any evidence that we are losing the propaganda war and thereby falling the moral cause of free men everywhere?

Czechoslovakia is the most recent example of what happens to those under Communist domination who seek freedom. Their voice of freedom is quickly threatened by the marching boots of the Russian Army.

It is one of the great contradictions of our age that nations who clamor most about the "colonialists" and "imperialists" are those that are embarked upon the most intense and complete program of colonialization that the world has ever seen.

And, men throughout the world are deceived by the Big Lie of Communism. Adolph Hitler and Dr. Goebbels perfected the Big Lie technique. The Russians, Red Chinese and Cubans have advanced its use.

We must again affirm our belief and strengthen our determination that the American people will not be content until our governmental system moves close to its own ideals, and the freedoms and benefits that increasingly more and more of our people enjoy are spread throughout the world, and until the captive nations are free to join in this journey toward a more perfect society.

In line with this our foreign policy must discard its negative rear guard atmosphere and assume the positive character necessary, within the general guidelines of the spreading of our system, to insure success, not only for us but for people everywhere.

We are their present hope, and must continue to be their symbol in the fight.

PROBLEMS OF RURAL AMERICA

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to a recent Associated Press article which highlights the problems of rural America. It is a problem that must be solved but first needs to be understood, not only by those in small towns and on farms, but also by their urban relatives and friends.

When considering minorities who have been denied their fair share of American prosperity, do not forget what is perhaps our most productive minority—modern American agriculture.

The article follows:

RURAL LIVING COSTS MORE—FARM INCOME NOT RISING AS FAST AS EXPENSE

WASHINGTON, July 13.—One of the reasons for the dissatisfaction of today's farmer is his late entry into the good life.

Technology let the farmer grow more food and fiber decades before he gained lights in his home, an electric pump at the well, good roads to town and better schools for his children.

Tractors were plowing millions of acres of wheatland a year in the Great Plains while farm wives used primitive wash boards. Eventually, after electricity, better highways and improved schools came to rural America, the farmer decided he wanted a home for his family as good as the barn for his cows. He wanted a washing machine for his wife, a truck to haul his grain and a radio for his children.

PREVIOUS NEEDS

The farmer who previously had required only two new sets of overalls a year, a couple of singletrees for his horse-drawn wagon and maybe a cotton print dress for his wife, became one of the greatest consumers in history.

Today, few farmers raise all the food their families require. Most shop in supermarkets the same as city dwellers and consume similar products.

But today's farmer has found that the old standards prevail too often, that he is sometimes viewed as an economic urchin who is discontented simply because it is his nature.

COSTS INCREASE

The Department of Agriculture reports regularly on the costs involved in agriculture. Last month, for example, prices for farm machinery showed a 5 percent rise from the year before.

Building materials used by farmers rose 6 percent from the previous year; automobiles and their supplies were 5 percent higher.

At the same time, prices farmers received for their products during the same period rose only 1.5 percent.

John A. Baker, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, said in a speech last week that rural America still is lagging in providing decent lives for its inhabitants. Half of the nation's poverty is in the countryside, he said.

The proportion of substandard homes is three times as great in rural America as in the cities, Mr. Baker said. Schools in the small towns and open countryside have less to spend per pupil than those in the cities, he added.

BOTH MAY BE HELPED

Yet, Mr. Baker said, the cities and rural areas both may be helped by development in the countryside.

"We must save the classic concept of the role of the city from being choked from self-

strangulation from too many people packed up too close together."

The crux of such a challenge, Mr. Baker said, is this: "to provide the chance for the 200,000,000 of us now here to lead decent, productive lives at the same time that we are preparing this land . . . to live in less congestion, squalor, ugliness and time-consuming traffic jams than now."

Mr. Baker's comments reflect a growing awareness among Government and private sectors of the need for a decentralization of the American economy to allow more industry to move into the open spaces, to provide more jobs in cleaner air, to apply the technology of industry and agriculture to family living.

ONCE EASILY DEFINED

In former times the "farm problem" was easily defined—low prices, drought, corn borers, boll weevils, hoof and mouth disease.

Today, the role of rural America has an added dimension, or one that only now is being recognized widely: Opportunity for a reversal of the population trends of the past.

GOD AND GOVERNMENT

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in Extensions of Remarks a letter I have received from Miss Eula Proctor, of Georgetown, Ky.

The letter expresses not only her thoughtful views, but those of many others in our country who are concerned with the religious aspects of our Nation today.

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

GEORGETOWN, KY.,
June 6, 1968.

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: You may never see these few words but I am an American citizen, who believes strongly in the great heritage of our country. The recent tragedy compels me to write this since you represent my state.

The youth of today are the third generation of parents who were brought up under the psychological movement that a child should not be inhibited. Naturally when one has developed into maturity without being trained to respect authority and the laws of organizations, they finish just as we are experiencing today.

Present conditions are not the fault of the young people, but the adults who permitted this to come about. When laws are not obeyed, adults brag about evading income tax, and other misdemeanors, it becomes the rule rather than an exception.

I am a retired teacher and saw these trends developing all through the latter years of teaching. The final blow came when the Supreme Court decided with one woman to put God out of the schools and governmental places.

I listened last night to the members of the Senate and President Johnson speaking as how to solve the problems and whom to ask. Never once did any one mention God. Yet when tragedy strikes, we implore Him to restore and bless the nation. If we expect a

blessing, we must also let Him guide its destiny.

Read II Chronicles 7: 14 and you will see exactly where we stand. Be sure to emphasize the *then*. I would ask that the entire Congress would burn this in the minds of the members.

I am not a fanatic, but an observer of history and its results. The Romans enjoyed luxury, prosperity, and power. We are so like them.

Very truly yours,
(Miss) EULA PROCTOR.

ROCKLAND COUNTY ADJUSTS TO THE CHANGING ENVIRONMENT

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Rockland County is the smallest in New York State, yet it is one of the fastest growing. Because it is within commuting distance of New York City, it is feeling the influx of urbanites into suburbia. As developers buy up the land, there is a continuing deterioration of the esthetic beauty of the natural surroundings. Through the efforts and leadership of the county's own cooperative extension service, an educational arm of the State's Agricultural College at Cornell University, the people are coping with the changing environment and the proper action to take in saving and improving it.

I ask unanimous consent that an article written by Joan Lee Faust and published in the New York Times of June 23, 1968, which clearly states the problem and points up the achievements of the cooperative extension service in New York's Rockland County, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE ROCKLAND APPROACH TO ENVIRONMENT (By Joan Lee Faust)

"Junkyards, Geraniums and Jurisprudence: Aesthetics and the Law." The title for a TV special? No. A topic for a town meeting.

Three town meetings on this subject have been held in New York's Rockland County this year. They were attended by elected and appointed municipal officials, members of planning boards, shade tree and park and recreation commissions. At round-table discussions, these men aired such county problems as shade-tree planting ordinances, open space programs and the preservation of historic landmarks.

Earlier this month, the Rockland County Committee on Natural Beauty published an eight-page report recommending actions on park and recreation planning. The committee urgently requested an increase in the county park land holdings from 630 acres which it now has to 2,100. This would raise the current ratio of park lands from three acres per 1,000 population to 10 acres per 1,000, the minimum standard now recommended by regional planners.

Although the Palsades Interstate Park Commission controls 29,778 acres in the county, it is a regional park and serves the metropolitan area. The Natural Beauty Committee's report was the result of a "Speakout on Parks and Recreation" held

last March at Clarkstown Junior High School. One hundred and seventy-five county residents plus observers from Federal and state agencies had an opportunity to speak their minds at the all-day program.

Rockland County is the smallest in the state, yet it is one of the fastest growing. Because it is within commuting distance of New York City, it is feeling the influx of urbanites into suburbia. The county's 173 square miles, once verdant apple orchards, are being gobbled up rapidly by real estate developers. Only 25 to 30 farms are left. The population, just over 200,000, is expected to reach 350,000 by 1985.

Rockland's growth is typical of many urban-oriented counties that are near large metropolitan complexes. The rush for land, building of homes and schools and spread of shopping centers is so rapid, the counties hardly realize what is taking place. They just know prices keep going up and up.

In Rockland, the attitude is different. There is an increasing awareness developing among the residents, municipal officials and planners that something is happening to their formerly idyllic life. Their environment is changing and they are learning to know how to save it, to improve it and to take proper action. Much of the learning, inspiration and guidance is coming from the county's own Cooperative Extension Service, an educational arm of the state's agricultural college at Cornell University. Extension sponsored the "Aesthetics and the Law" series and helped to plan the park "Speak-out."

This is quite a different role for an agency that used to spend its time helping local orchardists solve cultural and marketing problems for the country's large apple growing industry. Now in the center of a burgeoning urban-suburban complex, extension finds itself needed to help solve environmental problems by educating and inspiring the residents. Rockland's program is one of many cooperative extension services that is assuming this new role in suburban areas.

The United States Department of Agriculture reports for the six-month period ending Dec. 31, 1967, the Community Resource Development division of the Federal Extension Service provided assistance in the planning or operation of 6,470 organizations or projects dealing with natural resource development. Of these, 406 were air and water pollution projects.

Headquarters for the Rockland County Cooperative Extension Service is in an orange-colored office building in the center of New City, the county seat. Most every state's county extension service is usually located in the county seat. There in cramped quarters the hubbub of ringing telephones, clanging typewriters and piling of paperwork goes on.

"Part of the mission of Cooperative Extension is to tap one of the county's main resources—the resourcefulness of the people," Ira Caplan said recently at his division headquarters. Mr. Caplan is leader of the agricultural division and is a stemwinder for so many of the county's environmental programs. He is in charge of Community Resource Development.

Working with him are two other agents, Jack Focht and Ralph Snodsmith. Mr. Focht directs the nature and conservation education program. He works with school teachers and adult youth leaders to encourage school boards and educators to save and use natural areas on school grounds for environmental education.

Mr. Snodsmith handles the commercial and consumer ornamental horticulture by working with arborists, nurserymen, garden centers and homeowners. Other extension divisions handle the 4-H and home economics programs.

"Among the things we are trying to do," Ira Caplan said, "is to sensitize citizens, particularly children, to their natural environment, to make them aware of their relationship to the world around them."

The "sensitizing" got off to a big start two years ago when the county held a Conference on Natural Beauty, the first county-level meeting of its kind in the country. It was a direct response to the White House Conference on Natural Beauty and Governor Rockefeller's State Conference on Natural Beauty. Keynote speaker at the Rockland conference was Justice William O. Douglas who later hiked with the county residents on a Hudson walk to draw attention to the deterioration of the river and its shoreline.

The conference was one of the largest public gatherings of elected and appointed public officials ever held in the county. It was the beginning.

Recently, the county preserved 42 acres of scenic land through a legal tool often referred to as a "negative easement," provided by Section 247 of the General Municipal Law. Though the land still belongs to two private land owners in New City, its preservation in its natural state is guaranteed in perpetuity. Cooperative Extension assisted in working out the easement details with the property owners and hopes to make use of the property for an outdoor teaching laboratory.

Extension Services came into being in 1914 when Congress passed the Smith-Lever Act to carry the knowledge in agricultural research from the land-grant colleges to the people. The land-grant colleges were established by Congressional action in 1862 to provide states with minimum-cost colleges to emphasize research and instruction on agricultural production and the improvement of rural life. There now are 68.

The Cooperative Extension program in the counties is a partnership linked with the United States Department of Agriculture, the state land-grant colleges, the county governments and the residents. Partial funds for operations come from Federal and State appropriations. The major portions come from county and local residents.

Each county's extension program is an autonomous entity and is overseen by a board of directors comprised of lay people. In Rockland, a seven-member program committee is elected by the 3,500 people enrolled in extensions educational program. Financial appropriations for the activities are made by the County Board of Supervisors, chosen by the county electorate.

"The aim of Cooperative Extension is not to plan for the community, but with the community," as Ira Caplan puts it. At present, the department is working on a proposal to establish a Center for Suburban Affairs in joint cooperation with the Rockland Community College. Financing is to be sought from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's Title I program which links colleges and universities with the solution of community problems. The center would provide an environmental educational forum for community elected officials and members of county commissions.

Recently, as a demonstration project, extension constructed a model for a small park to be built on a triangular-shaped corner in a blighted downtown business district of Suffern. So far, the community has accepted the proposal and is awaiting approval of matching funds from Title VII of the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs urban beautification program.

A citizens task force has been established to recommend how school curriculums can teach environmental studies to the children. A "Discovering Rockland County" program distributes leaflets that describe self-guiding tours, walks and hikes to see some of the county's historical heritages. Part of this

program involved a county-wide search for the biggest trees which revealed that Rockland County has a giant honey locust, 17 feet in circumference. It is 7 feet more in girth than the national "Big Tree Champion" honey locust in Missouri reported by the American Forestry Association survey.

On Saturday the extension agents conduct a "hot-line" radio show to answer live questions on gardening and environment problems. It operates an extensive publication program with service letters, bulletins and magazines.

Last October, the county took inspiration from former New York City Park Commissioner Thomas Hoving and held two "happenings" in the three-acre Dutch Gardens park in New City that was being threatened by the expansion of county offices. The programs, on two consecutive Sundays, brought people into the park to hear concerts with the result that the park was saved.

Even extension agents gained this time. The park is quite near their office building. On nice days, they can enjoy a bit of open space, munch their lunch and escape the telephone.

THE FARM SUBSIDY EXTENSION FOR 1970

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the House Agriculture Committee will be insisting on congressional action for a 1-year extension of the agriculture subsidy or Price Control Act of 1965.

This bill, which has developed into a bonanza for a great number of corporate farms and wealthy farmowners throughout the Nation, will not be terminated until December 31, 1969. For some reason the advocates of this \$3½ billion annual subsidy insist that this session of Congress give an extension of the legislation over the year 1970.

Every Member should investigate the fabulous individual payments which are being received by thousands of large farming units over the Nation.

I wish to incorporate in my remarks some payments made to some wealthy individual and corporate farm recipients in the calendar year 1967:

LARGE INDIVIDUAL PAYMENTS UNDER 1967 GOVERNMENT FARM PROGRAMS IN COMPARISON WITH TOTAL PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN STATES AND TERRITORIES

The largest individual payment (\$4,091,818) under the 1967 farm program exceeded the total (\$3,979,988) received by farmers in 6 states (Alaska, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Connecticut and Delaware), plus the Virgin Islands.

Ten farming operations received a total of \$14,785,760, which is more than the total of \$13,409,756 received by all farmers in 10 states (Alaska, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Delaware, Nevada, Vermont, Maine and West Virginia), plus the Virgin Islands.

These 10 large operations received payments in excess of those received by all farmers in any one of 15 states (Alaska, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Delaware, Nevada, Vermont, Maine, West Virginia, New Jersey, Maryland, Hawaii, Utah, and Wyoming.)

Twenty-five farming operations received

a total of \$22,766,943 which is more than the total of \$17,610,650 received by all farmers in 11 states (Alaska, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Delaware, Nevada, Vermont, Maine, West Virginia and New Jersey), plus the Virgin Islands.

These 25 large operations received pay-

ments in excess of those received by all farmers in any one of 20 states (Alaska, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Delaware, Nevada, Vermont, Maine, West Virginia, New Jersey, Maryland, Hawaii, Utah, Wyoming, Virginia, Florida, New York, Pennsylvania and Oregon).

LARGEST INDIVIDUAL GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS UNDER FARM PROGRAMS, CALENDAR YEAR 1967

	Payment received	Cumulative payments
1. J. G. Boswell Co., Litchfield Park, Ariz. (Kings County, Calif.)	\$4,091,818	\$4,091,818
2. Rancho San Antonio, Gila Bend, Ariz. (Fresno County, Calif.)	2,863,668	6,955,486
3. Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co., Honolulu, Hawaii	1,353,770	8,309,256
4. South Lake Farms, Five Points, Calif. (Kings)	1,304,093	9,613,349
5. U.S. Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla. (Hendry)	1,275,687	10,889,036
6. Kern County Land Co., Bakersfield, Calif. (Kern)	838,130	11,727,166
7. Acco Seed, Leoti, Kans. (Fresno County, Calif.)	814,714	12,541,880
8. Kohala Sugar Co., Honolulu, Hawaii	800,718	13,342,598
9. Salyer Land Co., Corcoran, Calif. (Kings)	789,910	14,132,508
10. Delta & Pine Land Co., Scott, Miss. (Bolivar)	653,252	14,785,760
11. Lee Wilson & Co., Wilson, Ark. (South Mississippi)	619,489	15,405,249
12. South Puerto Rico Sugar Co., Fellsmere, Fla. (Palm Beach)	610,923	16,016,172
13. Waialua Agricultural Co., Ltd., Honolulu, Hawaii	600,477	16,616,649
14. Mount Whitney Farms, Five Points, Calif. (Fresno)	591,980	17,208,629
15. Oahu Sugar Co., Honolulu, Hawaii	571,453	17,780,082
16. Farmers Inv. Co., Aguila, Ariz. (Maricopa)	554,817	18,334,899
17. State of Montana, Helena, Mont. (Daniels)	553,358	18,888,257
18. Lihue Plantation Co., Ltd., Honolulu, Hawaii	539,570	19,427,827
19. S. A. Camp Farms Co., Shafter, Calif. (Kern)	517,285	19,945,112
20. Pioneer Mill Co., Honolulu, Hawaii	500,296	20,445,408
21. Ewa Plantation Co., Honolulu, Hawaii	486,233	20,931,641
22. Luce & Co., Aguirre, P.R.	471,952	21,403,593
23. C & V Sheep & Cattle Co., Inc., Maricopa, Ariz. (Pinal)	463,003	21,866,596
24. Boston Ranch Co., Lemoore, Calif. (Fresno)	458,020	22,324,616
25. H. B. Murphy Co., Brawley, Calif. (Imperial)	442,327	22,766,943

"ECONOMIC NONSENSE"—AN EDITORIAL

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an editorial of notable significance was published recently in the Aiken Standard and Review.

The article expresses concern for the expanded Federal spending by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the implementing of their various programs.

As the editor points out, there seems to be a disregard as to cost when the ultimate aim of HEW is to foster another of its social programs. These programs are in most cases economically unfeasible. Yet, the economic considerations seem to receive low priority in the evaluation of these programs by HEW.

The crucial significance of HEW's policy is the increased cost these programs are to the taxpayer. These programs are paid for by the individual taxpayers, and American citizens are most concerned as to how their tax dollar is being spent.

The people of this country do not mind supporting their country by paying taxes, but they do mind having their hard-earned tax dollars spent unwisely. It is the duty of this Congress to carefully examine the spending of all Government agencies, especially HEW.

Mr. President, I recommend this editorial to my fellow Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

ECONOMIC NONSENSE

The plan to desegregation of Aiken County schools for 1968-69 as ordered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and approved by the Aiken County Board of Education does not make economic sense while it does comply with the sociological aims and ideas of the federal government.

There looms a tax increase in the near future to pay for the high cost of the federal dollar in school aid as the county discards schools and purchases new ones in order to meet compliance rules of the government and thus does not utilize existing facilities to the fullest.

Following the next increase in taxation to pay interest on bonds will be another, and probably another and another, and no economic measures will be used in reducing the load of the taxpayer as the Washington dollar becomes costlier and costlier.

While desegregation in itself is not to be condemned to the fullest, the manner in which desegregation of the schools is being accomplished is to be not only condemned but deplored as well.

No true value of cost of desegregation is being used. The only determining factor in this effort of achieving an "open society" is the finalizing of desegregation regardless of cost.

One begins to wonder how long the American people will stand for this way of throwing away the peoples' money by Washington? Somewhere, somehow this mad uneconomic wasting of money must stop and utilization of existing facilities be made rather than the plan of throw away and purchase new as is now in effect.

No one will argue with the position the Aiken County Board of Education has been placed in as it continues to work toward providing the best education possible for the youth of Aiken County. However, the zeal of the office of Health, Education and Welfare in desegregation of the schools regardless of cost is most certainly debatable and should be of deep concern to the people of the nation who should take remedial steps to revise the thinking, the philosophy and aims of the department or sooner or later education for the youth of America will reach a very low ebb.

MONSIGNOR BOGACKI
FELLOWSHIP

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a fellowship has been established at State University College at Buffalo, N.Y., in honor of the Right Reverend Monsignor Maximilian T. Bogacki of Buffalo, N.Y., a former pastor of the church where I was a parishioner.

The fellowship resulted from a gift Monsignor Bogacki made recently to the Buffalo State College Alumni Foundation.

The annual award will be made to a graduate student at the college who is a candidate for the master of arts degree in East European history and is planning to write a thesis on Polish history and culture.

The original gift by Monsignor Bogacki was supplemented by a gift from the Polish-American Council on Cultural Affairs.

Dr. Walter M. Drzewieniecki, council president, said he hopes that "this is just the beginning—that other Americans of Polish descent living in the community will also help us in this endeavor."

I have known Monsignor Bogacki well for many years, and I know of his great contributions, not only to the religious life in our community, but also to our cultural life.

He was pastor of St. Luke's Roman Catholic Church during the major renovation which made it one of the most beautiful churches anywhere. Indeed, although not a shrine, the stately edifice with its beautiful murals has attracted visitors far and wide.

Monsignor Bogacki's cultural interest is well known in my home city of Buffalo and, indeed, throughout western New York.

I join with State University College and with the Polish-American Council on Cultural Affairs in saluting Monsignor Bogacki for his inspiration in developing this fellowship program of interest to all Americans of Polish descent.

Mr. Speaker, with my remarks I include a related article and editorial from the Am-Pol Eagle, Buffalo, N.Y.:

[From the Am-Pol Eagle, July 11, 1968]

MONSIGNOR BOGACKI FELLOWSHIP ESTABLISHED
AT BUFFALO STATE

The establishment of a "Monsignor Bogacki Fellowship" at the State University College at Buffalo, for "the purpose of preserving Polish culture through the promotion of serious work in the field of Polish history," was announced last week by President E. K. Fretwell Jr.

The announcement was made at a luncheon meeting held in the Burchfield Center, Rockwell Hall, to honor Rt. Rev. Msgr. Maximilian T. Bogacki, Pastor of Assumption Parish, 435 Amherst St., whose recent gift to the Buffalo State College Alumni Foundation, Inc., will provide the funds for the fellowship awards which will bear his name.

An annual grant, providing a minimum of \$500, will be awarded to a "graduate student at the Buffalo College who is a candidate for the Master of Arts degree in East European History, and planning to write a thesis on Polish history or culture, including his-

tory of the Church and history of the American Polonia."

Terms of the trust also specified that "funds can be distributed as 'seed money' for projects related to the development of scholarly works in the area of Polish culture and history."

In acknowledging the generous gift to the College, President Fretwell paid tribute to Msgr. Bogacki for establishing a fellowship to stimulate and encourage scholarly student interest in East Europe.

"In consideration of the Niagara Frontier's large population of Polish descent," he said, "our college committee on Soviet and East Central European Studies is planning new emphasis on Polish studies and comparative East European studies."

Dr. Walter M. Drzewieniecki, president of the Polish-American Council on Cultural Affairs, presented a check for \$750 to President Fretwell as the Council's contribution to the "Monsignor Bogacki Fellowship."

In making this additional presentation in honor of the Monsignor, he said "I am hopeful that this is just the beginning—that other Americans of Polish descent living in the community will also help us in this endeavor." Dr. Drzewieniecki is a professor of history at the Buffalo College, and Chairman of the Soviet and East Central European Studies Committee.

Donald L. Voltz, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Buffalo State College Alumni Foundation, Inc. announced that the trust-fund for the fellowship will be administered by the Foundation and an Advisory Committee.

The Committee membership will include Monsignor Bogacki or his designee; the director and two or more faculty members of the Committee on Soviet and East Central European Studies Program; two or more members of the College's Department of History; the Chairman and two or more members of the Polish-American Council on Cultural Affairs; and a representative of the Buffalo State College Foundation, Inc.

[From the Am-Pol Eagle, July 11, 1968]

CONGRATULATIONS, MONSIGNOR BOGACKI!

This newspaper on behalf of the entire Polish-American community, would like to take this opportunity of congratulating the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Maximilian T. Bogacki, pastor of Assumption Parish, for establishing a fellowship to preserve Polish culture at the State University College.

The "Monsignor Bogacki Fellowship" at the State University will award an annual grant of at least \$500 to a "graduate student at the Buffalo College who is a candidate for the Master of Arts degree in East European History, and planning to write a thesis on Polish history or culture, including history of the Church and history of the American Polonia."

We look upon this "Fellowship" not only as carrying out the name and good works of this progressive and beloved pastor, but also as an extremely practical approach to a problem on which much has been said but not enough accomplished.

It is our hope, as much as it is Msgr. Bogacki's, that this is but the first step and that other Am-Pols will join the Monsignor and a progressive college in aiding this valuable endeavor.

THE EDUCATION BILLS: MARYLAND
AND THE NATION

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, no single factor is more important to assuring

an equal opportunity to all citizens than education. If the quality of American life is going to continue to improve, we must insure that every child achieves not just a basic education, but an education that is commensurate with his ability. Schools must be well equipped, teachers well trained, and the curriculum must be current and relevant. Ignorance is one of the strongest links in the cycle of poverty. Providing excellent educational opportunities will help to break that link thereby benefiting us all, both individually and as a nation.

Obviously a man can improve his standard of living if he is educated to the fullest extent possible. Not only is his earning capacity increased, but knowledge contributes to his understanding and appreciation of life. Education may mean the difference between being swept along by forces which one cannot understand and controlling those forces in order to determine one's future.

It is educated men and women who improve the quality of life through creative work in the arts, humanities, science and technology. As more and more of our citizens find themselves with more and more leisure time, it will be imperative that Americans be able to contribute to and appreciate such activities. Education may mean the difference in whether or not the society of the future devotes itself to constructive pastimes and creative activities, or whether it is preoccupied with bread and circuses.

HIGHER EDUCATION

For all these reasons, continued reappraisal of the educational opportunities available in this country is essential if quality is to be the finest and equality assured. In this regard, the members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee are to be congratulated on the passage of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968. The National Defense Education Act, passed more than a decade ago, along with the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 have revolutionized higher education in America. Loans, grants, and work-study programs have allowed many Americans from low- and middle-income families to pursue a college degree. In addition, new facilities have been built with Federal loans and grants which have enabled institutions to accommodate the enormous numbers of students seeking admission.

Particularly notable is the talent research program which attempts to locate and assist talented but disadvantaged secondary school students and dropouts. Most of the provisions of these three vital acts are to be extended for 5 years by the 1968 bill.

The guaranteed student loan program is also extended by this act to help insure loans for students who cannot qualify for other educational assistance programs. The goal of this program is to create a series of State agencies which will guarantee loans made by the private sector of the economy to college students. It is expected that this program will assist primarily students from middle income backgrounds who may not qualify as economically needy under other programs. Low middle- and middle-income families have a very difficult time making

ends meet if they have a child in college. This program has provided guarantees for over 765,000 students so far, either by direct insurance or reinsurance of loans. Furthermore, this program is inexpensive—it requires relatively little money to insure a great many loans.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Yesterday the Senate passed a vocational education bill which will go a long way toward helping young people bridge the gulf between school and work. I supported H.R. 18366. It is a tribute to the members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee and particularly the distinguished Senators from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and New York [Mr. JAVITS], that this bill passed by a unanimous vote. It is the product of intensive and meticulous work. It acknowledges the diversity of educational and employment needs in the various states, and comprises some very helpful and hopeful means with which to meet those needs.

The Vocational Education Act passed in 1963 has considerably upgraded vocational education in the United States. As a result of that act, one out of every four, instead of the previous ratio of one out of every five, high school students is enrolled in some kind of vocational program. These programs are also being extended to the out-of-school population in an attempt to meet the challenges of automation and structural unemployment.

Yet there are still many areas in which vocational education is inadequate. The high rate of unemployment among young people in the work force including high school dropouts, plus the unskilled adults in the work force testify to the need for more job training. Fifty to sixty percent of the students leaving high school who seek jobs have had no preparation for employment. For those who do not go on to college and professional training, the bridge between school and employment is still, for the most part, inadequate. An alarmingly high proportion of high school graduates, therefore, must go through a period of unemployment before they are able to find a job. This problem is particularly severe in the inner-city areas where the population of this age group is dense and jobs for the unskilled are scarce.

The new Vocational Education Act amendments will improve curriculums so that training matches occupational vacancies, will broaden and coordinate State programs, and make adult education programs available to more of the population. These amendments will encourage local school districts to establish model innovative vocational programs to meet local employment needs, and will materially assist States in expanding and improving cooperative work-study programs. By requiring States to establish advisory councils on vocational education, a much-needed liaison between public school, vocational school and employment institutions will be created.

LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. President, in a few days the Senate will consider another matter which is of vital importance to the future of education throughout this country. I refer to the appropriations for Federal assistance to elementary and secondary education

in H.R. 18037. The House, in approving this measure, made severe cuts in the amount of funds requested for these programs.

Particularly severe are the cuts in the title I authorizations for assistance to educationally deprived children. These programs are of vital importance to the inner city schools.

More than 9½ million children are receiving special attention as a result of title I. Most States have noticed improved reading competency among these students, a lower dropout rate, increases in the number continuing higher education, increases in attendance, and decreases in vandalism.

In spite of the success of this program, and despite the need for even more intensified efforts in the disadvantaged areas, the House has made cuts in the authorization that will have unconscionable results. Even ignoring the effect on the disadvantaged children who will be deprived of educational opportunities because of lack of funds or the impact among the poor of another program being cut out from under them, there are solid reasons for restoring these funds.

The 1967 act authorized \$2.7 billion for title I. The Office of Education requested only \$1.2 billion but got \$1.064 billion from the House. HEW is asking for the restoration of \$126,873,000.

The State of Maryland in fiscal 1968 received \$14,590,115 in title I funds. In fiscal 1969 it would receive only \$13,285,656—a cut of over \$1.3 million. Baltimore City alone would lose \$679,000. Even if the local and State governments could make up these tremendous losses, it is too late. Funds for the next school year have already been budgeted without considering these cuts. If these funds are not restored, then the school system will be forced to cut back on important programs and levels requires a 5- to 10-percent increase in funds each year in order to cope with increasing enrollment and per pupil costs. Even with the increases of the past few years in Federal aid, the Baltimore schools have been falling behind on the amount of Federal funds per pupil. The cities and States have no way of restoring these funds even if there were time to do so. If we cut this assistance, the only result that can come about is the deprivation of poor children who are most in need of educational assistance.

