

and Adelina Pirozzolo and their two children, Marino and Marco Pirozzolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 16081. A bill for the relief of Cosima Bellucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.R. 16082. A bill for the relief of Maria del

Carmen Marciano-Soltero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 16083. A bill for the relief of Carmela Toschi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 16084. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sophia Takaacs and Sophia Kondor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

265. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the National Farmers Union, Washington, D.C., relative to the civil rights bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

American Involvement in Vietnam

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, several weeks ago I had the privilege of seeing a film by David Schoenbrun, former CBS correspondent, entitled "Vietnam: How Did We Get In; How Can We Get Out?" That film is a human document of American involvement in Vietnam. It presents a well-reasoned program for peace by a man who has known North Vietnamese President Ho Chi Minh for 21 years, who was the only American journalist to witness the French defeat at Dien Bien Phu, and who recently returned from a 6-week trip to Hanoi.

David Schoenbrun calls for American extrication from Vietnam. Yet he is neither traitor nor pacifist. He is one of those rare men who have witnessed history in the making, who have known the men who moved history, and who have recorded it all with freedom and objectivity.

Schoenbrun's demand for a new Vietnam policy is anything but a radical denial of God and country. It is an assertion that this is a great Nation led momentarily off course; it is a call to set a Nation straight.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Schoenbrun film be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. When I say that I'm pleased to be in San Francisco, I really mean it. It's a great pleasure. It may also be the last pleasurable thing that I will say to you today, for there is nothing pleasurable in discussing Vietnam.

I'd like to address myself with you to the questions that all Americans are asking, and to invite you to walk down the paths of history with me, for I have lived the answers to these questions in twenty-one years of my life.

Let's begin with the first question: How did we get into it in the first place? For me, this question began many, many years ago, when I was a young intelligence officer on the Staff of General Eisenhower. And in going through our intelligence reports, I saw that some colleagues of mine, Colonel Gallagher, Major Patti, and others, had been sent to a country named Vietnam about which I knew almost nothing. They had been sent to the north of that country to make contact with a great patriot who was fighting for the independence of his country, fighting against the Japanese, a man who was our ally in this great world struggle. I'll give you one guess—and one, only—of the name of this great patriot now. Yes, that's right—Ho Chi Minh.

Ho Chi Minh, the patriotic ally of the United States, today is a villain and our enemy. What has happened in two decades to change him from a patriot and ally to a villain and an enemy? In what way has he changed? Well, I have known Ho Chi Minh for twenty years—twenty-one years, exactly—from the first day I met him in June of 1946 to the last time I met him in August, 1967, just a few weeks ago. I must tell you that Ho Chi Minh has not changed. He is today what he was then, a dedicated Communist revolutionary. He was fighting for the independence of his country against the French colonial empire and against the Japanese invaders. He is still fighting for the independence of his country. He wants it to be a free country. He also wants it to be a Communist country. We knew that when we were allied with him.

So what, in fact, has changed? We have changed. Twenty-five years ago we were allied with the Communists—we were allies with the Soviet Union in the war against the forces of darkness of Hitler and of Tojo. We were also true to our most cherished traditions of anti-colonialism. We are the world's greatest anti-colonial power, or used to be. We threw off the yoke of tyranny—from Britain. We have always dedicated ourselves to freedom for subject people. That's one reason why we supported Ho Chi Minh, and many other peoples around the world who, in the wake of World War II's destruction of the old European colonial empires, were seeking freedom and independence. And we, under a great President—Franklin Delano Roosevelt—were dedicated to those goals. I was proud to be an American soldier fighting under the flag of the four freedoms, as well as our own beloved flag, the Stars and Stripes. I was proud to be a member of the country whose President said that we were not fighting the war to restore the colonial empires of France, Britain, Holland, Portugal but fighting for freedom.

I remember what other people's reactions were. What a wonderful feeling to be an American in those days! People's eyes would light up. Our country was the inspiration and the aspiration of all people. And it was grand to be an American to see people standing up and hoping for freedom. That's what Ho Chi Minh stood up for. That's what Ho Chi Minh hoped for. And that's what we were helping him to do until President Roosevelt died. Then the war ended and the allied coalition died too. The Cold War with the Soviet Union began. I supported the Truman Doctrine; I supported the Marshall Plan; I supported our entering the war in Korea. I tell you this because I want you to know that I am not a dove, and I hate the word dove, or hawk, or eagle, or owl, or any other of the creatures of the aviary of American politics. I'm a human being; I'm a man; my name is David Schoenbrun, and I am opposed to this war because it is cruel and unjust and immoral, and cannot be won. And I have reached that conclusion, not because I'm a dove, but because I'm a man, and I've got brains, and I'm a free man. And I've watched it, and studied it, and participated in it. I am covered with wounds from war; I have covered wars for a long time. Some wars are just, and I will fight; some wars are unjust, and I will fight against them. That's why I'm doing this today. I want you to know

there's no pleasure or privilege or profit in standing up and fighting the government this way. This is my duty as an American citizen to do. And, thank God, I still live in a country where it's possible to do so. The government isn't very happy about it, but there's nothing it can do to halt dissent.

Mr. Johnson admits that dissent is a tradition and basic right of our country. Of course, what he really says is, "I'm in favor of dissent, just so long as you don't criticize me." But he's going to have to stand still for the criticism. As we review the record of how we got in, it's a sorry record.

Ho Chi Minh, fired up by the talk of the four freedoms, determined to free his country, came out of the underground when the Japanese surrendered in August 1945. He went to Hanoi with his people and he proclaimed the Republic of Vietnam. And he read to them the Constitution, which he drafted in the underground, while fighting the Japanese. It began with these words, "We hold these truths to be self-evident." He translated the American Declaration of Independence and offered it to his country.

There were people who said then, and people who would say, "Oh, that's a cunning Communist play, a play for American sympathy." All right. Maybe it was. But what an inspiring play! Isn't it nice that someone should seek American sympathy by translating our Declaration of Independence? Anybody who wants to be cunning by translating our own beloved birth certificate, be my guest, because that's the kind of cunning that I like. Ho offered this document to his people; his people acclaimed him. And he became the President of Vietnam. And the French, who were too weakened by war to reconquer their colonies had nothing to do but accept it. Oh, they had mental reservations, and they were plotting to reconquer Indochina, but, in the winter 1945-1946 there was nothing they could do but accept the reality that Ho Chi Minh was the leader of his people. And this is important. They signed a convention with him, on March 6, 1946, recognizing Viet Nam to be "a free State."

Remember the date and the event when you discuss this war in Vietnam.

Americans are decent people, and Americans want to do what's right. I am sure the great majority of our citizens do not want to play a power political game unless justice is on our side. But justice is not on our side, and the facts will show it.

They signed the convention on the 6th of March, 1946, recognized Ho Chi Minh as President of Vietnam; this was accepted by the United States of America. At the same time, the Emperor of Indo-China, Bao Dai, abdicated his throne; took his birth name, citizen Vinh Thuy, became political counsel under Ho Chi Minh. So Ho had the recognition of France and he had the legitimacy of the dynasty. Nobody challenged his right to be President of Vietnam; not North Vietnam, or South Vietnam, but Vietnam, the one country shaped like an hour-glass that runs from the Chinese mountains down to the Gulf of Siam. One people, one language, one culture with aspirations for unity that they have fought for two thousand years. No other man has ever been elected and recognized as the President of Vietnam. Ho Chi Minh is the only legitimate leader of his country. I'm not his advocate. I regret the fact he is a Communist.

But this is reality. As President of Vietnam, he was invited by the President of France to come to Paris and to meet at Fontainebleau in the outskirts of Paris at a conference to work out the terms of a new relationship. Now that they were free—they were still poor, miserable, wretched—they needed the help of a larger power, so they turned to France, for all of them had been educated by the French. For 100 years French was their language. The French were a people with whom they'd establish trade and cultural patterns.

And, so, the French said, "Very well. We'll create something new called 'L'Union Francaise.' It was a nice round phrase, 'French union', signifying nothing, but sounding noble, which is the way de Gaulle likes to conduct foreign affairs.

Ho had no choice but to try to negotiate with them. And so he did. And, rapidly, he saw that the negotiations were a fraud. He told this to me and to other reporters every single day. You know what the French demanded in this new partnership? They said, "Well, we are the most experienced country, so we will be responsible for diplomacy in all of the commonwealth. All of your embassies will be inside of ours. Of course, we're the great power, so we'll be in charge of national defense; and, of course, the economics of the commonwealth; and, of course, we will handle customs and immigration." Ho said, "It won't work; a war's going to break out." And I said "How can you fight the modern army of France?" Ho replied: "We have a secret weapon that is called nationalism." I'm afraid I kind of snickered when he said that. And he said, "It's ill-befitting an American to laugh. Your country is founded on the love of nation. Your country's nationalism is a great motivating force. And don't ask me how can I fight against the French. I saw pictures in your history books of your wretched bands of guerrillas led by General Washington. Why, they didn't even have shoes. I saw the blood-stained rags, and you're proud of those blood-stained rags. Why do you then say to me that I can't do it?"

I said, "Well, President Ho, I meant no offense, sir, but that was in the 18th Century. Today, in the 20th Century the weapons of war are more powerful." Ho replied: "Remember my words. In the mid twentieth century, man's hunger for freedom is greater than it even was in the 18th century. And the hunger for freedom is greater than weapons. Never forget that."

Ho went on: "Let me tell you what kind of a war it's going to be. It's going to be a war between an elephant and a tiger. If the tiger of Indo-China is ever caught out in the open by the elephant of France, it will be pierced by the mighty tusks and trampled under, but it won't be caught because we're going to lurk in the forest, and in our jungles by day, and steal out by night and leap upon the back of the elephant, gouging huge chunks out, and slowly, the elephant of France, bleeding, will sink exhausted into our paddies."

That was August, 1946. Some of you may remember my broadcast about the elephant and the tiger, a prediction of the war—and it was fought exactly that way—when it broke out as he predicted it would. When did it break out? You ought to know this too. It broke out in November, 1946. How and under what conditions? The French sent their men to the port of Haiphong to control it. Ho Chi Minh's men said, "This is our country; this is our fort; get out." The French wouldn't. There was a fight. Seven Vietnamese were killed; two Frenchmen were killed too.

Do you know what the French did? Their Navy lined up four capital ships in front of the open port of Haiphong and cannonaded for four hours—a massacre of 14,000 people in one afternoon. That's in the Archives of the French Navy. I've seen that document. That document is reprinted in

Ellen Hammer's book, "The Struggle for Indo-China." Fourteen thousand people massacred in one afternoon by the country of liberty, equality, fraternity. What a denial of the magnificent culture of France. What a denial of Christianity and of democracy. This is only one example of treachery, duplicity and cruelty that make up the tragic story of Indo-China and of this unfortunate country, Vietnam.

The Vietnamese struck back because of the attack on Haiphong, just as they are striking back today, just as today, Ho Chi Minh and Phan Van Dong have announced that no longer will they even consider talking with the United States unless we stop bombing unconditionally. Why? Because we are massively striking at that same port of Haiphong and at the city of Hanoi. We are bombing them to try to force them to bow their heads and bend their knees, and they won't do it. They are self-respecting people. That's what courage takes. And the Vietnamese have got that courage in very large quantities.

I wish that these people were on our side—and they could have been. How they begged to be on our side. Ho Chi Minh begged me, back in 1946, "Get me a visa to Washington. I want to talk to the Americans." And they wouldn't talk to him because the Cold War was on with Russia. We did not at first help the French either, for we did not want to support an imperial power. But then something happened. The Communists defeated Chiang Kai-shek in China in December of 1949. The French went racing to Washington, to the State Department, and said, "Now, now, what do you see? China is on our frontier. Now it's a crusade against Communism. It's no longer a colonial war." And we bought it. We bought it because our country was living in fear and panic, back in those days. It is no coincidence that the first speech of Joseph McCarthy came in January of 1950, just when Red China came into the picture. And, so we began—to support the French in a colonial war of conquest. For four years, from '50 to '54, we gave them \$3 billion. We, Americans, supported a colonial war, trying to suppress people fighting for freedom. That was a shame on the record of our country, because our anti-colonialism had been superceded by anti-Communism. Everything fell into line for anti-Communism. We would align ourselves with fascists. We would align ourselves with the worst elements in the world if only they were anti-Communist. This was a self defeating policy and it failed for Communists had identified themselves with that secret weapon that Ho Chi Minh had told us about, nationalism. And the people fought and defeated the French at the battle of Dien Bien Phu. I was the only American at that battle of Dien Bien Phu and I saw the end come for western domination in Asia. Everybody knew it was the end; everybody except John Foster Dulles; he wouldn't accept the fact.

And I saw what followed in Geneva. I went to the Geneva Conference. My fellow Americans, I ask you to study very carefully what happened at that Geneva Conference. This is the crux of the whole matter. If you want to know where justice is, what cause you should support, and whether your Government is telling you the truth or not, you've got to know what happened at the meeting.

At the Geneva Conference the Russians and the Chinese told Phan Van Dong, representing Ho, that it would be better to agree to a cease-fire and the scheduling of free elections rather than to keep fighting and take the country by force. Yes, the record shows that the Communists proposed the ballot box instead of the battlefield. They had good reasons to do so.

In the last days of Dien Bien Phu, the French asked us to drop the bomb around Dien Bien Phu to save the garrison. And Dulles approved. So did Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. But President

Eisenhower vetoed it. Even though Ike turned it down, the Chinese were still worried that if the Vietnamese pressed too hard, there might be an American intervention. The Chinese didn't want war at that time. They didn't want to get involved in it at all.

And so, Ho Chi Minh said, "All right, I'll stop fighting, and, in return, we'll have free elections." He knew he was going to win the election.

Eisenhower, in his memoirs, states that Ho would have won eighty percent of the vote. Now, it doesn't matter who wrote Eisenhower's memoirs, he signed them and he's responsible for the statement. The Geneva Conference agreed on a cease-fire to be followed by elections. But the U.S. supported dictator Ngo Dinh Diem in Saigon, who refused to permit elections. Now, we're supposed to be in favor of free elections, you know. Apparently, though, only if we're sure we're going to win. You might call that the Cook County syndrome in world affairs. Well, the Communists gave up the territory they held in the South. They moved north of the 17th parallel to await elections and, by the way, I quote to you from the Geneva Treaty: The 17th parallel was described as a "temporary, military demarcation line"—temporary, not permanent; military, not political; demarcation, not frontier. It went further and said, "At no time shall this be considered to be a territorial frontier." It was a military line, between two "zones" of the one country, Vietnam. Never was the word "North" or "South Vietnam" mentioned in the Treaty, only Vietnam.

Now, I ask you to read that Treaty for yourselves: "Cease-fire, withdrawal to a demarcation line, free elections to be held in 1956." And, very important, my fellow Americans, in 1955, one year before the election, representatives of the two zones were to meet and determine the conditions for elections. In other words, to lay down the terms under which the elections can be free. Isn't that a magnificent agreement? Isn't that what we Americans want? No, it isn't what we want, I regret to say, for we refused to go ahead with the deal. We put into a power, a Catholic, Mandarin dictator, Ngo Dinh Diem. He was not elected by the Vietnamese people and he's the man who we made our agreement with, and when Mr. Rusk tells you that we're in that country by the invitation of the government that is untrue. We are there by the invitation of ourselves. We put Ngo Dinh Diem in. We made a deal with him. And then, later, we backed all the generals after they murdered him. We have, from the start, supported a minority military movement against a majority of the Vietnamese people who would have voted for Ho Chi Minh. That is part of history and nobody can deny it.

The real truth is that we wouldn't hold the elections and that we never intended to. And Ngo Dinh Diem, whom we supported, four days before the first meeting of an electoral commission to set the terms of a free election, announced that he would not meet with Communists, wouldn't even discuss the question. Not one meeting took place. This is a shame. This is something the United States of America does not stand for, and yet we stood for it. We made a mistake because Joe McCarthy was talking about a world Communist conspiracy. And John Foster Dulles, who had made his career by charging the Democratic Party with giving China to the Reds, was not, himself, going to preside over the loss of Indo-China to the Reds, giving the Democrats the chance to attack him. For internal political reasons; because of the hysteria of the moment, we betrayed our most precious heritage of American traditions. And I say we have to get back and be Americans again. I say that what we did then, and what we have done since, is un-American. And I say that I am not the dissenter; the real dissenter is Lyndon B. Johnson. He has dissented from what he said in 1964 when we

elected him to make peace in Vietnam, not to make war. He promised us that he would not make a wider war. He promised us that he would not escalate it. He said, October 12, 1964, "I will not send American boys to do the job that Asian boys should do for themselves." And he has sent American boys to do the job. This is a disgrace. That disgrace began at the Geneva Conference. Read the history of it. Read too the SEATO treaty that follows it and you will see that Mr. Rusk is not telling the truth about the SEATO treaty any more than about the Geneva treaty, for SEATO does not commit us to defend South Viet Nam.

You are businessmen; you understand a contract. The contract of Geneva said this to the Communists: Withdraw from the territory in the South, go north of the 17th parallel and wait for elections. After the elections the country will be reunified.

The Communists kept their part of the contract and went North to await elections. But the second half of the contract was broken. Elections were denied to them. So they went back and picked up their arms once again—that is to the state of affairs precedent to the broken contract—This is what Mr. Rusk calls an aggression. This is not an aggression. The Communists were fighting French colonialists. Then we intervened to change the course of Vietnamese history. That is the truth.

Eisenhower began the process by giving money and arms to Saigon. Then Kennedy sent advisors to Vietnam. Then we elected Mr. Johnson to make peace, and he made war instead, because the situation had deteriorated and the junta would not or could not fight the Communists. So Johnson sent American men in to make it an American war. That is the sad story of the history of Vietnam and the American involvement, and I would say we must change it.

Wars are really ended in one of two ways: either when one side is so much stronger than the other that it can crush it totally, or when one side gets weary of the war and is willing to pay a price to end it. So what is involved here is not a formula, but a will. Do we have the will, and does the majority of the American people support the will to make any sacrifice necessary to spill all the blood that has to be spilled to defeat the people of Vietnam? I believe we do not have that will and should not have that will. The people of Vietnam will never surrender to us. They'll fight on until the end, which means that we would have to have a policy of genocide. We'd have to wipe them out completely. We are already well away along that line, but we cannot go to the end of the line. I don't think the American people will support genocide. Perhaps we would rather be dead than Red but we can't make that choice for other peoples. Short of genocide by nuclear fusion we cannot defeat the Vietnamese.

To win a war an army must physically occupy the ground. I'm an old infantry man and I know that the Air Force does not win wars. We've got to occupy the grounds. You can't win a war by air power.

It has been estimated by the Rand Corporation, in special studies, that it could take as many as ten million American soldiers to defeat the Viet Cong and to occupy the territory of South Vietnam. Where are we going to get ten million people, or even five million, or even two million American soldiers? That means mobilizing the Reserves; that means ending college deferments, and calling up all of our youngsters, including those from white middle-class homes to fight this war. I doubt that even President Johnson would dare do it. So, I believe that we can't win the war. If we can't win the war, we've got then to decide how we are going to get out of it. We must build up at least a very significant minority—we don't even need a majority—but we need a large enough minority, and a responsible enough, and a

distinguished enough, and an important enough minority to convince the administration—or to change the administration—to show that the American people want to end this war and the American people want to get out of Vietnam. Now this involves some very bitter pills the American people are not yet willing to swallow, but they're going to have to—that is because they have to get out of Vietnam.

Now there are people saying, "We can't turn tail and run. We're a great power." And I agree. You make a mess, and you don't run away from it—you've got to clean the mess up.

How do we clean it up? What's an honorable settlement? An honorable settlement is based upon a tradition to which we Americans are, in principle, committed, and that every American Republican or Democrat, or whatever—can accept; self-determination of the people of Vietnam without coercion from the outside.

How do we accomplish this? We have to accept the basic principle of the Geneva Accords, which we violated in the period of 1954 to 1956. We have to accept general elections for South Vietnam, and an Assembly in South Vietnam, which will choose its own government and make its own decisions. And it's none of our business what that government is. If it's going to be Communist, then it's going to be Communist; that's their business, not ours. And our security is not affected very much by anything that can happen there. So, I say the first step—the most important step—is stop bombing; deescalate; bring about a change in the climate which will permit free elections to be held.

The first step in that direction is to stop bombing. Let us examine this question of bombing. Why should we stop bombing? Mr. McNamara has testified to the Senate Subcommittee on Preparedness—that the bombing had failed in its purposes. It had not stopped the supply and infiltration routes to South Vietnam. The Communist armies there need 100 tons a day—and those hundred tons are being supplied. I am an eye witness to that supply system. They use bicycles. I have seen bicycles with wooden planks fastened over the back wheel with straw baskets at either end, fifty pounds per basket, 100 pounds per bicycle, one ton for every twenty bicycles—tens of thousands of bicycles are going down that road—a hundred tons a day is a cinch; you can't stop them. It's like trying to fight a swarm of mosquitoes with a sledge hammer; try it some time. We're so big and strong that we can destroy the biggest power on earth, but we can't destroy all the bicycles in a rural country. Our strength is not meant for that kind of a situation.

I crossed rivers without bridges. How do you cross a river without a bridge? They poled sampans—flat-bottomed boats—down the river and then lashed them together with pontoons and laid over it a carpet of wooden planks. I've seen ten ton trucks go over these "floating bridges".

I was there one day on a dike at 2:00 o'clock in the morning when one of these ten ton trucks went over the bridge. As it came to the embankment the left rear wheel sunk in the mud over the hubcap, and I thought to myself, well, that's it. Even in America, it would take you hours to get a power winch to pull that out of a mudhole. Do you know how long it took them to do it without a power winch? Forty-five minutes. I watched them do it. The leader blew a whistle. Out of the village came the people, like ants, each one with a pail and a shovel and with ropes. I watched fifty of them lash their bare backs to the front fender of that truck, while, in the back, others came with gravel and sand and shovels. They dug the mud out, and as they were taking the mud away from the wheel of this truck, others were pouring sand and gravel into the mud hole, while, up in front, fifty of them were straining against the ropes. And, all of a

sudden, with a tremendous pop, the ten ton truck shot out of that mud hole. You can't stop people like that.

Now, if we can't stop them, and Mr. McNamara has admitted it; if we cannot bomb them to the peace table, as Mr. McNamara has admitted; and if we are losing \$2 billion worth of planes in an air campaign which can't succeed, I say stop the bombing. First step, stop bombing—unconditionally. Not a bombing pause. Remember, there's a difference. For them, a bombing pause is putting a cocked pistol on the table and saying, "I will stop shooting, but I want to see whether you will do what I want you to do. And if you don't, I'll shoot at you again." That is an ultimatum, not a peace offer. And they will not accept it. And they're prepared to fight on as long as is necessary, and they're sure that they can outlast us. I think they can too.

They have lost practically all. Their steel mills have been destroyed; their homes have been destroyed; they've got nothing left much to lose. We have a lot to lose. Our economy's at stake. You're businessmen; you know what that means. So stop bombing, start talking. Call for an international conference to arrange a cease-fire to be followed by elections.

Let those elections be held and let the results be whatever they be. Let us withdraw the American Army during the cease-fire and before the elections take place so that we can't be accused of controlling them.

This will not be easy to arrange but it was done before, from the battle of Dien Bien Phu to the Peace of Geneva. We can do it again and this time respect the Peace Treaty and make it stick as it would have if we had not broken it.

There are people who through misguided versions of patriotism think that we must, nonetheless, support our country and fight on even though it is wrong. They subscribe to the juvenile thinking of Stephen Decatur, who said, "Our country, may she always be right. But our country, right or wrong." I prefer the words of another great patriot, Carl Schurz, who was misquoted by Decatur. He said: "Our country, right or wrong—If right, let us preserve the right; if wrong, let us make it right." That's what free men can do.

Results of Questionnaire in the Third District of Michigan

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last fall I sent the residents of Michigan's Third Congressional District a questionnaire designed to elicit their feelings about many of today's pressing national concerns. The response was gratifying and the results have been most helpful to me. More than 18,000 individual forms were returned and many of these had additional comments.

With the thought that other Members might be interested in the thinking of my constituents, though belatedly reflected, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD, the questionnaire and its results stated in percentages:

I. STATE OF THE BUDGET AND THE ECONOMY

In a special message to Congress the President made the following recommendations. Do you support these recommendations?

A. Reduce the anticipated \$29 billion budget deficit to \$22.7 billion by imposing a 10%

temporary increases in individual and corporate income taxes? 19.6% yes, 80.4% no.

B. Postpone from April 1, 1968, until July 1, 1969, the reduction of the auto and telephone service excise taxes thereby reducing the anticipated budget deficit by an additional \$300 million. 60.8% yes, 39.2% no.

C. Send an additional 45,000 troops to Vietnam at an estimated cost of \$4 billion (this cost is included in the \$29 billion anticipated deficit), 30.3% yes, 69.7% no.

II. POVERTY—RACIAL IMBALANCE—EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

A. Is the taxpayer being required to contribute as much as he should to improve the standard of living, correct racial imbalance, provide equal opportunity? 87.5% yes, 12.5% no.

B. Is the taxpayer's dollar being used as effectively as it should to achieve the best results in the above areas? 5.8% yes, 94.2% no.

C. With respect to the following programs, would you:

	Percent
Manpower development and training:	
Increase funding	73.6
Reduce funding	26.4
Model cities:	
Increase funding	21.5
Reduce funding	78.5
Rent supplements:	
Increase funding	16.9
Reduce funding	83.1
Headstart:	
Increase funding	58.9
Reduce funding	41.1
Neighborhood Youth Corps:	
Increase funding	59.6
Reduce funding	40.4
Job Corps:	
Increase funding	40.0
Reduce funding	60.0
VISTA:	
Increase funding	41.0
Reduce funding	59.0
Water and sewage grants:	
Increase funding	63.6
Reduce funding	36.4
Community action program:	
Increase funding	48.8
Reduce funding	51.2

III. RIOTS—LAW ENFORCEMENT

A. Are the current riots caused by conditions of poverty in our central cities and slum areas?

[In percentages]

Yes	43.4
No	56.6

B. Are the riots caused by a breakdown in our law enforcement procedures?

Yes	67.9
No	32.1

C. If you answered (A) "yes," what particular conditions do you think are prime contributors to riots and, therefore, in greatest need of improvement?

Rat control and extermination	18.3
Job training and availability	43.5
Pure racial antagonism	29.0
Recreational programs	18.3
Substandard housing	30.9
Education	49.7

D. If you answered (B) "yes," do you think the law enforcement breakdown stems from:

1. Police improprieties or brutality?	
Yes	10.3
No	89.7
2. Police inadequacies, such as:	
a. Lack of personnel	44.8
b. Lack of adequate pay	43.6
c. Lack of training	33.2
d. Lack of understanding of condition of slum dwellers, etc.	17.2
3. Activities, opinions, or interpretations of the law by the courts?	
Yes	89.5
No	10.5

4. If you answered (3) "yes," do you think:

a. The courts are making it too easy for those charged with crimes to go free?	
Yes	93.6
No	6.4
b. The courts are too lenient in sentencing convicted criminals?	
Yes	91.9
No	8.1
c. The courts are too "liberal" in interpreting the law, thereby permitting the end or cause to justify means?	
Yes	92.2
No	7.8
d. Federal judges at all levels should be appointed for definite terms rather than serve for life as at present?	
Yes	87.5
No	12.5

IV. FOREIGN RELATIONS AND FOREIGN AID

A. What is your opinion regarding the degree of the present Administration's participation in alliances, engagements, conflicts, etc., with other nations?

1. We are too involved internationally?	79.9
2. We are not involved enough?	5.6
3. Our foreign policy is about right?	14.5

B. Do you think:

1. We should make every reasonable attempt to improve relations with the "East," or Soviet-bloc countries through:	
a. Expanding trade in goods considered nonstrategic but beneficial to their economy?	
Yes	65.7
No	34.3
b. Expanding our exchange of educational, vocational, and nonmilitary technological ideas and experts?	
Yes	73.4
No	26.6

c. Furnishing greater assistance by direct financial aid, credit, or goods such as foodstuffs?

Yes	17.0
No	83.0

2. We should forget about reaching an "understanding" with the Soviet Union and its satellites and take a "tougher" attitude toward them as the only way to improve substantially our foreign relations posture and protect our national security?

Yes	46.6
No	53.4

C. What do you think we should do, with respect to our foreign aid program in the following areas?

[In percentages]

Latin America:	
Keep as is	34.5
Increase	40.9
Reduce	14.5
Eliminate	10.1
Arab-bloc nations:	
Keep as is	17.8
Increase	4.4
Reduce	30.1
Eliminate	47.7
Israel:	
Keep as is	41.5
Increase	17.7
Reduce	22.2
Eliminate	18.6
Western Europe:	
Keep as is	31.5
Increase	4.6
Reduce	34.2
Eliminate	29.7

Great Britain and Commonwealth:	
Keep as is	34.3
Increase	9.1
Reduce	26.7
Eliminate	29.9

Soviet-bloc nations:	
Keep as is	18.5
Increase	6.3
Reduce	21.5
Eliminate	53.7

Southeast Asia (SEATO countries):	
Keep as is	36.4
Increase	17.4
Reduce	26.0
Eliminate	20.2

Africa:	
Keep as is	32.4
Increase	21.4
Reduce	22.3
Eliminate	23.9

D. Our foreign aid program should have as its primary objectives:

[In percentages]

1. Charity toward all countries and peoples less fortunate than ourselves:	
Yes	32.6
No	67.4
2. Improvement of the economy and self-sufficiency of any nation which has a potential for friendship and for adopting democratic principles:	
Yes	81.1
No	18.9
3. Assistance only to friends and allies and no help to others:	
Yes	54.5
No	45.5

V. VIETNAM

A. Should we continue the policy of the present Administration?

Yes	18.1
No	81.9

B. Should we escalate military operations?

Yes	50.6
No	49.4

C. What should be our policy regarding bombing raids on North Vietnam? Check one:

Step up bombing and expand the type of targets	67.2
Bomb only limited, strategic installations as at present	13.9
Refrain from bombing altogether	18.9

D. Should we increase efforts to pacify and stabilize economic, political, and social conditions in South Vietnam?

Yes	68.3
No	31.7

E. Should we make an all-out peace negotiation effort; and if it fails, withdraw to positions we can hold militarily, politically, and economically?

Yes	54.1
No	45.9

F. If negotiations fail, should we withdraw altogether?

Yes	42.5
No	57.5

Better Business Mail Service

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks a letter from Mr. Charles Ming, who is the building man-

ager of the United Founders Life Tower, in Oklahoma City, Okla.

Mr. Ming's letter points out the outstanding success of the VIM program—that means vertical improved mail—in this new building in northwest Oklahoma City.

His letter is another testimonial to the significant progress in the modernization and improved mail service characterized in the Post Office Department under the leadership of the Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien.

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

UNITED FOUNDERS LIFE INSURANCE CO.,
Oklahoma City, Okla., March 13, 1968.
Senator MIKE MONRONEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONRONEY: Since June 12, 1967, when two mail deliveries were established in the United Founders Life Tower through the installation of a full time delivery station in our lobby, it has appeared as though the entire economy of the United Founders Life Plaza and the business community in Northwest Oklahoma City has increased substantially.

At the end of February, 1968, our occupancy rate for this twenty story building was 97%, making us full for all practical purposes.

I am convinced that the establishment of your VIM program and the full time delivery station in our building has been one of the major factors in the rapid development of this business community, as the occupants of the area know that they have mail service equivalent to the downtown metropolitan area, if not better service.

Mail service is, as you know, extremely important to the many offices and businesses located in this area and it is extremely gratifying to all of us here, and especially to myself, that you and the Post Office Department have been able to see and share our optimistic feeling concerning the development of this area.

In addition to our success in the investment in the United Founders Life Tower, the National Foundation Life Building located immediately west and across Northwest Highway, has been extremely successful by achieving 100% occupancy in a short period of time. Their optimism is once again being demonstrated by the recent commencement of their second ten story tower within their office complex.

I have extended my thanks to you for your help in this project previously and I would like to take this opportunity to do so again. We are very happy with the service and hope that the Post Office Department will see fit to continue to work toward expansion of the services as required, feeling free to call on me at any time for any help or assistance that I may be able to render.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES MING.

Congressman Kupferman and the Hungarian Freedom Fighters

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague and friend, Congressman THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, of the 17th Congressional District, has always been a firm

supporter of self-determination for the people of Hungary.

On March 17, 1968, at Hunter College in the 17th Congressional District, he joined in commemorating the Hungarian freedom fighters of 1848 and 1956.

His address follows:

Today we assemble again to pay homage to a generation of Hungarian freedom-fighters; men who heard clearly the appeal of the 19th century liberals against absolutist rule and took arms against an emperor who had originally approved and then refused to grant constitutional government to the Hungarian nation based on parliamentary principles.

Their names, beginning with the unforgettable hero of Hungarian and world freedom, Louis Kossuth, is too well-known even in America to need a lengthy introduction. He is even better known to those, who were brought up in the old country and who rightly look upon him as a national hero, a fighter for liberty and justice, and a protector and defender of the weak, and the liberator of the Hungarian peasantry. We also are aware of the leading and guiding poetical light of the heroic period of 1848-49, Alexander Petöfi who, though dying in battle at the age of 26 had bequeathed to the Hungarian literature a heritage which has hardly been surpassed.

Today, I would like to concentrate upon those heroes of the Hungarian fight for freedom who, like you, have come to the American shores and spending the remainder of their life in the United States, contributed militarily and scientifically, politically and journalistically as well to the welfare of this country in its trying and fateful days of the American Civil War between 1861-1865, and who fought for the same freedom and liberties on the side of President Lincoln for which they were willing to shed their blood in Kossuth's armies against the absolutist rule of the Hapsburg Court in 1848.

Being from New York, the man closest to our heart and memory is Brigadier General Alexander Asboth, who later also served under General Grant as United States Minister to Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay. His name and military fame must be familiar to you, but let me now recount also, other events of his distinguished career so that in him today we may equally commemorate and hail the loyal American, the Hungarian patriot, the military leader, the engineer and diplomat and, last but not least, the fighter against injustice and for individual and human rights and freedoms. That fight is not finished, and we in America, and the Hungarian people everywhere will always continue to stand for freedom.

Alexander Asboth was born in 1811 in Western Hungary from a family of English descent. One of his ancestors was the court chaplain of Prince Emery Thököly, the stepfather of the first Hungarian freedomfighter, Prince Francis Rakoczy II. His father was a professor of agricultural sciences, the curator of Geogikon.

Graduated as an engineer, he joined the dapper regiments of Kossuth in 1848, and took part in several battles of the 1848-49 Hungarian fight for freedom. At the fateful day at Temesvar in August 1848 he chose Kossuth over the army command and accompanied him into exile in Turkey and was not separated from him until the time came for both to come to America. Asboth arrived into our city on the steamer *Mississippi* in November, 1851. Upon arriving here he immediately declared his intention of becoming a citizen, because he felt that the United States was to become his permanent home.

Louis Kossuth arrived on December 5 but after a short reunion, they separated again. Asboth could not accompany his Hungarian

comrade on his speaking tour that was to take him to Washington where he had the privilege of addressing the United States Congress, but kept in touch with him and was involved in buying arms and ammunition for the Kossuth forces.

In America Asboth worked as an architect, was employed by a firm at Syracuse, N.Y., then temporarily he went west as a mining engineer. Coming back to New York he opened a small steel foundry. In this business venture he has been moderately successful until his partner absconded. The failure forced him to accept city employment. He thus became an engineer with the City Planning Commission. In this capacity he had a prominent role in planning Washington Heights and also the famous Central Park in my 17th Congressional District.