There are other vital areas in which severe cuts have been made by the House that must be restored by the Senate. The funds to assist State boards of education to improve their administration and to formulate State plans for educational development have been cut by almost 12 percent.

Two much-needed new programs authorized by the 1967 act but never funded have been cut out again. These are the dropout prevention program and the bilingual education program. The first of these is an attempt to cut the national dropout rate, which now stands at nearly 28 percent. Under the dropout program 10 to 12 of our largest cities and one or two rural areas would get demonstration programs. These programs would attempt to deal with the problem at an early age in areas with

large concentrations of low-income families. There has never been a project which attempts to deal with the dropout problem with a wide range of imaginative remedies. The bilingual program emphasizes the development of programs to instruct the 5 million children in America who do not speak English as their native tongue. This program was eliminated by the House despite the fact that only \$5 million was requested.

The Teachers Corps was cut by more than 50 percent of the amount that the Office of Education requested. This program sends dedicated young people into disadvantaged areas to assist the overloaded educational systems, and it encourages institutions of higher learning to create new programs of teacher preparation particularly with respect to education for the disadvantaged. So far it has been enthusiastically received by school administrators.

Restoration is also being asked for funds which were designated to meet the increased administrative expenses of the Office of Education, and funds which were to go for the development of programs which previous research had indicated were promising.

IMPACTED AREA AID

In addition to the cuts brought about by the House, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has recommended that the Federal-aid-to-impacted-areas program be cut by over \$110 million to help defray the costs of the restoration of funds in other programs. To adopt this proposal would severely hinder the efforts of educators in many States including my own State of Maryland.

Maryland is entitled to \$26,000,000 in funds under the present impacted area law. The House has cut these funds slightly to \$24 million—a reduction that has serious implications for the State educational budget. The proposed HEW cuts, however, would leave the State with less than \$17 million—a cut of more than \$9.5 million from the originally authorized amount.

There is no way in which my State can overcome this loss. Because a high concentration of Federal employees live in Maryland, the State receives considerably more assistance under Public Law 874 than most other States. It is only equitable for the Federal Government to help defray the extra expenses for education caused by the presence of so many of its employees. To cut these funds out after they have been authorized and budgeted would have a drastic effect on the Maryland school system, and should be regarded as a failure of the Federal Government to meet its responsibilities.

CONCLUSION

In short, Mr. President, most of the programs which have been dropped or scaled down and the vast majority of the funds in H.R. 18037 which have been cut by the House would serve the needs of the poor and disadvantaged. Yet these are the people to whom education is most vital and these are the people who can least afford any cuts. The best hope that these people have is that the next generation will be able to move out of the poverty in which their parents are mired. But if we shortchange them on their edu-

cation, the next generation will not be equipped to improve their position in society.

Eventually every child grows up and leaves school. Every postponement of our duty to provide an adequate education to these people means the condemnation of more of our citizens to a life of poverty and ignorance. We cannot economize by decreasing our educational expenditures. That only defers costs which must sometime in some form be paid. They may be in the form of increased welfare expenditures or increased expenditures to fight crime, but they cannot be done away with completely.

If the Senate does not restore these funds, we will do great disservice to the school boards across the country. We will deprive needy and deserving children of an adequate educational opportunity. And we will add to the frustration of the poor by taking action that can only be regarded as a callous indifference to the most disadvantaged members of our society.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, every year Congress sets aside a week designated by public law as Captive Nations Week. This resolution covers the countries under the influence of Russian power, some in Asia, some in Europe, some even within the borders of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It covers some nations with thousand-year histories and some which lasted only brief moments during the turmoil of the Russian civil war. Some have lapsed into obscurity. Others, like the Ukraine, have maintained and even revived a national identity, in spite of decades within the Soviet framework and under Russian discipline. The spirit of this captive nations observance is exemplified by Ukrainian nationalism, one of the most curious phenomena in the history of national spirit. This nationalism has grown against all odds from its original base in the peasantry into an intellectual cause, advanced by the most educated elements of this republic. The persecution of intellectuals in this unhappy Soviet republic has been closely linked with Russian attempts to eradicate this "bourgeois nationalism." Scores of students, writers, journalists, and professionals have been subjected to secret trials since 1965 and have been consigned to the wastes of Russian prison camps. Today's observance is certainly an appropriate time to protest these outrages, clearly the work of a vicious and unbridled KGB. All decent men regard this suppression with disgust, even those living within the Soviet Union.

This week is also the time to praise and commemorate the brave men keeping alive the spirit of liberty throughout the Communist world. We have had more reason to hope this year that this spirit might revive and even grow in Eastern Europe than at any time since 1956. The year of 1968 has already earned its place

in history as the year in which a great ferment of liberalism and democracy arose throughout Eastern Europe from Estonia and Poland in the north to Yugoslavia in the south. This ferment is the central element in the very different histories of these countries. Some, like Poland, have suppressed it by a cruel and ugly campaign of anti-Semitism. Others, like the Ukraine, and Russia itself, have tried to keep it out by putting themselves in quarantine and suppressing all intrusions of foreign thinking. And, in the middle of this region and this history, the country of Czechoslovakia has attempted to reconcile freedom and communism, in an on-going campaign of liberalization which has excited the hopes of free men and the fears of Communist dogmatists.

The fact that this small country can still hope for freedom in spite of its nearness and strategic importance to Soviet Russia has aroused the jealousy and hatred of its dogmatic neighbors. Just this weekend, the hard-line powers of East Germany, Poland and Bulgaria, superintended by the three legal rulers of Russia herself, met in Warsaw for the purpose of intimidating the Czechoslovakian leadership. The attendance at this meeting showed how seriously Russia felt itself menaced by this spirit of freedom. Among the Russian delegation was Pyotr Shelest, the party boss of the Ukraine, who undoubtedly complained that word of free speech in Czechoslovakia had intensified the restiveness in his province.

The key to this year, and even to the future of the captive nations, lies in the events of the next few weeks in Eastern Europe. The Russians and their dogmatic lackeys are putting the squeeze on the Czechoslovaks. They would like them to slow down, and even reverse, their drive to liberate their own people. Russian troops are on Czech soil, 2 weeks after their excuse to be there had run out. Russian statements of the last few days have a threatening and ominous tone. It is not yet clear what form this squeeze will finally take, but it threatens to create a very ugly and possibly tragic situation for this small nation, which has the oldest and most admirable tradition of democratic, liberal government in Eastern Europe, and is trying to revive it.

Russia and its allies undoubtedly would like to act now, before the upcoming Czechoslovakian Party Congress in September finally confirms its country's liberal course and removes the last of its hardliners from the Communist Central Committee. The recent selection of delegates makes it almost certain that this party congress will do just that, unless someone intervenes. The hardline members of the Communist camp are threatening that intervention. There is the imminent danger that Russian forces still in the country might sponsor a coup against Dubcek, the Czech party secretary. They are now appealing to the hardline workers' militia, which was instrumental in the Communist takeover in 1948. It is possible that the 40 Novotny sympathizers still sitting on the Czech Central Committee could meet with the aid of these forces in a rump session somewhere in the country and

vote to replace Dubcek with a Russian-backed conservative. This type of coup would have more semblance of legality than the events in Hungary, since the Russian politburo has grown somewhat more sophisticated since 1956. But it would bring as bitter an end to our once-high hopes for a more humane regime in Eastern Europe.

The West should not stand by as these dangers threaten liberals in Czechoslovakia and throughout the captive nations. We should extend encouragement to the Czechoslovak leadership, which is now undergoing a brutal war of nerves. With encouragement from the West, they should be able to maintain their majority on the central committee. With indifference from the West, they may lose their grip on the party and succumb to Russian pressures. We can take immediate steps to extend this encouragement. We can move now to end the outstanding differences between our two countries. For instance, we could name a high-level Federal mediator to revive negotiations over the Czechoslovakian gold which we now hold in escrow. We should be willing to extend credits to the Czech leadership so that it can meet the urgent demand for improvement in its economy, the most vulnerable point of its reforms. We should be willing to take these steps if we are serious in our desire to see a humanization of politics behind the iron curtain.

The grip of Russia on its captives is weakening. It is losing its ability to control their internal life and even the details of their diplomacy. The days when Moscow was able to run its allies like departments of the comintern are dying. Nations like Rumania, Yugoslavia, and even Hungary, would like to see them gone forever. If we extend this urgently needed sign of sympathy to the Czechs, we may help put those days to rest. If we do, we will act in the truest spirit of this observance, which is to commemorate the expired freedom of the Communist camp and to attempt to revive it.

HEMISFAIR

HON. JOHN G. TOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on April 6 of this year, San Antonio, Tex., offered to the world its dazzling and impressive gift—HemisFair. This world exposition was an appropriate gift to celebrate San Antonio's 250th birthday. The \$158 million dollar fair has turned downtown San Antonio into a jewelbox displaying the treasures of San Antonio, the State of Texas, and the Western Hemisphere. Though the fair is set to run only 6 months, hopefully, millions of Americans and tourists from abroad will view the marvels and majesty of this exciting exposition. The citizens of San Antonio are to be congratulated for their civic pride and future insight. When HemisFair ends in October, San Antonio will retain the new \$13.5 million Civic Center as well as the impressive symbol of progress, the

622-foot-high Tower of the Americas, tallest observation tower in the United States.

Quite understandably, HemisFair has been lauded far and wide by the news media, architectural critics, and cultural experts. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several articles and excerpts from articles detailing the greatness of San Antonio and HemisFair.

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

[From Shell News, May-June 1968]

HEMISFAIR '68: A ROSE FOR SAN ANTONIO

(More than seven million people are expected to help San Antonio celebrate the 250th anniversary of its founding at the first world's fair ever held in the American Southwest.)

Will Rogers called it one of America's most interesting cities. J. Frank Doble, folklorist and writer, called it every Texan's second home. It's San Antonio, a colorful fiesta-mad town that spent six years and \$156 million figuring a way to celebrate its 250th anniversary. And now they're doing it, with the longest-running all-out party ever to hit the American Southwest—HemisFair '68.

The six-month extravaganza, which opened April 6 and will run to October 6, is a world's fair sanctioned by the same international agency that registered the Seattle fair of 1962 and Montreal's Expo 67. Resemblances end there.

Size and design make the difference. HemisFair rises on what Texas Governor John Connally calls the most "exciting 92 acres in Texas," just 200 yards away from the historic Alamo. That not only puts it smack in the downtown section—a switch as fairs go—but also makes it rather small. Expo 67, by comparison, covered 1,000 acres.

HemisFair is small enough, in fact, to be seen in one day. Its designers boast that their efforts had one aim: making the fair a pleasurable experience for 7.5 million expected visitors. That means taking the exhausting, hectic pace out of fair-going, and HemisFair officials have done it through compactness and convenient transportation.

You can ride a 7,560-foot minirail to most exhibits; cruise in excursion boats, river taxis, dining barges, and other small boats along a mile of spring-fed waterways and a special San Antonio River extension which permits entry to HemisFair from any point on the river; or walk along miles of flower-bordered footpaths reserved for pedestrians only. Also, there are rickshaws and a Swiss skyride.

For added comfort, many lunch and walking areas are cooled by forced air-conditioning, and an elevated walkway system is lined with seating space. More than 2,000 trees—hackberry, sycamore, poplar, chinaberry, elm, liveoak, giant pecan, and others—provide cooling shade for rest areas.

"Confluence of Civilizations in the Americas," the fair theme, is embodied dramatically in the Tower of the Americas, a 622-foot high central structure topped with a doughnut-shaped restaurant which revolves once each hour to give diners a long look at the South Texas countryside. Architecturally and thematically, the tower—87 feet taller than the Washington Monument—is HemisFair's unifying agent, symbolizing the meeting and merging of the Old and New Worlds in the Americas.

Outward from the tower, interspersed with floral-landscaped plazas, are the fun and fanfare that make a world's fair. At HemisFair are the pavilions of 25 foreign nations, the United States, the Organization of American States, the states of Arkansas and (of course) Texas, and 19 private and industrial exhibits. You can do most anything—take a simulated

space trip, visit a building—full of the world's folk toys, dine in any one of 20 old Victorian residences that have been remodeled as restaurants serving dishes of many countries.

The foreign government pavilions are all in one area, the *Plazas del Mundo* (Plazas of the World). There you can learn about the people and cultures of the Mexicans (whose history is traced in a color movie); the Germans (who present a full-scale model of the Lillenthal Glider, the newest concept in internal-combustion engines); the French (who model the latest in Paris teen-age fashions); the Spaniards (some of their greatest artists—Velazquez, Murillo, Goya, Zurbarán, and El Greco—are represented in the finest collection ever allowed out of Spain); or the Venezuelans (whose own confluence of cultures is traced in a corridor of displays). And when you feel like it, you can just sit down and listen for the gaily garbed *mariaichis* (strolling musicians) who roam the fair grounds, or watch for the flamenco dancers, the singing groups, or the HemisFair brass band.

One writer has characterized the fair as "Hispano-America with guests," and well he might; like San Antonio itself, half of whose population is Mexican-American, HemisFair is strictly bilingual. The signs, the programs, the exhibits all are in both English and Spanish, lending impact to the sense of historical confluence.

At least two major pavilions—the United States and Texas—closely adhere to the fair theme. The \$6.5 million U.S. pavilion features *Confluence U.S.A.*, a three-part movie on American culture, by Francis Thompson, whose film *To Be Alive* won an Academy Award after showings at the New York World's Fair. The movie is shown in the Confluence Theatre where walls separate viewers into compartments, then lift to merge them into one audience as screens grow larger and larger until one huge panorama fills the theatre. The \$10 million Institute of Texan Cultures, longer than a football field and dominating the fair's southeast corner, is out to debunk myths picturing the typical modern Texan, in the words of Institute Director R. Henderson Shuffler, as "a loud-mouthed wheeler-dealer in blue-jeans and big hat, who fell into a barrel of oil and came up smelling like a millionaire." It does this through an unusual ethnic history of Texan culture which traces the little-known roles in early Texan history played by the English, the Irish, the Italians, and the Negro, showing how heritages have melded to make Texas what it is today.

Another major attraction is the \$10.5 million Civic Center, a charming three-building convention and community center that provides entertainment to visitors who come directly by gondola taxi from their downtown hotels. A huge mural, Mexican artist Juan O'Gorman's interpretation of the fair theme, greets guests as they disembark in the center of the complex, at the River Court. Like many other HemisFair structures, the Civic Center will remain after the fair; but for now it serves an international audience with such diverse performers as the Bayanihan Ballet from Manila, the Isaac Stern—Eugene Istomin—Leonard Rose trio, the Baja Marimba Band, and comics Bob Hope, Phyllis Diller and Bob Newhart.

For the 750,000 people who live and work in the nation's 14th largest city, HemisFair is a boost to civic pride and a lot more. The fair is expected to account for \$175 million in retail sales and \$500 million in new construction. All this from a huge influx of travelers who, because of San Antonio's excellent interstate freeway system—the nation's second largest—are having little trouble getting there. Thanks to HemisFair, travel this year is also greatly increased in other parts of the Southwest: Many motorists, after visiting San Antonio, are moving on to Mexican border towns, the Gulf re-

sorts, Houston and New Orleans, to name a few neighboring attractions.

Another neighbor is Shell. About one-sixth of the Company's employees work in Texas, many at locations near San Antonio. The waterflooded Big Foot Field, about 32 miles southwest of the city, in Frio County, was discovered by Shell in 1949 and now produces 55,000 barrels of oil each month. Some 60 miles southeast of San Antonio, near Karnes City, is the Shell-operated Person Gas Plant, which treats and processes about 55 million cubic feet of sour gas and recovers 20 long-tons of sulfur daily. Further east, 90 miles from the fair city, is the Houston Central Gas Plant, located near Sheridan in Colorado County. This plant went on stream in 1966 and is among the largest gas plants in the state, processing more than 380 million cubic feet of gas daily.

To help the San Antonio visitor, Shell has made available 414,000 maps showing the fair site, nearby places of interest, and routes within and leading to the city. Included is a map of Mexico City where the 1968 Olympics will be held October 12 to 27. The maps have been distributed to all Shell marketing regions, and also are available from Shell Touring Service.

Shell is not the only travel booster in this year of HemisFair '68. For the first time the United States Travel Service has singled out only one event—HemisFair '68—for worldwide promotion as the year's outstanding travel attraction in the United States.

Since HemisFair is right downtown, travelers can't miss it. Just remember the Alamo. The fun's taking place a few blocks away.

[From Life Magazine, May 10, 1968]

FAIR THAT'S EASY TO TAKE IN

The only thing Texas-size about the new world's fair in San Antonio is the movies—and there are a lot of them. Almost every pavilion has its own spectacular, but by far the biggest—and also the best—is the U.S. exhibit's superb movie *US* (below) shown on three screens, each as big as a billboard. But in every other way HemisFair is a size that can be coped with, a pleasant rarity in world's fairs. Its 622-foot concrete tower (left) and the nearly 60 foreign and industrial exhibits can easily be taken in on foot or on the mini-Minirail in a day or two. Set smack in the middle of downtown San Antonio, it is even easy to get to. Much of the HemisFair, which celebrates the city's 250th birthday and will run until October, has a southwestern twang: tamale stands, flamenco dancers, gun-slingers, and a charming display of Alexander Girard's vast collection of Latin American folk art. The cultural prize of the fair is the exhibit of Spanish paintings, only fourteen of them but each a masterpiece.

HISTORIC SETTING—THANKS TO A BAND OF FEISTY LADIES

Not the least of HemisFair's attractions is the city it's held in. Besides the Alamo, San Antonio boasts ancient Spanish missions, buildings from every period of Texas history and a lazy river that meanders through the downtown and is traveled by floating restaurants. The river has been extended so that visitors can enter the fair by boat and take in its attractions from barges that travel along a man-made canal.

Much of this would not exist were it not for a group of embattled ladies who for 40-odd years have made it their business to protect San Antonio from "progress." Gracious gentlewomen and prominent citizens though they are, the feisty and stubborn members of the San Antonio Conservation Society will stop at almost nothing to achieve their end—the preservation of the city's architectural heritage. First they try cajolery, but if that doesn't work, they will buttonhole, argue, pester and make nuisances of themselves.

SAVED: RIVER, PALACE AND HALF A CONVENT

The fair itself is one of their recent battlefields. HemisFair was originally planned as part of an urban renewal project which would replace in toto a run-down section of the city's center. But the ladies leapt to the barricades to save the historically and architecturally valuable buildings that studded the area. Through their efforts 24 buildings have been saved—some balconied, some embellished with Victorian gingerbread, some the simplest kind of 18th Century cabins. Spruced up as shops and restaurants, they are one of HemisFair's most charming aspects.

The Conservation Society was formed in 1924, in order to balk plans to cement over the San Antonio River, then not much more than a ditch, and turn it into an underground sewer. The ladies who banded together then had an encouraging precedent. Eighteen years earlier the Alamo had been saved by a like-minded group. They saved the river and went on to restore the Spanish governor's palace and the only Spanish aqueduct in the U.S., preserve the city's only downtown park and renovate a dozen old buildings. In one of its major rescues, it saved the decaying mill and granary of the San José Mission, which dates back to 1720.

To restore the granary, they first had to buy it. With some embarrassment they had their husbands cosign a \$3,000 note, then raised the money to pay it off in the only way that occurred to them: through teas and cake sales. Recently the Society's sharp eye fell on the 19th Century Ursuline Convent with its rare Gothic chapel. The Society members knew they could not raise enough to buy the whole convent so they bought all they could afford: \$250,000 worth. For this they got exactly half—up to the end of the chapel. The other half is already on its way to becoming a high-rise apartment. Now the Society is trying to collect the \$250,000 by "selling" the convent at \$1 an inch.

The ladies don't mind at all that many fellow San Antonians regard them as prickly, uncompromising and sometimes a little nutty. They flaunt their single-mindedness, pass it on from mother to daughter, and keep looking in front of every bulldozer for new ways of acting on the Society's motto: "Shall I say, 'Yes, I remember it' or 'Here it is, I helped to save it'?"

HEMISFAIR

(By Arbon Jack Lowe)

The Americas are having their day—or rather, their six months—this year in San Antonio, Texas. HemisFair '68, the first world's fair to be held in the southern part of the United States, opened there April 6 with the entire Hemisphere as its guest of honor.

HemisFair may well bring about a new trend in international exhibitions. It is small, almost intimate—ninety-two carefully laid out acres contain thousands of things to see and do without putting the visitor's endurance to a test. It is tasteful—a charming blend of modern marble and glass structures and lovely eighteenth century houses restored for the occasion. And it is downtown, a scant six blocks from the Texas landmark, the Alamo.

In the fair, as in San Antonio itself, the emphasis is definitely Latin American. HemisFair's bright colors, open plazas, and strolling *mariachis* are, in a sense, an extension of San Antonio's way of life. The city was for more than a century under Spanish, then Mexican, rule, and reminders of that heritage abound on every corner: in the street names—Navarro, Alamo, Guadalupe; in the five early eighteenth century Franciscan missions; in the population itself, more than 50 per cent of whom speak Spanish or have Spanish surnames. And in this, the two hundred and fiftieth year since San Antonio came into being with the establishment of Mission San Antonio de Valero,

the famous Alamo, what better way to celebrate than with a fair? And what better theme than The Confluence of Civilizations in the Americas?

Creating a New World. HemisFair's Confluence theme is an examination of the Asian, European, pre-Columbian and Latin American influences and contributions in the creation of a New World. It has been adhered to almost lovingly by many of the pavilions in a near perfect combination of the educational and the entertaining.

The fair centers around its theme structure, the Tower of the Americas, which, at 622 feet, is the tallest observation tower in the Western Hemisphere. Elevators whisk passengers to the top in seconds; there a revolving restaurant and two observation levels command a hundred-mile view of the surrounding Texas landscape.

The theme is repeated in the three-building Civic Center complex, with theater, domed arena, and exhibit hall. A lively international season—opera and rodeo, folk ballet and theater—is now under way in the Center. The theater boasts a Confluence mural 110 feet long by Mexico's Juan O'Gorman, and the huge exhibit hall a mural by Guatemala's Carlos Mérida. The exhibit hall houses one of HemisFair's major exhibits: Confluence/Cosmos, which deals with man's relation to the universe from 3800 B.C. through Project Apollo—and beyond.

The State of Texas, pavilion, HemisFair's largest, tells the story of Texas through the twenty-six cultural groups who merged there to create it—Poles and Mexicans, Swedes and Negroes—in separate exhibits coordinated with a 360° movie projection on the central dome. It successfully demolishes the myth that "pictures the typical Texan as a loud-mouthed wheeler-dealer in blue jeans and big hat, who fell into a barrel of oil and came up smelling like a millionaire." The handsome two-building United States exhibit, Confluence U.S.A., has an unusual still graphics exhibit showing a nation built by immigrants from many nations. In the circular theater a three-screen film interprets the country's heritage, the harvest of the confluence, and the promise of the future in an imaginative video technique, done by the producer of the New York World's Fair success, *To Be Alive*—Francis Thompson.

The Woman's Pavilion examines the role of women in building the Americas and documents their accomplishments in medicine, education, the arts and the home. The story of the peoples of Latin America and the U.S. Southwest is told in a unique manner through the Alexander Girard collection of more than ten thousand pieces of folk art and folk toys, grouped to show every phase of life, from birth to death, and thereafter. It is the first public showing of the elaborate collection, *El Encanto de un Pueblo* (The Magic of a People).

Plazas del Mundo. For the first time at an international exhibition, the pavilions of foreign governments have been grouped in one area, the *Plazas del Mundo* (Plazas of the World), on the southwest side of the fairgrounds. This rambling international village contains the exhibits of the Organization of American States and of the twenty-six countries participating in HemisFair, and offers foods, entertainment, and handicrafts from the world over.

The Organization of American States pavilion, easily identified by the huge letter OAS on the exterior, represents all the Hemisphere's countries in its exhibits of paintings, sculptures and drawings from the Pan American Union's Permanent Collection of Latin American Art. The multi-faceted activities of the OAS are displayed in a dramatic panel of mural photographs—art exhibits, concerts, a meeting of the OAS Council, and so on—and another series of photographs depicts Latin Americans art treasures. Among the displays are the flags of member states, a panel on *Americas* and

other OAS publications, and important OAS documents. The participation of the OAS in HemisFair was made possible through a contribution of the Kampeo Foundation and its president, Mrs. Ike S. Kampmann, Jr., of San Antonio. The exhibit is staffed by members of the Pan American Student Forum of Texas.

A number of OAS countries have individual exhibits in the *Plazas del Mundo* area. Bolivia displays folk crafts and artifacts, as well as photographs of its stunning mountain landscape and of La Paz, highest capital city in the world. The five Central American countries—Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua—jointly occupy a pavilion that uses automatic vehicles to transport visitors through a slide and film tour of each nation, all around a central courtyard displaying the countries' products and art.

Colombia combines pre-Columbian artifacts in stone and gold with modern paintings and sculpture in its pavilion, staffed by Colombian girls in typical dress. Panama's theme is Bridge of the Americas, and the pavilion has a scale model of the Panama Canal, a tropical garden, art work of the San Blas Indians, and a 185-foot mural. Venezuela's display traces its history, emphasizing the floodtide of development after the discovery of oil. The story of progress is told through movies and still photographs, interspersed with several exhibits on the industrial theme.

Mexico is represented in one of HemisFair's largest government pavilions. Pre-Columbian and colonial art objects are displayed, as are thirty-one modern paintings on the theme of Mexico in the Confluence of Civilization. There is a striking mural by Rufino Tamayo, a three-part theater showing an excellent film on Mexico, a night club, a restaurant, an outdoor boutique, and almost constant entertainment.

Many other countries have contributed to HemisFair's confluence with unique pavilions. Spain has sent the most important display of Spanish masters ever presented outside Spain and some of the earliest maps of Texas; Italy shows Half a Millennium of Italian Presence in the Americas. Germany surveys its contributions in the development of the New World. And France, whose flag was one of the six that have flown over Texas, presents historical documents, sculptures, paintings, fashion shows, and an equestrian show. Canada (EXPO '67) and Japan (EXPO '70) are also on hand at HemisFair with striking pavilions.

In two separate areas, seventeen industrial and institutional pavilions have embraced the Confluence theme with a high degree of originality, with ideas ranging from a Latin American puppet show to a school of tomorrow to pit-your-brain-against-our-mechanical-one, to you-design-the-fabric, our-computer-weaves-it. The large corporations are to be congratulated for respecting the scale and purpose of the fair; instead of competing with one another (and with everything else), as often happens, (they have opted to share in HemisFair's glory rather than try to steal it. Their pavilions complement the fair's total integrated effect.

But for all the attractive new architecture in the fair (and there is much of it), the greatest delight is the twenty-five historic structures that HemisFair planners wisely left intact when they laid out the grounds. The old buildings were carefully blended into the fair, principally for use as restaurants, and speak perhaps more effectively than any modern ones of the cultural confluence that is San Antonio. A glance at the wide variety of styles—German or Spanish or Irish or whatever—gives as indelible a history lesson as any pavilion is able to provide.

"People-designed." Planning for HemisFair did not, fortunately stop with the build-

ings. In addition to being the first downtown world's fair, it has also been called the first "people-designed" one. The small and manageable area involved has been made to seem even more manageable by a number of innovations done with visitor comfort in mind. Still another turn has been added to the winding San Antonio River that wanders through the heart of the city (the Indians used to call it "drunken-old-man-going-home-at-night") so that visitors may reach the fairgrounds from their hotels in water taxis. Broad elevated walkways in the fairgrounds facilitate getting from one carefully coordinated section to another, and flower-decked boats cruise along the fair's mile-long interior waterways. There are also a mini-rail and a Swiss skyride—so much interior transportation, in fact, that it's hardly necessary to walk at all. Abundant seating has been provided, and outdoor lunch areas and walkways are mercifully cooled during the day by forced air conditioning from overhead canopies.

Step Right Up! Of course, no fair would be complete without an amusement area, and HemisFair has its own unique solution. The interior waterways form Fiesta Island, where a wide variety of rides are available. Above the popcorn level, though, there are a number of other interesting events being presented for the duration of the fair. The two Czech films that stole the entertainment show at EXPO '67 are at HemisFair: *Laterna Magika*, a film-live show, at renovated Beethoven Hall, and *Kino-Automat*, a film in which the audience votes at intervals to decide which turn the plot will take.

Also on hand in a strictly-for-adults spectacle are the Krofft Puppets in a spicy musical review (a modified version is presented for family entertainment in one of the industrial pavilions) and Los Voladores de Papantla, Mexico's flying Indians, who fly around a 114-foot pole. Free outdoor entertainment is provided regularly by singers and dancers from many countries.

HemisFair's Project Y is a kind of six-month Happening that gives visitors the chance to participate directly in sports, music, discussions of public issues, and craftsmanship. The area includes a theater and "discussion pit" for musical and intellectual jam sessions, a cabaret with Pop music from Hong Kong or Poland or Nigeria, and a "People Place," styled after a Latin American plaza, complete with the traditional evening *paseo*.

And to put the final candles on San Antonio's birthday cake, a number of internationally known stars and groups will appear at the Civic Center—among them the Ballet Folklórico de México, the Isaac Stern-Eugene Istomin-Leonard Rose trio in concert, the Philippines' Bayanihan Ballet, the Mormon Tabernacle Choir, Bob Hope, and even the Ringling Bros.-Barnum & Bailey Circus.

Colonial Charm. Visitors to HemisFair should allow time to explore San Antonio itself—which, even without HemisFair, is one of the four most interesting cities in the United States, according to the late Will Rogers. Though now the fourteenth largest U.S. city, San Antonio has retained much of its colonial charm and all of its traditional hospitality and love for a *fiesta*. Its people have worked long and hard to make HemisFair a reality, with a burst of public spirit seldom seen today, and they are now ready for that birthday celebration to begin.

San Antonio was founded in 1718 by the Marqués de Valero, Viceroy of Spain, as the Royal Presidio of San Antonio de Bejar; its accompanying mission was San Antonio de Valero, with the Alamo as its chapel. By 1731 four other missions had been established along the banks of the San Antonio River—the most distant only five miles from today's downtown area. The village became the seat of the Spanish Government in the Province of Texas, with its Governor's Palace. Later,

after Mexico won her independence from Spain, it was Mexican. Texas forces made a successful bid for independence in 1836, after first suffering a heroic but disastrous defeat in the famous Battle of the Alamo. In 1845, after nine years, The Republic of Texas became the State of Texas—the Lone Star State.