Nine years after his arrival to America, the United States faced a crisis of unprecedented magnitude. The existence of the Union was at stake, and the man who fought for freedom in Hungary could not help but choose the side which was to fight against slavery and for the maintenance of national unity against secessionist forces. He asked Governor Morgan of New York to organize a regiment, but the plans did not work out. Thus, Alexander Asboth went west again where the 1856 Republican Presidential candidate, John C. Fremont was raising a Union army in Missouri. In July 1861 he was already chief of staff of General Fremont who, on September 26, 1861 appointed him a Brigadier General and entrusted him with the command of one of his divisions. General Asboth's commission was approved by Congress in March 1862. By that time, however, the General had distinguished himself not only as a trusted staff officer of General Fremont, but also of his successors, Generals Hunter and Curtis. His valor was amply shown in the battles of Bentonville and Fayetteville, Arkansas and in the battle of Pea Ridge in Arkansas where despite his wound, was back in saddle the next morning and led his troops to victory.

Upon the clearing of Missouri from Southern forces, General Asboth was ordered to Kentucky. Later he was entrusted with the command of the West Florida Department at Fort Pickens. He was severely wounded in the battle of Marianna. His left arm was shattered in two places by bullets. Another bullet entered the right side of his face, and it was never possible to remove it. This injury was very painful and hastened his early death. He resigned from active service on March 13, 1865 when he was appointed Major General for his meritorious service.

After the Civil War, President Andrew Johnson appointed General Asboth as Minister to Argentina and Paraguay. He was in Washington when he received the appointment in March 1866, signed by Secretary of State Seward. After a short sojourn in Paris where he tried to get the bullet removed from his face by Professor Nelaton who had performed a similar operation on Garibaldi, he went to London in August and embarked for Rio de Janeiro. After a stop in Montevideo, an American warship took him to Buenos Aires on October 14, 1866.

The ambassadorship of the General was made difficult by his pains and sickness. However, he became a close friend of the Argentine President, and rendered excellent service in the diplomatic negotiations in the war between Argentina and Paraguay.

As the Austro-Hungarian Compromise was concluded in 1867 and amnesty extended to all of the Kossuth officers, he hoped to return for a visit, but his hope was in vain. He died after months in bed and in pain on January 21, 1868, a little over a hundred years ago in Buenos Aires. He was buried with state honors, the Argentine President Sarmiento delivering the eulogy at his funeral.

Such was the man whose memory we today

especially commemorate at the centenary of his death. A man of high courage, a splendid soldier and commander who coupled military discipline with humane treatment. A man of high ideals and integrity, a man of strong religious convictions in whose rooms the services were held for Hungarians while interned in Turkey. A man who gave his best, we can say his life and health, for his adopted country but who never forgot the ideals and values that he had received from the land where he had been born and educated. General Asboth remains a foremost example of the Hungarian immigrant to this country.

The Hungarian nation, too, has displayed the belief in the ideal of human freedom, dignity and national self-determination since 1848, and most recently during the tragic, but glorious fight for freedom in the fall of 1956.

While we remember the struggles, the trials and the temporary defeats, we also remember the spirit that had motivated the actions of the generations who believed and fought for national and individual freedom in Hungary and in the United States. And may I close with the remarks that despite the tragedies of the past, the bleakness of the fate of the Hungarian nation at the present, the spirit of March 1848 and the heroism of 1956 cannot remain without results and that the Hungarian determination to lead a life of human dignity and national honor will ultimately be victorious against the forces which now, just as between 1849-1967 have conspired to obstruct its progress and victory.

Job Corps: Hospital Career Days

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there is a critical manpower shortage in our Nation's hospitals. To meet this need and to utilize untapped manpower resources among the poor, Jay Wells, president of Wells Television, Inc., and a member of the Business Leaders Advisory Council of the antipoverty program, initiated a pilot program of considerable interest, Career Day, in which graduates of the Job Corps and hospital representatives met for job interviews. Working in close cooperation with him in this endeavor was William K. Klein, president of the Greater New York Hospital Association.

The Career Day, held in New York City, saw 60 eager young men, ready to graduate from the Job Corps in Camp Kilmer, N.J., meet with personnel directors and administrators of 33 New York hospitals in an all-day session. At least one job was offered to almost every one of the Job Corps graduates interviewed. A typical reaction of the interviewers to the clean-cut, well-dressed group was that of Helene Doneson, of the New York University Medical Center, who said:

I am impressed with the Job Corps trainees. I haven't seen applicants like this in a long time, and I've found them an excellent source of recruitment for jobs that have a career potential at the hospital.

Career Day and the opportunity which it represents is a significant step toward attaining the goals of employment,

achievement, and responsibility for America's youth. The entire community stands to gain a great deal from the full fruition of this program.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extension of Remarks the New York Times article describing Hospital Career Days.

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

SIXTY IN JOB CORPS ARE INTERVIEWED—CITY HOSPITALS OFFER WORK TO 47 OF THE TRAINEES

(By Val Adams)

Sixty young men who soon will graduate from the Kilmer Job Corps Training Center in Edison, N.J., were interviewed for hospital jobs here yesterday by members of the Great New York Hospital Association.

Forty-seven received at least one job offer from the 33 hospitals seeking to fill openings and the remainder of the men were said to have good prospects for jobs.

"All the men will be employed," said Jay Wells, a New York business executive who helped organize the interview session. "This is the first of a series of hiring days which will take place in various eastern and mid-western cities for men and women Job Corps graduates."

Mr. Wells, president of Wells Television, Inc., is a member of the Business Leaders Advisory Council of the Federal antipoverty program. The council acts as an adviser to the Office of Economic Opportunity, which set up Job Corps training.

VARIOUS TRADES INVOLVED

Mr. Wells obtained the aid of William K. Klein, president of the hospital association, in arranging the all-day interview session in the Brotherhood-in-Action Building, 560 Seventh Avenue at 40th Street. The Job Corps trainees, all neatly dressed and wearing ties, had been trained either for electrical work, offset printing, painting, carpentry or as cook's helpers.

Among the successful applicants was Billy McDonald, 20 West 115th Street, who was arrested about a year ago for possession of marijuana. He said low grades in high school kept him from playing basketball and left him dejected, but that he had learned much in his six months in the Job Corps—"group living, how to budget my money and personal hygiene."

Now being trained in food service, Billy will graduate from the Job Corps in September. He was offered jobs by Lenox Hill and Flower-Fifth Avenue Hospitals, but said he had made no decision.

COOK'S HELPER HIRED

Joseph C. Mitchell, 19 years old, of New Iberia, La., said he had been hired as a cook's helper by New York State Hospital. He was first trained by the Job Corps in Arizona as a tractor driver but found the climate there too hot, he said, and transferred to the Kilmer center.

Helene Doneson, an interviewer for University Hospital, said she had hired Hector Adorno of the Bronx as a multith operator.

"I am much impressed with the Job Corps trainees," Miss Doneson said. "I haven't seen applicants like this in a long time."

Senator Robert F. Kennedy visited the interview session and went around the room shaking hands and congratulating the trainees. The Democrat of New York said:

"There is a great job potential in the manpower shortage which grips our nation's hospitals. Today's meeting, therefore, represents an important step toward what I hope will be a continuing partnership between the Job Corps and hospitals all over the country."

Keeping the Vietnam Issue on a Rational Level

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, as presidential year politics heats up, there is a need to maintain commonsense about major, decisive issues.

The Kansas City Star on March 15, 1968, carried an editorial which should guide us in the tumultuous months ahead. I include it in the Extensions of Remarks:

KEEPING THE VIETNAM ISSUE ON A RATIONAL LEVEL

With the fascinating hold of a cobra's weave, the Vietnam war almost hypnotically is drawing political attention early in the 1968 campaign. Criticism of U.S. policy in Southeast Asia has absorbed Sen. Eugene McCarthy from the outset of his bid to wrest the Democratic nomination from President Johnson. Richard M. Nixon, the Republican front-runner, has already promised that a "new leadership" would find a way out of the Pacific conflict. The Johnson administration, speaking through Vice-President Humphrey, quickly challenged Nixon to tell how he would end the war.

Thus the course of Campaign Year 1968 is beginning to concentrate on the most unpopular war in American history. No doubt Dick Nixon will have more—much more—to say about Vietnam. So will Nelson Rockefeller if and when he openly enters the lists as a Republican candidate. Lyndon Johnson will be heard from, too, for he must defend his administration's war policy and discourse on its peace-seeking efforts as well. But the President can choose his own time for such dissertations and it may not suit his strategy to discuss Vietnam at length early in the campaigning.

Sen. Robert F. Kennedy is reassessing his position on whether to run against President Johnson in part, he said, because of the administration's plan to hold to its present course in Vietnam.

The Republicans—Nixon especially—may be driving for maximum vote yield from the initial Nixon pledge to "end the war and bring peace to the Pacific." The war-torn American public would like that, of course. The Republicans have the advantage of being able to offer a new team for peace initiatives. Still there will be demands from the electorate to hear exactly how a Republican President and secretary of state would handle the problem differently. It may not be good enough just to claim that "we could do the job better."

Appeasement is not the Vietnam answer for the United States. President Johnson is not an appeaser. Nor is anyone with a chance to become the Republican nominee. But both parties will be making pitches on trying to end the combat. Such talk will build up pressures and in turn demands for a way out—almost any way out. All along the enemy in Hanoi apparently has been counting on U.S. election results to dictate a peace settlement forced on Communist terms.

Thus an election-year debate on Vietnam could get out of hand and cause harm. The candidates of both parties have a responsibility to be as reasonable as possible in discussing the war. Only rational, unemotional discussion can avoid damage to the interest of the nation and the morale of its fighting men.

Other Important Issues—poverty, the racial

upheaval and defense of the dollar—will also have front-rank as campaign issues. But the struggle in Vietnam seems likely to be agonizing this nation next November as much as it is now. How responsibly it is dealt with in the quest for votes could well decide the outcome of the 1968 election—and even of the war itself.

The Uarkettes: Student Singers of the University of Arkansas

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a group of student singers at the University of Arkansas has received high recognition. They are the only singers from the United States scheduled to perform at the international convention of the Rotary Clubs meeting in Mexico City this May.

The group, known as the Uarkettes, has given performances in recent years in much of Western Europe and in many places in the United States. They make excellent ambassadors for our country and, I am sure, will give the 16,000 Rotarians from 66 countries at Mexico City a very good impression of the musical ability of our young people. Arkansas is certainly proud of them.

I ask unanimous consent that three press releases regarding the activities of the Uarkettes be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

FAYETTEVILLE, ARK., November 2, 1967.—Rotarians from all over the world will hear the University of Arkansas "Uarkettes" sing next spring during the Rotary International convention in Mexico City.

Prof. Kenneth Ballenger, director of the 19-voice student group, received an invitation from the program committee of the organization that has clubs in 66 countries.

The Uarkettes in recent years have toured Europe, under sponsorship of the United Service Organizations, to entertain American troops, and have also sung at many places in Arkansas and other states.

Ballenger has been told that the University of Arkansas singers are the only ones from the United States to be invited to perform at a grand assembly of some 16,000 Rotarians.

Several appearances will be made at convention meetings during May 12-16. The Uarkettes will also perform for the North American-Mexican Cultural Institute in Mexico City, and will also sing under auspices of the United States Embassy.

Members of this year's Uarkettes are Donna Axum, Penny Garrett, Julia Eddins, and George ("Pal") Owens of El Dorado; Brenda Dill, David Hallin, Sylvia Rose, Linda Thomas, Lorry Thomas, Ann Burleson, and Elizabeth Hallin of Fayetteville; Connie Gobel of Mount Ida; Randy Lee of Pine Bluff; Max Ryan of Springdale; Fredricka Silvey of Calico Rock; Carol Soule and Mary Henley of Tulsa, Okla.; David Wylie of Ruston, La.; and Linda Eubanks of Pensacola, Fla.

FAYETTEVILLE, ARK., February 8, 1968.—Fourteen performances in Arkansas and two adjoining states are on schedule for the University of Arkansas Uarkettes, a widely known student singing group that has entertained audiences at home and abroad.

Kenneth Ballenger, professor of music and director of the group, says the Uarkettes will be singing to raise funds for a trip to Mexico City in May. They've been invited to entertain some 16,000 Rotarians from 66 countries at the annual international convention in the Mexican capital, and will make other appearances while there.

Professor Ballenger says that the Uarkettes are the only singers from the United States invited to perform at the Rotary convention.

Concerts scheduled prior to the trip to Mexico are as follows:

Feb. 20, College of Ozarks, Clarksville; Feb. 21, Station KATV, Little Rock, the Bud Campbell Show; Feb. 21, Arkansas Arts Center, Little Rock; Feb. 22, Downtown Rotary Club, Little Rock; March 7, Ozark Cannery and Freezers convention, Fayetteville;

March 9, Mountain Home high school; March 15, Grove, Okla.; March 25, El Dorado, Ark., Rotary Club; April 6, UA Alumni club and Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City; April 20, Rotary district convention, Osage Beach, Mo.;

April 21, Rotary District convention, Muskogee, Okla.; April 27, benefit concert, UA auditorium, Fayetteville; May 4, Town Club, Fort Smith.

In recent years, the Uarkettes have toured western Europe, under the sponsorship of the United Service Organizations, to entertain American troops, and have sung in many places in the United States.

FAYETTEVILLE, ARK., February 15, 1968.—Four new voices have been added to the Uarkettes, internationally known singing group at the University of Arkansas directed by Professor Kenneth L. Ballenger.

The Uarkettes will begin a tour of 14 concerts on Feb. 20 that will take them to points in Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri, and then during May 12-16 they'll perform in Mexico City.

Additions to the group announced by Professor Ballenger, after auditions in which 15 singers participated, are: Susan Benschberg, Camden; Jack Meyers, Fort Smith; Susan Kemper, Coleman, Texas; and Mark Stevenson, Wheaton, Ill.

They join the following Uarkettes: Donna Axum, Penny Garrett, Julia Eddins, and George Owens of El Dorado; Brenda Dill, David Hallin, Fayetteville; Connie Gobel, Mount Ida; Fredericka Silvey, Calico Rock; Mary Henley, Tulsa, Okla.; David Wylie, Ruston, La.; and Linda Eubanks, Pensacola, Fla.

Ballenger has led the group in performances at many places in the United States, as well as in Europe where the Uarkettes entertained American troops under sponsorship of the United States Organizations.

Their concerts during the next several weeks will help raise funds to pay their expenses to the Rotary International convention in Mexico City, where they'll sing before approximately 16,000 Rotarians from 66 countries. While in the Mexican capital they'll also entertain at the North American-Mexican Cultural Institute, at Mexico City High School, and at the United States Embassy.

Address by the Honorable Manuel F. Cohen, Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, there has been a rapid growth in the number of investors in the securities

market in recent years. Reports reflect a total of 24 million investors currently which represents an increase of 7 million since 1962.

Chairman Manuel F. Cohen, of the Securities and Exchange Commission, said recently that the average daily volume of trading on the New York Stock Exchange has grown from 3 million shares in 1962 to more than 10 million shares in 1967.

On a recent day, Chairman Cohen reported, the American Stock Exchange volume exceeded 10 million—as compared with a daily average of 2.8 million shares in 1966 and by 2.2 million in 1965.

In this connection, Chairman Cohen recently delivered an address before the 1968 Conference on Mutual Funds at Palm Springs, Calif., which I am including in the RECORD, because of its broad interest.

Excerpts from the address follow:

THE MUTUAL FUND

(An address by Hon. Manuel F. Cohen, Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, before the 1968 Conference on Mutual Funds, Palm Springs, Calif., March 1, 1968)

The basic idea of a "mutual" fund is deceptively simple. A large number of investors, each with a small amount of capital to invest, pool their capital so that it can be jointly invested on their behalf by a manager who will decide what investments to make and when to make them. The asset value of shares in the fund is normally calculated on the basis of the market value of the portfolio securities, usually twice a day. The fund stands ready to sell an unlimited number of its shares at asset value plus a sales charge which may be reduced for very substantial sales. Outstanding shares may be redeemed at approximately net assets value.

This appearance of simplicity—combined with substantial rewards to salesmen—account, at least in part, for the great increase in popularity of these funds over the past two decades. But you know and I know that "mutual" funds are not simple—that they are in fact an aspect of a very complicated business which is growing more complicated all the time. * * *

In fact, very little about these funds is simple. Even the method of computing the net asset value for the entering or departing shareholder is not as mechanical or as simple as it might first appear. * * * We have also received expressions of concern by investors about the different methods by which their interests in a fund can be terminated; the difference between redemption and repurchase, and the fact that they may receive different prices under these alternative procedures, is not always completely understandable to them.

A second area of complexity relates to the objectives of the fund. . . . Investment policies differ in basic, and sometimes more subtle, ways. Funds go by such designations as "income", "growth", and "balanced", but the prospectus description of investment policy—drawn so as to preserve maximum flexibility for the fund managers—often provides only a hazy idea of what specific mix of securities may be held from time to time. . . .

A third area of complexity is the legal structure of the fund. Many investors do not understand the complex interrelationships among the fund, the advisor, the underwriter, the custodian, the broker and the various supporting players. We continue to receive letters from investors asking us to explain the roles of the various persons or organizations listed in the prospectus. These relationships are not always easy to describe in terms that can be readily understood.

Closely related to the rather complicated legal structure is the complexity of the

charges and costs that are involved in the acquisition and maintenance of shares in such a fund. One part—the sales charge—is paid by the investor at the time of purchase. It is usually based on the amount of the purchase, and may vary depending upon the amount and manner of the purchase. Another part—the management fee—is levied against the fund periodically—usually quarterly—and is based ordinarily on the total size of the fund. The third major part—brokerage commissions—is charged against the fund every time portfolio securities are bought or sold for it—including the investment of the proceeds derived from the sale of fund shares—and is based on the commission rate structures of the various securities exchanges. Additional charges may be levied for custodian fees, insurance and other miscellaneous services at levels based on a variety of factors. About all that can be said concerning the charges borne by the funds, and indirectly by their investors, is that they are substantial; yet it is difficult for the average investor to compute them with any accuracy or even to determine how substantial they are in relation to the gain he has achieved or hopes to achieve from his investment, since some of the charges are reflected in changes in the net asset value of his shares while others are not. Also, because of the unique external management structure of most of these funds, the investor has great difficulty in measuring the managers' compensation against generally accepted community standards regarding the compensation of individual corporate managers.

This brief recitation of the salient characteristics of "mutual" funds raises a serious question whether the word "mutual" is appropriate in describing this investment medium. That term is usually reserved for a situation where costs and profits are shared equally by all participants in the enterprise.

It was clear to the Congress in 1940, as I believe it is clear today, that adequate protection of fund investors requires substantive controls in the promotion, management and sale of mutual funds. The regulatory scheme devised in 1940, when the industry was in its infancy, reached the grosser forms of abuses, such as embezzlement and the more obvious form of overreaching. It seems evident that it is now important to deal with more subtle abuses which may flow from overcharging and overreaching which traditional disclosure techniques are ineffective to reach.

One problem—or group of problems—that the Congress foresaw in 1940 was in the area of size. The hundredfold growth of investment companies in the past twenty-seven years has greatly magnified the problem of assuring a fair sharing of the economies of that growth in size between the fund managers and the shareholders they serve. The Commission as you know, has suggested the enactment of an explicit court-enforced standard of reasonableness to assure this fair sharing. We suggested this as an alternative to true "mutualization" which is implied by the name under which these funds are sold.

Thus far, I have been talking about the complexity of the traditional "mutual" fund. But more complicated "mutual" funds have been developed in recent years, as promoters have exercised their ingenuity to attract more and more investors to this medium.

Most of you are familiar with the so-called "swap funds" which enjoyed a great popularity a few short years ago. We now have mutual funds which invest in other mutual funds. These funds add another layer of uncertainty—and frequently another layer of costs. Others propose to engage in complex securities transactions which were formerly considered the exclusive province of individual traders—puts, calls, straddles, short selling, short term trading and similar techniques. These practices, their risks and other consequences are difficult to explain or to describe adequately to investors. They

also harbor potential dangers to investment companies, as the important vehicles they are for the allocation of public savings, and to our public market places for securities.

The fee structure has provided a real opportunity for the exercise of the ingenuity for which fund managers have established an enviable reputation. After all, that is where the money is, and despite the common use of the term "mutual," the principal reason these funds are created and sold is to make money for the people who sell, and those who manage or otherwise act for, them.

A current and developing fashion seems to be the performance fee. An appealing case can be made for the proposition that the man who does well for the fund he manages is entitled to extra compensation measured by the quality of his performance. But, apart from the problem of establishing appropriate yardsticks against which to measure performance, a difficult problem which has not yet been resolved, we must not overlook the dangers inherent in certain types of incentive fees which led the Congress in the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to prohibit compensation for investment advisers based on a percentage of the gains achieved by their clients. These considerations are equally matters of concern in the investment company area today.

But it is in the area of sales compensation that the ingenuity of fund managers has had its greatest flowering. There are contests and other types of special incentives for dealers who sell a certain quota of the shares of a particular fund. Apart from the bias this introduces, and the manner in which it affects the dealer's or salesman's judgment in advising his customer, it is almost impossible to disclose the nature and amount of these incentives adequately and effectively.

I might say that in the course of our Congressional hearings last year, a fund dealer informed a Committee that he received extra compensation when he sold more than a certain amount of shares of a particular fund, and that this fact was fully disclosed in the prospectus. The Committee asked us afterwards whether this was the case. We advised that the general framework of the compensation scheme was disclosed in the prospectus—but that the scheme was so complicated it was extremely difficult for the ordinary investor to understand its general workings and impossible for him to determine how much extra compensation his dealer or salesman would receive for steering his investment into that fund rather than another. As all of you know, the Commission's staff has never hesitated to insist upon the most informative disclosure that can reasonably be achieved. While it is probably true that we have not exhausted all the possibilities, this incident emphasizes that disclosure has not proved to be the answer to these problems.

Of course, the most complex technique of all for compensating the dealer who sells fund shares involves the use of part of the commission dollars paid by the fund on portfolio transactions. Fund managers have developed a variety of ingenious devices to channel excess commission dollars to dealers who perform various services for the managers. In connection with recent proposals for change in the New York Stock Exchange commission structure, we published a proposed rule based on the proposition that fund managers have a duty to use these procedures to return the excess dollars to the fund—a practice, incidentally, which a number of large fund complexes initiated voluntarily some time ago.

In our release discussing these proposals, we described some of the existing practices and indicated that they raised serious questions under accepted concepts of fiduciary

responsibility. We do not believe, based on our present understanding of the situation, that disclosure of these practices is likely to benefit the average investor or to redress any grievances in this area, even assuming that he could understand from the prospectus description how the system worked, exactly how much compensation was being directed to dealers and salesmen generally, and to his dealer specifically, and how much of it constituted a charge against his interest in the fund. Paradoxically, disclosure may even lead a fund shareholder to believe that these practices raise no legal or ethical questions, since the disclosure is found in a document which, as the salesman advises his customer, has been filed with a government agency having certain responsibilities with respect to the practices of investment companies.

My cataloguing of these complexities of mutual funds does not indicate any desire on my part to return to a simpler era in all the areas mentioned. I wish only to point out that we must have an adequate system of regulation to assure that unsophisticated investors are fairly treated and that public confidence, so essential to continued growth of our securities markets, is not impaired.

Resolution on Vietnam

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, as the leaders of our Government, as well as leaders throughout the world, search for an honorable solution to the conflict in Vietnam, the National Council of Churches once again comes forth to show the way by suggesting a course that can lead to an end to the holocaust.

I call upon all of my colleagues to give serious consideration to the resolution on Vietnam adopted by the NCC general board February 22, 1968, which reads as follows:

RESOLUTION ON VIETNAM

(Adopted by the NCC general board, February 22, 1968)

The General Board of the National Council of Churches makes the following observations concerning the situation in Vietnam.

Prime Minister Harold Wilson is reported to have stated in the House of Commons on February 13, 1968 concerning the prospect of negotiations: "There is a very narrow gap to be bridged now, very narrow indeed." On February 14, The New York Times reports: "Secretary General Thant believes that if the United States unconditionally stopped the bombing of North Vietnam for as long as about two weeks, Hanoi would begin meaningful negotiations." The General Board welcomes these statements and considers that at this time no possibility of a peaceful settlement should be left untested by our government.

Secretary General Thant is further reported as saying that there is "a not unhelpful prospect for negotiations despite bloody military developments of the last few weeks." In the light of this, we view with disquiet the statement attributed to President Johnson: "that the search for peace appeared to be exhausted and therefore the time for debate had come to an end while brave Americans made their stand in battle." The General Board believes that this is a time when hardening of attitudes should be avoided, when there should be continued examination of U.S. objectives and methods in Vietnam, and when the search for a negotiated peace should be intensified.

Recent military and political developments in Vietnam indicate that the fundamental issues remain, and indeed grow more acute. Pacification programs appear to be in disarray, and the effective loyalty of large elements of the South Vietnamese people to the Saigon government appears to be in grave question. The Americanization of the war appears to grow in serious measure. There are many statements calling for intensification of the U.S. military effort. Assurances by General Wheeler that atomic weapons will not be used at Khesahn lead us to welcome and support the destruction statement of President Johnson that the use of nuclear weapons has at no time been considered or recommended. Whatever the provocation might be, we do not believe that nuclear weapons should be used in Vietnam. Indeed further intensification of the U.S. military effort whether by invasion of Laos or Cambodia or North Vietnam or by large increase of manpower or firepower appears to us to be futile, tending to the destruction rather than the attainment, of U.S. objectives in Vietnam. Similarly we believe that a massive attack on Khesahn by Hanoi will produce a hardening of attitudes in the U.S.A. and we appeal to Hanoi for restraint. Further, we ask that Hanoi, instead of simply rejecting the "San Antonio formula," initiate in its own way the stabilization of the present confrontation in the South even as talks are in preparation or underway. Intensification of fighting by either side appears to us to be self-defeating.

Encouraged by world leaders and members of Congress who feel that an early negotiated peace is possible, we urge the President to take leadership now along the following lines:

(a) Hanoi has made repeated statements, the latest on February 8 by the Foreign Minister, that meaningful talks will take place once the bombing of the North stops. We believe that we should move beyond the "San Antonio formula." Recognizing the grave risks involved, we ask for immediate cessation of the bombing of the North, realizing that this step will provide a definite test of Hanoi's integrity which if successful will lead to negotiations.

(b) Simultaneously with the above, we ask for reference to the United Nations General Assembly or other international body, to the end that cease-fire arrangements and negotiations be facilitated.

(c) We believe that the U.S. should restate its willingness to negotiate with all major elements of the Vietnamese population including the National Liberation Front, and with all parties to the conflict. We believe also that the U.S. must recognize the necessity for flexibility in negotiations.

(d) We believe that it is necessary that the U.S. restate now with decisive clarity its willingness and determination to withdraw militarily from Vietnam at an early date once a peaceful settlement has been attained.

Federal Impacted Area Funds

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a very serious matter in regard to Public Law 874, the impacted area funds. I have been told by some of my constituents in the Second Congressional District of the State of Nebraska that a cutback in impacted area funding could lead to a curtailment in quality of education now being provided for the dependents of our servicemen, and that

this curtailment could undoubtedly have a serious impact on the morale of our fighting men in Vietnam.

As you are aware, the Senate has passed a version of H.R. 15399, with an amendment which fully funds the impacted areas program. Undoubtedly the House bill with the Senate amendment will be sent to a conference committee. I recommend your support for the Senate amendment which would restore the \$91 million needed so urgently by over 4,000 school districts in the United States to educate the children of Federal employees and servicemen.

The cutback of impacted area funds will have a serious impact on my district and on the entire State of Nebraska. The State of Nebraska was planning on receiving an estimated \$4.7 million in Public Law 874 funds in fiscal year 1968. The supplemental appropriations we passed will net only 80 percent of this amount, which will result in a loss of Federal funds to the schools in our State of around \$900,000.

Educators from my district tell me that a good number of schools will have no choice but to curtail their educational programs for the remainder of the school year to the degree that education in federally impacted school districts could be far inferior to the education being offered in the districts with fewer Federal employees.

I would consider it a tragedy and a national disgrace if our boys in Vietnam should begin to receive letters from home saying that their children are only going to school half days or are being forced to attend overcrowded classrooms.

There is another situation which has recently arisen in the State of Nebraska which indicates to me that the cutback in funds will have a statewide effect. The Nebraska Unicameral Legislature recently passed a State aid to education bill. Prior to the passage of this bill, the loss of Public Law 874 funds affected only federally impacted school districts.

As the State aid bill is presently written, any loss of Public Law 874 funds by any Nebraska school district will have to be replaced by the State. I feel that funding of impacted area school districts belongs in the category of priority programs which should not be reduced. This program recognizes the inequity of asking local taxpayers to pay the expanded cost of educating a sudden influx of new pupils as a result of expanded Federal activities in local school districts especially in the case of military personnel.

The benefits of these Federal programs are nationwide especially in the area of our national defense, and I feel that the burden of educating the children of our servicemen should be nationwide, too.

International Education Without Federal Appropriations

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, a great many words have been written and

spoken on the subject of international education.

In questioning the wisdom of the International Education Act passed by the Congress last session, I sought to emphasize the need for additional activities by American educators abroad so that increased numbers of Americans might learn about the people, cultures, and languages of these nations.

A most valuable program has been initiated by a few American universities which have undertaken to send faculty members, administrators, and students abroad to help the educational programs of less developed areas. One such example is the program undertaken in Indonesia by a university in Iowa. The March 6 issue of the Christian Science Monitor comments favorably upon this activity in its editorial page.

As noted in this editorial, the valuable exchange of ideas and knowledge can be accomplished without huge congressional appropriations and serves the dual purpose of educating both Americans and Indonesians, and promoting good will and understanding between the people of the respective nations.

I call this editorial and the activities which it praises to the attention of my colleagues and Americans everywhere:

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
Mar. 6, 1968]

IOWA IN INDONESIA

A form of foreign aid that would not call for big congressional appropriations has been largely overlooked. It is college-to-college assistance.

A correspondent of this newspaper, visiting Indonesia, was made keenly aware of the need for such aid in that developing country. She found many capable young people clamoring for entrance to universities. But the universities were able to let only a tiny percentage of applicants in because they lacked the faculty and facilities to handle numbers.

This is a sad situation in a country where a greatly increased supply of educated personnel—professionals and technicians—is required to pull it up out of poverty.

Something can be done about it. A few of the large universities in the United States point the way. They provide for exchange of students, faculty members, and administrators with the Indonesian institutions. Sometimes the American universities send also much-needed books and laboratory equipment.

But their most important contribution is the assistance offered by exchange personnel. For most of them bring with them a knowledge of American methods of handling mass enrollments that can be shared with Indonesia. The exchange of ideas is stimulating to both.

Up to now the American universities which have established contacts with Indonesian universities are very few—not half a dozen. And the need is enormous.

More could be enlisted. In the United States are several hundred teacher-training colleges, and many universities with schools of education. All could benefit by establishing relationship with a similar institution in a country in need of help.

It would bring warmth and color to a prairie state college, for example, to have a sister college in an island nation like Indonesia halfway around the world. So would the presence on the American campus of an Indonesian exchange professor and Indonesian students. Gifts of books and materials for Indonesian students probably would follow naturally.

Everyone would stand to gain by such activity. If it works in Indonesia, it could be

expanded to include many other lands where educational opportunity is in short supply. An enthusiastic promoter of the educational foreign aid idea is needed.

Kiwanis of New York City Hear Stringfellow on Edison

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Kiwanis Club of New York City, which meets in my district with my constituent Edward Perlstein officiating, had the good fortune recently to have its member and former president, Mr. George E. Stringfellow, an associate of the late Thomas Alva Edison, speak about his work.

The address will, I am sure, be of great interest to my colleagues:

THOMAS ALVA EDISON, HUMANITY'S FRIEND

(An address by George E. Stringfellow, business associate of the late Thomas Alva Edison, delivered before the Kiwanis Club of New York City, February 14, 1968)

Thomas Alva Edison, father of the electric light and power industry, produced more inventions than any other man in the history of the world and was one of mankind's greatest benefactors. He was born in Milan, Ohio, on February 11, 1847—121 years ago. He died in West Orange, New Jersey, on October 18, 1931.

It was my high honor to have been selected by Mr. Edison to assume the management of one of his largest and most lucrative businesses. Any success I may have had in commerce or civic affairs, is largely the result of my daily association with this great American during the last decade of his long and productive life.

Embellishments can not fittingly pay tribute to one so humble, so plain and retiring.

He was passionately fond of work.

He was a genius in applying organized knowledge.

He was infinitely patient and undaunted in failures.

He brought forth inventions which broadened the lives of mankind.

He knew no class distinction; no national boundaries; no allegiance to any definite group—either political, religious or fraternal. His was the vision of the masses.

He brought amusement, joy and romance to man, woman and child. He lessened their labors. He widened their education for a fuller enjoyment of their daily lives. Great industries with employment of many millions followed in the wake of his discoveries. We can truthfully say there came from his laboratory, a supreme gift—a higher standard of life and higher living standards for the world.

At the time of Edison's death it was suggested that as a tribute to him, the electric power of the nation be turned off for one minute. It was felt this token of respect would cause the people to realize Edison's magnificent contribution.

Upon further consideration it was realized that somewhere in the bowels of the earth, men digging in tunnels and mining ore are dependent on electrically-driven pumps for air. Without it they would soon perish. In hospitals surgeons in the midst of operations with life hanging in the balance, are dependent on electricity to complete their work. The telephone and the police and fire alarms

are dependent on electric power. And in hundreds of other situations there would be great danger to life and property if the power of the nation was turned off at the source, just for a minute, as a tribute to its creator.

And so, in our very inability to pay as complete a tribute to Edison as we wished, we found a new and higher tribute to him. Life depends on the light and energy he gave us.

Civilization has been built around his work. At twenty minutes past three o'clock, the morning of Sunday, October 18, 1931, Thomas Alva Edison closed a long life of unparalleled usefulness.

Mr. Edison's approach to death was a wonderful example of unperturbed courage. Its inevitableness was thoroughly understood and on no occasion did he manifest any apprehension of spirit. He dealt with his falling health as impersonally as he did with any research problem. Before he entered the drowsiness which turned into the final coma, Mr. Edison compared himself with an old machine past repair.

The entire world followed the illness and passing of Mr. Edison with interest and sympathy reserved only for its beloved great, which he was. Throughout the eleven weeks of his illness, his home in Llewellyn Park, West Orange, N.J., was a focal point of unusual solicitude. Many thousands of inquiries on Mr. Edison's condition came to the inventor's home and to members of his family.

After the word of his passing had been flashed around the world, messages of condolence and tributes to his genius flowed into Llewellyn Park in unprecedented numbers.

Mrs. Edison, who had been his close companion over a period of 45 years, was constantly in attendance at her illustrious husband's bedside. She contributed everything possible to his comfort and peace of mind. She exhibited extraordinary courage and fortitude throughout the ordeal.

On October 19 and 20 Mr. Edison's body lay in state in the library of his West Orange laboratory. Except for the casket and the simple floral decoration, this room was left almost as he knew it, with its galleries lined with reference mementoes of his amazing life.