Today the Alamo and the four missions—among them the beautiful San José—stand as glorious reminders of a colorful history. The Spanish Governor's Palace and historic La Villita—opposite the fairgrounds, with seven carefully preserved colonial buildings—are also open to the public. And the same river that first attracted the attention of the conquistadors is still the center of San Antonio's festive night life. It is lined with clubs and restaurants blaring out Mexican and Dixieland music, and offering Polynesian, Irish, and German cuisine. The Paseo del Rio (River Walk) is also the setting for the Arneson River Theater, where summer spectators can see programs of Mexican and Spanish music and dancing on the stage across the river.

And there is Brackenridge Park, with its sunken garden and one of the nation's largest zoos; Sidney Porter's (O. Henry) home and the novel Buckhorn Saloon on the grounds of the Lone Star Brewery; the fine collections of the McNay Art Institute and the Witte Memorial Museum; and—back to the circus—the Hertzberg Circus Collection, tracing the history of that entertainment institution, in the Main Library downtown. "Across the alley from the Alamo" is the famous old Menger Hotel, whose register includes such notable names as Theodore Roosevelt (who trained his Rough Riders in San Antonio), Sarah Bernhardt, Mark Twain, Oscar Wilde, and Jenny Lind.

For two and a half centuries San Antonio has been a gateway to Latin America. She has seen conquistadors, missionaries, explorers, pioneers, and entrepreneurs, and this year will receive some seven and a half million visitors in her biggest *fiesta* ever. A fitting celebration, to be sure, for a grand old lady.

[From Look magazine, May 28, 1968]

SAN ANTONIO'S OWN WORLD'S FAIR

HemisFair '68, which opened April 6 in San Antonio, is a comfortable, walkable, bite-sized world's fair, a quarter larger than Seattle's in 1962, and about a tenth the size of Expo 67 last summer. It doesn't pretend to be spectacular, and it doesn't establish styles in taste for the next 25 years. What it does offer is air-conditioned fun and knowledge in untrifling doses, which can be absorbed in two or three days. As fairs go, it wasn't expensive—governments, industries and individuals invested \$200 million. It will start paying off for the city as soon as 7.2 million guests have passed through the gates and, at about \$4 apiece, have spent \$30 million. This is peanuts, San Antonians claim, against money-losing Montreal's draw of 50 million people in one year and New York's 51 million in two. What's there? Nineteen foreign and 15 industrial pavilions; about 100 price-controlled eating places; an impressive variety of diversions and rides that aren't exhaustingly apart from the "worthwhile" areas; the tallest observation tower in North America; a shaded canal stocked with bass; campy Victorian houses; a fountain visitors can operate; paintings from the Prado in Madrid. HemisFair is a splashy six-month celebration of San Antonio's 250th birthday. It will astonish no one if the aftermath of the party is the business and cultural flowering of one of America's most gently beautiful old cities.

IT'S THE BIGGEST NEWS IN SAN ANTONIO SINCE BARBED WIRE

"This town was Sleepy Hollow," says a San Antonian. "In the '20's, we dropped from first-to-third-largest city in Texas, and all anybody did was roll over and go back to

sleep." Another Texan explains that when General Santa Anna rode out of San Antonio in March, 1836, after his victory at the Alamo, he commanded: "Don't do anything until I get back." He went to San Jacinto, was defeated in battle and never returned. But his order nevertheless was strictly observed.

Suddenly, in the mid 1960's, everything changed. In a demonstration of unity that surprised even themselves, San Antonians voted bond issues to start HemisFair. In long-range terms, they were also voting to clear 92 acres of slums, skid row and houses of tattered gentility. The project—two blocks from the Alamo—is being financed mainly by the Federal and state governments, and the paying guests. After the show is over, it will all be turned over to the city, along with the profits. If there are losses, they will be made up privately, but no one expects that.

Whatever the result, the city will get a free legacy, which will include a \$15 million convention hall, arena and theater; a mile-long canal and a lake; a \$10 million Institute of Texan Cultures that aims to microfilm everything ever written about the state; a central downtown air-conditioning plant; the \$5.5 million Tower of the Americas (no one has lost money on a restaurant tower yet); a Tivoli-style pleasure park; a Mini-Monorail and a Sky Ride; acres of garage and exhibition space; and 23 restored Victorian houses that can be converted to restaurants, clubs or shops. New hotels and motels to accommodate upwards of 4,000 people have already gone up; so has the value of land bordering the fair grounds. So has employment (by 10,000) and so have tax collections. W. W. McAllister, Sr., the 79-year-old mayor, can barely contain his jubilation. The San Antonio economy, he predicts, will increase by \$40 million in five years, tourist business will double, and within ten years, the population of 730,000 will rise to a million. HemisFair, says James M. Gaines, its chief executive officer, "has mended the heart of a city."

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Apr. 7, 1968]

SAN ANTONIO LAUNCHES HEMISFAIR, BIRTHDAY PARTY (By Lucia Lewis)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.—To some travelers it may seem that North America has a chronic case of World Fairitis, with San Antonio's HemisFair opening yesterday after only a few months' breathing space since great Expo 67. But these are two completely different affairs and this is one time Texas makes no claims to being bigger, better, or in any way rivaling Canada's incomparable exposition.

HemisFair is unique as a *fiesta* of the Americas, a birthday party celebrating San Antonio's founding 250 years ago, and also a project with two long-range aims. One was to accomplish a permanent rejuvenation of a blighted urban area, which has made the city more attractive than ever before just as Seattle's 1962 World's Fair did for that city. The other is to create a lasting center of cultural and economic cooperation for the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

Most interesting for the vacationing family this year, it's a lot of fun as well as enlightenment. Of course, in true Texas style, they started off in a big way by extending the channel of the San Antonio river to join waters from natural springs and create an almost Venetian effect where the stranger expects to see an inland, arid landscape. A lake, tree-shaded lagoons, winding streams and fountains in HemisFair park extend the cooling effect of air conditioned buildings to the outdoors.

Visitors can "do" the exposition on a variety of pleasant vessels and arrive like aristocratic dogs in gondolas at the pool reflecting the stunning new Civic Center complex. This is the heart of HemisFair and will remain as San Antonio's permanent convention,

sports, theater, and entertainment center. Its three buildings are a symbol of HemisFair's theme, to dramatize the "confluence of civilizations in the Western Hemisphere." This is expressed in the theater's brilliant exterior mosaic by Mexico's famous Juan O'Gorman, among whose works is the mosaic library of Mexico's University City. A splendid mural by Guatemala's Carlos Merida, in the entrance lobby of the exhibition hall, carries on the inter-American theme.

The third building in the group is what some local citizens call their "mini-astrodome". It may be "mini" as compared to Houston's astrodome, but it holds 10,500 spectators in luxurious and colorful surroundings. Every seat affords a fine view of the arena floor, huge enough for almost any sports event, spectaculars and circuses—all of which are on the HemisFair program during its six-month run.

Surrounding this new center are the bright and lively pavilions of a dozen Latin American countries and the main exhibit building of the Organization of American States, representing all the countries of the Americas. Their exhibits are varied and impressive and their entertainment ranges from folk dances, choruses, and the amazing "voladores" of Mexico who leap from the tip of a high tree trunk [look, compadres, no parachutes!] and whirl dizzily down on unwinding ropes, to mariachis tootling away on barges floating around the waterways.

Though the colorful and enjoyable Latin American atmosphere is an important feature, there's a lot more to HemisFair.

This is a true world's fair, officially approved in its category by the Bureau of International Expositions, so that governments may participate with national exhibits and the exposition is not restricted to commercial displays. Dramatizing the meld of many races and nationalities in this hemisphere are the pavilions of 13 European, Asian, and African countries, as well as the exhibit buildings of the Canadian and United States governments.

Most impressive of all the exhibit buildings is that of Texas, which will remain as the permanent Institute of Texan Cultures. Its vivid displays trace the influence of 25 national and racial groups important in Texas history, and the treasures the Institute has collected from all over the state and hemisphere should make this one of the great ethnological museums of the southwest.

Also permanent additions to the San Antonio scene are the two handsome United States buildings. Those visitors who thought our exhibit at Montreal was a bit frivolous and Hollywood-style will be pleased to find that here we take a more dignified, tho vivid and entertaining, look at our national life. No one should miss the great cinema documentary, in three parts, covering "The Legacy," "The Harvest," and "The Promise," of the United States, which probably will be one of the hits of HemisFair. This was produced by Francis Thompson, whose "To Be Alive" was such an outstanding attraction at the New York Fair and an Academy Award winner.

Since the building of the Eiffel tower few cities have let a world's fair go by without emulating Paris and, naturally, Texas has to top them all.

Its Tower of the Americas is 22 feet higher than Seattle's Space Needle and, they claim, the tallest observation tower in the Western Hemisphere. Those who have revolved while dining in other towers around the world may be a little biased about these structures but the San Antonio tower does have some unique features.

Its graceful concrete shaft is certainly more attractive than the bald ironwork of the Eiffel tower and more harmonious with the other permanent structures of HemisFair park than Seattle's Needle. Its three glass-fronted elevators provide breathtaking

but not too scary ascents to the upper levels of the "tophouse." Here there are a gently turning and attractive restaurant, a second informal snack level, a glare-free observation deck protected by bronze glass, and an open observation deck.

The tower is the center of Fiesta Island where concessions, amusements, and rides concentrate the fun features of HemisFair. Among the rides that eliminate foot-weariness are the quarter-mile Sky Ride, and the novel Mini-Monorail which you can board at three stations along its mile-and-a-half length around the grounds. Most relaxing of all are the attractive excursion boats, river taxis, entertainment and dining barges on the waterways.

Even walking won't tire you, however, along the easy grades of the pedestrian ways with shaded benches at frequent intervals. Like Seattle's, this is an "intimate" fair of no great exhausting distances altho it is slightly larger. HemisFair park covers a little over 92 acres compared to Seattle's 75. It is decidedly intimate when one recalls New York's 646 acres and Montreal's 1,000.

Admission to HemisFair is \$2 for adults, \$1 for children.

The exhibits and entertainment at HemisFair can keep a family busy for days but San Antonio itself has long been an attractively "different" city, with much to offer the vacationer. In the depression years before World War II its vigorous mayor, Maury Maverick, undertook a major restoration of the historic section of the city along the river front that was an unsightly blot right in the heart of downtown. This "La Villita" or "little village" dated from the early mission days of 1724. The first settlers' huts had been replaced by later Mexican mansions and by the quaint old world homes and churches of the German and other European immigrants who came in the mid-19th century.

By 1939 these, too, had become a crumbling slum but Maverick did not obliterate them ruthlessly. With some help from the National Youth administration and the Carnegie Foundation, the best of the old, including the fine Cos home [mansion of the Mexican General Martin de Cos who was defeated by the Texans in 1835], the old German church, and many more of the original Spanish and German homes were restored to their picturesque beauty. Flowering plazas and new buildings following the traditional architecture of the restorations made the downtown river front a beauty and pleasure spot instead of a city scar.

Visitors and local citizens enjoy rowing on the picturesque river or strolling on the river walk, a peaceful refuge below the bustling traffic of the present business district. The Cos House is a center for civic parties, services are held in the old church, Juarez Plaza is a popular setting for outdoor dances, the river theater presents colorful productions on its outdoor stage, and Bolivar Hall is a fine Pan American cultural center, museum, and art center. In the restored old homes are arts and crafts shops, studios, and galleries to fascinate the shopper and many distinctive restaurants and night spots, some Spanish, some noted for Dixieland jazz, and even a recent Irish immigrant, Kelly's Pub, housed in a restored European home that might be a quiet pub in Dublin or London.

For more information, on HemisFair and San Antonio, for city maps and brochures, a walking-tour guide, information on missions, and ticket and accommodations data on the fair, write Betty Keefe, Chamber of Commerce, Dept. C. T., P.O. Box 1628, San Antonio, Tex. 78206.

[From Time Magazine, Apr. 12, 1968]

EXPOSITIONS: TIVOLI IN TEXAS

Brussels, Seattle, New York, Montreal—and now San Antonio. Of fairs, there seems no end. Why another now?

For one thing, because HemisFair '68, which last week opened its six-month run,

gives a big lift to the civic pride of San Antonio, long a sleepy city (pop.: 755,550) at the edge of the Texas hill country, previously noted mainly as the site of the Alamo. For another, it stimulates tourism: officials estimate conservatively that, during HemisFair, 7,500,000 people will visit San Antonio and will spend \$35 million there.

Beyond this, the city has good reason to pick a fair as its 250th birthday present to itself. For what the city has really accomplished is urban renewal under the guise of a carnival, with the Federal Government paying a portion of the bill. Already the \$158 million fair has turned 147 acres of downtown San Antonio "from slum to jewel box," as Texas' Governor John Connally puts it, provided the city with a permanent new \$13.5 million Civic Center and contributed an impressive symbol of progress in the 622-ft.-high Tower of the Americas, tallest observation tower in the U.S.

Seizing a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to inject new life into the city core, San Antonio has dredged out a short waterway linking the fair to the San Antonio River and threaded the 92.6-acre HemisFair site itself with a network of canals. It has refurbished its heritage by restoring 24 fine 19th century Victorian houses on the fairgrounds, and the area adjacent bristles with new construction, including the 445-room Hilton Palacio Del Rio, which overlooks HemisFair from the bank of the San Antonio River.

Bumpkins in Buckskin. As international expositions go, HemisFair is a minifair, only slightly larger than Seattle's Century 21 but only one-tenth the size of Montreal's Expo '67, the alltime giant. As a result, the exposition is "manageable in human terms," says HemisFair's chief designer, Allison Peery, meaning that all the exhibits are within easy walking distance. On the elevated "people expressway," no point is more than a ten-minute walk from any other, and for variety there are flower-bedecked barges plying the canals, a minimonorail, and that familiar world's fair fixture, the Swiss Skyride, lofting fairgoers 80 ft. in the air from one edge of the grounds to the other. Pure Texas: the massive outdoor air conditioners that cool off the busiest walkways, rest areas and queues.

HemisFair's modest size does not mean that there is not plenty of room for fun. The 43-second ride up the side of the Tower of the Americas in a glass-fronted elevator is a guaranteed bellygrabber. And from the tower's open-air observation platform, or its two levels of restaurants, one revolving at the rate of one complete turn every hour, Texas stretches out to the horizon 90 miles away.

As at Montreal, the multi-media mix of film and colored projections is everywhere, including the reinstallation of two of Expo's best received shows, Czechoslovakia's Kino Automat and Laterna Magika. One of the chief displays at the \$10 million Texas Pavilion uses 38 projectors and 24 screens to convey a sweeping impression of the state from cattle to oil to space. Purpose, says Historian R. Hendersson Shuffler, who organized the exhibit, is to dispel the myth that Texas is built up entirely by "a bunch of hell-roaring bumpkins in buckskin who came brawling across the frontier and settled down to shooting each other at high noon in front of the village saloon."

There are some 100 restaurants to choose from, serving everything from Texas hush puppies and Belgian waffles to Breton cider and Polynesian pu pu. There is a delightful display of some 10,000 pieces from Designer Alexander Girard's collection of Latin American folk art and toys, and a \$10 million art exhibition including 13 masterpieces by Goya, El Greco and Velásquez lent by the Spanish government, and a fresco of Geographer Amerigo Vespucci lent by Italy.

Second Bonanza. But the most dazzling display of all is at the U.S. Pavilion, where

Francis Thompson, who won an Oscar for his 1964 New York World's Fair documentary *To Be Alive*, has triumphed again. With a script by Poet W. H. Auden and a score by Composer David Amram, he has produced a 23-minute documentary that captures both the pathos and the promise of American life.

The first five minutes of the film, titled *U S* (standing both for U.S. and us), are shown simultaneously in three separate but adjacent 400-seat theaters. Then, with a roar that sounds like a Boeing 707 talking off, the walls and screens fly up into the loft, leaving the entire audience of 1,200 engulfed for the duration of the movie by a vast, curved screen 38 ft. high and 135 ft. long. This is bombarded by images from three 17-mm. projectors, playing off magnificent shots of the nation's still existing wilderness against moving scenes of poverty, congestion and blight.

Come October, when HemisFair closes, San Antonio will reap its second bonanza: the entire site and its structures, 60% of which are permanent, will become the property of the city. Just as Seattle came out of its 1962 fair with a cultural complex that has immeasurably enhanced the city's vitality, so San Antonio intends to use HemisFair as a permanent civic and cultural center. There to be used and enjoyed will be a 200-000-sq.-ft. convention hall and a 3,800-seat auditorium. The Texas Pavilion will be converted into a history-oriented Institute of Texas Cultures, and plans are afoot to maintain the spruced-up grounds as a Texas version of Copenhagen's Tivoli Gardens. As for the sculpted concrete Tower of the Americas, San Antonians expect it to remain as much a symbol of the city as Paris' Eiffel Tower. And all that, for citizens of San Antonio, is fair enough reason for the fair.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1968]

HEMISFAIR, OPENING TOMORROW, ISN'T TEXAS-SIZE, BUT IT'S FUN

(By Ada Louise Huxtable)

SAN ANTONIO, April 4—There are only three things that are Texas-size about HemisFair, the international exposition that opens here Saturday: The theme, "The Confluence of Civilization in the Americas;" the handsome 622-foot Tower of the Americas built as the tallest observation tower in the Western Hemisphere; and the \$10-million Texas Pavilion.

Everything else is almost miniaturized on a 92-acre site that is about one-tenth the size of Expo 67 in Montreal and one-seventh the size of the New York World's Fair of 1964-65. The state that does everything big has done its World's Fair small.

It has, however, chalked up three firsts. This is the first World's Fair held in the Southwest, the first to be located in the heart of a city as a part of a total downtown urban renewal plan, and the first to save and incorporate a group of landmark buildings for use in the fair.

HemisFair celebrates San Antonio's 250th anniversary. A Special Category World's Fair licensed by the Bureau of International Expositions, it is similar to Seattle's Century 21 in 1962. It is not a large First Category Fair, such as Montreal's or the next First Category effort, scheduled for Osaka, Japan, in 1970.

MANY BUILDINGS TO STAY

But when HemisFair completes its six-month run, from April 6 to Oct. 6, it will leave behind more than 60 per cent of its buildings as part of a downtown plan, including the tower, 20 historic houses and a spanking new \$13.5-million Civic Center.

This Civic Center complex, which opens simultaneously with the fair, consists of a convention hall of 200,000 square feet, a 2,800-seat theater being inaugurated on opening night with a \$50-a-seat performance of "Don Carlo," and a 10,500-seat arena. The architects are Noonan & Krockner and Phelps & Simmons & Associates. It is all carried out in a kind of *retardataire* modern style, with

good spaces that will probably wear well, but it will cause no excitement on the art or architectural scene.

Urban renewal cleared 147 acres of downtown San Antonio at a cost of about \$28-million, with the Civic Center as a prime objective. The land was bought by the city for about \$3-million, and the 92-acre fair site was then leased to San Antonio Fair, Inc. HemisFair cost about \$175-million. It expects to break even with 7.2 million visitors.

In the abracadabra of Federal-city urban renewal arithmetic, about \$6-million in "urban improvements" on the fairgrounds can be used as "credits" against costs of other urban renewal projects, including low-cost housing. The future downtown could be San Antonio's real 250th birthday present to itself.

HemisFair does not bill itself as an extravaganza. The site, dotted by some 1,200 pecan, hackberry and other Texas shade trees saved during demolition, and crisscrossed by waterways, elevated walks and a mini-monorail, can be traversed briskly by foot in an hour.

Exploration of the exhibits of 23 participating countries (in standard, fair-provided space, since nations do not build their own pavilions in a Special Category Fair) and of 19 corporate pavilions can take a few pleasant days or a relaxed, Texas-style summer.

ATMOSPHERE WITH MEALS

International eating, from local chili to imported haute cuisine, can go on for more than three months of varied snacks and meals, with the fanciest in an assortment of the old houses saved with the trees. The price for some of these meals will be high, but the 19th Century historic Texas atmosphere is thrown in.

HemisFair's amusement area is smack at its center, surrounding the monumental tower. Near it is Project X, a kind of continuous youth center fun-and-games happening.

Everything is comfortably pedestrian in scale. This is a fair that is less world-of-the-future than here-and-now. Its character is deliberately tied to a city that has a tourist-oriented Villita, or historic town, a meandering river with landscaped banks a cool 18 feet below the urban bustle, and a string of 18th Century Spanish missions on its outskirts.

It is a city that also has its contemporary quota of parking lots and neon and tree-shorn main roads that are probably the longest automobile showrooms outside of California. It has just added a brutally ill-conceived parking garage at the end of La Villita, the siting and design of which were shrouded in political and economic mystery.

OUTSIDE THE FRONT DOOR

The way to the historic missions is past Mission Oldsmobile, Mission Industrial Park and what should be called, if it isn't, the Mission Auto Dump.

The way to the fair is simpler. It is right out of your front door if you happen to be staying at the new Palacio del Rio Hotel, a 21-story Hilton questionably placed on the wandering riverbank. This Miami-Hacienda hybrid is notable chiefly for the fact that its prefab rooms were lifted into place in a record total of 202 days, in time for the fair. It has also brought prefab Hilton culture, cuisine and prices to San Antonio.

It is possible to enter the fair by way of the river, the city's outstanding amenity, because one of the better bits of planning extended it into the convention center. Additional waterways provide internal fair transportation.

The HemisFair site, like most old center-city areas, contained slums, mixed industrial uses, some tenacious middle-class homes and a large number of the city's historic houses in hopeless to salvageable condition.

About 20 of these houses, preserved and

incorporated into the Fair as restaurants and boutiques, are proving to be its most attractive feature. Without their special local flavor, this would be just another, smaller carbon copy of the flashy commercial formula that has become overly familiar to 20th Century fair hoppers.

To save or not to save the houses has been a headline battle during the five years of HemisFair's preparation. The fate of at least one went as far as the United States Senate, where historic preservation was written into the Federal participating legislation.

WOMEN ARE SAVING THE WEST

The result, 20 old houses kept, out of a possible 75 or 80, represents a partial triumph for the early planners of the fair and San Antonio's formidable, largely female conservation Society. If men won the West, the women are saving it.

HemisFair's most visible high spot is the soaring \$6.5-million Tower of the Americas, a slip-form concrete shaft with revolving restaurants and observation platforms at the top. It has been carried out with substantial style by the San Antonio architects Ford, Powell & Carson.

The tower, a genuine act of serious design and construction, makes most of the rest of the fair look like architectural amateurism. Staff-designed facilities and graphics, while adequate, failed to match the flair and finesse that marked the high level of design professionalism at Montreal.

The two-part, \$6,750,000 United States Pavilion is a large, sleek, pretentious piece of marble-wrapped nonarchitecture.

It can only be called extravagantly ordinary. The absolutely standard commercial exhibits inside are redeemed by Francis Thompson's latest movie miracle, which will make more people think about the despoliation of the American heritage, from land and air to liberty, than any urban riot.

TEXAS-SIZE STATEMENT

Texas has built a block-buster, which, like the United States Pavilion, is permanent. The 368-foot-long structure makes a Texas-size statement outside and then tells the story of Texas inside in terms of its little people and nonheroes of every contributing nationality.

Designed by Caudill Rowlett Scott of Houston to house the Institute of Texan Cultures, it looks like \$10-million worth of precast concrete and red granite. Its use of water and hard, sophisticated, expert detailing save it from being an aggressive cliché.

But the fair's greatest delight is "The Magic of a People," some 10,000 items from Alexander Girard's famous Latin-American folk art collection in Girard-designed settings of brilliant beauty and wit. This is life, art, culture and confluence all rolled into one and worth the trip to Texas. A pre-opening dry run of children couldn't be gotten out; adults will find no less pleasure.

Among the commercial exhibits, I.B.M., with two pavilions by Elliot Noyes and Associates, and the Ford Building, by the Detroit architect Gunnar Birkerts, break the mold of corporate banality.

Plans for the fair site are less than firm. There is talk of an inter-American educational center for the permanent structures other than the Texas museum. A Tivoli is envisioned for the entertainment sector.

In the meantime, the fair is fun, Southwest style. But what San Antonio does with the center-city site after October will be the real measure of HemisFair's success.

HemisFair's hours are 9 A.M. to 12 P.M. for gate time every day except Saturday, when the gates are open until 1 A.M.; 10 A.M. to 10 P.M. for pavilions.

Admission is \$2 for adults and \$1 for children. There are special charges for the Tower of the Americas and some exhibits, such as the theme gallery and the Girard collection, ranging from 50 cents to \$1, and for special entertainment and transportation. Lodging

can be arranged through the HemisFair Visitor Services.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1967]
THE MAGIC OF A PEOPLE: HEMISFAIR 1968,
OPENING TOMORROW, SHOULD DELIGHT THE
YOUNG AT HEART

(By Howard Taubman)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., April 4.—Some days before the official opening of HemisFair '68 on Saturday, the management opened one of its happiest exhibits, "El Encanto de un Pueblo" (The Magic of a People), specially for the children of men and women on the staff. To an outlander who was allowed to mingle with the eager and excited small fry and the relatives they had in tow, "El Encanto de un Pueblo" is sure to be one of the successes of this fair dedicated to the confluence of civilizations in the Americas. For "El Encanto" is indeed a kind of magic, created with toys to achieve childlike simplicity and wonder. It will rejoice the spirits of the young in heart.

"El Encanto" represents a vital part of the life work of Alexander Girard, 60-year-old American architect and designer who lives in Santa Fe, N.M. It is a series of 41 visualizations of different aspects of Latin-American life and imagination put together with folk toys, ranging from the tiniest of soldiers to a vast variety of landscapes, buildings, plants and trees, animals, angels and mortals in rich, primary colors.

Mr. Girard, a slim, bald man, seemed to be lurking in the shadows of the corridors of "El Encanto" as the youngsters and their parents filed by. If he was pleased by the repeated exclamations of delight, he gave no hint of it. If he wasn't, he would be hard to please.

There are more than 10,000 objects in this exhibit, representing a tenth of the material Mr. Girard has accumulated in 40 years and maintains in the Girard Foundation in Santa Fe. These 10,000 have been assembled to tell Bible stories and to depict the daily concerns of the people. They begin with the Creation and end with a scaring vision of hell and a blissful one of paradise. Mr. Girard has been here for months supervising the installation, often permitting no one else to set the figures in their places.

When I observed that the crowd in the stadium in the large maquette of a corrida was so numerous that it must have taken many hands to fix it there, he shook his head and said he had done it all himself and needed a day to accomplish just that. As for the matador with his red cape and the charging bull in the center of the ring, their positions were approved only after a professional bullfighter vouched for authenticity.

If the Girard exhibit was ready for the public this weekend, a lot of HemisFair '68 was in the final, agitated stages of being completed. Huge wooden boxes were being uncrated and weird sculptures were being exposed. A group of paintings from the Prado in Madrid were en route by truck from the Gulf of Mexico port where they had just landed.

Oddly shaped screens and their films were being tested. The film in the Ford Pavilion was cheerfully puffing, on the 360-degree screen, the felicities of the company's products and people. In the United States pavilion I got permission to look at the three theaters that can become one in a flash but I could not yet see Francis Thompson's 21-minute film. But the word was that it was likely to be a winner, like his contributions to the New York and Montreal fairs.

Despite the bustle, fair officials took off time to worry about an assortment of questions.

Victor Alessandro, the conductor of the San Antonio Symphony which is producing the work, is doing it uncut, opening with the Fontainebleau scene, which is almost never performed. That will start at 6 P.M.

and end in less than half an hour. Then there will be an elaborate buffet supper. When the opera resumes, it will probably go on until midnight. That is a rigorous schedule even for opera buff.

Another question: How will the hall's acoustics be? Listening from the balcony to stage hands chattering while putting up a set, one would guess that they will be all right. But one never knows. Meanwhile, Mr. Alessandro, the orchestra and Hilde Sohmer, the soloist, were rehearsing the specially commissioned piano concerto by John Corigliano Jr., which will have its premiere here next Sunday in the barnlike Municipal Auditorium.

And the biggest question: How will HemisFair make it with the public? The cautious hope here is for a minimum of 7.5 million paying customers before the closing in October. But to judge from a look at the exposition a few days before its opening this is a human-sized fair, set in the center of a cosmopolitan city in the heartland of America. It should have a special appeal of its own.

[From the Wall Street Journal, April 4, 1968]

MINIFAIR MASQUERADE: SAN ANTONIO FINDS
RESPONSE BY EXHIBITORS LIGHT, BUT SAYS
HEMISFAIR STAR IS BRIGHT

(By Jim Hyatt)

SAN ANTONIO.—By some standards HemisFair '68 is minifair masquerading as a world's exhibition.

The fair, which begins its six-month season Saturday, is only one-tenth the size of Montreal's 1,000-acre Expo 67. Some of its attractions are copies from other fairs. And, despite strong endorsements from President Johnson and Gov. Connally of Texas, HemisFair has attracted a somewhat meager representation of foreign and corporate exhibitors.

But fair officials stoutly insist HemisFair will prove a charming counterpart of colossal shows such as Montreal's and New York's. They expect 7 million to 10 million visitors, or roughly the same as the 9.6 million attendance at Seattle's 1962 "Century 21" exposition. Seattle lured 40 foreign nations and dozens of business exhibits. San Antonio has scrambled to count three dozen foreign countries among its exhibitors, some of them with token participation. About 18 U.S. industrial and institutional participants will be on hand.

Although particular emphasis has been placed on the Western Hemisphere, since this is the first world's exhibition in the Southwest, only seven Western Hemisphere nations, including the U.S., are sponsoring individual pavilions. Officials blame economic and political conditions for the absence of separate pavilions from such major Latin American countries as Brazil and Argentina.

TRUE TO ITS IMAGE

Still, officials assert the fair is true to its hemispheric image. Five Central American republics have a joint pavilion, and other Latin American countries are joining an art exhibit sponsored by the Organization of American States and financed in part by a San Antonio family.

Such difficulties are common with events of this magnitude, fair officials insist. Indeed, tourists may find HemisFair particularly appealing owing to its size. The emphasis is on compactness, with pavilions separated by cozy courtyards, art work, two dozen restored old homes and several thousand trees preserved or added to the site.

Like San Antonio, the 250-year-old host for the fair, HemisFair avoids lavish architectural flourishes and concentrates on developing a certain charm and a flavor of history. HemisFair's theme, "The Confluence of Civilization in the Americas," is what San Antonio is all about. Spanish explorers landed in Texas a hundred years before the Pil-

grims docked at Plymouth. San Antonio was a flourishing Spanish outpost when George Washington was a youth. Teddy Roosevelt recruited his Rough Riders in the bar of the local Menger Hotel. Today, scientists explore the frontiers of space and medicine.

HemisFair is just 200 yards from the famed Alamo in downtown San Antonio. The city's historic river has been diverted into the 92.5 acre site. Boats carry visitors from their hotel or a favorite restaurant to HemisFair's front door. On the fairgrounds, visitors can ride an elevated mini-monorail, a skyride, an inland-waterway system, or stroll across sweeping concrete walkways to various exhibits.

BROAD ECONOMIC IMPACT

Publicists say a tourist could walk from one end of the fair to the other in five minutes. Not that a visitor would choose to. Spain's priceless art exhibit, for example, could take an afternoon. One could eat at HemisFair for three months without duplicating a meal, according to the press agents.

HemisFair, which closes Oct. 6, is expected to generate a broad economic impact. Millions of dollars already have been spent in San Antonio improving tourist facilities. The Fair itself will cost \$156 million. One architectural marvel is a new hotel across from the fair, built from rooms fabricated at another site and brought to the hotel. Each room, complete with furniture and Gideon bible in place, was swung into position while a helicopter rotor atop each unit furnished stability. The hotel was built by H. B. Zachry, head of a major construction firm and chairman of the group running HemisFair.

The fair is expected to result in more than \$250 million of retail spending, including a \$39 million gain to the nation's balance of payments from expected foreign visitors.

Even on peak attendance days, planners assert, adequate commercial lodging will be available within 90 minutes driving time of the city, including Austin, the state capital. Interstate highways provide motor access to the fair. The fair will be easy for motorists to locate. Rising at its center is the massive 622-foot concrete Tower of the Americas, theme structure of the event. Its elevators will carry up to 1,750 persons an hour to the observation platforms and revolving restaurant at its top.

(Even the tower has had its problems. Plans for private financing fell through, and voters finally authorized \$5.5 million city revenue bonds. The bond election delay and recent unusual bad weather conditions have forced workmen to round-the-clock work turns to meet their deadlines.)

OPERA, RODEOS, AUTO STUNTS

Millions of dollars in permanent buildings will be left on the site after the fair. The city has built a \$15 million civic center complex, including an arena, exhibit hall and theater. All three will be packed with entertainment during the fair, beginning with a \$50-a-ticket opening-night performance April 6 of Verdi's Don Carlo. The opera will even revive the seldom-performed first act at 6 p.m. The remaining four acts will go on after a champagne supper.

The Bolshoi Ballet, Jack Benny, Bob Hope, a rodeo, auto stunt drivers and various concerts also will appear during the fair.

The fair is on an urban-renewal site which the Federal Government purchased for \$12,500,000. The land was sold to the city, which in turn leased the area to the group organizing HemisFair. The U.S. pavilion here is a \$6,750,000 two-building project. An exhibition hall will trace the nation's history in a "confluence" theme display.

Nearby, Academy-Award winner Francis Thompson has produced a special film to be shown in a 70-foot high theater. The 1,200-seat theater has been divided into three sections, each with its own screen. The first two parts of the film, The Legacy and The Har-

vest, will be shown on small screens. Then, in a "confluence," curtains dividing the seats will rise, the small screens will disappear, and the final movie segment, *The Promise*, will be shown on a huge 135-by-38-foot curvilinear screen.

Mr. Thompson received an Academy Award in 1966 for best documentary short subject: the film *To Be Alive*, was shown at the Johnson's wax pavillion at the New York World's Fair.

At a \$10 million Institute of Texan Cultures, displays will trace the 26 ethnic groups that have lived in the state. At a center display, back projectors will show movies and slides on 65 overhead screens.

A "HAPPENING" AND A LOOM

R. Henderson Shuffler, the institute's director, says the exhibit will shun the traditional vision of Texas as "a bunch of hell-roaring bumpkins in buckskin." Instead, visitors will discover that the first Jew in Texas was Gaspar de Sosa, governor of a state of Spanish Mexico who led an expedition across West Texas in 1590, and that William Goyens, a Negro land owner, helped bankroll the Texas Revolution.

There will be plenty of other entertainment, too. Officials have set aside a special area as "Project Y," a sort of permanent "happening" where young people will gather for musical jam sessions, sports, soap-box oratory, mechanical or artistic projects.

A Texas firm has brought from Expo 67 the two popular Czechoslovakian features: *Laterna Magika*, which combines a stage and movie show, and *Kino Automat*, where the audience directs the plot by taking frequent votes. One of the exhibits most faithful to the theme is Alexander Girard's collection of folk-art figures collected during 40 years from Latin America and Europe. More than 12,000 of the figures have been fashioned into a 41-window exhibit called *El Encanto de un Pueblo*, or *The Magic of a People*.

At International Business Machines Corp., specially programed computers will answer questions, and operate a Jacquard loom. The original loom was exhibited at the 1801 International Exposition in Paris. Here, visitors will "draw" a design on a cathode ray tube. The computer will direct the loom to transfer the design into a four-inch swatch of cloth, which the visitor will get as a souvenir.

HELP FROM OTHER EVENTS?

HemisFair officials are counting on other events to help draw visitors. Both Rotary and Lions Clubs are holding international conventions in the Southwest this year. The Professional Golfers' Association tournament will be here during the summer. And the Olympics in Mexico City just as HemisFair closes.

Local businessmen and citizens underwrote about \$8 million in expenses for the fair, and more than \$13 million has already been spent by San Antonio Fair Corp., the official sponsor Marshall T. Steves, its president, says the fair will show a profit with anything above 7.5 million visitors. Profits will be turned over to the city while underwriters will cover any losses.

[From Business Week, Mar. 30, 1968]

THIS WORLD'S FAIR HAS A LONG FUTURE

(San Antonio's HemisFair is the first exposition put together along with an urban renewal project. Among its many legacies will be a civic center complex in a former slum area.)

Legend has it that when Mexican General Santa Anna rode away from the Alamo in 1836, he told those he left behind in San Antonio not to do anything until he returned. Accordingly to the story, San Antonians have followed his orders to the letter ever since.

But today residents of the South Texas city, who once greeted the tale with a shrug and a weak smile, boldly declare that they

can accomplish as much as any city. In the current refrain of city officials, "If you don't believe it, look at HemisFair '68."

Their hope, of course, is that thousands of tourists will look at HemisFair after it opens next week and see a lot of San Antonio in the process. The fair rings up several firsts for the city.

It is the world's first exposition in the Southwest, the world's first fair in the downtown area of a city, and—most important to San Antonio—the first world's fair put together along with a multi-million dollar urban redevelopment project.

BENEFITS

Facts like these may mean little to the sightseer intent on enjoying the fair's attractions and having a good time. But as far as San Antonio is concerned, HemisFair '68 means more than wads of money brought in by tourists.

For one thing, the enormous job of putting the fair together created a bracing new morale in San Antonio, the 17th largest city in the U.S. in terms of population, but little known except for the Alamo and its five military bases in which thousands of servicemen have been trained. For another, the fair was planned to leave San Antonio with many tangible assets after it closes.

San Antonians hope the fair will be the first step toward the achievement of a number of goals:

Draw fair tourists to such other scenic attractions as the redeveloped and colorfully Mexican-accented San Antonio riverfront that meanders through the heart of the city.

Focus attention of businessmen on the city and encourage them to consider it in terms of new plant locations.

Point up the advantages of urban development which, though not as staunchly opposed as in some other Texas cities, has had only tepid support from business.

Rid the city once and for all of the "siesta and mañana" characterization of its Mexican heritage. It is one reason that it has been slow to experience change and growth.

But there are others, too. Besides a large percentage of Mexican-Americans in its metropolitan area population of 800,000, there is a large group of people of German ancestry who, in the words of one official, "like things the way they are." This conservatism also finds support among San Antonio's many retired military men.

"Most of the people in a position to do anything made their money on ranches and oil outside San Antonio and they weren't concerned with the welfare of the city," the official says.

A meeting of the city's 26 banks produced a \$4.5-million loan for San Antonio Fair, Inc., which was formed to develop the exposition, and within three months local businessmen had pledged \$8-million both as backing for the loan and for additional expenses. "It's the only time I can remember the banks all joining together for one cause," says Steves.

By mid-1968, enthusiasm for the fair was running high. The city's urban renewal agency acquired and cleared 147 acres of land for the civic center at a cost of about \$28-million and sold it to the city for just over \$3-million. The city then leased 92 acres to San Antonio Fair, Inc., for the fair site.

On the eve of the opening of the fair, San Antonians can point to a number of benefits that will last long after the last visitor has left. One, of course, is the \$13-million civic center, now nearing completion. It includes a 10,500-seat arena, a 2,500-seat theater, and an exhibition hall.

The fair also resulted in the clearing of some bad slums and the relocation of 1,600 people.

FUTURE PLANS

The city has adopted a plan for using the fair's \$156-million worth of major facilities

after it closes in October, and a citizens advisory committee has been set up to work with the City Council in implementing the plan.

Allison B. Perry, HemisFair's director of planning, says the fair was built with an eye toward future use. Accordingly, exhibitors whose facilities were deemed suitable for reuse were required to build permanent foundations and frameworks.

Parts of the plan are firm. The \$10-million Institute of Texan Cultures, built on seven acres in a corner of the fair site, will acquire another six acres and become a museum devoted to telling the story of the state's development. And the fair's cooling system will continue to serve the permanent buildings, the civic center, and a private hotel.

More ambitious but vaguer parts of the plan involve an area called Tower Plaza surrounding the 622-ft.-high Tower of the Americas, and the area now occupied by the U.S. and international pavilions. For the Tower Plaza, now dominated by rides and pavilions, Perry envisions a permanent garden-recreational facility "similar to the Tivoli Gardens of Copenhagen."

An even more sweeping idea calls for turning some of the pavilions into a U.S.-Latin American educational and cultural center.

While the fair has made a substantial dent in the city's slum problem, urban renewal officials are tempering their enthusiasm to avoid creating an impression that HemisFair was built with urban renewal funds.

"We didn't contribute anything to the building of the fair," says Winston Martin, director of the city's urban renewal agency. "Urban renewal is involved only in assisting San Antonio develop a civic center complex. It's the business of the city that they have arranged with San Antonio Fair, Inc., to have their exposition in the center."

One of the biggest contributions of Martin's agency has, in fact, gone largely unnoticed. This was the successful relocation of the families from the slum housing on the site of the civic center. Martin built a strong relocation organization and devoted great care—and \$1.3-million—to avoid charges that people were being thrown out of their homes to make way for a business-backed exposition. Martin thinks the effort went smoothly, and none of the city's Negro or Mexican-American spokesmen dispute him.

IMPRINT

San Antonio will wind up with some \$6-million in excess urban renewal credits because of the improvements it made in the fair area. The money can be applied to projects, including low-income housing, that have been in the planning stage for some time. Martin says that "urban renewal is in better shape than ever" in San Antonio.

This, plus the many tangible assets that will be left standing after the fair closes, insures that HemisFair will leave a lasting imprint on San Antonio.

HUNGER AND DIFFICULTIES FACED BY FARM FAMILIES

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Extensions of Remarks* the text of a letter my wife received from the wife of a farmer in Kentucky, expressing her deep concern over the problem of hunger in our country and the difficulties faced by our farm families today.

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

AUGUSTA, Ky.

DEAR MRS. COOPER: I have in the past thought about writing to you to tell you how much I enjoyed your "Woman in Washington" articles and your Evening with Milton Metz on WHAS radio and how much I admired your husband. All these things I want you to know. Now, however, this morning I am most disturbed because last night I watched the CBS report on hunger in these United States. It was shocking beyond belief, especially since I am the wife of a tenant farmer, and we are facing the decision of leaving the farm after this crop year. We have been crushed by the death of misbegotten hope, after 20 years of hard work, we can no longer operate on the high cost of credit instead of profit. Our sons will be lost to agriculture. Where we shall go or what we shall do remains to be seen—my question is why when American farmers are facing ruin are so many—10 million according to the report—going hungry in this richest nation in the history of the world?

The report also stated that this year the U.S. Department of Agriculture will turn back to the Treasury \$200 million—why? So that it can pay for more bombs? More subsidies to airlines? More funds for highways? The surplus food supplies given to the poor do not begin to provide an adequate diet for their children.

The report dealt with the Mexican-Americans of San Antonio, the Navajo Indians, the Negro sharecroppers of Alabama, the white tenant farm families of Virginia Hunt country. If you weren't able to see the program, my dear lady, may I suggest that you arrange with CBS for a special showing of it for the Senate Wives. It is the women of the country who can bring about the changes so badly needed. The American farmer has the know-how and the willingness to feed the world—God demands that we do it. The poor everywhere demand it. If the farmers had the smallest increase in income now the entire economy of the nation would get a boost. The result would be reflected everywhere. We have no buying power—no money to hire help. Believe me, I speak from experience. I used to spend my time cooking for hired men. Things have changed. Now I am the hired help. I just finished weeding tobacco plant beds, and that is a backbreaking job to say the least.

I grew up in Cincinnati, worked for the Air Corps during the war, then married a young farmer. I love the farm. I have seven children, ages six to 19—I love this country, but I wonder how long we can expect God to continue to bless us when we ignore the cry of the poor—is it any wonder we face the problems that we do with this dreadful war, the race riots, the revolt of young students? Thirty-five billion dollars a year on a war—\$72 billion each year on defense budget and then these 10 million of our own going hungry. It doesn't make sense. The lines are being drawn between the have and the have-nots, and the gap between is ever wider.

Another thought I have had concerns those in this county of Bracken and the adjoining Pendleton and Mason Counties, who were badly hit by the tornado April 23. In Bracken 171 barns were destroyed. In 100 days the tobacco crops must begin moving into barns. The shortage of carpenters in the area is acute. Why can't our good Senator have the Secretary of Agriculture provide that the tobacco crops on the farms where the barns were destroyed be allowed to go into the Soil Bank just for this year? Then landowners and the tenant who had committed himself to the crop could share in a payment of 50-50. I read recently that 31 million acres of farm land are being directed into the Soil Bank this year in corn, wheat and feed grains, so why not in this critical emergency

tobacco? Also ask Mr. John why England recently imported 200 tons of Cuban beef to ease the shortage caused by their epidemic of hoof and mouth disease? So why not American beef? All their meat is coming from Iron Curtain countries. No wonder we face falling cattle prices.

I suppose I should add that I have always been a Democrat except to vote for Senator Cooper—there is no one more loyal to him than we. Since he was Ambassador to India I have had the greatest respect for him. You all are great representatives for Kentucky.

I must get busy. I have a full day ahead of me. I have never been to Washington. I still have hopes, and when I come I will be able to meet the Coopers—if not there then in Somerset. I should think that some of these days Senator Cooper should be a member of the Supreme Court of this land.

With every good wish that you can do something about the hungry people of this nation, I am respectfully—

MRS. WILLIAM R. WARD.

THE QUESTION OF TAX REFORM AND TAX SURCHARGE

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a transcript of an interview last week on the WTTG-TV Metromedia program, "Opinion: Washington," with Joseph W. Barr, the Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Secretary Barr's remarks range over a host of important economic issues. In particular, however, he deals with two very timely topics: The question of tax reform and, second, whether the recently enacted temporary tax surcharge should be continued past next June 30.

The interview follows:

COLUMNIST ROWLAND EVANS. Mr. Secretary, why haven't President Johnson and your Treasury Department ever really faced up to the "Guns or Butter" issue?

SECRETARY BARR. I'm not precisely sure just what you means by Guns or Butter." If you are talking about the deficit in our Federal economy, I think we did jump on it the moment we recognized it in August of 1967. I have to admit it took us a bit longer to convince the Congress—about 10 months.

EILEEN SHANAHAN of the New York Times. Mr. Barr, that tax increase you fought so hard for—now, we've got it, and in another week or so everybody's paychecks are going to be smaller. When are we going to feel the consequences in less inflation and all the other good things the administration promised if we would only tell our Congressmen to vote to raise our taxes?

BARR. We were very, very careful in our presentation to the Congress on this whole inflationary question. You know as well as I do that this is a new tax for the United States. Never in our history have we raised taxes when one of the main reasons for raising taxes was to halt an inflationary process. We indicated, Gardiner Ackley, Secretary Fowler, and myself, and several others who testified that we thought we would slow down this inflationary spiral. Starting the third or fourth quarter of this year, we would make a real dent in it in the first quarter of 1969.

SHANAHAN. It's going to take awhile, then?

BARR. That's right. It takes a while to stop it and get it turned around. You get these wage increases, you get all sorts of price increases, built into your system, and it takes

a time for the brakes of the tax increase really to work.

EVANS. When the current Democratic administration took over in 1961, John Kennedy was President, the inflation rate was roughly 2½ percent. Now, Dick Nixon, who is probably going to be the Republican nominee, is estimating that under your policies inflation will hit at least 5 to 5½ percent rate next year.

BARR. I don't want to get into partisan politics. It's difficult to stay out of them, I know, but let me disagree with Mr. Nixon. I think the inflationary rate is around 4 percent now. I believe that this tax increase is going to work. I don't believe it will get above 4 percent this year, and I would be willing to bet that next year it will be closer to 3.

EVANS. You made a very interesting and somewhat controversial speech on, I think it was, June 25 or 26, and I want to ask you one specific question about this. If the war in Vietnam should end, you said you saw very little savings in the sense of money now being spent on the war in Vietnam coming back to be used for domestic purposes; you saw very little chance of that, and, you also said you also expected a big increase in quote regular unquote defense expenditures to replace, or to use up, the saving resulting from the end of hostilities. What are these new expenditures?

BARR. The thing I was trying to get across to the American people, and I think they have a right to know, is that if we stop fighting in Vietnam tomorrow, we're not going to pull thirty billions back to be used on the domestic programs that we'd like to have. First of all, I know of no Presidential candidate who can say that we can re-deploy our troops at once. I just don't think we can do that. We are going to have to leave some troops in place. Secondly, we've been fighting this war on a very, very lean budget. We don't have any big excesses of ammunition, trucks, guns or ships, planes or choppers. As a matter of fact, I think the military people will tell you that their inventories are lower than they should be. So, if war would stop almost immediately, I think the military would argue and with good cause. The first thing they should do would be to rebuild their inventories. This is going to take time. You can't re-deploy, so I would say the best information we're getting at the moment is that after a year, or a year and a half, after the fighting stops, there can be a saving of from five billions up to fifteen billions over what we are spending now in Vietnam.

SHANAHAN. Somewhat connected to that: A few years back we used to hear about something that never materialized—the fiscal dividend—that, as the economy grew, tax collections automatically grew and thus gave the government more financial resources with which to do the things government wanted to do. Has this, too, somehow gone a-glimmering like the twenty-seven billion we're not going to save when the Vietnam war ends, or can we still count on that?

BARR. No, I think if the economy continues to grow at what I would say would be a sustainable pace, getting back to a rate of inflation that doesn't exceed 1½ to 2 percent a year—if we keep growing along that curve, I think we can look for an increase of ten to twelve billions a year in our federal tax revenue, if the growth is steady. That is what I guess everybody referred to as a "fiscal dividend". Then I think the nation faces a choice: we can either reduce taxes possibly; we could give some money back to the States as some people have suggested, or you could take on new programs such as the negative income tax, or the pollution that the Senate is debating or mass transit, or crime. Heaven knows, there's enough places to spend the money right here.

SHANAHAN. How much of that "fiscal dividend" might be chewed up in simple expan-

sion of existing government programs, a point the government always makes when increases in spending are attacked. They say "well, there are more people; we need more services". You said ten or twelve billions is the "fiscal dividend". How much of that might go to new programs as opposed to just keeping up with population growth. . . .

BARR. You remember Maurice Stans back in 1960, the last Republican director of the Bureau of the Budget, estimated at that time that it took 2½ to 3 billions a year, in addition to what was spent the year before, just to keep up with the growth of the United States without adding any new programs. We have more new programs, I would say if we funded education to a level where I think many people think it would be adequate, and bring several other programs up to a little higher level; if we took care of the simple fact that we have three billion pieces of new mail each year; three billion new people have to be processed for tax returns; twenty million new visits to national parks each year; add all those up, I would bet that in the decade ahead it is going to take about seven billions a year. You might have five billions a year for new programs.

SHANAHAN. One other question also leading from another side into the question of what we are going to have to devote to new programs, you mentioned, in response to Mr. Evans' question, that the military feels their inventories are low, etc., and for a lot of other reasons, we're not going to be able to save that twenty-seven billions a year even after the war in Vietnam is over. I assume your answer is based on the assumption of sort of a prewar concept of what the Department of Defense role should be, what the size of forces should be, etc. Is this administration, in its final months, asking itself the question: "Is that the right military posture, or should we have a wholesale review of what defense spending really should be once the war does come to an end?"

BARR. The defense posture of the United States is predicated on our diplomatic objectives. In other words, the diplomatic objectives of this country in Europe, Asia, Latin America and Africa determine our military posture. In other words, the Department of Defense funds up to meet its mission as defined by our diplomacy in this country. I think, as I pointed out in a statement, I believe in the years ahead there is going to be a real donnybrook shaping up in this country between those who feel we should spend much more money at home and those who feel that we should maintain our current diplomatic posture with our current military position. I think there is going to be a big battle in this area because I doubt that we can do both. You're aware of the balance of payments restraints, too, we can talk about that if you want to; but it's two things: It's a battle for the resources—who is going to get them—the domestic needs of the country or the diplomatic needs.

EVANS. On that, what savings would you see if the Soviet Union and the United States do, in fact, eventually reach some agreement on not building an anti-ABM (anti-ballistic missile) system and even in a gradual reduction of the existing capabilities in terms of nuclear weapons? What is the financial angle on that very complicated question?

BARR. I'm not an expert on costing out a defense system. I do know this, however, any sort of very sophisticated ABM system is enormously expensive. It goes up into the tens of billions of dollars. I can't cost it precisely, but it would be a huge savings.

EVANS. You talked a moment ago about the possible savings a year or year and a half after the war is over as being between five and fifteen billions of dollars. You've also mentioned this ten billions in regular

annual increases in Federal revenues, which could go back to the States. That's a substantial sum when you put those two items together. That brings it up to twenty-five billion dollars. With that, could you see this new tax increase being phased out immediately after the war is over?

BARR. The next administration is going to have to answer that question. I don't want to prejudice the Treasury's position.

EVANS. You have to make a recommendation in your message next January.

BARR. Possibly. We're not prepared to make it at the moment, I'm not ducking the issue. I say, here, I'll give you the calculus of the factors you would have to consider. Number one, they are going to have to consider what is the level of total spending that we want to achieve in the United States? In other words, how much are we going to spend on our military and diplomatic objectives? How much on our social programs? What is the total level? If it's going to be very high, you'd better keep it on because you're going to disrupt your credit markets probably, and because you'll be adding a stimulus to the economy from the level of government spending. On the other hand, if a decision is made that we can cut back in our military levels; they're not going to increase the social programs; there appears to be slack in the economy; we're not working at full speed; then, perhaps, the prescription would be to knock it off and get rid of it to keep the country on that growth pattern. If you ever get off that, you won't have the ten or twelve million a year in addition; you have what we had in 1958, a twelve million dollar drop.

EVANS. As you see it now: If the war did end and I am in no way suggesting that you think it is going to end, but if it did end in, say, the next six months, your inclination would be to keep that present tax structure intact for at least another year?

BARR. No. Now, don't be putting words in my mouth.

EVANS. Do you agree with that?

BARR. No. I would not. I would say that I would be in a position along about November or December, I hope to have a hand in the consultations at that time, to make a recommendation after we have done these things: after the President has submitted his budget, has got his budget in place. Of course, that budget can be changed by the next President, changed completely if he wants to. So you have to determine the level of the budget and the health of the economy, and I don't have to make that decision for six months.

EVANS. You have no intimation at this point at all?

BARR. At this point, I have none.

SHANAHAN. You mentioned the health of the economy. How much chance is there that your tax increase, designed, in effect, to slow the economy, will slow it to the point where you could properly call it a recession.

BARR. There are those who are concerned in this area, as you know. I just don't see it as possible. You can always be wrong. I don't claim that my ouija board or my glass ball is unclouded, but I just don't think it is in the cards. If there is a chance of some slight overkill, one side or another, I think the Federal Reserve Board can adjust its policies quickly and effectively to take up any slack that may occur. You know the tremendous pressure we have for housing in this country; we're building at the rate of about a million four units at this time. The country could take care of demand which could run about two point four million units a year if the Federal Reserve Board could slacken off on its monetary policy, if there's a little bit of overkill here. The housing industry, I think, would take up an awful lot of the slack.

SHANAHAN. The administration has long promised to send Congress a comprehensive proposal for tax reform, and I think the new

tax bill, in effect, requires you to do so by the end of the year. Is that right?

BARR. That's right.

SHANAHAN. Are you going to wait until after the election to send it up, or when do you think you'll send it up?

BARR. I'm not going to duck that, but I think the only man who can answer that is the President who will make this decision. He is under a mandate, but he has a legislative program and he has a lot of fish to fry in the Congress and a lot of objectives he wants to reach. He is going to have to fit that in with all of these other objectives.

SHANAHAN. Is it possible that this might be a campaign document, say, for candidate Humphrey to run against oil zillionaires and their tax loopholes and promise to put the package into effect?

BARR. I think the Congress and the country is quite well aware of all the tax reform proposals we have made and haven't achieved in the past eight years, so I think any candidate can run, and I think rather effectively, on some of the proposals we have sent to the Congress and have not been able to enact into law. I think tax reform is good politics.

EVANS. Surely, Mr. Barr, you have a plan already in the Treasury Department and you're ready to go.

BARR. We're ready to go; yes, indeed.

EVANS. To get back to Miss Shanahan's question, why don't you go?

BARR. Well, because this is a determination, as I say, that only the President can make. It's part of his whole legislative objective. We have maybe a month left in the Congress, and it will be up to the President. He doesn't have to send it now. If he decides to send it after Congress adjourns, he has to make that decision.

EVANS. Surely, I am not suggesting in any way, Mr. Secretary, that you could enact a tax reform program this year. It's out of the question, but you would be about ready to send something up any day that the President wanted. You have packages ready, and have had for years. What, in your opinion, is the most blatant area of our tax system which needs reforming?

BARR. The thing I personally dislike most about it is the rather wide-spread awareness that very, very wealthy people in this country don't pay taxes. Now, the technicians would probably say that this is not the greatest defect in our system, but it is the one that irritates me. I don't like the idea that we do have in this country extremely wealthy people who pay little or no taxes.

EVANS. One example?

BARR. One example that that we put before the Finance Committee, I think four or five years ago, some man who made twenty-three million one year, paid no taxes. Twenty-three million income in one year. That's pretty good, isn't it?

EVANS. Too much. I wouldn't know what to do with all that money.

BARR. No, I wouldn't, either. This was Mr. X who made this amount of money. I was in Asia not too long ago, and I hate to be teased by the Asians. We preach tax administration to them trying to get them to collect taxes, and they say "Well, you people don't do it very well yourselves".

EVANS. What about abolishing all deductions and many exemptions and having a lower rate than the existing scale, a flat line income tax rate which would be paid on the basis of income? I hate this encrusted deduction system.

BARR. It's encrusted, but on the other hand, it's worked rather well. When I talk about the very wealthy people who don't pay taxes, I'm talking about just a few hundred people. Most of us do pay our taxes and pay them rather well. I think some of the deductions should be looked at. I think they are getting out of hand, frankly, if you want my opinion. We've made recommendations along these lines. We were not successful, I might add.

SHANNON. Alternatively what do you think of the proposal that was made by the late Senator Kennedy and, before him, by chairman Long of the Senate Finance Committee, that these people like your twenty-three million dollar Mr. X pay a certain minimum tax if your income is over, I think Bob Kennedy's proposal was if it was over fifty thousand dollars, you had to pay at least ten percent. Is the Treasury for that?

BARR. You know I can't answer that question because we can't answer anything until we get it out. May I speak personally, however. I did not catch up with Senator Kennedy's suggestion, but I am quite well acquainted with the technical details with what Chairman Long, Russell Long of the Finance Committee, has suggested. I can't say what the Treasury or the administration will be for, but I think it should be clear from my previous statements that I don't like to see wealthy people not paying any taxes. I would personally find such a proposal, be very sympathetic towards it.

SHANAHAN. Do you think Congress will enact that kind of a minimum tax on rich people?

BARR. They just might. In other words, they would say that the man who made twenty-three million a year should be paying the fourteen percent tax that the fellow at the poverty level has to pay.

EVANS. What about oil depletion and other depletion allowances. Do you think that, of course, you've had proposals on this, too, there is any chance of reducing the oil depletion amount from twenty-seven and a half percent?

BARR. I've looked at it, and it seems to vary in that it seems to be a geographical distribution.

EVANS. Curious how it works, isn't it? BARR. Yes, it is. It seems that votes for depletion come from the States that have oil, and about sixty percent of the States have oil, so the votes are about sixty percent to keep it there. You know, the country gets all charged up about depletion. Actually, if you knocked it out completely, not just reduce it, but eliminate it completely, it's a billion and a half dollars for corporations and individuals. So it is not, by far, the largest item.

SHANAHAN. Aren't dollars the biggest item? BARR. Oh, yes.

SHANAHAN. What about capital gains? BARR. Capital gains is by far the biggest item. Now, some people say that is not a tax loophole.

SHANAHAN. Are you talking about oil capital gains or just certain things that you regard as loopholes?

BARR. I'm talking about all capital gains. SHANAHAN. There are some particular pieces of capital gains which are regarded, I think, as a loophole.

BARR. Yes, I think one thing at the Treasury which we have recommended for years, as you know. We have specifically recommended that you make a man pay capital gains when he dies. At the moment, if I have a million dollars in capital gains, I would pay at least two hundred and fifty thousand dollars. I can die, and it goes on to my heirs and no tax is paid. Now, we've tried to cure that situation without too much success, either. We've tried, and sooner or later these things come about. It's been fun, I must say. It's a fascinating operation to go after this because the people—what is a loophole to me, or what is a loophole to you—is a great privilege and a constitutional right to the fellow who is enjoying it.

EVANS. It's a way of life. SHANAHAN. Is it safe to assume that things like that, capital gains, which were recommended before, that most of the things you have recommended before all the way back to 1962 and haven't gotten enacted, in one way or another will be in the new package?

BARR. I'm going to duck that one again. I'm not going to prejudice a package that is

going to be coming forward. I can say I would hope a lot of these things would be there, but what will be there. . . .

EVANS. Let me get back to that again. Your point is that you could send a package over to the President and say, "Here is the administration package" . . .