After Mr. Edison's employees and co-workers had taken their last look at all that remained of their "old chief", the gates obstructing the way to the laboratory were thrown open and the public allowed to pass through the library. Four abreast they waited in line and moved sadly through the room. Old men and women, shabbily dressed, and school children were in line. Limousines with liveried chauffeurs discharged passengers who took their places in line.

During the two days and nights that the body lay in state, it is estimated that more than 50,000 persons filed through to render a last act of reverence.

On Wednesday morning, October 21, Mr. Edison's body was carried to his home in preparation for the funeral rites and burial. The funeral service was extremely simple, in keeping with the taste and character of Mr. Edison. While the ceremony was private, more than 400 close friends were in attendance.

After the ceremony the body was carried to Rosedale Cemetery in Orange, N.J. which overlooks the hills and valleys among which he had spent the most productive years of his life. It was dusk when the last rites were being said, and autumn leaves drifted softly to the ground from the distant fringe of trees. President Hoover's wreath of magnolia leaves lay at the head of the grave. Electric lights flashed on in the distance while Mrs. Edison stood in silent contemplation before the flower-banked grave.

Only members of the family and a few intimate friends, including his old cronies, Harvey Firestone and Henry Ford, and their wives, attended the interment.

In commenting on Edison's passing, the New York Times said:

"Edison, the light bearer, has gone into darkness. The master of the waves of sound is silent. Around him had gathered an atmosphere of respect, admiration and affection such as surrounded no other American of our time. . . . He might have wrought all these marvels and remained apart, solitarily in his laboratory. His companionable and social nature, his fine simplicity and boyishness, endeared the man, set up his essential human image in millions of minds. He was not only honored, but loved."

Three years before Edison passed on to his reward, a special Congressional Medal of Honor was given him for "development and application of inventions that revolutionized civilization in the last century."

Few men have received, or receiving, deserved such a compliment from the United States Congress.

The manner of his life became the manner of his death. Slowly, calmly, peacefully, he faced death. It found him as unafraid to meet the mysteries beyond as he had been unafraid to explore the mysteries here.

On his deathbed he said, "It is very beautiful over there." How true that must have been with his coming, and equally true it is that he made it very beautiful over here.

He ended his long life, not with a sudden stroke, but with a slow folding-up that seemed perfectly to suit it. No one can yet entirely estimate his place in history, but it can at least be said of Edison, as it was said of Lincoln, and can be said of very few others: "Now he belongs to the ages."

The Washington Post said of him:

"Few men will have the privilege of influencing the life and civilization of their fellow-beings after they have crossed the bridge of death, so much as this great American."

There are those who feel that Edison's greatest contribution to civilization is not listed in his more than 1,000 inventions and is not a material product of his laboratory. It is his inspiration to youth, his example to those who would dare to dream of new worlds, his challenge to accomplishment that will always spur onward those who fight the past with the future.

President Hoover said:

"It is given to few men of any age, nation or calling, to become the benefactor of all humanity. That distinction came abundantly to Thomas Alva Edison, whose death in his 85th year has ended a life of courage and achievement."

"By his own genius and effort he rose from a newsboy and telegrapher to the position of leadership among men. His life has been a constant stimulant to confidence that our institutions hold open the door of opportunity to those who would enter. He possessed a modesty, kindness, a staunchness of character rare among men."

Among the lessons from the life of Edison are his uniformly courageous and optimistic outlook, his triumph over his handicap of deafness and his consistent exemplification of the doctrine of self-help. In his achievements he reared for himself an enduring memorial.

Edison's last public utterance remains the best advice given to a perturbed world. It was:

"Be courageous. I have lived a long time. I have seen history repeat itself again and again. I have seen many depressions in business. Always America has come out stronger and more prosperous. Be as brave as your fathers before you. Have faith. Go forward."

Thomas Alva Edison was humanity's friend!

President Johnson Pays Tribute to Veterans of Foreign Wars

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson paid tribute last week to one of America's most distinguished and important organizations—the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The VFW has been a strong right arm to many Commanders in Chief—including President Johnson. They have never wavered from supporting the President's efforts to provide for the security of America and the well-being of our fighting men.

They have recognized—in President Johnson's words—"that the greatness of a nation is measured by its willingness to fulfill its moral obligations to its own people, as well as to mankind."

Since the end of World War II four American Presidents have willingly accepted the new and costly obligations thrust upon the United States. The VFW has been in the forefront of those who recognize the folly of turning our backs on responsibility—and the enormous price of retreating into isolation.

Our goal in the world has always been peace—as it is in Vietnam today. But Americans—and President Johnson—recognize that peace cannot come to Vietnam—or to the world—when aggression, terror, and coercion are allowed to overrun the forces of freedom.

The VFW is helping to unite Americans behind this Nation's commitment to resist Communist aggression in Southeast Asia. Thus today, as in days past, the Veterans of Foreign Wars are—as President Johnson put it—a "voice of conscience and responsibility" for America.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the RECORD the President's remarks before the VFW dinner:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE VFW DINNER, SHERATON PARK HOTEL

Commander Scerra, Senator Russell, distinguished Members of Congress, Members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, ladies and gentlemen:

I came here to join you briefly this evening because it gave me a chance to share in the high honor that your great organization is paying to a champion of the American fighting man, a great friend of the American veteran, a leader for decades of all the people of this country, and I am very proud to say my long-time and good friend, Richard Russell of Georgia.

I would also like to take a moment now to pay tribute to another splendid Georgian—a great American—Dean Rusk. I do not believe ever in our history has this office been filled by a more dedicated or by a more sincere American. I have never heard United States policy and our commitments so eloquently stated—and under such very trying circumstances—than was done by Secretary Rusk in the last two days before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

If this Nation is secure—and if it is kept secure—all Americans will owe a great debt to these two great Georgians, Dick Russell and Dean Rusk.

I have always heard that the Veterans of Foreign Wars dinner attracts more Members of Congress than any other social event. As

I look around this room tonight, I can well believe that. I see many of my old-time friends from Capitol Hill here. I do still have some friends left up there.

Of course, many of my political friends are home tonight, watching TV. I am told that there is a special on tonight—from New Hampshire.

You know the New Hampshire primaries are unique in politics. They are the only races where anybody can run—and everybody can win.

I think New Hampshire is the only place where candidates can claim 20 percent as a landslide and 40 percent as a mandate and 60 percent as unanimous.

I had an early report from New Hampshire this morning on one of these unbiased television networks. They had counted 25 votes there. In the first 25, the vote for LBJ was zero. I said to Mrs. Johnson: "What do you think about that?" She answered: "I think the day is bound to get better, Lyndon."

Well, it has been a long day. I have not been home to dinner yet. But I am proud to come here and to bring to this great organization my message of gratitude. I want to thank your Commander and every member of this organization for all that you have done—for all that you are doing—for the security and well-being of the United States of America.

I want to thank you for the support that you gave our surtax proposal which would make fiscal responsibility possible and would give confidence to the rest of the world.

I want to thank you for your support when the debt ceiling had to be raised.

I want to thank you for joining me and helping me settle the railroad strike.

I want to thank you for endorsing the extension of the draft so we would not have to send our Army home.

I told Tiger Teague, my dear friend, Chairman of the Veterans Committee, coming in tonight: I want to thank you for backing every piece of legislation to aid our men in Vietnam when they come home and when they join you as Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I want all of those who hear me or read me to know that I believe that you are great spokesmen for the American veteran—for the man who has laid his life on the line for his country.

But you have also been a voice for responsibility in all world affairs. You have understood that duty always travels with strength—that the greatness of a nation is measured by its willingness to fulfill its moral obligations to its own people, as well as to mankind.

The United States, at the end of the Second World War, did not go out in search of new obligations. Our strength, and our commitment to man's freedom, brought those obligations to our door. Four Presidents now have recognized those obligations. 10 Congresses have verified them.

They have been costly—in blood and in treasure. The only higher cost would have come from our ignoring them or from our failure to assume them. The price of isolationism—

Whether it is the old-fashioned kind of isolationism that is rooted in ignorance,

Or the new-fashioned kind that grows from weariness and impatience,

Whatever its kind, isolationism exacts the highest price of all and, ultimately, as well learned, it is unpayable.

Our goal, my friends, is not the unlimited extension of American responsibilities anywhere. It is clearly not the conquest of a single foot of territory anywhere in the world. It is not the imposition of any form of government or economy on any other people on this earth.

Our goal is peace—the blessed condition that allows each nation to pursue its own purposes:

Free of marching invaders and aggressors;
Free of terror in the night;

Free of hunger, and ignorance, and crippling diseases.

If we take up arms, we take them up only to guard against those enemies. It is to help the nation builders. It is to try to shield the weak so that time can make them strong. It is to bar aggression. It is to build the lasting peace that is our country's single purpose today.

We send our young men abroad because peace is threatened in other lands tonight, and ultimately in our own.

We take our stand to give stability to a world where stability is needed desperately.

We rattle no sabers. We seek to intimidate no man.

But neither shall we be intimidated. And from American responsibilities—God willing—we shall never retreat. There is no safety in such a course. Neither reason nor honor nor good faith commends such a course.

You of the VFW have been the strong right arm of many Commanders in Chief, of many Presidents. You have been a voice of conscience and responsibility for many years for many millions of Americans. I ask only that you hold straight to that course. You will help to lead your nation and you will help to lead your world beyond danger to the peaceful day when free men know not fear, but when free men know fulfillment.

I will leave you now in that confident expectation.

But before I go, just let me close as I began—with a word about our great honored guest who strives daily to make this nation more secure, and also a word about a resident of his State in his early manhood—our great Secretary of State. There is something I would like to say about Dean Rusk. He is a good and a wise man. He has known the heat of the kitchen—as well as the television lights. The dignity that comes from the clay soil from which he sprang—he has known it long enough to know that good humor and great patience also play their part in history, too.

So, I will return home now to watch another television replay—the Dean Rusk Show.

That's the show, you know, that was two years in production. We had a great cast—but no plot.

We also had trouble picking the title. "Gunsmoke" had already been taken. We finally decided on "Shoot-Out at Capitol Hill."

Then we couldn't find a sponsor. They all said: "Sorry, quiz shows are dead."

I saw Secretary Rusk tonight before I came over here. He looked different. I said: "Where have you been?" And you know—for the first time in two complete days the Secretary of State did not have an answer.

But you men of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, who, in order to qualify for your membership, have had the answer.

You have Dick Russell's appreciation and Dean Rusk's gratitude and my thankfulness. Thank you so much.

Increase Our Gold Production

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, for years I have been in the forefront of those in this country who have seen a very serious problem developing as to our gold supplies.

Having reviewed carefully production and pricing figures over the years, I have always believed that we should increase the domestic production of gold in order

to have sufficient on hand to protect both our monetary and industrial demands if that could be at all possible.

To this end I have been sponsor of gold bills to provide for increased domestic production of gold without incurring any change in the overall price as it affects our monetary situation.

The events over the last few days have indicated to me, as well as to many of my colleagues, that I have been right. Were we to have heeded the warning that I and a good many of my colleagues pointed to, we would not today find ourselves in a shortage position with respect to our own gold supply.

I firmly believe that we are in an era where we may well see an embargo placed on gold, and a run occurring on what little gold supplies we have, even after the last desperate tack has been taken to remove the cover behind our own currency.

It seems to me that if France refuses to go along with protecting gold in international exchange we have no alternative but to increase our own output and at the same time provide our own citizens with the rights to procure gold and hold it in our own interest.

Again, I most urgently urge the passage of legislation to bring about increased production of domestic gold at a price adequate in the face of current costs to help delay the flight of gold from this country. And I am of the opinion that we may very well have to approve legislation sometime in the very near future to permit our own citizens to become on a par with other citizens in other countries in the world with respect to ownership of gold.

I commend to my colleagues and to those who have the interest of our financial future at heart to quickly and carefully review the needs of this country in respect to gold development and holdings.

Sputnik Now Spins in Liquid Space

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, we are aware that Russia has made, and is making, great strides in its efforts to bolster its seapower.

This fact should be of major concern to all of us. For this reason, I include in the RECORD the thoughts of Charles F. Duchein, national president, Navy League of the United States, on this subject.

Not only does Duchein bring this rising threat to our sea superiority to the forefront, but he also offers seven strategic safeguards to preserve American maritime supremacy.

The article follows:

[From Navy magazine, January 1968]

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE: SPUTNIK NOW SPINS IN LIQUID SPACE

(By Charles F. Duchein)

The Mediterranean, strategically significant since history began, now sports a brand new Communist center of maritime studies

and power. Today, the two super powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, are pitted face to face in this ancient sea.

One of the most sweeping strategic events of the 20th century is Russia's emergence as a Mediterranean maritime power. When elements of the Soviet Navy sailed out of the Black Sea into the "Med" under the cover of last June's Arab-Israeli war, the shock wave of Sputnik's first spin in space was lacking, but the implications were more ominous.

Elements of the 40-ship Soviet squadron, going far beyond the shadowing tactics of the Imperial Japanese Navy in the pre-war Pacific, brazenly joined the formations of the U.S. Sixth Fleet. They deliberately developed collision situations. While testing the nerves of our naval commanders, they photographed the Fleet and intercepted the ships' radio communications as part of an intense operational intelligence effort.

However spectacular, the Soviet penetration of the Mediterranean was but the first phase of an unfolding plan. Durable bases were needed next to sustain their presence and to serve as a springboard.

Conveying a protective paternalism toward their Arab allies, the Soviet warships put in to Alexandria and Port Said, in Egypt.

With a few flourishes and an ingratiating display of diplomacy and friendship, the Soviets were "in." With these bases assured, their sights were quickly trained on Mers el Kabir in Algeria. As the French firm up plans for withdrawal, 10 years in advance of the termination of their treaty, the modern Soviet missile ships made operational visits there. No time was lost in preparing for their westward advance toward Gibraltar.

Then, Soviet plans for a carrier construction program were revealed. Intelligence estimates indicated that their first carriers were for amphibious employment, quite possibly in the Indian Ocean. The assumption, based on their size, is that they will handle helicopters and carry the newly created Soviet Marine Corps. But they also might carry new high performance vertical take-off and landing (VTOL) aircraft.

On the heels of the carrier report came news that the ELATH, an Israeli destroyer, was sunk by Soviet-made missiles fired by an Egyptian patrol boat. ELATH was the first surface ship in history to be sunk by missiles.

This rapidly developing mosaic of Soviet maritime accomplishments was uppermost in my mind when we flew to Spain for our Navy League sectional meeting in November. Obviously, many pressing questions about the Soviet build-up remained to be answered; I looked forward with intense interest to discussing the maritime developments in depth with the U.S. naval leaders on the scene with first hand knowledge of this surge in Soviet sea power. They were frank in expressing their concern. The substance of Admiral Don Griffin's remarks to our group is recorded in the December 11 issue of *U.S. News & World Report*.

Their observations were diverse in detail but confirmed the crucial significance of the mounting maritime threat. They agreed that we are witnessing the start of a massive Soviet effort at global conquest via the oceans of the world.

Returning to the States impressed with the necessity for developing a naval program of comparable magnitude to that launched by the Vinson-Trammell legislation which established our Two-Ocean Navy, I realized the clear-cut responsibility of the Navy League's positive action. Broad maritime knowledge would be needed to gain support for a program of the magnitude required to maintain our control and command of the sea. The critical need was for a national maritime policy to met the unprecedented oceanic challenge confronting the nation. Manifestly, the maritime educational purpose of the Navy League has never been more important than it is today.

Shortly after our return, the White House announced that the Secretary of Defense would step down after seven years of service. Changes in our strategy could be anticipated.

And so, these two factors, expanding Soviet pressure and the prospect of a new look at our national defense needs, led to the formulation of this program of seven strategic safeguards to preserve our maritime supremacy:

1. Establish an Indian Ocean Fleet Without Further Delay. The British withdrawal east of Suez has created a power vacuum that may be seized by the Soviets.

2. Build a U.S. Nuclear Navy By 1976 to Celebrate the National Bi-Centennial With a Truly Modern Fleet.

3. Launch a Major Long Range Ship Construction Program to Build Up the U.S. Merchant Marine to the Strongest and Most Modern in History to Regain a Competitive Posture at Sea; and to Modernize the U.S. Navy and Double Its Power.

4. Streamline the Defense Organization to insure that naval advice to the President, as provided for by the law, is adhered to and the maritime viewpoint gains "equal time" consideration.

5. Establish a Secretary of Maritime Affairs at the Cabinet Level. The President requires both maritime thinking and advice encompassing the entire spectrum of oceanic advancement.

6. Stress the Educational Importance of the Oceans on the College Campuses Throughout the Country. Regaining the posture and perspective to prevail in the world's maritime arena on into the 21st Century requires knowledge, understanding and intellectual interest in the oceans.

7. Reorient the National Strategy to a Predominantly Maritime Mobile Power Structure. The geography and power problems of our predominantly water world, coupled with the weaponry of mass destruction, place a premium on military mobility. A sea pressure strategy is required.

I am confident that with the adoption of these strategic safeguards the nation will move forward to its flourishing maritime destiny.

Baltic States Commemorative Stamp

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on October 31, 1967, I introduced a bill (H.R. 13770) which would provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the independence of the Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Since the introduction of this legislation, I have received many resolutions and letters from interested ethnic groups, as well as civic and political organizations. Every one of these messages endorse the idea for such a stamp and urge that early action be taken by the Post Office Department to officially recognize these countries' fight for independence by the issuance of such a stamp.

The fight for justice is not confined to one certain group, a certain segment of our population, nor confined to an individual political party. For justice, each is united into a solid front and I am pleased to place into the RECORD a resolution which I have received from the Young Republican Club of Arlington, Va., which expresses the desire of that group

for the Post Office to act and issue such a commemorative stamp.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Be it resolved by the Young Republican Club of Arlington, Va.:

Whereas the year 1968 marks the fiftieth anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the three Baltic States—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia; and

Whereas there exist historical, cultural, and family ties between the people of the Baltic States and the people of the United States; and

Whereas the occupation and subsequent annexation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union is violative of both fundamental human rights and international law and has never been officially recognized by the United States and other nations of the free world; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has overwhelmingly expressed its deep concern for the plight of the Baltic States, therefore

The Young Republican Club of Arlington, Va., requests the United States Post Office Department to issue a commemorative stamp to call the attention of the free world to the fiftieth anniversary of the proclamation of independence of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

Adopted by the Young Republican Club of Arlington, Va., February 14, 1968.

CLAUDE H. SMITH, Jr.,
President.

Attest:

CAROLYN PERSINGER,
Recording Secretary.

Dual System in HEW Guidelines

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have received from Mr. Peter Libassi a copy of his latest guidelines issued by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare setting out the manner in which he believes we are required to proceed in order to comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Thus far in the enforcement and administration of this act, much has been said about a dual system. My observation is that the dual system means that in the 17 Southern and border States we must integrate the schools while the other 33 are not required to take any such action.

I place in the RECORD a copy of a letter I am today writing Mr. Libassi in this connection and when I receive his response to it, I shall afford it the same publicity.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., March, 18, 1968.

Mr. PETER LIBASSI,

Director, Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. LIBASSI: Thank you for sending me a copy of the new guidelines recently released by your office setting out the manner in which you propose to continue enforcement of what you understand to be the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1968.

It is extremely gratifying to me that these particular guidelines recognize the fact that

ours is a nation of 50 states and not just 17 Southern and Border States.

For the record, I would like to pose a specific question:

Are you now saying that you are going to proceed to insist that ghetto schools in the other 33 states be brought completely up to the standards of the virtually all-white schools in nearby suburban areas or have the suburban schools face loss of federal funds, or are you going to arrive at the conclusion after issuing these latest guidelines and this latest news release that the ghetto schools are, for the most part, in separate central city administrative units, and that the virtually all-white suburban schools in the north are untouchable?

In other words, you are really going to launch an assault against the hypocrisy of the "neighborhood school" system in the north while insisting with an iron hand on total integration in the south, or is your latest plan and release just more of the same thing we have had in the past?

I am sincerely interested in a frank answer to this question, and will give your response the same publicity I am giving this letter.

Sincerely,

DAVID N. HENDERSON.

The Racket That Won't Go Away

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce began another round of hearings on legislation to control the critical problem of aircraft noise. I am an author of a bill in this field and it is my strong hope that the committee will take favorable and expeditious action on this proposal as I urged in my own testimony before the committee last November.

In the March 16 issue of Business Week is an article entitled "The Racket That Won't Go Away" which discusses the jet aircraft noise pollution problem. It is must reading for all who seek to avoid another long, ear-shattering summer.

TRANSPORTATION: THE RACKET THAT WON'T GO AWAY

(NOTE.—With jet flights increasing rapidly—there will be 400 jetports in a few years—jet noise increases, too. Quiet engines are a long way off, so the goal is a "tolerable" noise level.)

Hot weather is coming again and with it open windows, outdoor barbecuing, and the eardrum-shattering effects of jet airplanes.

Every year the aircraft noise problem gets worse. What was once merely a major nuisance has, with the vast increase in the number of jet flights, grown into a roaring calamity for millions of people living near airports. And unlike the threats of trouble from sonic boom when supersonic transports start flying, jet noise is a calamity that is here today.

Jet noise stops conversation dead; it keeps people awake at night; it terrifies children; it can damage buildings and can lower property values. Moreover, it will get a lot worse before it gets better. Nothing now in the works will make planes substantially quieter before the mid 1970's. By that time the number of takeoffs and landings will triple.

The problem is not confined to the big cities. New, short-range jets are bringing high decibel counts to an increasing num-

ber of smaller communities. Within a few years, jets will be operating out of more than 400 airports—more than double the number handling them today.

CATCHING IT

"A lot of people living around airports are going to catch plain hell," says the Federal Aviation Administration's noise abatement chief, Isaac H. Hoover.

So will the Federal Aviation Administration, though, if something isn't done about the noise problem. For congressmen whose constituents live near airports the pressure to take action is intense. There is also talk that Ralph Nader will make jet noise his next major crusade.

And yet, jet noise cannot simply be legislated away. A solution will cost billions of dollars, assuming that government, industry, and the long-suffering public can agree on the solution—which, so far, they have not.

WALKOUT

Early this month the nation's airport operators angrily resigned from the National Aviation Noise Abatement Council, an all-industry group, charging that they were being made the "scapegoat" for noise. They declared, in effect, that the airlines and aircraft manufacturers are more interested in producing and flying planes at low cost than they are in reducing noise. They recommended drastic measures, including junking present jet engines and replacing them with new, quieter ones available in a few years.

The airlines are strongly opposed. The cost of replacing engines today would amount to more than \$3-million a plane for the big, four-engine jets, they claim, or approximately half the original cost of the plane. Airlines and manufacturers want the stress put on making the area around airports "compatible"—soundproofing existing homes, banning new ones, limiting the area to industries or open space. Most of these measures, too, would be extremely costly.

THREE CHOICES

"There are, generally speaking, three methods of abating aircraft noise," says John R. Wiley, director of aviation for the Port of New York Authority, which operates New York City's commercial airports: "moving the noise away from people; moving the people away from the noise; and reducing the noise at its source—that is to say, the airplane."

So far, moving the noise away from people has been the method most extensively tried. Most major airports have preferential runways that lead airplanes over water or vacant land when weather permits. Many also direct plots to throttle back after lifting off the runway, often while making a sharp, climbing turn.

New York Kennedy Airport is famous for these requirements. The Port Authority began worrying about jet noise as early as 1951. At that time it passed a resolution saying that no jet aircraft could land or take off at any of its air terminals without permission.

DECIBEL COUNT

After much study it further declared that this permission would be granted only if the takeoff noise was comparable to that of large, four-engine piston planes then in use. The measurement the authority arrived at is expressed in something called perceived noise decibels or PNdb, and the maximum allowable under Port Authority rules is 112 PNdb.

This sound level is a generally accepted maximum figure at many major airports even though, in the words of one U.S. government official, it renders the surrounding area "unfit for human habitation."

To stay within that limit at New York, pilots on big intercontinental jets, heavily laden with fuel, have been throttling back—or so they have been accused—as their plane passes over a Port Authority monitor several miles from where the takeoff roll started. While this avoids trouble from the Port Au-

thority, it means the jet hasn't gained the altitude it otherwise would have achieved. So when the pilot pours on the power after passing the "black box" he annoys a different group of residents farther away from the airport.

NEW REQUIREMENT

For planes with lighter loads, which don't have to struggle into the sky, there is a trend toward requiring jets to climb at steeper angles in order to reduce the area where the noise is bothersome. Such procedures have already been put into practice at Washington National Airport, and are to be required at other metropolitan airports beginning this summer. Although this means higher fuel consumption, airlines are cooperating voluntarily.

Other experiments are being carried out to try to devise controls sufficiently precise to permit planes to climb and descend even more steeply, at an angle of six degrees. The angle generally in use today is three degrees. Government officials hope that by this summer the program will be far enough along to let the airlines begin evaluating whether such changes would be acceptable from a safety standpoint. The sharper the descent, the more precisely a pilot must gauge his landing. But even if better controls are found to be feasible, they would have to await future aircraft. They could not be added onto today's planes.

UNPOPULAR

Generally speaking, the measures designed to take "noise away from the people" require operating procedures that are distinctly unpopular with the pilots because, pilots say, they reduce the margins of safety. For this reason they are unpopular with airlines and passengers, too, though there is an argument over how much safety is compromised.

But if moving noise from the people is unpopular with those in the sky, moving people away from the noise is unpopular with those on the ground.

Airports are centers of economic activity. Thousands of people work at the biggest ones, and they understandably want to live near their jobs. Additional thousands in service industries need to live near these people.

It is politically impossible to rezone the land around an airport for industrial and commercial use. No matter how loud the complaints from people living under the flight patterns, the residents still will not move en masse to quieter locations. What particularly galls airlines and pilots is to watch the land around a new airport fill up with houses, hospitals, churches, and schools.

FUTILE ATTEMPT

The new Dulles International Airport outside Washington, which is owned and operated by the federal government, has been involved in just this sort of problem. Officials tried to persuade Virginia's Fairfax County to zone land near the field against residential housing and to permit only soundproofed industries or businesses on it. But the county declined to do so.

"If more localities understood the difficulty of producing quieter planes," says an official of the Housing & Urban Affairs Dept., "they'd think more carefully about what they allow builders to put up near airports."

EXCEPTION

Only Los Angeles International Airport has taken the approach of removing people from the noise to any marked degree. It has bought up land and houses between the west end of its runways and the Pacific Ocean and has torn down the dwellings, at a total cost of \$20 million. But this hardly makes a dent in the problem.

One proposed solution has been to soundproof and air-condition houses in the worst noise zone, which would at least help indoor living. HUD estimates that to do that around just the three noisiest airports, Kennedy, Chicago's O'Hare, and Los Angeles International, would cost \$240-million. HUD has put

out a handbook showing how to soundproof a home at a cost of a few hundred dollars to a few thousand dollars, but there is no federal money to help do it.

HUD does have a policy of refusing federal mortgage money for construction of homes, or grants for water and sewage projects in areas where noise exceeds certain levels. But others have gone right ahead. Near Kennedy, new homes are still being sold by realtors with private financing.

The Port Authority even suspects that real estate salesmen have aircraft-type radios or make telephone calls to contacts in the tower to see which runway will be used on a particular day. They then presumably take customers out to see houses on a "quiet" day. They also reportedly tell would-be customers that "that runway over there is going to be abandoned soon." Somehow, the houses are sold.

If people won't be moved from the noise and if, according to Wiley, "the end of the road has just about been reached" in the area of preferential runway systems and approach and departure procedures, then the only alternative is eliminating noise at the source.

This is a difficult problem, indeed. A truly "quiet" engine is at least eight years away.

The Administration's present objective is simply to reduce noise to at least a tolerable level in areas more than a mile from the runway—this, within a few years. Studies have shown that below 90 PNdb there are few complaints; between 90 and 105 there is a marked increase; above that, complaints rival the noise of the jets.

NOISE LIMIT

The priority goal for the Administration is passage of a key bill (whose Senate designation, incidentally, is S707). This bill, on which some hearings have already been held, would give the government authority to certify airplanes for noise performance just as it now does for safety. Planes would be permitted to fly only if they did not exceed 106-110 PNdb. Eventually, this limit would be worked down as technology permitted.

Engineers are working on several aspects of engine design to try to dampen the noise, which comes from two basic sources: air rushing out the rear of the engine, and the whine of the fan up front.

FINDING A FIX

For more immediate relief, commercial plane manufacturers are working under contract from the National Aeronautics & Space Administration on ways to line the nacelles of present-day engines with sound-absorbing fiber. And sometime in 1969, a plane will be equipped and flown with modified engines for tests of operating efficiency. NASA has "reasonable hopes" that this plane can cut noise by as much as 10 PNdb. However, the potential cost is still unknown.

Even with such modification, present engines would continue to be abusively noisy. Therefore, unless existing engines are replaced by entirely new ones, today's planes will continue pouring out a high-decibel bombardment.

Graves Well Drilling Booms With SBA Help

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, America started as a small business—a joint stock company with shares sold to the public by the Virginia Company.

People may shake their heads today and say that the little man has no

place in our increasingly mechanized, technological society; the day of the individual, the small businessman, is past.

But here are the facts:

There are more than 5 million small businesses in our Nation today;

These businesses comprise 95 percent of all American businesses;

These small businesses employ four out of every 10 of our wage earners;

They provide family income for more than 75 million Americans.

Someone once wrote:

The greatest works are done by the ones.

The hundreds do not do much—the companies never; it is the units—the single individuals, that are the power and the might.

Individual effort is, after all, the grand thing.

This feeling is what made America a vigorous and prosperous nation.

The Small Business Administration was created in 1953 to help continue our American tradition of individual enterprise.

When necessary, SBA reviews and updates programs to meet new needs of the small business community. SBA Administrator Robert C. Moot consults with small businessmen and community leaders both individually and through local and national small business advisory councils to learn how the agency can be of more help to the community, urban or rural.

A good example of SBA's progressive attitude is the year-old program of arranging balanced economic growth conferences. These conferences, held in various cities around the country, have provided a forum which has proven to be of immense benefit to SBA, the small businessman, and his community.

Graves Well Drilling Co., of Sylacauga, Ala., will give you a good idea of the help SBA offers to businessmen in rural communities.

The company was started in 1946 by Louie Graves. In 1951 he took on a partner, but when the partner became disabled in 1959, Graves bought back his interest in the business.

Prior to 1959 the sales of the company were small because Graves Well Drilling performed mostly small jobs on a unit basis. Mr. Graves began to expand the business after purchasing his partner's interest, by broadening his territory and contracting for larger jobs. Sales in 1958 were about \$5,800. By the end of 1960 sales had grown to \$214,522 and the company had a net profit of \$11,672.

By December 1960, Graves had well-drilling equipment in 18 counties of Alabama and Georgia. The business was also engaged in the sales and service of pumps and water conditioning work. Because of the rapid expansion of his company Graves had to purchase a great deal of equipment needed to fulfill his contracts. The equipment was purchased on short-term financing requiring high monthly payments which consumed all of his working capital.

Lack of adequate financing put the business in a very difficult financial position. In the spring of 1961, Graves went to the Small Business Administration and applied for a loan. SBA made a direct loan of \$50,000 to him.

Through the assistance of the Small Business Administration, Graves Well Drilling Co. was able to pay its financial obligations and continue operating.

Graves' company provides a living for 10 families besides his own.

Net profits have increased to \$22,000.

Net worth is now \$51,500.

And the \$50,000 SBA loan was repaid in full December 2, 1967.

I think that is fine. And so does Louie Graves, who said he would have had difficulty in meeting business obligations and that the company would not have progressed so rapidly without SBA's help.

And what about the effect of this successful small business on the economy of Sylacauga, Ala.?

It does not sound very important to say that Mr. Graves' business supports 10 families as well as his own.

But Sylacauga is a town of about 12,000 people, with no large industrial payrolls. It is a farming area. Those jobs are important to Sylacauga.

The 10 families supported by Graves Well Drilling Co. think those jobs are important. Louie Graves thinks so. I think so. And, obviously, so does the Small Business Administration.

Tax Exemption on Industrial Revenue Bonds

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective tools for industrial development, particularly useful in the State of Mississippi and throughout some 40 other States, will be taken from the many communities of these States if the Treasury Department carries out its announced intention to repeal the tax exemption on industrial revenue bonds.

I think it would be wise to consider the resolution passed by the Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board by unanimous vote at its meeting on March 14. The agricultural and industrial board is the administrator of Mississippi's industrial development program. I insert the resolution passed by the Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board in the RECORD at this point:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the State of Mississippi has since 1936 had an effective and beneficial program for the economic development of this State known as the "Balance Agriculture With Industry" plan, which program has been declared by the Legislature of the State of Mississippi to be essential and necessary, and that the present and prospective health, safety, morals, pursuit of happiness, right of gainful employment, and the general welfare of the citizens demand as a public purpose the development within Mississippi of commercial, industrial, agricultural, and manufacturing enterprises; and

Whereas the Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board has continued faith in and a vital concern for the "Balance Agriculture With Industry" program and the economic development of this State, and is desirous of doing everything necessary to further foster and promote the general welfare of

Mississippi and to meet its responsibilities under the laws of this State; and

Whereas this Board has been informed about and has inquired into the proposed regulations by the United States acting by and through the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Treasury Department, and the Internal Revenue Service, and on the basis of such inquiry feels that the proposed Rule 131 under the Securities Act of 1933, proposed Rule 3b-5 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the proposed regulation discussed in Internal Revenue Service Technical Information Release TIR-972, will have a clear and present detrimental effect on Mississippi's industrial development program and thus adversely affect the public interest as announced by the Legislature of the State of Mississippi.

Be it therefore resolved by the Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board that it opposes the proposed regulations set forth above; that it is the judgment of the Board that such proposed regulations, because of their adverse effect upon the economic development program and on the economy of this State, should be vigorously and firmly opposed by all means available to this Board; that the Director and staff of this Board be and they are hereby directed to continue to carefully follow any developments pertaining thereto, and to take such action as is necessary to protect the interests of this Board and the State of Mississippi as expressed in this resolution.

Be it therefore resolved that the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Treasury Department, the Internal Revenue Service, the entire Mississippi Congressional Delegation, all Members of the Mississippi Legislature, and the appropriate agencies of all the States interested in these matters be advised of this Board's position.

Rural Areas Development Program

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in June of 1961, the Department of Agriculture in response to congressional action initiated a rural areas development program directed toward the elimination of the low-income and underemployment problem in rural areas by stimulating economic growth and income opportunities.

From that time to the present, the Rural Electrification Administration, an agency of the USDA, has actively participated in the RAD program by cooperating with its electric and telephone borrowers to assist them in improving their local economic conditions. I would like to review briefly the remarkable history of that cooperation.

Through the rural areas development staff of REA, the agency's borrowers have received technical assistance and other help, including credit finding, in the formation of local development organizations and in planning local community projects.

During 1967, in my home State of North Carolina, 21 of these development projects were energetically supported by REA borrower systems. These 21 alone sparked 1,075 new jobs. From the beginning of the program in 1961 to the present time, 156 such undertakings have been launched in the Tarheel State. This

has meant that, in all, 8,656 jobs have thus been created in North Carolina's countryside.

In rural America, during the 1967 fiscal year, these rural electric and telephone systems entered upon or broadened 616 rural areas development projects, helping to create some 34,000 new employment opportunities. From the inauguration of this program, only 6½ years ago, to the present, 2,700 such community projects have sprung into being. These projects have occasioned a great number of jobs which today has climbed to some 216,000.