BARR. The Treasury's package. EVANS. You mean he might change your package?

BARR. Well, he's the President of the United States, you know.

EVANS. Well, of course, but you speak for him in this area. My question is this: Have you already sent the Treasury's package to the White House? For the President to look at in preparation of sending it up to the Hill?

BARR. I don't think I will answer that one, either. I think both of you are probing around in areas that maybe might make news, but I hope you realize that I am loyal enough, that where something might make news . . . I've been around this town long enough . . . I hope you realize that I am loyal enough that I am not going to prejudge a package. . . .

EVANS. Let me get back into something very simple. Your boss, Mr. Fallon, Secretary of the Treasury, said the other day that a fifteen dollar exemption in the travel tax would make possible tax-free trips for students and teachers. Can an American citizen live abroad on fifteen dollars a day?

BARR. Every statistic that we have available indicates that they can, and not only students, but professors. For instance, Senator Fulbright was very explicit. He said we would have the whole educational system down on us unless we did something to take care of it.

EVANS. What's the prospect for the travel tax?

BARR. I was quoted in the press yesterday as saying it was still breathing. The Senate Finance Committee could have killed it. They could have knocked it in the head yesterday, or on Tuesday of last week, but they didn't. They said they were going to schedule public hearings; they are going to have witnesses; there will be a hundred witnesses show up; a hundred witnesses will be against it. We haven't had a witness for it yet except us, I think.

SHANAHAN. Speaking of things overseas, I think many of us have looked at the recent French financial troubles with, perhaps, a mixture of anxiety and a little glee. Where do you think that's headed? Is there potential real trouble for the United States' economy growing out of France's gold losses and threats of devaluation, etc.?

BARR. I know you saw, this week, the stories that came out of Europe that the industrial nations of the world had agreed to put up a package to guarantee the sterling balances that are lying around the world. I think it is only logical to conclude that all of us were concerned that if France got in bad trouble, then the people who were holding sterling in places like Australia, New Zealand, etc., and all these places that had big balance, I've never heard of them, they all got worried that the British would get into trouble, and we'd all be in the soup. That was part of the reason. I think we took care of the British situation for the time being. On the French situation, itself, the only thing I can tell you is that it has stabilized as of this week. It's been much better since the election.

SHANAHAN. Do you think the apparently charitable attitude the other nations have taken toward France's troubles will make any difference in De Gaulle's attitude the next time we, or the United Kingdom, get into trouble?

BARR. All I can say is that I can hope. We can't afford to be vindictive. We're too large; we're too rich. The troubles of France are magnified if they come back to our shores. We can't afford it. I hope that our charity will be reciprocated in the future.

THE QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF WATER

HON. CLIFFORD P. HANSEN

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the availability of a supply of water which is adequate for future growth in both quantity and quality was once a problem felt only by Western States. It is now a national problem shared by all States.

To the Western States water is still, without question, a decisive factor in their economic development and well-being. It is a most valuable resource and requires constant attention and wise use.

This is a matter of concern to all States and most have been actively pursuing additional sources through State and interstate organizations. Two of these organizations have recently furnished me with a copy of resolutions they have adopted in the effort to manage water in a meaningful way.

The first, the Western States Water Council, recently adopted a number of resolutions concerning scenic rivers legislation.

The second group, the National Association of Attorneys General, passed resolutions in order to insure that State views on legal matters relating to Federal-State relations in water pollution control be considered before further regulatory programs, under Federal administration, are pursued.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions of the two organizations be printed in the RECORD.

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

WESTERN STATES WATER COUNCIL,
July 9, 1968.

To: Members of the 90th Congress representing the Western States.
From: Jay R. Bingham, executive director.
Re resolutions adopted by the Western States Water Council.

The enclosed resolutions were adopted by the Western States Water Council at its annual meeting in Spokane, Washington on July 2, 1968.

The Council is anxious for you to be informed of its views as you give consideration to the National Scenic Rivers Act.

In addition, the Council urges your support of the 640 Acre Limitation.

RESOLUTION OF THE WESTERN STATES WATER COUNCIL REGARDING WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS LEGISLATION

Resolved that in the event Wild and Scenic Rivers legislation is further considered by the Congress, the legislation should include provisions that no area of any state be included or set aside as Wild and Scenic River Area, either as might be established on passage of the act or thereafter, unless it first be approved by the respective states affected in accordance with state law.

CERTIFICATE

I certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate copy of a Resolution adopted by the Western States Water Council on July 2, 1968, at Spokane, Washington.

JAY R. BINGHAM,
Executive Director.

RESOLUTION OF THE WESTERN STATES WATER COUNCIL SUPPORTING 640-ACRE LIMITATION

Whereas, the 160 acre limitation is economically outmoded in western farming areas, making it inefficient to operate in view of modern methods and costs of operation.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that acreage limitation provisions of the Reclamation Laws be modified to provide:

1. Substitution of 640 acres as the limitation for individual ownerships.

2. That in areas of limited productivity due to land, water and climatic conditions, the limitation be raised in keeping with what would be considered an economic farming unit.

3. That water be furnished to lands in excess of these limits if interest is paid on the cost of construction attributable to the lands within a project in private ownership in excess of the acreage limit set herein.

4. That the acreage limitation shall not in any event be made applicable to any ownership of land by a state or any political subdivision thereof, including municipal entities; and

Be it further resolved that the Western States Water Council supports the introduction of legislation to modify these provisions of the Reclamation Law; and

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be transmitted to the appropriate members of Congress and to the Secretary of the Interior.

CERTIFICATE

I certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate copy of a Resolution adopted by the Western States Water Council on July 2, 1968, at Spokane, Washington.

JAY R. BINGHAM,
Executive Director.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS IN WATER QUALITY CONTROL

Whereas, the Water Quality Act of 1965 has provided for continued state responsibility for the formulation of water quality standards; and

Whereas, a number of Attorneys General have already been apprised by their respective state water pollution control officials of actions of the Secretary of the Interior under the federal statute which appear to go beyond the spirit and letter of the Congressional enactment by arrogating to a federal administrative agency the authority to set effluent standards and pass upon the legitimacy of water uses determined pursuant to state law and policy; and

Whereas, a failure on the part of the Secretary of the Interior to modify the present course along lines that will accord with a proper distribution of responsibilities as intended by the Congress can only precipitate litigation; and

Whereas, the appropriate role for both federal and state officials should be to promote cooperation rather than intergovernmental disharmony.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the 1968 annual meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General that the Attorneys General of the several states, in direct contact with one another, and through the Association where appropriate, be urged to consult together in order that state views on legal matters relating to federal-state relations in water pollution control be brought effectively to bear, and to the further end that any suits which individual states may be impelled to bring in order to protect their own regulatory programs in the water quality field from distortions resulting from federal administrative action beyond the intent of Congress may be properly pursued.

PENNSYLVANIA HAS MADE TREMENDOUS PROGRESS TOWARD COMPLETION OF ITS 1,577-MILE INTERSTATE EXPRESSWAY NETWORK

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include some of the highlights of a report from Pennsylvania on the progress our State highways department is making in completing the interstate expressway network of 1,577 miles in the Keystone State. The report follows:

It is gratifying to report only 160 miles remain on the drawing boards. Much of this will move to the construction stage by the end of this year, depending on the availability of federal funds. Ninety percent of Interstate highway costs are reimbursed by the Federal Government.

Another 120 miles were opened or placed under construction during the past 12 months. Currently, 1040 miles are serving travelers and another 377 miles are being built, an aggregate of 1,417 miles. The combined figure one year ago was 1,297 miles, of which 1,009 miles were in use.

Almost 60 more miles of Interstate 80 will be opened during the balance of this year, increasing the usable total to 242 miles. This will leave only 71 of the entire 313 miles remaining in construction. On July 10 Governor Raymond F. Shafer and Highways Secretary Robert G. Bartlett participated in ground breaking ceremonies in Clinton County, the last section of the cross-state highway to go into construction. These additional openings connecting to portions already in use will provide almost 90 continuous miles from the Ohio border to Reynoldsville, Jefferson County, including the towering Allegheny River Bridge at Emlenton, Venango County. Another 52-mile continuous stretch will be available from Elliott State Park, Clearfield County, to the Bellefonte Interchange, Centre County. Already serving motorists are 103 miles from the New Jersey line near Delaware Water Gap, Monroe County, to the west branch of the Susquehanna River in Union County. Interstate 80 will be completed during 1970, two years ahead of the federal deadline.

Openings in Luzerne and Schuylkill counties will enable continuous travel on Interstate 81 from Frackville into New York State. Bids were taken June 28 on Schuylkill County's last link of this 234-mile expressway.

In western Pennsylvania, additional portions of Interstate 79 will be opened in Erie, Crawford, Mercer, Allegheny, Washington and Greene counties.

Almost eight more miles of Interstate 95 will be available in southeastern Pennsylvania, comprising two links in Philadelphia and the portion from Chester to the Delaware State line.

Pennsylvania has made tremendous progress since the inception of the Interstate program 12 years ago. The striking benefits already apparent where portions of the expressways are serving travelers, will be compounded many times when the network is completed within the next four or five years.

Mr. Speaker, I thought it appropriate to bring to the attention of Congress not only the progress of Pennsylvania on completing its highway system, but the actual evidence in concrete, blacktop, steel and aluminum that will combine to

provide the greatest highway network ever developed.

This system will be lasting proof of an expenditure of Federal and State funds that will have contributed much to the economic growth of each of our States.

When you realize what this highway system has done for the strengthening of the economy of Pennsylvania, we can ill afford to curtail funds that so dramatically provide the people of our Nation with more jobs and prosperity. This is what the Interstate Highway System means to us in Pennsylvania.

RISING CRIME RATE IN AMERICA

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, as one who has long been interested in the rising crime rate in America, I would like to bring to the attention of this body certain facts which I think have great bearing on this rising crime. I can no longer permit this fallacy of permissiveness toward lawbreakers to go unchallenged. Our courts have been protecting criminals instead of society and now this permissive trend is reaping outrageously brutal rewards.

The time has now arisen for all Americans, and for us as legislators, to strongly urge the judiciary of our country to abandon the nonproductive psychology of protecting the lawbreakers from our society. They should once again protect society from the lawbreakers. In keeping with this general subject, I have been following with great interest the situation in the District of Columbia. We have seen four policemen killed in the line of duty in 7 months. Our lack of dealing with this runaway situation is a sickening display of permissiveness in our society. It is with this purpose in mind that I wish to strengthen the respect for society and its laws.

Mr. Speaker, I offer this material for your information and possible action by the Members of this body. It is inconceivable to me that we can have appointed officers who are supposed to represent all people in the District of Columbia representing organizations like the Black United Front. I think this is a sickness that should be stopped immediately.

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I include this material in the RECORD at this point:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE WIVES ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Clinton, Md., July 11, 1968.

HON. JOHN W. HECHINGER,
Chairman, City Council,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HECHINGER: Your D.C. Gun Registration Regulation won't stop Murder. Doesn't the City Council care about murder? Surely you are aware that four policemen have been killed in the past seven months. Your gun regulation provides a fine not to exceed \$300.00 or imprisonment not to exceed 10 days. Such sentences will be even less effective in stopping the killing of police and

citizens, than the incredible fines given out for murder in the District. One man was given two years for first degree murder, another man given one year for second degree murder. President Johnson on July 8, 1968 urged enactment of legislation to strengthen the authority of the D.C. City Council to issue gun regulations that will effectively protect the safety of the entire community with penalties far stronger than prescribed by existing law. It is clear that President Johnson recognizes how ineffective the City Council Gun regulations are in stopping murder of policemen and citizens.

We appeal to you and the members of the D.C. City Council to immediately support President Johnson's March 13, 1968 message to the Congress, to add a mandatory ten years imprisonment to the regular penalty when a firearm is used in a robbery or an attempted robbery. The President pointed out that last year 2500 major crimes were committed in the nation's capital at gunpoint—murders, assaults and robberies.

The D.C. Government can help write the President's plan into law by supporting Congressman Casey's amendment providing ten year sentences in addition to the regular penalty when a firearm is used in major crimes such as murder-rape-assault-burglary-robbery and kidnapping. To date the City Council under your leadership and the leadership of deputy chairman, Reverend Walter E. Fauntroy have totally ignored and failed to give any support to President Johnson's call for an effective D.C. Gun Control Act of March 13, 1968 which would stop, as the President said, "murders, assaults and robberies."

The City Council has not expressed its horror over the continued killing of policemen. This was pointed out by the Police-man's Association in a full page ad in the Star on July 7, 1968.

We are shocked at the incredible inflammatory and divisive statement issued by the Black United Front, justifying the killing of white policemen. The D.C. City Council has not repudiated or condemned this statement. When our husband's sacrifices are not appreciated, it is time for them to go fishing. Why should our husbands sacrifice their lives for a community and a district government which doesn't care?

Never in all our lives have we heard such irresponsible statements as that written by the Reverend Channing Phillips, recently elected to the D.C. Democratic National Committee, for the Black United Front of which, the Reverend Walter Fauntroy is a leading member. The Reverend Walter Fauntroy said, we should look behind the rhetoric. Well, that is what we have been doing. We have come to the conclusion that we have no intention of letting our husbands continue to put their lives on the line to insure the safety of any member of the Black United Front and their families.

Like the women of the ancient world who campaigned against war, we are going to campaign to have our husbands go fishing, until this community comes to its senses. We earnestly believe that the society which does not appreciate the sacrifices of the lives of its police officers does not deserve protection. Our husbands can stay home with our children. They can go fishing. They can take up safe, highly paid, 9 to 5 careers in the Federal Government. Why should they die for members of the Black United Front? Why should they die to protect the families and the persons of the Reverend Channing Phillips and the other 150 members of the Black United Front and their families, who are being protected by police officers whom they fling their vile invective at, day after day, week after week and month after month?

We are confident that if our husbands went fishing or stayed home with their families they would get more attention from the D.C.

Government than what the bus drivers did when they were being shot at and murdered. We think the time has come for the entire community and all of the citizens who want law and order to speak out like Mayor Walter E. Washington, Patrick V. Murphy and you, Mr. Hechinger, have done and denounce the incredible divisive and heartless statement of the Black United Front.

This community has failed to support its police. The Judges are handing down irresponsible sentences, repeaters are back on the streets thumbing their noses at the police before their cases have even been filed. The Judges and the courts have listened to special pleaders for the criminal elements of our city. They have refused to listen to the anquished cries of the police and the law abiding citizens. They have looked for the loop holes to let the criminals get off easy. Now it is time for our husbands to look for their own loop holes so they can get acquainted with their families, be fathers to their children instead of lying beneath a stone in a forgotten corner of a graveyard.

It is time for them to enjoy family life, instead of sacrificing their lives for a silent non involved community that won't rise up, becoming dignant and won't throw out the heartless irresponsible spokesmen and leaders for disorder and anarchy in the Black United Front.

Yes, Mr. Hechinger, we have looked behind the rhetoric of the Black United Front as the Reverend Walter Fauntroy has requested and we see no reason for urging our husbands to sacrifice their lives while the D.C. City Council, the D.C. Government and the Community fails so abysmally to do their duty. Sincerely,

JOAN ABBOTT,
President.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE
WIVES ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Clinton, Md., July 15, 1968.

The PRESIDENT,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Four policemen have been killed in the line of duty in the Nation's Capital in the past 7 months—Your D.C. Gun Control Act, which you recommended to the Congress on March 13, 1968 would stop such tragedies.

Former President Eisenhower writing in the Reader's Digest of May, 1968 declared; "one of the principle aims of our Constitution was to 'insure domestic tranquility'; indeed, in sequence of objectives, the authors placed it ahead of common defense! The wise men who founded this nation well knew that anger over justice denied, or envy and hatred begotten of ignorance, and prejudice, would as always before, create trouble; that there would always be false leaders ready to inflame men to acts of purposeless violence."

We the members of the District of Columbia Police Wives Association have always been deeply appreciative of your interest and concern for the interest in and concern for the Metropolitan Police Department. As recently as July 3, 1968 you said, "Washington's policemen are among the nations finest. In the critical hours of unrest and violence which gripped the city they performed most difficult missions . . . the backbone of law enforcement in each of our communities is the policeman on the beat. In no city of America is this more true than in the District of Columbia." The very day you wrote this letter to both Houses of the Congress, police private Stephen A. Williams was killed and police private Frederick Matteson was critically wounded while trying to do their duty in the 1300 block of Columbia Road N.W.

The past ten days have seen the issuance of the incredible, divisive and inflammatory statement by the Black United Front which has been condemned by Mayor Walter E. Washington, D.C. Public Safety Director,

Patrick V. Murphy, City Council Chairman John W. Hechinger—editorials in the Post, Star and the Washington Daily News, and by many members of the Congress. The D.C. Federation of Civic Associations, an outstanding Black-led organization of some 40,000 district citizens, was highly critical of the Black United Front statement and as, reported in the local newspapers, expressed its sympathy to the families of slain police private Stephen A. Williams, critically wounded police private Frederick Matteson and voted to send a letter of condolence and a check of \$50.00 to each.

The Reverend E. Franklin Jackson, the District's outgoing Democratic National Committeeman, said it is his own opinion "and that of a vast majority of the black people" that the statement of the Black United Front was inflammatory and antagonistic to the entire community." He said, regarding the Reverend Channing Phillips, that "the national committeeman must be concerned with the welfare and the well-being of the total community, and must not in any sense of the word give in to one side or the other" in a way that would polarize the community.

Four policemen have been killed in line of duty in the past 7 months in the Nation's Capital since November. This is an incredible toll to have taken place in 7 months. In the pace of this record, unequalled in any other Capital City in the world, the Washington Post reported July 12, 1968 on its front page under the astounding headline "City Democrats Hit 'Assaults' by Police" the following "The city's new Democratic Central Committee adopted a resolution last night strongly condemning what it called, assaults on citizens by police. At the same time, the Committee deleted from the proposed language of the resolution a statement of sympathy for the family of police private Stephen A. Williams, who was killed with his own gun on July 2, while attempting to make an arrest. The section cut from the resolution said "We strongly condemn assaults against police officers who are properly carrying out their vital responsibilities to protect the public."

We pray you will speak out, Mr. President, and provide leadership to this troubled community and clarify the issues. The Democratic Central Committee and the Black United Front have done more than shout "Fire" in a crowded theatre. They have poisoned the relationships between the Police and the Community. Unless you take immediate steps to correct this situation and to provide leadership in this crisis, more lives will be lost and this community will descend further into anarchy and chaos.

You have said "the safety and security of its citizens is the first duty of government." You have also said: "the long shadow of crime falls over the streets of the Nation's Capital, mocking its proud institutions . . . the liberty of every citizen is diminished." We agree, Mr. President, with these moving statements of yours. We also agree with former President Eisenhower, "that there would always be false leaders ready to inflame men to acts of purposeless violence," and we believe General Eisenhower's words apply with special aptness to the inflammatory language in the resolutions adopted by the Democratic Central Committee and the Black United Front.

We request not only you to speak out on these issues but to throw your support behind Congressman Casey's amendment reported by the House Rules Committee to "add 10 years imprisonment to the regular penalty when a firearm is used in a robbery or an attempted robbery, which is the central recommendation of the D.C. Gun Control Act which you called on the Congress to enact into law in your historic message of March 13, 1968 "safeguard the public order and stop

tragedy." It will help prevent the killing of our husbands. The Policeman's Association of the District of Columbia in a full page ad in the Star on July 7, 1968 asked "Who Cares?" We do, Mr. President, and we are certain you do too.

May we hear from you?

Respectfully yours,

JOAN ABBOTT,
President.

PRESS RELEASE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE WIVES ASSOCIATION, INC., JULY 16, 1968

We challenge City Council Chairman John W. Hechinger to have the courage to bring the complete text of our letter of July 11, 1968, and not just excerpts from it which he branded "incendiary" before the D.C. City Council as the first order of business at its meeting on Tuesday July 16, 1968. It surely would not take as much courage on his part to bring our letter before the City Council as it does for our husbands to face the armed criminal element in the District of Columbia. Four policemen have been killed in the line of duty since November.

Mr. Hechinger has missed the main point in our letter, which in fact was speaking out for stronger sentences for the using of guns in major crimes in the District of Columbia.

In our letter we called upon the City Council to support President Johnson's D.C. Gun Control Act of March 13, 1968, which calls for 10 year mandatory sentences to stop murder and other major crimes.

80% of all major crimes committed are by repeaters. Why is this so, Mr. Hechinger? Because the sentences doled out to these criminals are far too lenient. When you consider that in some states judges give more stringent sentences for killing game out of season than some D.C. judges give criminals for first and second degree murder, you can see why that 80% of the crimes are committed by repeaters.

From 1960-1966 335 policemen in our nation were slain, of these 322 died of bullet wounds. 2500 major crimes were committed in the District at gun point this year. In most instances the sentences were small or suspended. 242 Metropolitan Policemen were assaulted this year in the District as compared to 193 combined assaults on Metropolitan and Park Police last year, but this goes unnoticed. Nationwide last year guns were used in more than 125,000 assaults, rapes and robberies.

If the law required a mandatory 10 year sentence for using guns in major crimes it would go far in removing the criminal element from the streets of the District of Columbia and help stop these senseless slayings of policemen and citizens. The policeman on the beat is all that remains in America between law-abiding citizens and that element of society that would take every remaining right and indeed the very lives of those that obey the law. When it comes to condoning the assaults and killings of policemen who have dedicated their lives to protect all citizens what happens to the rest of us? We die bit by bit, one by one. A creeping plague of crime has hit this nation and most severely the District of Columbia.

It is time to stop making excuses for those that would have it so and recognize crime for what it is, a plague of destruction that knows no barrier of race, color, creed or financial status.

President Johnson stated that "The District of Columbia has one of the finest police forces in the world." Why aren't these men backed to the fullest in their lonely campaign against crime? If the City Council does not back their policemen nor does the community there is no need for them, and they face danger and die without purpose. When the chips are down it is the policeman in the middle that bears the crux. Where are the voices of support for these gallant men? We're listening for them, Mr. Hechinger!

CXIV—1400—Part 17

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the week of July 14 through July 20 has been designated as the annual "Captive Nations Week." We are more hopeful today than at any time in the past that all of humanity will enjoy the freedoms which we so dearly revere.

In observing Captive Nations Week our thoughts turn to those smaller nations which lost their identity during and after both World Wars, and particularly the countries of Central and Eastern Europe which succumbed to the might of the U.S.S.R. in the 1940's. Then there are also the nations of Asia which are exposed to the pressures of Communist China. Cuba was added to the listings in 1960 following the coup by Fidel Castro.

It should be clear that we are not referring to nations or peoples which have been captured in the older imperialistic sense of the word. We are concerned with people who do not enjoy basic human freedoms. We are acknowledging that there are many individuals in this world who cannot comprehend the nature of a free society and that many who can understand it may never experience it. We are also commemorating the heritage of such nations as Armenia, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania for whom the self-determination proposed by Woodrow Wilson never proved valid and whose identity and tradition is being diluted in the mainstream of history. Finally, we are paying tribute to the many thousands of people who have died in the quest to remain free from Communist control.

Perhaps our parents or their forefathers were able to visualize the ideals and advantages of this land better than we who have been raised without the fear of worshipping freely or of expressing our thoughts. As time passes, we often tend to take our personal freedoms for granted. Occasionally, however, an incident occurs which makes us suddenly aware of the totality of our freedom and of the few and insignificant restrictions on our personal decisions.

The hope which I expressed for the captive nations in my opening lines is based on two contentions. First, I believe that the totalitarianism behind the Iron Curtain appears to be weakening as national identity and new national leaders emerge. The control of a distant authority based upon a dubious and sacrificial philosophy may begin to dissolve at the lowest level of power and gradually work upward. Perhaps some will consider my enthusiasm over the developments in Czechoslovakia as too optimistic. Yet, I shall never feel that man can become so depraved as to exist in a semiservile state, indefinitely denied the basic freedoms of thought and expression.

To sit idly by and hope is not our only recourse. As President John F. Kennedy once said:

This country must never recognize the situation behind the Iron Curtain as a permanent one, but by all peaceful means, keep alive the hopes of freedom for the peoples of the captive nations.

Second, I believe that the basic promise of freedom is the right to develop the type of government which is popular and responsive to the people. What ever type of government it may be, it is essential that it is equitable in its representation and its application. To the hypothesis that no society can be entirely and socially equitable, I say that we can be proud that our Nation is attempting to make the benefits of this land of opportunity more meaningful to every citizen, whether he be rich or poor, privileged, or underprivileged. This trend I attribute not only to our Nation but to a humanistic instinct which is prevalent in this age of relative wealth. I contend that this consciousness of a need for social freedom, as well as political freedom, is international and will favorably influence the nations and people who are not part of the free world.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all people may one day enjoy the experience of expressing their opinions freely. The observance of Captive Nations Week is a step in that direction and as such it deserves our full support.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, 10 years ago, Congress, by a unanimous vote, passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week.

The purpose of this law, in part, was to remind those of us who partake of the blessings of freedom here in America that many millions of people in other areas of the world do not enjoy national independence.

Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Byelorussians, Ukrainians, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Croatians, Serbs, Armenians, Albanians, and other nationalities, that once enjoyed independence and self-government are now either incorporated into the Soviet Union or have become citizens of Communist satellite states.

The commemoration each year of Captive Nations Week also serves as public testimony that we in the United States have not forgotten those who are denied their rights of nationhood and that we have not abandoned our traditional role as champion of the right of independence for all the nations of the world.

Mr. President, we can have no doubt that were these subjugated peoples allowed to express their true feelings in free elections, they would vote overwhelmingly for national independence.

It is still too early to predict the final outcome of the on-going struggle in Eastern Europe, particularly in Czecho-

slovakia, for greater independence but it does offer vivid proof of the intense yearning for freedom on the part of the peoples of that area.

I am proud to join with my colleagues in the U.S. Senate and with the friends of freedom everywhere in speaking out in support of self-determination for all nations.

I have faith that one day the people of the Captive Nations will once again be masters of their own destiny.

PEACE CORPS LIVES ON

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD an editorial from the July 1, 1968 issue of the Kansas City, Mo., Star on the subject of the Peace Corps. The editorial is informative and gives a proper perspective for the Peace Corps which has drawn so much favorable attention since its creation both at home and abroad.

The editorial follows:

DESPITE PAST BURIALS, THE PEACE CORPS LIVES ON

The time has rolled around, it seems for another of those semiannual obituaries on the Peace corps. The old luster has vanished, goes the refrain. The young are disenchanted, less willing to serve. The implication is that irreversible decline has set in.

The problem is not in getting applicants, however. This year, in fact, some 20,000 young Americans are expected to offer their services—nearly twice as many as the corps currently has at work in the field. The difficulty lies in a shrinking number of applicants who are qualified by Peace corps standards.

This might have been expected for a couple of reasons. In the first place, the corps has gotten more selective with the years. The time when anyone with a pair of hands and good intentions was welcomed like a brother is now history. So is the vision of the volunteer charging off to his grass hut with some vague mandate to save the world single-handedly.

The Peace corps has learned, by hard experience, that what it needs are young people—in years or in spirit—willing to equip themselves with a particular set of skills so that they may work, under considerable handicap, toward limited and often undramatic goals.

In the aggregate, these small efforts can be wonderfully significant. But it demands a recognition that, in attempting to lift the yoke of famine from millions of people, your own best contribution may be to help five farmers learn how to raise better chickens. And this is not a glittering lure for the adventurer, or for the messianic type who must be a miracle-worker or nothing.

For another thing, there is no question that the Selective Service does draw for the nation's military manpower needs from among those young men who, in many instances, would be the likeliest Peace corps candidates. Exactly how deep the bite may be is impossible to say, since the decision of whether to grant a temporary deferment for Peace corps service rests with individual draft boards. But certainly it is a factor.

All considered, we would say again—as we did the last time the crepe was hung—that the epitaph is premature. The premise of

world need that gave the Peace corps birth is as valid today as it was in the first days of the Kennedy presidency. And it will take a good deal more evidence than we have yet seen to convince us that the concept of voluntary service has lost its relevancy to American youth.

THE DRAFT: "SWORD OF DAMOCLES"

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the draft issue is still foremost in the minds of our young people throughout the country. Many times in the past few years, I have joined with colleagues to urge draft law reforms.

I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues, the remarks of the distinguished Governor of the State of New York, Nelson A. Rockefeller, who is also a candidate for the Republican presidential nomination.

Mr. Rockefeller has spoken on one area of the draft which I feel strongly about—the so-called sword of Damocles which hangs over the head of our youth, college students, and young men.

The remarks follow:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT A RALLY ON CAMPUS, UNIVERSITY OF IOWA, IOWA CITY, IOWA, MAY 2, 1968.

For a long time, I've been convinced that the way to know what people are really concerned about is to pay close attention to what they are joking about. Like the man telling me the other day about his son, who will graduate from college next month.

The father asked this young man what he would like as a graduation present.

"Well, dad," his son said, "how about an apartment in Montreal?"

Or consider the slogan scrawled on a New York State University blackboard the other day.

Somebody had written:

"Draft graduate students—care enough to send the very best."

This wry humor tells us a lot about the unpopularity of the war in Vietnam and the draft law supplying U.S. manpower for that conflict.

The present draft law is indeed serious cause for concern, and that is what I would like to talk about here today.

The basic principles of Selective Service proved themselves in World War II and the Korean War. Today, however, hardly anyone can tell you what recognizable principle determines why one young man is drafted while another is not. Why is this so? Because the law has not been kept abreast of changing conditions.

Because of high birthrates during World War II, the number of young men reaching draft age increased from about 1,000,000 a year in the Korean War period to 1,900,000 this year.

The armed forces do not need anywhere near this many men today—but draft procedures went unchanged.

The result is that millions of young men and their families are kept in a state of needless uncertainty over an eight-year period—from the young man's 18th birthday to his 26th birthday. Thus, the workings of the draft law today are arbitrary and inequitable. Our Nation calls on its youth for military service as a duty which accompanies

the privilege of citizenship, as a part of the price we must pay for our freedom.

Our young men have every right to expect that in return they will get fair treatment under a draft law that makes sense. But they are not getting fair treatment under an outdated law that in effect favors the well-to-do and drafts the poor.

Obviously, some degree of uncertainty is inevitable in any war. But we ought to try to reduce that inherent inequity—and not add to it. The present draft law should be changed to achieve three objectives:

1. To reduce the needless uncertainty in which young men are kept.

2. To end the requirement in the present law that the oldest be drafted first.

This provision, as it now operates, imposes an arbitrarily heavy draft burden on graduate students and seniors who will be graduating in June. Some seniors and graduate students should serve as part of a balanced manpower pool, but no one age group should be singled out disproportionately.

3. To end the present built-in discrimination against those who lack the economic means or academic standing to go to college or who feel they can serve the country best in non-academic pursuits.

One way to achieve these goals would be to provide that each young man, on reaching the age of 19, be given a choice of either a student deferment or taking a chance on being drafted through a lottery. If the youth put his name into the lottery and wasn't drafted in a year, he would be passed by and would be clear of the draft unless war needs worsened.

If he took a student deferment, he would be allowed to continue his education up to and including his bachelor's degree but on graduation would go into the lottery pool for one year. If after this year he was not drafted, he could consider himself free of the draft unless war needs increased.

This lottery plan, in short, would limit each student's exposure to one year, either at 19 or on college graduation. This plan is not only completely fair—it's practical. It would supply all the manpower now needed by our armed forces. I am sure that this is a selective service system that a young man could support—and this is vitally important. Any system that could cost a man his life should make sense to him and, above all, seem fair to him. The question of military service always raises the related question: "If you're old enough to fight, are you old enough to vote?" I say you are. I vigorously support giving the vote to 18-year-olds. As a public official, I have no fear of exposing my ideas to the judgment of voters under 21. In fact, a good gauge of a man's actions as a leader is how well they appeal to the high ideals of youth.

If our policies don't have relevance to the problems we face—then we had better re-examine them. For those of us in office today are, in reality, the trustees of your future. You young people are like an insistent challenge to anyone who is ready to rest on old laurels or to rely on old dogmas. It's a new world, an ever-changing, dynamic place. And you continually remind us of this truth. Yes, this world also offers unlimited possibilities for confusion and uncertainty. But it has powerful potential for commitment and fulfillment and excitement.

The problem is that increasingly our concepts and actions are unrelated to the realities of the world around us. We need youthful understanding and involvement. The college campuses in America have a tremendous opportunity to contribute to this understanding of the problems and the emerging forces and to bring independence and integrity, the open-mindedness and creativity of youth to bear on the shaping of our future. There is no reason for America to lose faith in itself or in its political institutions. The problems are soluble. The more difficult tasks are doable but with your help in bridging

the gaps in understanding caused by the speed and magnitude of change, we should not fear change. Rather, we should shape it to serve our goals and not let it overwhelm us in the form of crisis. I am confident that in doing so—together—we can lead not only America but the world in the greatest period of peace and progress in the history of mankind.

GUNS AND GUN LAWS—FACT AND FANCY

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the sudden surge of pressure for more firearms legislation has generated more mail, and more controversy, than any other topic to come before the entire 90th Congress. Almost overnight, as the result of a major propaganda campaign from anti-gun forces which at times has skidded and gyrated on the treacherous oil of its own hysteria, the American people and the Congress have been bombarded with an unbelievable collection of half truths, misleading allegations, unjust charges, and outright distortions of fact.

There has already been 1 day of debate on this measure; more debate is yet to come, and the bill will not be voted on until tomorrow. Now, therefore, is the time to look at all the facts.

The present administration bill on firearms control calls for the following: First, mandatory Federal registration; second, licensing provisions, requiring fingerprinting, photography, police statement on record and identification, doctor's certificate on mental competency; third, permits cutoff of Federal wildlife conservation funds if a State does not comply with this; fourth, has no provision for minors under 18 to use firearms; fifth, provides occasional periods of amnesty during which unregistered firearms may be registered without a penalty.

The bill before us today, as it came from committee, applies restrictions to rifles and shotguns which are similar to those already applied to handguns. The handgun restrictions, contained in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, for which I voted, bans interstate mail-order sales of handguns; limits counter handgun sales to persons 21 or older who live in the same State as the dealer; bars importation from abroad of all weapons not suitable for hunting, virtually prohibits except for police departments any dealings in mines, hand grenades, machineguns, and similar heavy weapons, forbids possession, receipt, or transportation of handguns and rifles by certain individuals including convicted felons, veterans who did not get honorable discharges, judicially determined mental incompetents, illegally settled aliens, and persons who have renounced U.S. citizenship.

H.R. 17735 would allow licensed dealers to sell rifles and shotguns to persons 18 years old and would also allow dealers to sell or deliver a rifle or shotgun to a nonresident if such sale or delivery conforms to the law of the State where the

transfer is made, and if the purchaser lives in an adjacent State which by law authorizes such out-of-State purchases.

The provisions for ammunition would prohibit dealers from selling handgun ammunition to persons under 21, or rifle or shotgun ammunition to persons under 18. Dealers could not ship ammunition interstate to unlicensed persons; that is, nondealers, such as in a mail-order transaction. There is no prohibition on sale of ammunition to nonresidents by either dealers or private individuals. Ammunition bought elsewhere may be brought into one's State of residence.

The committee bill that has been reported omits the registration and licensing provisions which the administration wants. The only reason these parts were dropped was to give the bill better chance of passage. However, there are those who wish to add them in the House; there will also be an attempt to place them in the Senate version of the bill, and then through a conference committee force House acceptance.

WHAT REASONS ARE GIVEN FOR MORE LAWS?

Let us consider the main arguments given in support of more and stricter firearms laws:

First. The proposed laws will affect only a few people.

Second. They will not infringe on anyone's rights; besides, there is really no constitutional guarantee of any sort, because the second amendment does not mean what it says.

Third. Firearms are a major menace to every American and a leading cause of accidents.

Fourth. Tight gun laws will keep down the crime and murder rate and help stem the tide of violence.

Fifth. Other countries have tight gun laws; so should the United States.

Sixth. A powerful, sinister and mysterious "gun lobby," basically backed by extremists, is preventing the Congress from carrying out the people's will. No organization should have this much power.

Seventh. Gun owners need not fear confiscation; control is all anyone wants. SOME 40 TO 50 MILLION AMERICANS OWN GUNS

First, just how many Americans would be affected? We must remember, the matter does not end simply with those who own guns. There is also the economic aspect of the question to be considered. Here are the facts:

It is estimated 200 million firearms are owned by between 40 and 50 million people. At least 50 percent of the American households own at least one gun; in 1967 over 20 million took part in various shooting sports. In 1964, U.S.-made guns and ammunition—not counting military—totaled \$282.5 million in sales, meaning 20,000 jobs and a \$100 million payroll. There are 100,000 retail outlets for guns and ammunition and 1,600 firms manufacturing hunting and shooting accessories.

THERE IS A RIGHT "TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS"

Second, we have the constitutional question. It is said that possession of a gun is not a "right" in any sense, and the second amendment to the Constitution, part of the Bill of Rights, has

been misinterpreted. Just what does "a well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed" really mean?

The Bill of Rights itself came into being, as Chief Justice Warren wrote in 1962 in New York University Law Review, because—

The people were still troubled by the recollection of the conditions that prompted the charge of the Declaration of Independence that the King has "effected to render the military independent and superior to the civil power." They were reluctant to ratify the Constitution without further assurances, and thus we find in the Bill of Rights Amendments No. 2 and 3, specifically authorizing a decentralized militia, guaranteeing the right of the people to keep and bear arms, and prohibiting the quartering of troops in any house in time of peace without the consent of the owner.

How did the second amendment itself become part of the Bill of Rights? Massachusetts was the first State to propose amendments to the Constitution, and Samuel Adams offered one containing, among other things, the statement that—

The Constitution be never construed to authorize Congress to . . . prevent the people of the United States, who are peaceable citizens from keeping their own arms.

New Hampshire, at the time, asked for a Bill of Rights to be added that would include this provision:

Congress shall never disarm any citizen unless such as are or have been in Actual Rebellion.

In Virginia, Patrick Henry noted and protested that under the Constitution as it had been submitted, "you are not to have the right of having arms in your own defense."

Now, let us consider the term "militia." Antigua forces say it refers to only National Guard and Reserve components, but the truth of the matter is that under the law as it stands today, "militia" means just what title 10, United States Code, section 311, says in its opening lines:

The militia of the United States consists of all able-bodied males at least 17 years of age and . . . under 45 years of age who are, or who have made a declaration of intent to become citizens of the United States.

In 1939, a Supreme Court decision defined "well-regulated militia" as "all males physically capable of acting in concert for the common defense of the country."

"Militia," by act of Congress and by Supreme Court decision, is not restricted to National Guard or Reserve components. It means just what the law says it means and in effect covers most of the men in the United States.

Writing in 1929, Prof. Charles Kellogg Burdick, of Cornell University, an authority on the Supreme Court, said that the right to keep and bear arms was certainly subject to the police powers of the several States, but he also said:

The Supreme Court has said that a State may not prohibit its citizens to possess and bear arms and so destroy the resources of the Federal Government for protection of public security.

The Congress has on at least two occasions voted directly on the matter of the right to keep and bear arms. The first time was in 1941, prior to Pearl Harbor; the War Department had requested and Congress passed a measure known as the Property Seizure Act. The committee of the House that was then known as the Committee on Military Affairs, in its report on the bill, commented on an amendment to the act that forbade registration or requisition of privately owned firearms:

The amendment provides in substance that nothing contained in the bill shall be construed to authorize the President or require the registration of firearms possessed by an individual for his personal protection or sport . . . and that the act shall not impair or infringe the right of an individual to keep and bear arms. . . . in view of the fact that certain totalitarian and dictatorial nations are now engaged in the willful and wholesale destruction of personal rights and liberties, your committee deems it appropriate for the Congress to expressly state that the proposed legislation shall not be construed to impair or infringe the constitutional right of the people to bear arms. In so doing it will be manifest that, although the Congress deems it expedient to grant certain extraordinary powers to the Executive in furtherance of the common defense during critical times, there is no disposition on the part of this Government to depart from the concepts and principles of personal rights and liberties expressed in our Constitution.

Then, in 1963, an amendment, section 33, was added to the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, which read:

Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any policy or action by any Government Agency which would interfere with, restrict, or prohibit the acquisition, possession or use of firearms by an individual for the lawful purposes of personal defense, sport, recreation, education or training.

Incidentally, the constitutions of 35 States have sections on firearms; most of them read much like the second amendment. Indiana's Constitution, article I, section 32, says:

The people shall have a right to bear arms, for the defense of themselves and the state.

I would also like to point out that the most recent Supreme Court ruling dealing with firearms laws, a decision handed down on January 29, 1968, with only one dissent—Chief Justice Warren's—and only one Justice—Justice Marshall—not participating, dealt with registration, something now zealously sought by the administration.

In the case of Haynes against United States, the defendant, Haynes, had been prosecuted under the National Firearms Act for having an unregistered sawed-off shotgun. On appeal, Haynes' attorney argued to the Supreme Court that the mandatory registration requirement under one section of the act meant he would be incriminating himself under another section.

The Supreme Court agreed. From the Court's decision:

We hold that a proper claim of the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination provides a full defense to prosecutions either for failure to register a firearm under #5841 or for possession of an unregistered firearm under #5851.

The implication of this ruling is clear but seems not to have been taken into account by those asking for mandatory registration—and would the Court hold the same thing would apply to required licensing as well?

A request for a registration law, with penalties for failure to comply, is a request for a law that has already been held to be unconstitutional.

There is, then, definitely a constitutional guarantee of the "right to keep and bear arms" and neither the Congress, the executive, nor the judiciary have any basis for infringing on this right.

THE TRUTH ABOUT GUNS AND ACCIDENTS

Now, how about the assertion that firearms are a major menace to every American, and a prime cause of accidents? Travelers Insurance Co. ranked firearms and shooting sports 15th on the list of sports or recreations most likely to cause accident; guns ran far behind swimming, boating, bicycling, and golf, to name four. Based on the accident rate for 1966, considering the danger of death by guns, you are 20 times more likely to die in a traffic accident, eight times more likely to die in a fall, 3½ times more likely to die by fire, and three times more likely to drown. Your chances of dying by gun are just a little bit higher than your chances of dying by a machinery accident or by poisoning.

"NO GUNS, NO CRIME" IS FALSE ARGUMENT

Let us look at the next charge, that the gun problem is getting worse, and that restrictive and repressive gun laws will cut down the crime and murder rate, and stem the tide of violence.

The preamble to a highly restrictive firearms bill now pending before the Congress begins by saying:

The Congress hereby finds and declares—That the ease with which any person can acquire firearms . . . is a significant factor in the prevalence of lawlessness and violent crime in the United States. That there is a causal relationship between the easy availability of firearms and juvenile and youthful behavior.

Not one word of this is true; Congress has found no such thing and passage of a measure with such a beginning would be a complete fabrication.

For the country overall, firearms ownership has gone up steadily since 1910 and the rate of guns used in homicides has been going down. There were 3,243,370 serious crimes committed in the United States in 1966, and handguns were used in 3.4 percent of these. Rifles and shotguns were used in 0.005 percent.

The grand total of all crimes in 1966—not including traffic offenses—was over 31 million. Serious crimes involving handguns came to 0.0035 percent of the total; rifles and shotguns to 0.0005 percent. If all handguns were completely eliminated and no substitutes were available to a criminal, we would still have 96.6 percent of our serious crime and 99.6 percent of total crime. If all rifles and shotguns were eliminated, as well, there would still be 99.5 percent serious crime, 99.9 percent of all crime.

What has happened when exceedingly strict laws are adopted? Consider New York City's "Sullivan law," probably the

tightest in the entire United States. In 1930, New York City issued 6,363 "premises" pistol permits and 28,295 carrying permits. By 1966, premises permits were cut to 282; carrying permits to 18,256. New York City has 43 percent of the total population of New York State, and it also has 74 percent of the State's murders, 82 percent of its aggravated assaults, and 90 percent of its robberies. At the Appalachian "crime convention" in 1967, 12 of the 35 New York State residents arrested by the the police were "clean" under the law; they had permits for the pistols they were carrying.

California strengthened its firearms law in July 1965; the then-Governor Pat Brown, said as he signed the bill:

The California firearms laws, even before the passage of this new legislation, were among the best in the Nation. These measures strengthen them significantly.

Sirhan Sirhan, Senator Robert Kennedy's killer, broke three sections of this law; he was an alien, possessing a pistol; he was carrying it concealed without a license; the pistol was also stolen.

In 1966, according to the latest figures available, Wyoming had the highest rate of gun ownership of any State in the Union; 36,991 per 100,000 people. Wyoming's rate of serious crime, per 100,000 people, was 1,080. In contrast, Hawaii had the lowest gun ownership rate—961 per 100,000—but a serious crime rate of 2,077.1 per 100,000, almost double that of Wyoming.

WE MUST APPLY AND ENFORCE THE LAWS WE HAVE

Do we really need more laws? There are today no less than 20,000 firearms laws—State, Federal, and local—in the books in this country. More laws, or better enforcement?

Enforcement on the Federal level of those already in existence has been lax, to put it mildly. There was a 30-year gap between passage of the Federal Firearms Act and the first indictment brought under its section forbidding mail-order sales of firearms in violation of local laws. There is also on the books, and has been for 10 years, a Federal law aimed at switchblade knives but to date there have been only 17 convictions under this statute.

When Martin Luther King was killed, the Attorney General said the killer "may not have been able to have bought that rifle at that time with impunity" if there had been stronger laws. There was a law already in existence—it is in title 15, United States Code, section 902(f) that plainly 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 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.

James Earl Ray, the man now charged with King's murder, being a fugitive from justice—having escaped from prison—was, under the terms of this statute, forbidden to buy the rifle. But

he did so, "with impunity," to quote the Attorney General, and no law on the books would have kept him from a rifle if he wanted to get one.

The Attorney General, in testimony before the Congress, cited two commonly used figures on firearms. One statement, that since 1900, 750,000 people have died by firearms, was made out of whole cloth; the FBI did not begin to compile data on this category of deaths until 1961. The other is that 17,000 Americans were killed by guns in 1965. Clark said most of the 17,000 were due to criminal acts, which is false—5,634 were homicides—and that of the 750,000, most were due to accidents. How could he say that when the 750,000 figure, itself, is false?

The Attorney General's performance has left a good deal to be desired when it comes to carrying out his responsibilities as the Nation's chief law-enforcement officer. He has said he sees no crime wave in this country. He has spent much of his time telling Congress why laws on the books could not or should not be enforced. As a result of this, the Attorney General was quite literally "written out" of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1967, when it went through the Congress. Authority for running the anticrime program was specifically given to the individual States. As I said at the time, it was a vote of "no confidence" in the Attorney General by the Congress.

Recently, in June 1968, the Attorney General said the Federal Government would refuse to use the wiretap authority recently granted in the omnibus crime bill "except in national security cases." The Washington, D.C., Star responded with a lead editorial on July 3, 1968, saying:

If there is such a thing as a blue ribbon for inconsistency and nonsense in the field of law enforcement it should be pinned on the lapel of Attorney General Ramsey Clark. Or perhaps he should share the award with his superior, Lyndon B. Johnson.

It would seem that before the administration goes off in mad pursuit of new legislation, it would give a little time and attention to enforcing what it now has. The administration cannot say that what is already there is inadequate, for the simple reason what is there has not been used. If the Department of Justice is going to be selective and pick and choose before it does enforce the laws Congress writes, then there is good reason to believe the Department does not know what it needs and would not know what to do with it if it were to be given.

FIREARMS OWNER NOT A POTENTIAL KILLER

Does the availability of guns lead to murder? Again, the answer is no. A study of 588 criminal homicides in Philadelphia for the period January 1, 1948, to December 31, 1952, by the Chairman of the Department of Sociology at the University of Pennsylvania said in part:

It is probably safe to contend that many homicides occur only because there is sufficient motivation or provocation, and that the type of method used to kill is merely an accident of availability; that a gun is used because it is in the offender's possession at the time of incitement, but that if it were not present, he would use a knife to stab, or fists to beat his victims to death . . . It is the contention of this observer that

few homicides due to shooting could be avoided merely if a firearm were not immediately present, and that the offender would select some other weapon to achieve the same destructive goal.

In 1960, the California Department of Justice, Bureau of Criminal Statistics, made a study of 640 homicides in that State for that year:

One of the clear conclusions of this research is that the mere availability of weapons lethal enough to produce a human mortality bear no major relationship to the frequency with which this act is completed. In the home, at work, at play, in almost any environmental setting a multitude of objects exist providing means for inflicting illegal death. Though the true number of times criminal homicide was attempted during 1960 cannot be known, and in spite of improved medical services, it is undoubtedly much more reasonable to conclude that the low yearly incidence of unlawful slayings is largely the product of human inhibitions to kill.

The Senate majority leader told the U.S. Senate on June 10, 1968 that—

Again, I want to repeat, so that the issue can be set forth in perspective, that we can pass all the gun laws in the country and still not prevent people from getting shot. Gun laws, no matter how stringent, are not the answers and are not a cure-all and we all had better face up to that fact. The answer lies in a sense of responsibility, parental control, more and better trained police, improvement of environmental conditions, obedience to the law, and less protection for the criminal and more protection for the innocent. There is too much lawlessness, disrespect and irresponsibility today, and as far as guns are concerned every weapon in the country could be seized and confiscated, but we would still have the problem of guns of a crude type which could be manufactured at home, could be used with deadly accuracy, and they could kill.

Criminal elements wanting guns do not walk into the store, put down their money, give personal data on themselves and be fingerprinted and wait 3 days—as Indiana law requires for handguns. They do just what was tried in Indianapolis recently, as described in the following opening sentence from a story in the Indianapolis Star of June 27, 1968:

An Indianapolis policeman who infiltrated a gang which called itself the Black Panthers here testified yesterday he was with three gang members when they tried to break into the United States Marine Corps Training Center in an effort to steal firearms.

And if someone wants guns badly enough to steal them from the Marines, there is nothing that will stop them from trying to get them.

Gunowners, hunters, sportsmen, collectors, shooters—as a group, they are probably the most law abiding in the entire United States. They know their avocation well; they go to great lengths to strengthen, protect, and use it wisely and carefully. Probably the most outrageous distortion in the entire antifirearms campaign is the one that pictures a gunowner as a potential killer or menace to his community.

SHOULD WE FOLLOW EXAMPLE OF OTHER COUNTRIES?

How valid is the "other country" argument, that points to other countries where gun controls are so strict as to virtually prohibit any sort of private gun-

ownership, notes their relatively lower homicide-by-firearms rate, and says the same sort of restrictions should be applied to the United States? Unfortunately, the comparison does not end merely by comparing laws and statistics: I have never been overly impressed by this "other country" argument when applied to anything that someone wishes to put into effect here, and firearms laws are no exception.

The President's message of June 24, 1968, entitled "The People's Right to Protection," in which he asked for registration and licensing, cited the Netherlands, Japan, England, West Germany, Italy, Canada, and Belgium as examples which, by inference, should be followed by the United States.

Japan and England are the cases most frequently cited. In Japan, no one may possess handguns except police, military, 50 Olympic marksmen and a few Government research agencies. Japan's reported homicide rate is 0.04 per 100,000—that of the United States is 2.7. But what else does Japan have in the way of law enforcement and criminal justice besides strict gun laws?

Tokyo is the world's largest city, with 11 million people; it has narrow, badly lighted streets, poor housing, little privacy, a low standard of living, and life for the residents is, by our standards, miserable. Here are all the conditions for a truly explosive, crime-ridden situation—but in the last 10 years Tokyo's population has increased 50 percent while the crime rate has dropped one-third. Why?

Consider the Japanese themselves: a homogeneous people with no racial problems or tensions. Oriental mentality and resignation more readily accepts uncomfortable and depressing surroundings and circumstances. Respect for authority—from the family right on up—is traditional in Japan; political agitators get permits before holding protest demonstrations. Family pride and honor, another centuries-old tradition, is still very strong. Respect for work is high; there are few "problem families" who make a living from welfare from one generation to the next.

With this for a background, consider the police system. Most people in Tokyo live no further than one-half mile from small police stations; officers, using this station as a base, patrol the area 24 hours a day, on foot or bicycle. Twice a year, each family in the area is visited and the dossier on every single Japanese citizen, that follows him through life wherever he goes, is updated by the authorities. This file is complete—it is kept on everybody and covers everything. If such a thing were ever to be introduced into America, it would very likely cause a revolution.

Also, 93.6 percent of all major crimes reported are solved. A prisoner has a right to a lawyer from the moment of his arrest; the state provides counsel if he is indigent. He may refuse to answer any question, and a guilty verdict cannot be obtained on the strength of a confession alone.

However, the suspect may be detained 48 hours by the police before he is turned over to the prosecutor. The prosecutor

may hold him another 24 hours, and can with little trouble get 20 days' additional detention. Fewer than half of all applications for bail are granted; habeas corpus writs in criminal cases are unknown; only about 15 percent of the verdicts are appealed to the next highest court. Convictions are obtained in 95 percent of all criminal cases brought to trial.

England has a homicide rate of 0.05. British weapons legislation dates to the 14th century; licensing of guns started in 1870. All firearms are registered with the police, and in effect, permission to own a gun is granted only to supervised members of Britain's 4,500 gun clubs or to farmers who need guns to control pests.

But British criminal law has always been very hard on lawbreakers. In 1967, in an interview in the United States, Britain's chief law-enforcement officer said:

I think there may be more concern in (Britain) at the moment about the danger of the guilty getting off than there is in the United States.

Until quite recently, under British law, if two men were involved in a crime and one killed the victim, then the killer in turn lost his life during police pursuit, the second man would be charged as equally responsible for the killing and tried for it. And hanged.

Let us look for a minute at the situation in the United States when it comes to bringing criminals to justice, both in overall statistics and in one specific locality. In our country at large, only one lawbreaker in eight is tried and convicted; of all persons arrested in 1966, 76 percent were repeat offenders. Of 18,000 convicts released in 1963, 55 percent were rearrested for new offenses by June 30, 1966.

For a specific locality, consider the following in the District of Columbia; bear in mind that in the Nation's Capital three out of every four armed robberies are not solved.

In Washington, from January 1966 through the first 6 months of 1968, the 47 drugstores of a certain chain were held up 63 times, and burglarized 148 times. In these 63 robberies, there were arrests in 16 cases—25 percent. Only three of the 16 ever came to trial; the delays in two of the trials—both of which ended in acquittal—were 7 and 12 months respectively because of court backlogs. The third trial led to conviction, but it took 13 months because the defendant jumped bond and could not be found. Five cases still await trial. Three have been pending 15 months or longer.

Over one-third of the 17 adult defendants in the 16 cases where arrests were made were on probation or out on bond awaiting trial in other cases when they were arrested for robbing the drugstores. Both of the juveniles arrested for these robberies escaped from the District Receiving Home. One is still at large; the other was rearrested for three robberies and a murder committed after his escape. One adult defendant is presently an escapee. Three others jumped bond and were not found until they were rearrested for other crimes.

The idea is that "we should not get tough" to meet the threat of crime, but

the chief of police in Miami, Fla., did just that. He sent patrolmen armed with shotguns and dogs into crime-ridden neighborhoods, told them to freely use the city's "stop and frisk" ordinance, and also said:

When the looting starts, the shooting starts.

In the first month after this, strong-arm robberies dropped 62 percent in Miami's Negro neighborhoods and 45 percent for the entire city. Police brutality? Hardly. The Chief's actions were applauded by the Negro residents and storekeepers; one said:

Let him use lions if it'll keep crime down!

One more word about Britain's example of keeping a disarmed populace, the example the administration says would be good for us to follow.

It was 1940; Hitler had driven deep into France and Belgium and pushed the British Army into the evacuation at Dunkirk. The next move was Hitler's; Operation Sea Lion, a cross-channel invasion of England, had been planned and drawn up. Britain's Home Guard was defenseless; there were barely enough rifles for the Army, and the Home Guards were being armed with spears, pikes, and clubs.

An appeal was made to the United States to hunters, shooters, and sportsmen to voluntarily contribute their weapons, to be sent to England to arm the Home Guard. The appeal was for private firearms, from private individuals; at the time, no one thought of making a statement like the following which was in the President's June 24 message asking for registration and licensing of guns:

Last year more than 3 million guns were added to private stocks, building a massive arsenal which arms the murderer and the robber" (italics supplied).

So American hunters, shooters, and sportsmen responded to meet the urgent, critical need of an ally that stood in danger of invasion. No one knows how many thousands of guns were sent, freely, and with no question or hesitation. We do know, though, that even though Operation Sea Lion was never carried out, thanks to the generosity of American firearms owners Hitler would have met an armed and ready island.

One sad footnote to this: At the end of World War II, the British collected all these guns from the Home Guard. To return them to the United States? No—they were destroyed.

Who can say this will never happen again—to Britain, or to our country? In 1960, the man who is now Vice President of the United States and is seeking the nomination for President on the Democratic ticket had this to say about such a possibility:

Certainly one of the chief guarantees of freedom under any government, no matter how popular and respected, is the right of the citizen to keep and bear arms. This is not to say that firearms should not be very carefully used, and that definite safety rules of precaution should not be taught and enforced. But the right of the citizen to bear arms is just one more guarantee against arbitrary government, one more safeguard against a tyranny which now appears to be remote in America, but which historically has proved to be always possible.

I would not find fault with one word in that statement and neither would any gunowner I know. It speaks for itself.

GUNOWNERS HAVE A RIGHT TO BE HEARD

Organizations whose members are writing in support of the right to keep personal firearms without undue, repressive restrictions are being attacked—along with their members—as being part of a sinister and ominous "gun lobby" that is standing in the way of what, so it is said, an overwhelming majority of the people want. The implication is that the organizations have no right to speak on a major national issue. But let us see what Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas said about this in January 1963:

Fear of assassination often produces restraints compatible with dictatorship, not democracy. . . . We have a Bill of Rights designed to keep government out of private domains. But the fences have been broken down; and machinery to restore them has been denied. The Bill of Rights—with the judicial gloss it has acquired—plainly is not adequate to protect the individual against the growing bureaucracy. He faces a formidable opponent in government, even when he is endowed with funds and with courage. The individual is almost certain to be plowed under, unless he has a well-organized active political group to speak for him. The church is one. The press is another. The union is a third. But if a powerful sponsor is lacking, individual liberty withers—in spite of glowing opinions and resounding constitutional phrases.

ADMINISTRATION'S ANTIGUN ACTIONS "PETTY"

The executive branch of the Government has already begun to move and some of its actions can only be described as petty. In November 1967, the support of the Department of the Army for the national rifle and pistol matches at Camp Perry, Ohio, were canceled due to "economy" reasons. At the time, I called this what it was: "A form of savage reprisal taken against a large segment of the American people because the administration's gun control legislation had not passed the Congress."

I did not know it at the time, and neither did anyone else, but it was just a foretaste of what was to come.

On June 12, 1968, the Postmaster General issued an order that all guns shipped by parcel post must be labeled "firearms." He also ordered all postmasters not to deliver any package with such a label to the addressee until the chief law-enforcement official in the locality had been notified. Existing law against shipping pistols and revolvers by mail was gratuitously extended in this decree to apply to sawed-off rifles and shotguns. The Post Office Department itself admitted it had no power to enforce the labeling order. Where, then, was the authority to make the rule?

An editorial in the June 15, 1968 Indianapolis Star summed it up:

While it appears that this effort will be of limited effectiveness, the making of law by administrative decree is a very serious matter. The Constitution vests the legislative power solely in Congress. The Constitution therefore is seriously eroded if the Executive Branch can make law and make it stick."

Then, on June 21, 1968, the Department of the Army announced that Government aid would be ended to pistol clubs, and assistance in the future would

be limited only to those clubs whose members still have their military service obligations ahead of them, and this under the strictest of rules. "Whose marksmanship training would be of greatest value to the military services," was a phrase in the order; I wonder who let that slip through, because for years antigun forces have consistently said the marksmanship training program was of no conceivable military value. Now it is admitted to have some value.

THE CLIMATE OF HYSTERIA

Many times more lives are snuffed out in auto accidents or from drowning than by firearms. Does anyone talk of abolishing automobiles? Or of prohibiting boating and swimming? Of course not—that would be silly. Our schools and public service organizations, instead, cooperate and put heavy stress on driver training and traffic safety, on teaching every child to swim, and water and boat safety.

Can we ever hope to completely wipe out the toll of traffic deaths and those caused by engaging in water sports? Again, of course not, but through these training and safety courses, we do know we have cut down on their numbers.

Cannot the same consideration be extended to the 20 million Americans who enjoy shooting sports? Every gun organization and club I know of—and there are literally thousands of clubs and their affiliates in the United States—sponsors, conducts, staffs, and supports training and safety courses in firearms. For some reason, this does not seem to make any difference. Just ban the guns.