This clearly activates a very healthy economic and social cycle. These key undertakings stimulate the economy of their areas, thereby boosting REA borrowers' revenues, which in turn augment the capacity of the rural electric and telephone systems still more to carry out their area coverage and service requirements as well as community obligations.

Such coordinated enterprises, begun by local rural organizations and aided by REA borrowers, have exerted a profound and widespread impact in many rural regions across the Nation. By so participating in the growth of various projects in their communities, REA borrowers once again contribute in a significant way toward the solution of our current—and critical—rural-urban imbalance.

In reality, these rural electric and telephone systems are performing a valuable service to the entire Nation by developing rural job opportunities in what otherwise might be depressed areas; by providing electric and telephone service, so vital to rural needs; and by bringing to light the rural areas' grassroots benefits—open space, fresh air, and clean water.

The Congress acted wisely in establishing the RAD program and the USDA is to be commended upon its administration of this program.

Keep Industrial Development Bonds Tax Exempt

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 1968, the Treasury Department issued technical information release 972. TIR 972 announced that regulations would be formulated governing the tax status of interest on State and local industrial development bonds sold after March 15, 1968. In addition, TIR 972 stated that persons may contract for the sale of these bonds only until midnight March 15.

Mr. Speaker, this effort to gain revenue through the taxation of these bonds will force marginal companies and individual small businessmen to seek financing in regular commercial issues in a financial market that is already prohibitive. This ruling will not affect the giants of industry. They do not need this type of financing. They have the resources necessary to successfully compete for high-

cost financing to expand present facilities and build new ones.

This ruling is damaging to the little fellow in American business. Industrial development will be very seriously retarded in the small rural community without the help of these bonds. In many rural areas of America these industrial development bonds have provided small industries with their only access to vital funds. The tax incentives associated with these bonds have been the law of the land for 15 years. To remove these incentives is to hamper industrial development in those areas which most need it.

One would have thought that by now, looking back on the unprecedented economic growth this Nation has enjoyed under the Kennedy-Johnson administrations, that we would still believe in tax incentives to stimulate and foster sound economic growth. Now the Treasury Department wants to deny this fact.

This ruling by the Treasury Department is a misguided effort at fiscal responsibility. This ruling will raise no real revenue and it will plug no real tax loopholes. All it will do is discourage industrial development in rural America. In the long run, the Treasury Department will realize more revenue in the form of taxes on newly created profits and jobs than it can by taxing the bonds themselves.

I approve of the spirit of thrift motivating the Treasury in issuing this release. But I submit the executive is not the proper branch of government to effect this change and even were it to enjoy this power, such a change will be self-defeating and not in the long-range development interests of America.

Therefore, I offer today a joint resolution which, in effect, directs the Secretary of the Treasury to refrain from enforcing this new ruling. Discussion and decision on this matter is properly the domain of the Congress. My resolution writes no new law. It merely maintains the status quo until such times as the Congress decides for or against new legislation in the area of industrial development bonds.

Mr. Speaker, I urge speedy action on this resolution so that we may restore confidence to business, local government, and the bond market. I also urge speedy action to make clear to the executive branch that they had best leave tax policy where it belongs—in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the joint resolution at this point in the RECORD:

H.J. RES. 1179

Joint resolution to provide for the exclusion from gross income, under section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, of interest on industrial development bonds

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) until otherwise provided by law hereafter enacted, interest on obligations which are so-called industrial development bonds shall be excluded from gross income under section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in accordance with—

(1) the regulations prescribed under such section by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate, as in effect on March 13, 1968, and

(2) the principles set forth in Revenue

Ruling 54-106 (CB 1954-1, 28), Revenue Ruling 57-187 (CB 1957-1, 65), and Revenue Ruling 63-20 (CB 1963-1, 24).

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate is authorized and directed to issue ruling letters with respect to so-called industrial development bonds in conformity with the provisions of subsection (a).

Report to the People of North Dakota's Second District

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of my report of March 19, 1968, to the people of North Dakota. It might be noted that since this was prepared, a two-price plan for gold has been adopted. Text of the newsletter follows:

	December 1960	December 1967	Percent change
Net public and private debt.....	\$890,200,000,000	\$1,430,000,000,000	+60.7
Total farm debt.....	\$26,200,000,000	\$49,900,000,000	+90.0
U.S. Government debt.....	\$290,400,000,000	\$345,200,000,000	+18.9
U.S. Government spending (annual).....	\$93,000,000,000	\$167,500,000,000	+80.1
Yearly interest on Federal debt.....	\$9,200,000,000	\$13,500,000,000	+46.0
Interest rates:			
AAA corporation bonds (percent).....	4.41	6.19	+40.4
High-grade municipal bonds (percent).....	3.73	4.49	+20.4
Taxable Federal bonds (percent).....	4.02	5.36	+33.3
3-month Treasury bills (percent).....	2.928	5.012	+71.2
Consumer price index (1957-59) (percent).....	100.0	118.2	+18.2
Foreign short-term dollar holdings.....	\$21,300,000,000	\$32,400,000,000	+52.1
Gold reserve.....	\$17,800,000,000	\$12,000,000,000	-32.6

¹ Fiscal year 1960.

² Fiscal year 1968.

Administration spokesmen continue to assure foreign countries and the people of the United States that the dollar will not be devalued nor will the price of gold be increased over the present \$35 per ounce level. Nevertheless, the dollar is being devalued steadily through inflation. Gold continues to move out of the United States because other countries mistrust our fiscal policies and apparently believe that a rise in the world price of gold is inevitable.

The United States is rapidly running out of options in the area of fiscal decision. It may not be ours to decide whether the dollar will be devalued or the price of gold increased.

STRICTLY FOR THE BIRDS

Not since the "four and twenty blackbirds" were baked in a pie has the species received so much attention as now. Rep. Durward Hall (R-Mo.) spots these two items in the President's "bare bones" budget: 1. A grant of \$50,400 to the University of Wisconsin to prepare "An Ecology of Blackbird Social Organization", and, 2. an \$11,200 grant to California Polytechnic College for a study of "Competition and Social Organization in Mixed Colonies of Blackbirds."

THAT GOLDEN SPIKE

May 10, 1969, will mark the 100th anniversary of the completion of America's first transcontinental railway which came into being with the juncture of the Union Pacific and the Central Pacific at Promontory, Utah. Someone has suggested it would be nice to place the famous golden spike on display there again—if we can borrow it back for a few days from General De Gaulle.

HOW I VOTED IN 1968

For increased benefits under the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance

SOME HARD FISCAL FACTS

The gravity of this Nation's growing financial crisis is without parallel in our history. It is getting worse by the day.

Public and private debts are skyrocketing. Interest rates are the highest in the memory of living men. Our international balance of payments position steadily worsens as more dollars go abroad and fewer return home. The U.S. gold reserve dwindles as more of our holdings move into the hands of the central bankers of Europe and private speculators. Federal expenditures continue to mount, with a record-breaking \$186.1 billion budget projected for the fiscal year beginning next July 1. A deficit of some \$20 billion is forecast for the current fiscal year. Escalating war costs and ballooning domestic outlays may bring a larger deficit in Fiscal 1969, even with a tax increase.

Most alarming of all is the fact that the Johnson Administration steadfastly refuses to take positive steps to halt and reverse this rush toward financial chaos. There seems to be no real concern, much less a sense of urgency, over what is happening to the country. Profligate spending and galloping inflation seem to be accepted as the normal way of life. I urge you to consider the following figures:

Acts. This vote was consistent with my earlier votes on Social Security and Veterans Pensions to provide those on fixed incomes a small but needed catch-up on inflation. (Passed). For an Amendment to the Truth-in-Lending Bill making loansharking a Federal offense. (Passed). For passage of the Truth-in-Lending Bill. (Passed). For recommitment of the Export-Import Bank Bill. (Defeated). When the motion to reduce the limitation on the outstanding loans, guarantees, and insurance by \$1 billion failed, I voted against passage. (Passed). Against the Fire-Research and Safety Act of 1967. (Passed). I voted against this bill because another costly study commission should be deferred during this period of national financial crisis. For recommitment of the bill removing the gold cover from our currency. (Rejected). When the recommitment motion failed, I then voted against passage of the bill. (Passed by only 199 to 190). I am fully aware that our currency does not, in fact, have gold backing. Passage of this bill simply puts off the inevitable—thorough and strict fiscal reforms by the Administration. For a recommitment motion of a bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act. After the recommitment was agreed to, and the authorization was cut from \$33 million for 3 years to \$20 million for 2 years, I voted for passage of the bill. For amendments to the National School Lunch Act strengthening and expanding food service program for children. (Passed).

BILLS INTRODUCED IN 1968

H.R. 14727—To require the Secretary of Agriculture to make advance payments to farmers participating in the 1968 and 1969 feed grain program. H. Res. 1086—To amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to cre-

ate a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban Affairs.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

As a Member of the House Agriculture Committee and its Subcommittee on Grains and Livestock, I have attended extensive hearings on farm legislation since early January. The first major bill reported by the full Committee revises and updates for the first time in more than half a century our *Federal grain grading system*. One major benefit anticipated is substantial easing of the chronic boxcar shortage. This would come about through the permissive sampling and new sampling techniques which would decrease turn-around time for cars. The Subcommittee has before it a *poultry inspection bill* which would bring sanitary standards up to the levels achieved in the meat inspection bill enacted late last year. I believe this is in the best interests of both consumers and producers. The full Committee is holding hearings on extension of the *Food for Peace program (P.L. 480)*. Through the years, this program has literally saved the lives of many hungry people abroad. It has built and expanded vast markets for U.S. farm products. I strongly support its continuance. I believe further efforts should be made, however, to utilize more effectively the foreign currencies we receive in exchange for wheat and other farm commodities. The full Committee is scheduled to begin hearings today on *basic farm legislation* to replace the present act which expires next year. I doubt that Congress will approve new legislation before 1969. Action on the *rural telephone bank bill*, which I supported in Committee last year, has been indefinitely postponed by the Rules Committee.

HIGHWAY AND SCHOOL FUNDS CUT

The President's freeze of some highway construction funds and his cut in aid to federally-impacted schools may be designed to twist the arms of Congressmen who oppose his 10% income tax surcharge and who voted for reductions in foreign aid and the "Great Society" programs. The Presidential cuts, of course, are in programs which have strong public support. Actually, the highway fund freeze saves not a penny. This is a trust fund, collected exclusively from highway users. By law, it can be spent only on highway projects. For North Dakota, it means that nearly \$1.5 million which was to be obligated in 1968 will be released and spent in the future. This is a serious inconvenience to the public and to highway program planners. It in no way reduces the federal budget. The reduction in impacted area school aid throws a further burden on taxpayers in cities adjacent to federal installations such as the big Minot Air Force Base. They must provide additional funds to educate the children of federal personnel stationed there. For Minot's public schools, the cut amounts to \$177,198. Certainly an Administration which can budget billions for foreign aid could find a few additional dollars for the education of American children, especially after such a commitment has been made.

ARMS FOR OUR MEN IN VIETNAM

Recently the news media carried a report I received from an Air Force Sergeant in Vietnam who said his group was not issued weapons even after they were under attack. I brought this to the attention of Air Force officials who have promised to investigate. I understand there has been a change in policy as a result and that weapons are now being issued to some Air Force personnel. One man with a son in Vietnam wrote me: "Why are we continuing to send more men to Vietnam when we have men there without rifles to protect themselves?" I am continuing to press for the answer.

LAKE OAHE

The Senate has passed House-approved legislation sponsored by myself and Rep. Ben Reifel (R.-S.D.) to name the reservoir Lake Oahe. It awaits Presidential okay.

Need for a Reassessment of U. S. Foreign Aid Policy

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the February 19, 1968, issue of Barron's magazine contains a lead article entitled "Foreign Aid Has Done More Harm Than Good." The article raises some pointed questions about the value of U.S. foreign aid over the years and even states that in many cases such aid has done more harm than good.

A good example of the harm foreign aid can do is to be found in the agricultural sector. The Public Law 480 program—known also as food for freedom—may have seriously harmed the incentives for farmers in developing countries to increase agricultural productivity. By providing free food, the United States has made it possible for foreign governments to keep farm prices low, thus discouraging agricultural production. And, what is even more shocking, the food the United States sends is not even being sent for the purpose of feeding hungry people. The Director of AID to India, speaking informally in Congress the other day, asked for millions of tons of wheat for India, not to feed Indians but merely to rebuild buffer stocks that had been depleted over the past 2 years. The rebuilding of the buffer stocks, of course, insures that the Indian Government will be able to keep farm prices down and reduce agricultural incentive.

Another aspect of U.S. foreign aid policy as brought out in the article is the emphasis on large capital projects, even though they may absorb an excessive share of the recipient country's resources.

In general, it may well be that U.S. foreign aid has enabled foreign governments to avoid making the tough necessary decisions to put their own economic houses in order. For years, foreign aid has made it unnecessary for foreign governments to balance their budgets and reduce inflation.

With the gold crisis now upon the United States, the United States is being forced to take a hard look at its overall economic policies. In this reevaluation of our economic policy, we should reappraise the entire AID program to really determine its economic impact upon developing countries.

The article follows:

DEAD GIVEAWAY: FOREIGN AID HAS DONE MORE HARM THAN GOOD

In a recent interview in Fortune magazine, Paul Mellon, well-known financier and philanthropist, wistfully observed: "Giving large sums of money away . . . is a soul-searching problem. You can do as much damage as you may do good." His thought was echoed the other day by George D. Woods, outgoing president of the World Bank. "Some aid," Mr. Woods told the second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in New Delhi, "has not only failed to be productive. By doing the wrong thing at the wrong time, by making the wrong use of the slender resources available, at times it may actually have retarded economic growth." Mr. Woods tactfully was not specific, but his statement at least makes it clear that in his own ex-

perience he has arrived at a conclusion which sharply differs from the general assumption that foreign economic aid somehow cannot fail to do good.

Soul-searching in this realm is long overdue. Ever since the publication of Professor William Graham Sumner's essay on Purposes and Consequences, few American scholars have doubted that the purposes of political action may differ sharply from its results. All political enterprise risks getting caught in what Professor Yale Brozen of the University of Chicago calls the Untruth of the Obvious, as formulated in Brozen's Law: "Most obviously true economic propositions are false."

So it has proven with foreign aid, which, more often than most Americans would believe, has done its recipients more harm than good. Let us begin our critique with the Marshall Plan. Since it involved all the governments of Western Europe, as well as that of the U.S., little effort at critical evaluation has been made. However, few students of economic history doubt that the plan's success remained in jeopardy until the beneficiary governments embraced policies patterned on what one may call the economics of the horse and buggy age, i.e., they balanced their budgets, stopped monetary inflation and encouraged free enterprise. In Germany, Dr. Ludwig Erhard pursued such policies against the advice of Walter Heller, who subsequently became chief economic adviser to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. Full success of the Marshall Plan was assured only after Winston Churchill won the election of 1951, and, for 17 years, saved the pound from devaluation.

Prior to his ascendancy, however, his predecessors saddled Britain with a burden which has proved crushing to the present day. Assured of Marshall Plan subsidies, they decided not to transform into long-term obligations Britain's nominally short-term foreign debt: the so-called sterling balances. Lacking U.S. support, they could not have afforded such extravagance.

Moreover, under the Marshall Plan, the U.S. for the first time disclosed its inclination to favor socialism on a global scale. In the early post-war years, for example, the French proceeded to nationalize one industry after another—notably coal and electric power—and to launch grandiose national plans. The latter embraced such costly and abortive schemes as the effort to displace Ruhr coal by developing high-cost French coal mines, and to expand the steel industry of Lorraine, which now finds itself in the wrong place. In electricity, the planners pushed the development of water power resources, a massive and costly mistake from which the Electricite de France to the present day has failed to recover.

Whatever history books and politicians may say, then, the billions of dollars laid out under the Marshall Plan by no means have netted unmixed blessings. The same holds true of later U.S. programs, misleadingly known as Food for Freedom and Food for Peace. Thus, students of agriculture wonder whether the U.S., by giving away food, has not dulled the interest of foreign governments in raising the productivity of their own farms, or at least in not hamstringing their peasantry. Evidence on this score appears in the January Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, in which Theodore W. Schultz discusses the ailments of world agriculture. He argues that U.S. policies have contributed mightily to the failure of foreign countries to develop the productivity of their land.

Instead, with U.S. support, foreign governments have focused on industrialization as their primary job, relying on certain postulates of the New Economics, with its emphasis on crude quantitative measurements—X capital funds invested yielding a Y increase in Gross National Product. This line of thought has led to continuing neglect, if not exploitation, of the peasantry, even though in most poor countries, the bulk of the popu-

lation—i.e., the poor—lives on (and off) the land. In most developing countries exploitation has taken two principal forms: price control for farm products, which depressed rural incomes, and very high prices for such farm inputs as fertilizer, farm tools and pesticides.

Such discoveries by farm economists—Dr. Schultz by no means stands alone in his critique of U.S. foreign aid programs ("bitten by the industrialization bug," as he puts it)—have not changed official U.S. policies. Thus, Washington is shipping grain to India as Food for Freedom (not to feed hungry Indians but to get rid of an unwanted surplus) even though India's 1967-68 harvests are so large as to exceed available storage facilities. Dr. Schultz also points out that free wheat has done its share to cripple the development of farming in Chile. In Yugoslavia, it enabled Marshal Tito to maintain a farm policy which systematically exploited the peasants for the benefit of the cities. The peasants responded by reducing their output, adding to the "need" for U.S. wheat.

Still worse have been the effects of Food for Peace in Egypt, where it helped sustain Egypt's war for the conquest of Yemen. If you add up the value of U.S. wheat shipments to the United Arab Republic, you find that Washington has financed a bigger share of the cost of the Aswan Dam than the Soviet Union.