There is simply a major, concerted attempt to panic and stampede the Congress and, in the process, thoroughly frighten, confuse and mislead the American people as to just what issues are involved in this matter. There is hysteria attached to this question, probably more than on any other that comes before the Congress. I remember after President Kennedy's assassination, in 1963, legislation was introduced that would require licensing of all persons who could mount telescopic sights on rifles. Anyone remotely familiar with rifles would have known that many of them sold today are already drilled and tapped for scope mounting; anyone who can use a screwdriver can mount the scope.

Yes, there is hysteria about it; there was hysteria in the letter I received saying quite flatly that if I did not vote for stricter gun controls my own life might be in danger, and that I might be assassinated in my own congressional district.

THE ULTIMATE AIM IS CONFISCATION

There is also hysteria, carried to its ridiculous extreme, for example, in the editorials of the Washington Post. This paper ran in 1965 a series of 77 consecutive editorials, for 11 weeks straight, calling for rigid and repressive firearms controls. It is back at work again; on June 7, 1968, on the same day this paper called the omnibus Crime bill a "repressive, punitive, authoritarian measure," it had this to say—in which it revealed its true feelings about firearms; namely, confiscation:

Regarding pistols and revolvers, the control should be just as rigid as possible. No one ought to be allowed to possess one of these weapons, designed only for the killing or maiming of human beings, unless he is a member of the military, a law-enforcement officer or an individual whose peculiar occupation and circumstances require him, in the judgment of the police, to possess a handgun for self-protection.

In short, private sale of these weapons should be ended. Everyone now possessing a pistol or revolver should be required to turn it in to police authorities by a fixed date—with just compensation, of course. Licensed shooting galleries and clubs may be allowed to keep such guns under stringent controls for target shooting purposes. . . .

Possession of sporting rifles and shotguns should be limited strictly to law-abiding, responsible adults; and every one of these weapons should be registered, along with all sales of ammunition for them. Regulations should be formulated also for the responsible handling of these firearms, requiring that they be kept unloaded and disassembled except when being employed at appropriate places for target shooting or hunting. Better still, perhaps, they should be kept, as in Japan, at gun clubs where they can be obtained by their owners when actually needed for sport. . . .

And the magazine the New Republic, in the issue of June 29, 1968, referring to the omnibus crime bill, said:

It should have been vetoed. * * * the popular mood as reflected by the Congress is anxious, punitive and shortsighted.

But 1 week before, in the June 22, 1968, issue, an article entitled "The Kind of Gun Control We Need" said:

Put simply, private citizens should be disarmed. A modest effort in this direction would include the following first steps: No person should be permitted to buy or possess a hand gun or ammunition for any hand gun. Possession of all automatic or semi-automatic firearms should be banned. So should all rifles. However, licenses for the purchase of shotguns for sporting purposes could be obtained from the local police chief who would be required to enforce certain Federal standards. * * * The Defense Department should be directed to grind up all firearms. * * * Such measures should be accompanied by others to disarm the police of lethal weapons. Their casual use of these weapons merely invites response in kind.

Just who is getting "anxious, punitive, and shortsighted?"

The aim is confiscation and all the hypocritical talk to the contrary cannot disguise it. If not outright confiscation by fiat, as the above two statements call for, then it will be slow and insidious by making firearms ownership a burden too heavy to bear. This last tactic is already being considered in some metropolitan areas, that are talking about imposing registration/licensing fees of \$50 per year per weapon.

In conclusion, I wish to add two editorials from the Indianapolis News and two from the Indianapolis Star on the subject of gun control, plus my own recent newsletter on the question of violence. The Congress must legislate and put new laws on the books only under the following conditions:

First. When new laws are really needed, because old ones are unworkable; not merely because old ones have never been enforced;

Second, to meet specific objectives and

not be detracted by "red herring" legislation;

Third, only after sound arguments have been advanced, and rational judgment has been employed, free of taint of fear and hysteria;

Fourth, within the framework of the Constitution; some rights cannot be guaranteed if legislation takes other rights away; and

Fifth, only if it can be unequivocally and unquestionably said that the new laws, considered in the context of our history, our heritage, our role in the world, our people as a whole, are really what would be best for the United States and its citizens.

The drive for more gun laws is a drive that will never really stop until the ultimate, extreme goal of total personal firearms confiscation, and total civilian disarmament, has been attained. Total law-abiding civilian disarmament and confiscation; there is a real distinction to be made, as surely no one is so naive to believe that the criminal will voluntarily surrender his weapons, or will voluntarily cease his attempts to get them in any way he can.

The analogy with the prohibition era, often made, is quite accurate. Liquor was branded a vice and a menace to the country. Ban it; all problems will be solved. That was the argument and that was the solution attempted. To name something a vice, arbitrarily, and just as arbitrarily move against it, hastily, roughshod, without adequate consideration of the short- and long-range factors involved, is not a way to legislate on anything.

The method was counterproductive in the case of prohibition, to put it mildly. It resulted only in giving organized crime yet another opening and another source of illegal gains. As it happened then with liquor, it could—and would—happen again with firearms, if the Congress would legislate on the matter without making sure the finished product met the requirements I have cited above.

And nothing now under serious consideration by the Congress comes close.

The editorials and the newsletter follow:

NEWSLETTER OF WILLIAM G. BRAY, SIXTH DISTRICT OF INDIANA, WEEK OF JULY 14 TO JULY 20, 1968

The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse—War, Famine, Pestilence and Death—those symbolic yet grim apparitions representing the scourges of mankind, have been joined by a Fifth Horseman in their cataclysmic route across the span of human existence. This Fifth Horseman is Violence.

Unrestricted to the battlefield, it is the force that almost brought civil war (in France); meant slaughter of hundreds of thousands in domestic upheaval (Red China and Indonesia); crippled and almost halted operation of great universities (United States); sent pillars of fire and smoke curling upwards from major cities (United States again); and, yet once more for our own country, has given rise to personal fears for personal safety that has left streets, parks and public places deserted after nightfall.

What to do about it?

Appoint a commission and study it? This was the Administration's reaction immediately after Senator Robert Kennedy was murdered. The Commission was told last week, however, that collective violence is "by no means a uniquely American problem" and

is much worse in totalitarian nations around the world. "There are much higher levels of collective violence, . . . especially in Latin America, Asia and Africa," said a Princeton University professor. He told the Commission the United States stands about 40th when collective violence in the world's 114 largest countries is considered.

A note for those who maintain restrictive firearms laws cut down on violence: he also told the Commission that France, Italy and Belgium, all of which have gun laws that can only be called repressive, ". . . have as much, if not more, violence than the United States."

Buy off potential trouble sources? Last week, in New York City, to quote from the New York Times of July 11, 1968:

"An angry crowd of 1,500 youngsters protesting cutbacks in summer job programs erupted into violence outside City Hall yesterday. Some of the youngsters smashed six automobiles parked outside City Hall, hurled rocks, bottles and broken glass at the police and looted frankfurter wagons and newsstands in the area. At the height of the disturbance, bands of youngsters fanned out from City Hall Park, smashed several windows in the nearby Woolworth Building, and knocked down and robbed a 50-year-old woman assistant to New York State's Secretary of State. . . . Willie J. Smith, the bearded \$18,000-a-year director of the city's Neighborhood Youth Corps (was) angry at being unable to see a high-ranking member of the Lindsay administration. 'Violence—that's the only thing this city understands,' he declared. . . ."

New York City's Mayor John Lindsay, quoted in the same story, responded with: "The disgraceful demonstration at City Hall has substantially set back these efforts and maybe killed any hope. If so, the young men of the city who are jobless this summer can place responsibility on the leaders of this demonstration who already have jobs."

The temptation, and usual practice, to blame such things on a stingy, negligent, cold-hearted Congress cannot be invoked this time. In a companion story, in the same issue of the Times, we find the following: "Mr. Wirtz," of course, refers to the U.S. Secretary of Labor: "In his four-paragraph telegram, Mr. Wirtz pointedly reminded Mr. Lindsay that the city had not appropriated any money for the Youth Corps, which received \$5.2 million in city aid last year."

Blame it on an inanimate object, like the gun? This approach has been revived by everyone from the Administration on down. Oddly enough, it has its roots probably going back to the very dawn of man. It is known as "deodand," a legal term meaning, according to Webster, "any property instrumental in a person's death and consequently forfeited to the crown, to be used for some pious purpose."

The great American jurist Oliver Wendell Holmes commented on "deodand" in his book "The Common Law." Writing of legal procedures in England at the time of Edward I (late 13th-early 14th centuries A.D.) he called its use examples of ". . . barbarian laws at their rudest stage. If a man fell from a tree, the tree was deodand. If he drowned in a well, the well was to be filled up. It did not matter that the forfeited instrument belonged to an innocent person." In a contemporary, milder form, this is equivalent to a child stubbing his toe on a rock, then blaming the rock for being in his way.

Blame it on the examples of violence in television and in the movies? I find a curious double standard here. The same persons who say TV and movies encourage violence are generally the first to defend the so-called "new wave" of films—many of which are nothing less than obscene and pornographic by any moral code the world has ever known—as shining examples of "freedom of speech and expression."

I have cited these points to show how prevalent, and how much easier it is, to look for new excuses rather than own up to past mistakes, which same mistakes are still not only being committed but compounded.

Giving tacit approval to what began as "civil disobedience," a dangerous and ambiguous terms in any vocabulary, as a ploy to win bloc votes or as an excuse to refrain from enforcing the laws of the country, and making it clear the process of change is through the legislatures and the courts, started it all. This encouraged those who can see no basic difference between taking part in an illegal demonstration or sit-in "because we want something" and pitching a brick through a jewelry store window, or shoving a gun over the counter, and taking a handful of watches, "because we want something." Our national leadership gave in, and when our country is flayed so hideously as a result, the moral courage to admit the errors of a few years ago, and attempt to reverse them, is simply not to be found.

John Wilkes Booth was protesting what he considered in his own demented mind to be an unjust situation. Just what was that television program he watched the night before he went to Ford's Theater?

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News, June 28, 1968]

WRONG WAY ON GUNS

President Johnson's proposal to impose further restrictions on the sale and ownership of firearms could seriously impair the ability of law-abiding citizens to defend themselves.

The crime rate in the United States has been on the increase since the end of World War II. Crimes of violence—assault and battery, rape, robbery and murder—have increased 1,000 per cent in the last 20 years. In the face of this development, how is the average citizen to defend himself, if and when he is attacked by a criminal?

Proponents of antigun legislation say we are no longer struggling on the frontier with survival dependent upon the sixgun and the repeating rifle. But the teeming asphalt jungles of our cities are in many ways more dangerous than anything our forefathers faced in settling this country.

Never before has there been so much lawlessness or a greater need for the citizen to defend himself against burglars, bandits and roving gangs of hoodlums who prey upon defenseless people. No conscientious American could object to the ban on mail-order sales of firearms as a means of reducing the number of weapons that fall into the hands of people bent upon violence. But to go beyond this would make it too difficult for citizens to protect life and property against an element which has no regard for law.

Instead of more laws, what is sorely needed is stricter enforcement of existing laws and heavier penalties for criminals who use weapons to terrorize, maim and kill.

[From the Indianapolis News, June 18, 1968]

ON GUN CONTROL

The renewed agitation for gun control demonstrates once more the ability of the liberal community to whip up public emotion on cue and to screen out issues which do not suit the liberal program.

The assassination of Senator Robert Kennedy should stir deep-going reflection about measures to control acts of criminal violence in our society. Permissiveness in dealing with anti-social behavior, recent decisions of the Supreme Court, exhortations to civil disobedience, laxness in dealing with revolutionary advocates of force, the breakdown of elementary morality—all these require some sober consideration.

In the liberal view, however, all such questions must be ignored. Public feeling should be riveted instead on a single subject—gun control. We must, cry a score of commenta-

tors, achieve a tough gun control law in order to quell the rising tide of violence in America. No other issue is mentioned. We must pass a rigid gun control law now and not turn aside to think about anything else.

This agitation is very curious. Firearms play a contributory role in the general advance of crime, and reasonable laws aimed at limiting this role should be considered. But the evidence across the board reveals that firearms do not cause crime; the urge to violence comes first, and the choice of weapons second. Homicide studies show that the will to murder is the central factor, and if a gun is not available a knife or a club or a broken bottle will be used.

Obviously, the root of the difficulty is the spreading belief that, if some one angers you, or you don't like "the system," or there is something you want that belongs to somebody else, you are justified in resorting to violence to fulfill your desires. In increasing numbers, people seem to believe they are entitled to resort to mayhem and murder and feel they have a reasonable prospect of getting away with it. It is only after that determination is made that the choice of weapons comes into play.

If the tide of violence is to be stemmed, we must get down to this level, where the original decision is made in favor of violence. This means imposing external restraints through the courts which severely penalize criminal actions, and inculcating internal restraints through education and example which can hold violent impulses in check. It means a new insistence upon discipline, self-restraint, and tough treatment of thugs and criminals.

These are conclusions, of course, which liberals find uncongenial. Since Supreme Court softness, repeal of capital punishment, attacks on the police, "civil disobedience," and general permissiveness are major products of liberalism itself, public rethinking of these issues would be hostile to the aspirations of the liberals. Could that be the reason they don't want to discuss anything but controlling guns?

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, June 27, 1968]

JOKER IN THE DECK

President Johnson has now asked Congress for a gun control law which would include provisions for confiscating guns from "persons considered unfit to own firearms."

The proposal is for registration of all firearms and licensing of all persons possessing them. Minimum standards for licensing would be set by Federal law, and pressure would be brought on the states—through threatened withholding of money from the Federal Wildlife and Conservation Trust Fund—to enact laws meeting those standards. The Federal law would be applied in states not complying.

The licensing requirements would prohibit gun possession by "alcoholics, narcotics addicts, convicted criminals, those considered mentally incompetent, and other persons considered unfit to own firearms."

This is exactly what is feared by many if not most of those who oppose sweeping gun control laws. There would be created the machinery with which government officials could decide which persons should not have guns—and seize guns from such persons.

It would be machinery by which all the people could be disarmed.

It would be a fine thing to keep guns out of the hands of criminals, if it could be done. It can't be done, however, by a law prohibiting criminals from possessing guns. If they were not already lawbreakers they would not be categorized as criminals.

We can see the wisdom of preventing possession of guns by persons legally adjudged to be mentally incompetent. Note that he said "legally adjudged," which is quite a dif-

ferent thing from being "considered" to be such.

Who can say what sort of persons might be "considered" to be mentally incompetent? Even more broadly, what sort of persons might for other reasons be "considered unfit" to possess firearms? The terms "alcoholic" and "narcotic addict" are broad and, in the absence of precise medical diagnosis, ambiguous.

This proposed law thus would set apart uncalculated numbers of people from whom police would be authorized to confiscate any guns they possessed, on the basis that they were "unfit" to have them.

Once this principle were established, the next step would be to authorize confiscation of guns from persons not having a satisfactory reason to own them.

Next would come the confiscation of guns from all persons not considered to need them. This would pretty well narrow the legal possession of guns down to those in the business of enforcing the law, guarding property or high officials, in the armed forces, and so on. The people at large would be disarmed.

After all this, the criminal still would not be disarmed. He would be reduced to stealing guns from government stores, but he would manage to do it. The unarmed people would be completely at his mercy.

This brings us to the rationale for such drastic gun control proposals as this one. The clamor for gun controls has arisen precisely because government has failed to protect the people effectively from the violence of armed lawbreakers. That is why it is logical to predict that the controls would be made more sweeping and more stringent, step by step, in pursuit of the vain effort to reach and disarm lawbreakers by this method.

Every time a firearm is used in violence, even if used only to threaten, the law is broken. What is needed is more effective enforcement of the laws against violence and the myriad assortment of other defined criminal acts.

That is the way to cut down the toll of murders and woundings, not only by shooting but by use of other weapons as well.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, June 19, 1968]

AIMING AT THE WRONG TARGET

A widespread outburst of calls for strong gun control law raises the possibility of unwise legislation passed in the heat of excitement. But worse than that it diverts attention from the real problem of murder and other crime and violence.

If new and stronger Federal gun laws are enacted, the pleaders for such laws and many other people will sit back with a sigh of relief, believing that a great victory has been won and Americans at last are saved from armed assailants.

It won't be so. As a matter of fact, strong new gun laws won't make much difference at all to murderers, armed robbers and thugs and such. The main difference it will make to them is that their victims will be somewhat less likely to be armed.

The current wave of enthusiasm for gun laws was touched off by the shooting of Senator Robert F. Kennedy. There has been much writing about the gun used by the alleged assassin. But in all the outpouring of words about the deed we saw no mention of how the alleged assassin arrived at the scene of the murder.

He probably came by automobile. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. also was murdered with a gun, a fact which started at that time a wave of demands for gun laws. An automobile used by the prime suspect figured very prominently in the presumed planning and execution of that killing, and in the killer's getaway.

The point we have been leading up to is that all automobiles are registered, and this

has been so for decades. They are prominently tagged with their registration numbers. Sales are regulated, and every transaction is noted in the official records. There are many laws regulating the ownership and use of them.

Every person who operates an automobile is required to be licensed. In most states the license is issued only after demonstration of fitness and ability to drive, which must be repeated periodically.

Has all of this regulation of automobiles prevented the use of them as tools of crime, or prevented accidental automobile deaths? Quite obviously it has not.

The automobile is an essential tool in many kinds of crime, and a common tool in almost all kinds, from murder on down. It is sometimes used as a murder weapon. It was reported the other day to the American Medical Association convention that more than 500 Americans are killed annually in high-speed auto chases of criminal suspects.

Do criminals have difficulty acquiring automobiles? Last year there were 436,561 officially recorded thefts of automobiles.

Last year 53,100 Americans, including 9,300 pedestrians, were killed in accidents involving motor vehicles.

Facts and figures plainly demonstrate that the registration and regulation of automobiles does not keep them out of the hands of criminals, nor of juveniles, drunkards, drug users or incompetents. Regulation of ownership and drivers probably does reduce accidents to some degree, though we have no way of knowing how much.

Similarly it cannot be expected that gun control laws will keep guns out of the hands of murderers and other criminals, nor put any effective damper on their activities or on violence involving guns.

Laws in themselves do not prevent crime. They are only instruments for punishing crime, thereby removing criminals from society and deterring would-be criminals by the threat of punishment. It is in the enforcement of laws—not in making them—that America has fallen short.

Efforts to regulate and control the tools of crime and violence are, in the main, digressions from the primary task of controlling criminals and perpetrators of violence. It is to this task that greatly intensified effort must be applied.

PRAISE FOR CHARLES H. SILVER

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it pleases me to share with the friends of Charles H. Silver, consultant to the mayor of the city of New York, the pleasure I received in reading the letter sent to him by the Minister for Foreign Affairs for the State of Israel, Abba Eban.

The text of the letter follows:

JERUSALEM,
May 22, 1968.

HON. CHARLES H. SILVER,
Municipal Building,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR CHARLES: During the recent visit home of our Consul General in New York, Mr. Michael Arnon, I had the opportunity of hearing from him again of your continued efforts and exertions on our behalf. With his return to New York I have asked him to forward this letter to you as an ex-

pression of my warm feelings and deep appreciation.

The recent untimely death of Cardinal Spellman reminded us all, if indeed such a reminder were necessary, of the truly yeoman service you have personally rendered to the cause of Israel through your articulate and informed spokesmanship of Israel's sovereign revival, the significance of its restored nationhood within the perspective of history, and the universal implication of its human drama.

Throughout the two decades of Israel's independent existence you have not only maintained your own steadfast support and devotion to our cause, but have spared no effort in canvassing sympathy and assistance in areas vital for Israel's welfare and progress.

It is with these thoughts in mind that I write these lines expressing sentiments that are shared. I know, by the Government and the people of Israel. Please accept the enclosed Victory Medal as a token of our friendship and appreciation.

With kindest personal regards,

Yours sincerely,

ABBA EBAN.

WHO'S HE KIDDING?

HON. JAMES V. SMITH

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, recent attempts by the Johnson-Humphrey administration to implement reduction in Federal spending is producing some rather interesting examples of misguidance and inefficiency. The elimination of Saturday mail for instance is in opposition to the will of the House of Representatives as witnessed by a vote taken on the matter recently, which was accomplished in full view of the fact that the Congress had raised postage rates.

There are many meaningful reductions in spending that can be made and at the same time eliminate questionable practices and duplication. A recent editorial by the Lawton Constitution, Lawton, Okla., addresses this matter most intelligently and I submit it for the RECORD for consideration by the Members of the House:

Who's He Kidding?

President Johnson reluctantly agreed to a \$6 billion reduction in federal spending in return for Congressional approval of a big tax increase to alleviate a mounting fiscal crisis. Now the time has come to make the cutbacks.

Predictably, the Administration in this election year is putting the economy knife into the bone and muscle where it hurts the most, rather than whacking away at the blubber evident in the welfare-poverty programs.

A prime example is the announced elimination of all Saturday mail deliveries in city residential areas, and the closing of nearly 350 fourth class post offices. By cutting where it hurts, the President is making a point that economy is being practiced.

However, a closer look at federal spending shows there is no cutback in the poverty programs where the Administration hopes to reap strong support for the Democrats at election time. Locally, the poverty board has just voted large pay boosts for administrative personnel, some as much as \$1,400 a year. Most increases amounted to 15 to 20 per

cent, almost unheard of in private industry. At the same time, complaints were being heard that poverty funds were not seeping down to the real needy.

President Johnson may fool some of the people by drastically reducing essential public services, but he will have a hard time convincing most voters of his sincerity when the "savings" obviously are being diverted to vote-producing programs.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1968

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. This year also marks the sad 28th anniversary of enslavement of Baltic nations by Soviet Russia. The Soviet Union invaded the Baltic States on June 15, 1940, and took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms. These three peace-loving republics have been suffering in Russian Communist slavery for 28 years.

Since 1940, when the U.S.S.R. incorporated into its territory the sovereign states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, the Soviets have hoped that the Baltic issue would gradually drift into oblivion. This has hardly been the case. The Baltic community in the free world has never ceased to keep world opinionmakers informed on the plight of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians living under the drab and regimented Soviet system.

During the past 28 years of Soviet overlordship, there have been periods of mass deportations, breaking up of families, and even outright genocide. In an attempt to integrate the Balts, the Soviets have initiated vigorous russification drives designed to thwart Baltic nationalism and eradicate the memory of the rich national heritage of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Fifty years ago, when proclaiming their independence, the Baltic States had high hopes of embarking upon a road toward a new destiny. These hopes were shattered by Soviet neocolonialism. The national quest for a form of government that would allow all citizens to live in dignity and enjoy personal freedom came to an abrupt end with Soviet occupation in 1940.

Yet the spirit of man cannot be shackled forever. This summer from July 14 to July 20 millions of Americans and East Central Europeans again observe Captive Nations Week. I join with the many Americans whose homeland lies in these Baltic States in marking those two anniversaries—one bright and one dark.

These Americans who are descendants of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, many of whom reside in my district in Chicago, have become great citizens of this Republic. Through their spirit and heritage, they have contributed to the American democracy.

I join with free men everywhere in praying that the liberty of their homeland may soon be restored to them.

THE MYTH OF THE SCHOOL OF FOREIGN SERVICE

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, next October marks the beginning of the 50th anniversary year of the school of foreign service at Georgetown University. As the Nation's oldest institution for the training of men and women for careers in both diplomacy and trade, this school has produced an impressive number of graduates.

Presently the administration and faculty of the school are conducting an intensive examination of its curriculum. Calling upon the country at large to assist them in this, they have had publicized various articles offering different suggestions as to improvements in the school.

Mr. Donald P. Panzera, a member of the academic committee of the school of foreign service, has written a provocative and knowledgeable essay in which he argues that a school is more than a name, a building, and a catalog. It must provide an education and the quality of its graduates is the test of its effectiveness as an institution of learning.

The first student to enroll in the school of foreign service, Hon. Harry Sandager, later became a Republican Member of Congress from Rhode Island. For years the teacher of American Government in the school was the Honorable David I. Walsh, U.S. Senator from Massachusetts. For decades the school has had a close and fruitful relationship with our Nation's Government. Because of the significance of this development in the history of the school of foreign service, not only to other colleges and universities with international affairs programs but also to those intending to prepare themselves for service abroad, I place the article, which appeared in the March issue of the *Courier*, in the *RECORD*, as follows:

THE MYTH OF THE SCHOOL OF FOREIGN SERVICE

(By Don Panzera)

Hanging above the main entrance to the building that bears his name, partially hidden by large white pillars, is the "Edmund A. Walsh Memorial." That Father Walsh is now dead has been fairly well substantiated, but rumors persist that the school that he founded lives on. These rumors are hearsay and therefore inadmissible as proper evidence of the existence of the so-called "Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service." Some students have discovered rumors that the alleged School is contemplating the revision of its curriculum. Similar rumors appeared last year, and now the smart money is saying that curriculum reform can't be hurried through the sacred halls of procedure before 1973. Since those students now have so much money riding on the value of their education, and since the curriculum does have bearing on the quality of that education, they decided to pursue the latest rumors as far as possible. The following is based on their findings.

The School of Foreign Service is a myth, existing only in the minds of a few administrators and students unwilling to face the fact that they attend a non-school. There

was a time when the School did indeed exist, the time when it earned a reputation difficult to kill and made it impossible to lay away without arousing violent protest. But the difficult is being achieved and the protestors are being checked. In 1960, the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools made the following observations about the SFS:

"The most troublesome question is whether this unit is really a school at all; or whether it is a kind of social science major that in most cases spans three departments . . . the School of Foreign Service has no faculty of its own, no library of its own, no admissions policy of its own, not even a building or reading room exclusively its own.

" . . . the terminology of school, dean, directors, chairmen, and majors does not, in its present context, fully reflect the actual operations and practice . . . If the school is to regain its former prestige, someone must have the authority to develop its curriculum, its university status, its admissions policy, and its public relations."

Certainly the situation has not improved in the past eight years of confusion and drift. In some ways the Dean's Office has been reduced to the status of University VP in charge of add-drops. The Dean must bargain with the famed "feudal barons" in the departments. It is generally acknowledged that the departments are oriented toward liberal arts variety majors leading to graduate degrees in that particular major. Of course there is no "International Affairs" department, and faculty who identify with that major are hold-overs from the Walsh era and very much out of favor today.

The question remains to be answered, what is a school without a faculty, without a bank account, a library, admissions policy, or building of its own? Before the Anschluss with the College in 1951 it had all these things except a building, and it had the money to build one. The School's relation to Georgetown University consisted of the fact that it granted a degree under the University charter and rented space from the University for its classrooms, etc. Since 1951, the School has come under the domination of the central administration and the autonomous faculty departments. The department chairmen, for instance, hire faculty members, assign them to courses, and even determine the syllabi of SFS courses (by way of the teacher of that course). A personally effective Dean can often get his way about what goes on in his school, but he must get the approval of department chairmen and the Academic Vice President of the University to make meaningful changes. Father Fitzgerald's proposed reform, by which the departments of history, government, and economics would come somewhat under supervision of the SFS Dean has been allowed to die a slow, unnoticed death. The departments opposed the change.

The School of Foreign Service today lacks the institutional power and, more importantly, it lacks the will to effect substantial reform. It sits in Nevils passing into history.

Who speaks for the School of Foreign Service? Those who should direct the School deny that a problem exists. Their chief concern at the moment is coming up with satisfactory answers to the pesky questions the Middle States will ask when it returns in 1970. The idea that the Middle States intends to help the school evaluate its education seems to have slipped by unnoticed. The fact that Freshmen are bored or disgusted, probably both, raises no question of self-evaluation in their minds. The problem must lie with the Freshmen.

Who speaks for the School of Foreign Service? It has no faculty, and the few teachers around who still identify with the School have cried out from the wilderness and have been mostly ignored. There are

other teachers who are important to the School because of the positions they hold in their departments. At least one of these would like to burn the School down. If he can find a school to burn down, more power to him!

Do the students speak for their school? The students, who are "organized" into that absurd historical accident known as the "East Campus Student Council?" Does that social events mediation board speak for the SFS students?

Yet amid all the ambiguities and hierarchical claptrap, there is the matter of rumors of curriculum reform. The issue of curriculum reform appeared last year and was properly subdued lest anything dangerous happen because of all the excitement. This year it was promised that a faculty curriculum committee would be formed to consider the matter. Five months later the committee has not yet been appointed. The economics department has done all manner of wondrous things considering curriculum reform, but the history department has received no notice that any reform is being contemplated. It is understood that this sort of thing must not be rushed. In fact, the latest rumor is that nothing will be done before 1973, even if every last Freshman dies of boredom. Due process and all.

As Dean Sebes pointed out last May, there can be no piecemeal revision of the curriculum. Since that time, however, the distinction between East Campus and College English sections has been eliminated. The SFS requirement of Freshman logic has been changed to read "Philosophy and Logic," and of course no aspiring philosophy teacher is going to bother with something as mundane as logic. Recently the SFS required course of U.S. Constitution and Government has been made interchangeable with the College American Government course by the government department and with the approval of the Dean. The latter is a course designed by government majors. Although this decision may be rescinded, the threatening implications for the SFS are clear.

Fortunately, piecemeal changes have not been undertaken so that the non-committee on curriculum reform may take an overview of the needs of a "foreign service" education. Other rumored non-changes in the curriculum include the abolition of Dr. David's U.S. History and Diplomacy course and its replacement by the College American History course, to be taught by Professors Walsh, Brown, and Davids. A course in U.S. Foreign Relations would become elective for students studying International Affairs in the non-School of Foreign Service. The fact that Dr. Davids is one of the non-School's more respected teachers and a carry-over from an earlier day has not been allowed to prejudice the case in his favor. The International Law course taught by Professor O'Brien, head of the Institute of World Policy, is also believed to have fallen from favor and is rumored on the way out.

The most spectacular rumor of change has the acceptance of Advanced Placement credit for the Development of Civilization course. This would spare the best history students the burden of sitting through what is probably the most valuable course taught at this university. And this would be only a step toward the easing out of the course altogether.

Facts which might corroborate these rumors include the dismissal of Professors Giles, Quigley, and Davids from the non-School's Executive non-Faculty. Quigley, Giles, and Fr. Kelly of Psychological Services have also been removed from the Standards Committee. In neither case were the tenured faculty members given notice of their non-membership on the committees. They discovered it accidentally. Due process and all.

The judgment that the School lacks guidance seems premature. *Someone* has enacted

non-piecemeal curriculum changes while non-appointing a committee to study comprehensive reform. Someone has been easing influential faculty members out of positions they have long held. All these changes have been made amid official silence and sanctimonious mysticism. Like Imperial Britain, the SFS may be in a "fit of absentmindedness," and like Imperial Britain, someone is guiding her destiny unseen and generally unknown. We all may judge the glory we are gaining.

The School of Foreign Service is suffering no "identity crisis." There is no School of Foreign Service. It is a myth propagated to add lustre to the reputation of Georgetown University. It has no teachers, no books; it has students only because they believe themselves to be its students. Its curriculum is being steadily eroded, so that many wonder what differentiates it from The College. Many of the courses it still calls its own are taught by teachers who identify with their departments and the Graduate School, and who have no comprehension of what it means to teach an integrated approach to the study of international affairs in the manner dreamt of in the catalogue. The School of Foreign Service has been colonized since 1951, and soon it will be ready for annexation into the College.

Optimists among us may refer to it as "the once and future School." As long as the Administration perpetuates the myth of its existence, there is a slight chance of its resurrection. Very slight. Quigley may *not* be immortal. Resolutions will do nothing unless backed up by radical action, and the time is now, if indeed there is any time at all. The School has no books, no teachers. The students are all it has.

TRANSPORTATION, USA

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to "Transportation, USA," a handsome and pithy leaflet just published by the U.S. Information Agency for worldwide distribution.

It is a noteworthy "first," being the initial publication in a comprehensive series the Agency plans to issue on important aspects of American life.

I am especially pleased to salute the author, Stanley Hamilton, a former Kansan and a graduate of the University of Kansas. Mr. Hamilton, a former reporter for the Kansas City Star who was director of the publications staff of the U.S. Department of Transportation when he wrote the leaflet, is now director of government and public affairs for the National Association of Motor Bus Owners here in Washington.

By unanimous consent, I include the text of "Transportation, USA" with my remarks, as follows:

TRANSPORTATION IN THE UNITED STATES

President Lyndon B. Johnson: "Two centuries ago the American nation came into being. Thirteen sparsely populated colonies, strung out along the Atlantic seaboard for 1,300 miles, joined their separate wills in a common endeavor. Three bonds united them. One was the cultural bond of a single language. There was the moral bond of a thirst for liberty and democratic government. There was the physical bond of a few roads and

rivers, by which the citizens of the colonies engaged in peaceful commerce. Two centuries later the language is the same. The thirst for liberty and democracy endures. The physical bond—that tenuous skein of rough trails and primitive roads—has become a powerful network on which the prosperity and convenience of our society depend. In a nation that spans a continent, transportation is the web of union."

Transportation in its many forms made and makes the United States what it is. Crisscrossing the nation are nearly 6.4 million kilometers of turnpikes, other highways, roads and city streets, nearly all of them paved. Railroads move on 550,400 kilometers of steel rail. Commercial airlines fly some 373,000 kilometers of domestic routes and countless more internationally. Tow vessels and their barges navigate some 40,000 kilometers of rivers and streams. Approximately 1.6 million kilometers of pipelines, both above and below the surface of the land, carry oil and gas. A thousand oceangoing merchant ships flying the U.S. flag are regular callers at world ports and link American coastal cities to one another.

This is transportation, an activity that provides for the livelihoods of 9.5 million Americans and is one of the largest in the nation in total expenditures for goods and services.

There are 81 million privately owned passenger automobiles (compared with 25.5 million when World War II ended), 142,000 taxicabs and 2.4 million motorcycles for the 6.4 million kilometers of road. Four out of every five of the nation's 60 million families own an automobile apiece, and 12 million of them have two or more per family. Every year, these people travel 1,150 million kilometers, using 190,000 million liters of gasoline. Each year, 7 million of these vehicles wear out and are scrapped, but in the past few years an average of 9 million new ones have been produced and 1 million others imported. To produce these 9 million vehicles, the assembly lines consume 18.2 million metric tons of steel, 2,750,000 metric tons of iron, 1,370,000 metric tons of natural and synthetic rubber and 445,000 metric tons of aluminum, not to mention numerous other raw materials.

As if 81 million automobiles weren't enough traffic, there are 16.5 million trucks, ranging from small single units to giant combination vehicles with five or more axles, plus more than 300,000 buses. More than 15,000 companies, most of them small, are used in the trucking industry. Bus lines number 1,400.

Thundering right alongside the highways, in most cases, are the railroads with their nearly 2 million freight cars of various types (some with capacities of almost 240 metric tons), 20,000 passenger cars and 28,000 diesel locomotives (which have reduced the number of picturesque steam locomotives in use from 60,000 in the 1920s to a mere 25 today). Some of the 580 or so railroad companies range over thousands of kilometers of trackage, others run only fractions of a kilometer. Not only are the railroads the country's largest haulers of freight, mail and express—with some 42 percent of the total—but they carry more than 100 million persons a year, mostly in short commuter rides to and from work.

Next are the barge lines, with their heavily laden tows often covering the rivers almost from bank to bank. In all, 18,000 barges and 4,000 towboats are used in this business.

Gas and petroleum pipelines are another important segment of the transportation complex. And being built is a pipeline through which coal will be pumped 440 kilometers from mine site to an electric power-generating plant, starting in 1970. In the planning stages is a similar pipeline which will carry grain.

Overhead are the ubiquitous airplanes. Nearly 2,400, half of them jetliners, are

flown by the commercial airlines—11 coast-to-coast trunk lines, 12 regional carriers, 10 charter operators, three all-cargo lines and several hundred small companies offering limited passenger and freight service with small planes. The biggest passenger carriers, these lines combined carry more than 100 million persons a year on domestic flights and on 12 million trips to and from almost all the other nations of the world. Further crowding the U.S. airways are more than 100,000 planes in general aviation, that is, all civil flying except that performed by the airlines.

A key to the future success of the U.S. transportation system is in growing coordination among the different modes. A prime example is "piggybacking," whereby entire highway trailers make their journey by truck, then by rail and then by truck again. Another is containerization, making possible the speedy transfer of a fully loaded metal container from truck, to rail, to ship, to plane.

Perhaps the major factor in the success of the American transportation system is the tradition of close industry-government co-operation and partnership. The Federal Department of Transportation, with its 95,000 employees, serves as the main promotional arm for the industry and as the overseer of safety. Promotion is represented by funds to help build the massive national superhighway system, to help in constructing and expanding airports, to help shipowners build and sail their vessels, to help the airlines develop and acquire supersonic jets, to help barge operators by keeping the rivers and waterways open, to help with harbor development and to help conduct research into possible future forms of transportation. Freight and passenger rates and fares, plus operating routes, are actually arrived at by the carriers themselves with a goal of reasonable earnings. But standing by to make certain that the traveling and shipping public is not disadvantaged in any way are three strong federal regulatory agencies—the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Maritime Commission. Working closely with them, each of the 50 states has one or more agencies of its own dealing with carriers operating within its borders.

What of the future? Says Alan S. Boyd, Secretary of the Department of Transportation:

"The demands for transporting people and goods in the future will most certainly increase. This means we will need bigger and faster types of vehicles than we now have. And it means exciting new forms of transport, some already being developed, that will revolutionize the nation—and the world."

STANLEY HAMILTON,

U.S. Department of Transportation.

KEYSTONE EMPLOYEES SUPPORT DOMESTIC STEEL LEGISLATION

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, more than 7,500 employees of the Keystone Steel & Wire Co., of Peoria, and their families have submitted to me petitions urging congressional action to help curb the abuses and excesses which have permitted foreign steel production to consume so great a share of our domestic market.

The petitioners pointed out that in 1967 steel imports reached a record of

11.9 million tons and based on current trends, 1968 will see this figure increase an alarming 40 percent to nearly 17 million tons. During all of 1964, only 4 years ago, there were less than 6½ million tons imported to our country.

As an indication of the mutual concern they share for the general welfare of the Nation's steel industry and its ability to provide job opportunities for its many thousands of men and women employees, they addressed this petition to me as an Illinois member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

They declared that they are American citizens whose mode of living, and social and economic progress are determined to a large degree by the vigor of the American steel industry. Many of them are directly employed by various domestic steel firms. Any decline in domestic steel production has an immediate effect on paychecks. Others depend upon the payrolls generated by the domestic steel industry as a source of funds for the sale of their own products and services, the support of their schools, churches, businesses and entire fabric of the community. All of them share a deep concern for the economic stability and defense capability of the United States of America.

The petitioners further stated that they do not seek the abolition of free world trade, only the opportunity for domestic steel companies to compete equitably.

ST. PETERSBURG STUDENT DANNY BRADLEY PUTS RIGHT TO DISSENT IN PROPER PERSPECTIVE

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when student uprisings both in this country and abroad are receiving widespread attention in the press, it comes as a breath of fresh air to find that there are indeed young people in this country who do not concur in this type of activity.

Following my remarks is a guest editorial written by Mr. Danny Bradley, a St. Petersburg High School student, whose views on the proper function of higher education are most welcome.

This guest editorial, which appeared in the St. Petersburg Evening-Independent of June 20, 1968, is a part of that newspaper's program of encouraging comments from students on topics of general interest. In addition to commending Mr. Bradley for his very fine editorial, I think the St. Petersburg Evening-Independent should likewise be complimented for making this space available to students in the Tampa Bay area of Florida.

Mr. Bradley's guest editorial follows:

WHEN DISSENT BECOMES AN UPRISING

(By Danny Bradley)

All across the country this year, there have been student uprisings. They have ranged from Columbia and the usually placid Florida State to the perennial trouble-spot of Berkeley, Calif., and countless others. Many rebellions were serious, but none as troublesome as those in other countries where in two cases (France and Czecho-

slovakia) they succeeded in causing anxiety and change in even the highest citadels of federal power. But at what point does innocent student dissent become a criminal student uprising?

No one disputes a student's right to protest what he considers wrong—peacefully. Protests at Florida State were against censorship and at Columbia they were against the building of a gymnasium in a Negro playground. There are a great number of things every citizen should protest against and this is their right.

Even so, the right to dissent does not include arson, vandalism and the coercion of a large university by a small minority of the student body. Most student dissent is peaceful; but sometimes, especially at Columbia, it has gotten out of control and irreparable damage has been done. At Columbia buildings were burned, offices ransacked and destroyed, and campus life disrupted for over a week. The sole function of a college is education and anything that interrupts this function unduly should be disposed of as quickly and efficiently as possible.

Yet when moves of this type are activated at long last, more cries of protest than ever before are heard. Amazingly, such protest even comes from the victimized majority.

College plays a large part in anyone's life who is lucky enough to attend, and if a student is expelled from one college his future academic career is usually ruined. But there is a point where one person's or group's action infringes on the rest of the campus too much. At that point, they must be dealt with severely. Perhaps, if this action is taken sooner in the future, once again there will be peace on our campuses.

ON THE SUBJECT OF VIOLENCE

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as never before America needs discipline. As never before we need to practice and teach patriotism. As never before we must teach respect for the laws of our land and the flag that flies over it. There is nothing that our Government can do that will so effectively restore the confidence of the American people and the respect of the people of the world than to show that it means business in demanding and enforcing a return to law and order. The people of America today are looking for leaders who will make use of all force necessary to stop street violence and organized civil disobedience and riots and provide law protection for innocent victims and law enforcement across our Nation.

A thought-provoking and sensible editorial appeared in the McDowell News, of Marion, N.C., entitled "On the Subject of Violence." I recommend this editorial to my colleagues:

ON THE SUBJECT OF VIOLENCE

It is utter nonsense to supinely accept the judgment frequently voiced by both foreign and domestic critics that violence in the United States is the symptom of a critical and perhaps fatal breakdown in the moral fiber of our people who are now senselessly engaged in dismantling the legal, economic and social structure of our society. It is especially ludicrous when violence and lawlessness in the U.S. is looked upon with shock in countries such as France, very nearly em-

broiled in a civil war of her own; Germany, with an unparalleled record of brutality; Russia, with one of the most barbaric backgrounds in world history, or other communist countries whose governments are founded on the concept and daily practice of oppression and brutal disregard for the value of human life.

Violence of the type that could one day precipitate World War III exists in China, in Cuba, and in the Middle Eastern countries from whence came the twisted mind and the hatred that felled Senator Kennedy. But, the fact that there are few countries in the world with a national record justifying their throwing rocks at the United States does not excuse in any way what is happening here or explain it. Far from being too violent, it may be that the people of the U.S. are not violent enough. This country has gone further along the way of advancing the cause of individual freedom and opportunity than any other nation in history. This has been our national purpose and the reason why millions of the world's oppressed came to our shores. Perhaps the American people have leaned too far over backwards to avoid any semblance of violent oppression of the individual's freedom. Perhaps this is why leaders in education and government and the courts have, by their collective action, fashioned the new "policy of permissiveness" that encourages individual, as well as mob, license and undermines the rule of law—the basis of liberty itself.

It seems to many that what we are experiencing in the United States is not a sickness of our society, but rather what will prove to be in the perspective of history, a relatively short period of confusion concerning the proper application of legal and economic principles vital to the life and development of a free society. Certainly, the vast majority of Americans support our institutions which have more successfully than any others in the world secured human freedom within a framework of order and material abundance. Most people voluntarily live according to standards of behavior that do not outrage the rights, property, and lives of those around them. Laws are really only necessary for the small minority who don't have the desire, judgment, or responsibility to make such standards part of their own behavior. Such people must be controlled. For example, it is beyond understanding why a great center of learning, such as Columbia University in New York City, and the nearly 18,000 students attending it, should have been left at the mercy of a program of terror, false imprisonment, criminal trespass, and extortion as instituted by a couple of hundred hard-core members of a militant left-wing student organization.

There is no future in a policy of law enforcement which allows a mob or a well-organized group of any kind to do what would be patiently a crime if it were undertaken by an individual. The alleged goodness of the cause being pursued does not change the imperative need to stop with the force of police power those who go beyond the law. There is much evidence that public sentiment is changing, but the drift toward anarchy is something that cannot be stopped overnight. Public policy follows public opinion, but, with the president having announced his retirement, strong leadership cannot come from the top until after a new administration takes office March 4 of next year.

In the meantime, new laws will not solve the problem. As an example, the most restrictive gun legislation in the world may disarm the law-abiding citizen, but it will never stop the criminal or the deranged person from firing an assassin's bullet. The future of the United States lies in upholding the freedom and security of the law-abiding individual and implementing the will of the

people to enforce decent standards of behavior upon those few who have no standards of their own.

RETIREMENT OF THE LAST NAVY FLYING BOAT

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on July 12, 1968, it was my privilege to participate in an historic ceremony at the U.S. Naval Air Station, Patuxent, Md., on the occasion of the retirement of the last Navy flying boat from active service. The famed SP-5B Martin Marlin was flown from the Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, Calif., last week for delivery to the Smithsonian Institution for the proposed National Armed Forces Museum.

The retirement of the flying boat marks the end of an era in aviation, as well as in naval history. I can think of no chapter in American history that speaks more eloquently of the courage and vision of the men of our armed services and I trust that I can be excused for recalling that the people and industry of southern California have contributed substantially to realizing the dreams of our early naval aviators.

In the hope that the spirit of adventure which these brave men passed on to us may continue to inspire future generations, I would like to include here the remarks made by the Honorable John Nicholas Brown, Regent of the Smithsonian Institution and former Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, on accepting the last flying boat from Vice Adm. Thomas F. Connolly, U.S. Navy Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air).

As chairman of the National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board, Mr. Brown has devoted considerable study to implementing Public Law 87-186 authorizing expansion of the Smithsonian Institution's facilities for portraying the contributions which the Armed Forces of the United States have made to the development of this country.

If this Nation is to maintain its role of leadership among the nations of the world, we must seek continually to renew the spirit of valor and sacrifice which made America great. I am proud to join with Mr. Brown in acknowledging the many contributions to the betterment of man made by the men and women of our Armed Forces. I echo his hope that the Congress will move to provide necessary further legislation to authorize establishment of a National Armed Forces Museum Park—hopefully in time to permit the new museum to play a meaningful role in the coming commemoration of the bicentennial of the American Revolution as provided for under Public Law 89-491, approved July 4, 1966.

Mr. Brown's remarks follow:

REMARKS BY JOHN NICHOLAS BROWN, REGENT OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION AND CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL ARMED FORCES MUSEUM ADVISORY BOARD, ON THE OCCASION OF ACCEPTING THE LAST P5M FLYING BOAT

IN U.S. NAVY COMMISSION, NAVAL AIR STATION, PATUXENT RIVER, JULY 12, 1968

Today I feel as though I were back on familiar territory. For three years—from 1946 to 1949—I was privileged to be part of the Navy team as Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air. For all of my life, I have shared—as an American—a deep pride in the stirring accomplishments of our Navy and Marine air arms, so I am fully aware that, at this very moment, we are witnessing in a real sense the end of an era in aviation history.

The passing of the flying boat from the naval service is akin to the retirement of the horse from the cavalry. It will be difficult to image our Navy without a single flying boat. Slow, sometimes ungainly when out of her element, but always graceful in flight, the float plane holds a special significance—an historical nostalgia—to the sea service which no wheeled aircraft can ever replace.

I was still in my teens when, nearly fifty years ago, the NC4 made aviation history in the first aircraft flight across the Atlantic. In those days it took a flying boat to accomplish what we of today take so much for granted as a normal occurrence of everyday life.

What an incredible amount of history has been written in the sky—and now in outer space—over the intervening years! I cannot help but feel that time in a way has overtaken us, for now I find myself a participant in writing *finis* to a chapter in the history of aviation that I witnessed in its entirety, one that was opened by the vision and fortitude of men such as John Rodgers, Jack Towers, Albert Read, Dick Richardson, Albert Cunningham, Roy Geiger and others of their breed, the early aviators, Navy and Marine—not to mention my fellow regent of the Smithsonian, Jerry Hunsaker, who helped provide the technical genius that opened the sky to exploration by man after eons of earth-bound existence.

Within a lifetime, I have seen the birth—and now the retirement—of the sea plane, while in the wings, a new generation literally is poised for flight to the moon.

To be a part of all this—no matter how fleeting—is enough to satisfy the most ardent thirst for adventure.

In ceremonies held in San Diego, at the commencement of this historic last flight, Admiral Karaberis dedicated this P5M to the youth of America. I can think of no more fitting tribute to the last of the flying boats. The words of Admiral Karaberis are especially appropriate to this plane's future with the Smithsonian.

The National Armed Forces Museum—of which this plane will be a part—has been envisioned by the Congress as an inspirational monument to the contributions which the Armed Forces of the United States have made to the development of this country. The hardships endured, the valor and sacrifice called forth, the demands placed upon the full energies of our people—yes, these shall be shown. But so, too, must we demonstrate the extensive peacetime contributions which our armed forces have made to the advance of human knowledge—in science, nuclear energy, polar and space exploration, electronics, engineering, aeronautics, and medicine, to name just a few areas in which the military and naval services have played so vital a role in national growth and in working for the betterment of man.

In the final analysis, the history of America's armed forces reflects the philosophy, the achievements, and the aspirations of the nation as a whole, for traditionally our uniformed services have been instruments, not masters, of national policy.

As science and technology advance, accompanied by sociological and economic change, there is compelling need for a deeper public understanding of the role of the armed forces in a free, democratic society.

The new museum will be more than a mere collection of historic artifacts—important as these may be. A vital element of the Armed Forces Museum will be devoted to scholarly research into the meaning of war, its effect on civilization and the role of the armed forces in maintaining a just and lasting peace by providing a powerful deterrent to war.

Amidst the conflicting and often-confusing ideologies competing today for the minds of men, we cannot afford to forget the valor and the sacrificial service of our forebears. The future of America lies in the hands of our youth. Their inclination to carry forward the spirit of daring and adventure—and to meet the challenge of the future—exemplified by the history of naval aviation, will be nurtured in no small way by what we pass on to them.

It is my earnest hope and aspiration for the people of this country that the Armed Forces Museum, so dedicated to the history and accomplishments of our armed forces, will be given the further necessary legislative approval in the 91st Congress.

Admiral Connolly, on behalf of the Smithsonian Institution, I accept this historic aircraft with great pride for future display in the National Armed Forces Museum Park. I assure you that we are mindful of its significance as an example of the continuing contributions which you, sir, and all the men and women of our Navy and Marines make to the well being and to the security of our Nation.

VISTA GAINS RECRUITS AS THE PEACE CORPS LAGS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, in its 4-year existence, VISTA, the volunteer arm of the Office of Economic Opportunity, has made remarkable contributions to the war on poverty. A July 4 New York Times article, written by Joseph A. Loftus, offers some interesting reflections on this national volunteer effort. Mr. Loftus feels that the surge of applicants to join VISTA indicates that America's youth is acutely aware of the challenges presented by the poor of our Nation. What is more important, America's youth is determined to meet that challenge.

I was interested to learn that VISTA's budget allows for only 5,000 volunteers. This is less than a third of the Peace Corps capacity, yet VISTA has been getting more applications than the Peace Corps. From my State of California there are at present 488 VISTA volunteers working across the Nation. These volunteers are counseling juvenile delinquents, working with low-income neighborhoods, mobilizing the poor around neighborhood centers, and providing tutorial and referral services. Their contribution is extremely valuable.

I urge my colleagues to strongly support this Office of Economic Opportunity program. On the basis of the excellent work of VISTA in California and across the Nation, I certainly will support this national volunteer effort.

I insert the full text of the New York Times article in the RECORD at this point:

VISTA GAINS RECRUITS AS THE PEACE CORPS LAGS—OUTGOING CHIEF OF VOLUNTEERS SAYS YOUTH IS CONCERNED WITH DOMESTIC PROBLEMS

(By Joseph A. Loftus)

WASHINGTON, July 3.—The Peace Corps' recruiting lag apparently reflects a sharpened awareness of challenges to be met at home rather than a cooling of youths' desire to serve.

Some of the evidence supporting that analysis is the surge of applicants to join Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA), a program of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The program has more volunteers than its budget can absorb.

VISTA is in many respects the domestic counterpart of the Peace Corps. Its volunteers not only deal with poverty and ignorance, as Peace Corps volunteers do; their task is complicated as well by racial discrimination.

"It's a great generation," said William H. Crook, VISTA's retiring director, discounting reports that disillusionment with the Vietnam war had "turned off" young people with respect to all Government service.

"This is the first year we have not only met but exceeded our goals," Mr. Crook said. He is about to go overseas himself as Ambassador to Australia.

RESULTS OF POLLING

The Peace Corps' recruiting goals for the coming year are lower than they were a year ago, and the agency foresees greater recruiting expense to meet the lower goals.

For this condition the corps has borne a variety of criticisms, but professional polling on the campus suggests that the causes of the lag lie beyond the Peace Corps control.

The chief causes appear to be a combination of antagonism toward Vietnam policy and a looking homeward at events such as Negro protests and the slaying of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

"The pendulum of history has swung from Africa, Asia and Latin America to Harlem, Hough and Appalachia," said a VISTA official. "It is becoming increasingly difficult for college students to concentrate on youth in Malawi when they know children are starving in Mississippi, or to focus on Latin-American problems when Puerto Ricans and Mexican-Americans are rejected by racists in our own land."

Hough is a Negro section of Cleveland.

Jack Hood Vaughn, the Peace Corps Director, while not conceding any long-term decline in volunteers during recent testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said that in travelling around the United States he found "a detectable move for isolation."

"An increasing number of people are saying, 'since we do not or have not been able to solve our own problems, perhaps we had better focus more attention and resources on our own problems at home before we continue our effort to save the world,'" he said.

These comments stirred the interest of the committee chairman, J. W. Fulbright, Democrat of Arkansas, who is a friend of the Peace Corps and a foe of the war. He wanted to know if the war was the basic cause of a change in attitudes of the American people.

"I think," replied Mr. Vaughn, "they are just as disturbed by the racial problems in our society. Certainly, the people I talked to are, the volunteers are, and more especially in the past few weeks. . . ."

COLLEGE STUDENTS' VIEWS

The exchange took place at a hearing on April 23, just 19 days after the murder of Dr. King in Memphis.

A recent Gallup Poll of college students, conducted under contract with the O.E.O., reported:

"Racial problems are regarded by half of the nation's college students as the greatest

single social challenge their generation will face between now and the year 2000.

"When students who expressed an interest in either VISTA or the Peace Corps were asked which program they would prefer, both programs scored equally well.

"A majority of those students whose parents' annual income exceeds \$10,000 indicate a preference for the Peace Corps, while a majority of students whose parents earn less than \$10,000 prefer the VISTA program.

"Students who expressed an interest in serving VISTA and the Peace Corps were asked why they preferred the program they did. Three-fourths of the VISTA group said that 'it helps the United States first.' Among those who preferred service in the Peace Corps, the largest single reason mentioned was that it provided 'an opportunity for travel.'"

The Louis Harris polling organization, under a contract with the Peace Corps, asked some questions inspired by published criticisms of the corps. After a poll of a thousand college seniors last December, it reported:

"The Peace Corps itself has been successful in not equating its existence with support or opposition to Vietnam. By 64 per cent to 18 per cent, the seniors reject the idea that: 'If you really are strongly opposed to the war in Vietnam, the Peace Corps is probably not interested in having you join.'"

INEVITABLE FALLOUT

However, the Harris organization also concluded that "the inevitable fallout of an anti-government position on the war has had an impact on attitudes toward the Peace Corps.

"One-quarter of the seniors agree that 'a lot of people who might have joined the Peace Corps a few years ago are staying away because of their opposition to United States policy in Vietnam,'" it said.

There are contributory causes to the peace corps' recruiting problem.

"One of them is age," said the Harris report: "The Peace Corps has been in existence for seven years; and, even with all the good things it has done, it would be difficult to say the world situation has greatly improved in this period."

"While no fault of the Peace Corps, of course, this sense of discouragement is bound to gradually dim the excitement and high expectations for an organization that began with such high hopes for change."

VISTA is not yet four years old. It has room for only 5,000 volunteers, less than a third of the Peace Corps capacity, but it has been getting more applications than the Peace Corps.

VISTA put 1,900 persons into training in June. Its June applications were 120 per cent over last June's.

"We can fill all our scheduled training classes through next December with no new applications at all," a VISTA official said.

CANDIDATES FOR RETIREMENT

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1968

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the 90th Congress recently enacted, and the President signed into law, a measure providing for a 10-percent income tax surcharge and a \$6 billion spending reduction. At the same time, however, this Congress is preparing to further extend agricultural legislation which will pour additional millions into a losing battle to reduce crops, with full knowledge

that the bulk of this money goes to those farmers who have the least need. The Chicago Tribune has stated the case in a manner which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

CANDIDATES FOR RETIREMENT

The Senate agriculture committee has approved a four-year extension of the federal subsidy programs that pay farmers to reduce crop production. A one-year extension was voted by the House agriculture committee.

By the end of this year the government will have paid farmers nearly 12 billion dollars since 1961 for not growing wheat and feed grains. Yet, on the same day the Senate committee acted on the extension, the Department of Agriculture estimated this year's wheat crop will set a new all-time record and be 29 per cent larger than the average crop in the years 1962 thru 1966. This year's corn crop is forecast as the second biggest of record, 15 per cent larger than average.

With the nation's economy strained to the breaking point by excessive government

spending, Congress has been forced to enact a 10 per cent income tax surcharge and call for a 6-billion-dollar spending cut. This emergency action seems to have escaped the attention of the agriculture committees of Congress. They blithely go on approving billions of more dollars for crop reduction, while crops grow larger and larger.

The members of these committees may think they are making hay with the farmers by such wasteful extravagance, but come next November they may find the voters have decided to retire them to pasture.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, July 19, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Jack P. Lowndes, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength.—Isaiah 40: 31.

Lord, we wait upon Thee for Thou art the living God, who alone knowest the secrets of time and space. Help us to achieve the good things prepared for those who cooperate with Thee and follow Thy will. Work by Thy spirit upon this Nation and the world that the energies of man may be turned from all that is destructive, and dedicated to peace and freedom for all men.

We pray Thy blessings upon this body of Representatives who have such great responsibility. Help them to be honest with themselves, open to all truth, and humble enough to seek and follow Thy will.

In the midst of the complicated situations of life and the unsolved problems of the world, deliver us from a sense of futility. Help us to know that God's power has never been obstructed by difficulties nor His love limited by the confusion of human plans. Help us to turn toward the resources of God and make larger use of spiritual powers.

In His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arlington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 510. An act providing for full disclosure of corporate equity ownership of securities under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

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 title:

H.R. 18366. An act to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 17023) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development 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. MAGNUSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. HRUSKA 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. 18366) entitled "An act to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MORSE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. DOMINICK, and Mr. MURPHY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3710) entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FONG, and Mr. MURPHY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that Mr. FANNIN was appointed as a conferee on the bill S. 20, an act to provide for a comprehensive review of the national water resource problems and programs, and for other purposes, and that Mr. ALLOTT was excused as a conferee on the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that Mr. CANNON be appointed an additional conferee on the bill (S. 3293) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1969 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes."

THE REVEREND JACK P. LOWNDES

Mr. BRINKLEY. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, St. Francis of Assisi, a favorite of Pope John, taught that it is better to love than to be loved and better to minister than to be ministered unto.

So it is that the State of Georgia takes pride in her splendid sons of the ministry who exemplify this spirit, particularly those who have left our State in this calling for other places of service.

As a new Member of this body, I have been very fortunate to have had the opportunity to visit many churches of the Washington, D.C., area and to have observed several such Georgians in the performance of their ministry.

I have heard the words of Rev. James Bruner, and those of Rev. Lester Cornett; and today I have heard again the measured, simple eloquence of Rev. Jack Lowndes, of Arlington Memorial Baptist Church, as he opened this House with prayer.

He exemplifies that which is good in man and translates his beliefs into the living of his life. Earlier this week, "SONNY" MONTGOMERY, our excellent colleague from the State of Mississippi, sent a Prayer Breakfast notice to all Members and referred to a poem quoted by Congressman JOHN ZWACH at the previous meeting, which is particularly apt in describing Brother Lowndes.

I'd rather see a sermon than hear one any day.

I'd rather one should walk with me than merely show the way.

The eye's a better pupil and more willing than the ear;

Fine counsel is confusing, but example's always clear;

And the best of all the preachers are the men who live their creeds.

For to see the good in action is what every-body needs.

So it is I am grateful today for Rev. Jack Lowndes and other men like him of good example.

HOUSE REDUCTIONS IN 1969 BUDGET EXCEED THE \$10 BILLION BUT NOT THE \$6 BILLION GOAL

Mr. MAHON. 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.