To be sure, when people talk of foreign aid, they rarely think of farm surplus disposal but rather of power plants, factories and the like. What could be wrong with such facilities? Earlier this year, Vice President Humphrey traveled through Africa. His first stop was in Abidjan, capital of the Ivory Coast, where he announced a \$36.5 million Export-Import Bank loan for a dam on the Bandama River (which altogether will cost \$100 million). The U.S. in this case is financing a project which the World Bank turned down.

The project involves a number of highly technical questions which I am not competent to discuss. However, I think I can look at its economics. The Ivory Coast probably is the most prosperous newly independent republic south of the Sahara. It has a capable—though scarcely democratic—government. Its population numbers five million. Merely on the basis of population, then, the Bandama River dam is equivalent to a \$4 billion project in the U.S. However, the national income of the Ivory Coast per capita is perhaps one-third that of the U.S.; hence Bandama is tantamount to a \$12 billion venture in the U.S., one that is disproportionately large and bound to absorb an excessive share of the Ivory Coast's resources.

Moreover, from experience—if somebody would heed it—one could know that such projects are beset with risks rarely foreseen at the outset. In 1950, the U.S. launched the so-called Helmand Valley Irrigation Project in Afghanistan with an Export-Import Bank loan of \$21.5 million. In 1954, it added a second loan of \$18.5 million. In the latter 'Fifties, the International Cooperation Administration took over both loans, of which Eximbank was glad to be rid. In 1956, two reporters wrote about the failure of the Helmand Valley Project as a "lesson in foreign aid policy"—i.e., what not to do. Nearly a decade later, Interior's Bureau of Reclamation reported to the Agency for International Development—the current successor of ICA—that the Helmand Valley project was still a flop. Contrary to the hopeful view that failure in Afghanistan might serve as a lesson, however, things have not worked out that way. It's a long way from Afghanistan to the Ivory Coast, and Eximbank's memory is short.

These are relatively minor instances where foreign aid has proven unhelpful, if not actually damaging, to those on the receiving end. There are more horrible examples. One is the Republic of Korea, into which the U.S. for many years poured billions of dollars

with the avowed purpose of making it "a showcase of democracy." For years, however, all the showcase demonstrated was the unmitigated evil of rampant inflation. Then, after a brief military dictatorship, Seoul decided to stabilize the currency. It did so in two ways: by balancing the budget, and by allowing interest rates to rise to levels which to most Westerners look outrageous. A rate of 2% a month currently is cheap in Korea.

The U.S. politician's first reaction is doubtless that such rates spell usury. In fact, small personal loans in the U.S. carry similar price tags, while throughout Eastern Asia, rates of the magnitude are prevalent in the villages. In allowing such high rates of interest, Korea merely followed the example of the National Government of China in Taiwan, which also coupled currency stabilization with permission to charge and pay very high interest rates.

What such rates really indicate is the disparity between savings, on the one hand, and the demand for funds on the other. Both Korea and Taiwan have enjoyed very rapid economic growth ever since confidence in their respective currencies was restored. Indeed, their growth rates far exceed those of any other Far Eastern country. As for Taiwan, it is currently listed with pride as one developing country that no longer needs U.S. economic aid.

Let us end this rapid survey of foreign economic aid in Asia with a few remarks on India. For diplomatic reasons, the U.S. and other donors have preferred to close their eyes to one of the greatest burdens carried by India's people: the huge population of sacred cows. It probably is no exaggeration to say that India's bovines have eaten as much food as the U.S. ever has dispatched to feed the people.

For at least 15 years, moreover, the donors of aid to India have behaved as if its Five Year Plans were also sacred cows. Except for the first, the plans were misconceived and led to a widespread waste of foreign and domestic resources. Moreover, in the guise of socialism, India's economic policies in effect enriched a relatively small clique of businessmen who received special favors. Large state-owned enterprises, nearly all of which are wallowing in red ink, were launched. Finally, owing to the federal character of the Indian Union, industrial projects were located all over the map, mostly on a scale too small to be efficient.

Huge dams were built to supply supposedly cheap power and irrigation water. However, investments to distribute the latter lagged, and the nation's dependence on water power proved destructive when, in two successive years, a drought depleted the reservoirs. Failure of the monsoon yielded the Indian famine of 1966 and 1967.

Wasteful military spending and excessive outlays for industrialization have resulted in continuous financial irresponsibility. For over a decade, New Delhi has been both unwilling and unable to stop printing paper money to meet its perennial budget deficits. Combined with the maintenance of interest rates far below the proper level, these financial practices have richly rewarded hoarding and speculation. New Delhi and the state capitals have, of course, tried to impose price ceilings on many industrial products and to ration food. None of them, however, has been able to prevent black markets from defying such dictates—often with the connivance of officialdom. Reality in India, therefore, increasingly has been at variance with what official statistics and reports show.

India's record thus indicates that foreign aid in effect enabled its authorities to do what they ought not to have done, and not to do what they ought to have done. On balance, the people of India have suffered, rather than benefited, from foreign aid.

The same largely holds true of U.S. aid in the Western Hemisphere, especially since it took the form of the Alliance for Progress.

In the guise of relieving poverty, Washington has sponsored not only the usual stress on industrialization but also a concept of continental integration which runs counter to the continent's interests. All of the southern republics have grown out of coastal settlements (landlocked Paraguay and Bolivia lost access to the coast in protracted bloody warfare). Now emphasis has been placed on continental integration across the thinly settled and often inhospitable interior. One high official, for instance, observed critically that it is cheaper to ship goods from Buenos Aires to Valparaiso by sea than overland. In the name of integration, huge costly road and water power projects, which never can pay for themselves, are being launched.

To finance such ventures, nearly all South American republics depend on both U.S. aid and money supplied by their printing presses. Hence, even a country as sound and solid as Peru finds itself caught in a serious inflationary spiral. A mere 10 years ago, South American countries considered balanced budgets and stable currencies achievements worthy of praise. Since 1961, contrarywise, such feats are deemed unworthy of progressive government. Virtually all have been induced to "make no little plans."

The consequences are the usual ones. Financial insecurity induces capital flight: the methods of the Alliance for Progress thus have created an artificial scarcity of local funds. Here, too, foreign aid has done more harm than good.

From any realistic appraisal, it follows that past standards of the magnitude of foreign aid have no relevance to what needs to be done. Legislators who urge cutting the foreign aid budget year after year may just think that foreigners don't vote—as most commentators suggest. Some, however, also may realize that the record of foreign aid fails to justify piling billions on billions without critical appraisal.

Conventional appeals for "aid to the poor" simply ignore the dismal record of foreign aid. Mr. Paul Mellon's wisdom on the difficulty of "giving large sums of money away" has yet to be taken to heart.

Resolutions Adopted at the Meeting of Hungarian Freedom Fighters

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of the Hungarian freedom fighters of 1848 and 1956, Americans of Hungarian descent met on Sunday, March 17, in New York City and adopted the following resolutions which I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues:

RESOLUTIONS

We, Americans of Hungarian descent living in New York and vicinity, meeting in commemoration of the Hungarian freedom fight of 1848 at the Assembly Hall of the Hunter College in New York, solemnly reaffirm our faith in and allegiance to the Constitution and Government of the United States of America.

We also affirm our dedication to the cause of just and equitable peace based on the self-determination of nations, including the Hungarian, and on sovereign equality of states in international relations.

We abhor Communist aggression and subversion in any part of the world, including the Republic of South Viet Nam where our sons are fighting for freedom and self-determination of small nations;

We call the attention of the United States and other free nations to the fact that despite numerous United Nations resolutions between 1956-1962, Russian occupation troops are still in Hungary and our former homeland is deprived of national self-determination and political independence;

We note that while 1968 has been declared as the year of Human Rights, they are constantly and grievously abridged by the Communist Government of Hungary by the one-party dictatorship, hideous censorship, suppression of church activities and denying the people of the rights of free assembly and speech;

We note that the Soviet Union has not yet released all former prisoners of war, deportees and 1956 freedom fighters and call upon the Government of the U.S.S.R. to fulfill this legal and moral obligation during this Year of Human Rights;

We must protest the fact that despite open admission of the illegal methods of the show trials of the Rakosi era, the Communist Government fails to annul the illegal and unjust sentence against Cardinal Joseph Mindszenty and restore him to his archepiscopal see in Esztergom;

We note with sorrow and indignation that the 1957 law which has resulted in the legal murder of 1.3 million Hungarian fetuses is still in effect despite the protest of the Hungarians abroad and the realization of medical and social workers in Hungary of the genocidal consequences of this immoral legislation; and we demand its immediate abolition by the Communist Government of Hungary;

We criticize strongly the disastrous economic policies of the Communist Government of Hungary which resulted in unemployment under the new economic reforms and in the contracting of 50-100,000 Hungarian youth and students to East Germany; and demand policies which favor Hungarian consumers and exploit Hungarian raw materials;

We cannot forget that thousands of our former countrymen are still languishing in prison for political reasons despite the 1963 amnesty, many were arrested and sentenced under flimsy pretexts or dictatorial laws since;

On this day of commemoration of the Hungarian National Independence Day, we salute our valiant armed forces in Viet Nam, at home and other countries of the world; the officials of our Government who are burdened with the difficult task of fighting Communist aggression and yet maintain peace as much as possible. We protest in strongest terms against those who, under the guise of democratic dissent, unwittingly or consciously serve the cause of our enemies by sowing confusion, resistance and treason in our midst. May they recall that this course, if continued unchecked, can only lead to national disintegration and a takeover by Communists and fellow-travellers as it has done in Hungary in 1918-19.

May God bless these United States and our former homeland, Hungary.

No Halfway House Between Victory, Defeat in Vietnam

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the syndicated columnist, Joseph Alsop, has been consistent in his advocacy of the correctness of our current policy in Vietnam. Recently, in his usual clear-headed fashion, Mr. Alsop has once again discussed the Vietnam issue. I include a recent column of his which appeared in

the Washington Post in the Extensions of Remarks:

NO HALFWAY HOUSE BETWEEN VICTORY, DEFEAT IN VIETNAM

In the prevailing fog of gloom and uncertainty there are only two things that can be said with perfect certainty about the war in Vietnam. The first is bleakly simple.

There is in fact no comfortable, easy halfway house between defeat and victory.

No one who has studied North Vietnamese policy, labored to read the captured documents, and followed on the spot the development of Hanoi's war plans, tactics and strategy, believes for one moment that such a halfway house exists today, or will ever exist in the future. The well-intentioned people who offer theoretical blueprints for such halfway houses are as ignorant of the realities as the people who used to peddle the view that Josef Stalin was really a nice guy at heart.

The North Vietnamese leaders are men with a tenacity and courage that seem all the more admirable in the present climate in Washington. They are also men endowed with the most steely ruthlessness. In the month of February, they expended their troops at a rate of more than 10,000 men a week and in the week of March 2 to March 9, they were still expending troops so lavishly that their losses exceeded 6700 men—and this is without counting their wounded!

Take as their population base the 16,500,000 people of North Vietnam, plus the 5,000,000 plus-or-minus under V.C. control in the south. Make the appropriate conversion. You find that the Hanoi leaders are in fact accepting losses which, if accepted by the United States of America, would run from 60,000 to 100,000 men a week in killed-in-action alone.

They are accepting these quite unprecedented rates of loss—10 times as high as the average in the recent past—because they are going for broke—trying to win the war in a short time—because they know they cannot stand the strain of greatly prolonged war. And they are ready to make such appalling sacrifices because they want to get their grip on South Vietnam.

To get their grip on South Vietnam at cheaper cost, the Hanoi leaders might well accept one or another of the crazier halfway house solutions that have been proposed in this country. But if that is ever permitted to happen, Saigon will be ruled from Hanoi in a very short space of time.

All the millions of Vietnamese who have put their faith in the United States will then suffer cruelly for this misplaced faith. The U.S. will also have experienced its first defeat in war since this Republic was established. And that leads to the second certainty in the present situation, which is also bleak and simple.

Feeble, needless acceptance of defeat in Vietnam will poison American political life for a generation or more.

The circumstances that produced the terrible McCarthy-time were downright trivial, compared to the hideous circumstances that will confront this country after acceptance of defeat in Vietnam. The resulting outcry about "stabs-in-the-back," the search for scapegoats, the accusations of disloyalty and worse, can in truth be expected to make the McCarthy-time seem downright cozy in retrospect.

Considering how obvious this ought to be, one is all but driven to conclude that the American Left has gone collectively insane. As anyone should be able to see, there is already acute danger of the most frightening sort of a turn to the right in this country. The extreme postures of the Negro racists and the trouble in the cities are quite enough to provoke such a rightwards turn.

The President's riot commission was no more realistic, when it warned of the possibility of American apartheid. That risk, God knows, will be hard enough to circumvent, and that problem will be hard enough to solve, without the added poisons that are

sure to be engendered by the first defeat in war in American history. Add these other poisons to the present mix, and the American future hardly bears contemplation!

Without regard to the wisdom or unwisdom of past decisions, there is therefore only one safe course to take. That course is to make the needed effort to win the war. Winning does not mean crushing North Vietnam, and it does not demand the measures proposed by men like General Curtis LeMay. Winning means no more than forcing the Hanoi leaders to call home their troops, and to cease threatening their neighbors in Laos and South Vietnam.

As any rational man should be able to see from the loss rates and population figures cited above, the Hanoi leaders cannot imaginably sustain the kind of effort they are now making for a very long time. If you go for broke and fail, the failure leaves you broken. Hence there is nothing hopeless in the present situation; but because of the American advocates of defeat-at-any-price, there is profound danger for the American future.

President Johnson Stresses Importance of Continued Studies in Oceanography

HON. ALTON LENNON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, in his message March 8 on conservation, President Johnson once again stressed the importance of continued progress in the vital field of oceanography.

That thought was behind the action of the Congress, a year and a half ago, in passing the landmark Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1967.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Oceanography of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am naturally proud of the initiatives in oceanography taken by the Congress, especially the landmark Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1967. And I also congratulate the President on his leadership. He has repeatedly demonstrated his commitment to the peaceful uses of ocean research. In the state of the Union address on January 18, he said:

This year I shall propose that we launch with other nations an exploration of the ocean depths to tap its wealth and its energy and its abundance.

And now President Johnson has spelled out his intent in his forthright message to the Congress, entitled "To Renew a Nation." Even in this age of space, the President pointed out, the sea remains our greatest mystery. Yet modern science and technology give us the ability to use the ocean for many purposes, such as to develop and use its living and nonliving resources, and information on weather and climate. We can now place electronic buoys in deep water, leave them unattended, and then through space satellites and other means gather data for improved long-range forecasts.

The President said:

The benefits will be uncalculable—to farmers, to businessmen, to all travelers.

He has made a specific proposal that we begin development of improved ocean

buoys. And he urged the Congress to approve his request for \$5 million in the fiscal year 1969 Coast Guard budget for this program.

I am pleased to see the President take this strong stand, and I heartily endorse his plea. The marine science program is one of the best investments this Nation can make to secure the fullest benefits for succeeding generations.

I believe Congress will continue to wholeheartedly endorse and support this vital program.

Freedom Resolution for Lithuania and the Baltic Nations

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian birth or descent held in the city of Worcester, Mass., on February 18, 1968, a resolution was unanimously adopted to seek United Nations action in obtaining independence for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

The resolution was forwarded to me by Mr. Pranas Stanelis, president and Mr. Joseph A. Starenas, secretary, of the Worcester, Mass., Council of Lithuanian Organizations. At this point I would like to include the resolution, and it follows:

RESOLUTION

On the occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Restoration of Lithuania's independence we, the representatives of the Lithuanian ethnic community of Worcester, Massachusetts, have assembled here on Feb. 18, 1968 in the Lithuanian Naturalization Club, to commemorate Lithuania's Declaration of Independence proclaimed on Feb. 16, 1918, in Vilnius, whereby a sovereign Lithuanian State was restored which had antecedents in the Lithuanian Kingdom established in 1251; To honor the memory of the generations of Lithuanian freedom fighters who fought in 1812, 1831, 1863, 1905, 1941 and the Partizan War of 1944-1952 to defend Lithuania's national aspirations and values against foreign oppressors;

To recall with pride the political, cultural, economic and social achievements of the Lithuanian Republic during the independence era of 1918-1940;

And to express our indignation over the interruption of Lithuania's sovereign function as a result of the military occupation of our homeland by the Soviet Union on June 15, 1940, as a result of which national traditions and values were trampled, the personal freedoms of the people were suppressed and hundreds of thousands of people were liquidated by the Soviet genocidal practices.

Gravely concerned with the present plight of Soviet-occupied Lithuania and animated by a spirit of solidarity we, representatives of the Lithuanian ethnic community of Worcester, Massachusetts,

Do hereby protest,

Soviet Russia's aggression and the following crimes perpetrated by the Soviets in occupied Lithuania;

1. Murder and deportations of more than 400,000 Lithuanian citizens to concentration camps in Siberia and other areas of Soviet Russia for slave labor;

2. Yearly systematic deportations, under various guises, of Lithuanian youths to forced labor in Soviet Russia and their un-

lawful conscription into the Soviet Russian army;

3. Colonization of Lithuania by importation of Russians, most of whom are communists or undesirables, who receive various privileges at the expense of the Lithuanian people;

4. Pauperization of the Lithuanian people, conversion of once free farmers into serfs on kolkozhes and sovkozhes, as well as exploitation of workers;

5. Persecution of the faithful, restriction of religious practices, and closing of houses of worship; and

6. Distortion of Lithuanian culture by efforts to transform it into a Soviet-Russian culture and continuous denial of creative freedom.

We demand, that Soviet Russia immediately withdraw from Lithuania its armed forces, administrative apparatus, and the imported Communist "colons", letting the Lithuanian nation freely exercise its sovereign right to self-determination.

We request, the Government of the United States of America to raise the issue of Lithuania in the United Nations and in international conferences as well as to support our just requests for the condemnation of Soviet aggression against Lithuania and for the abolition of Soviet colonial rule in that country.

Revision Needed

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation which will extend the maximum period for broadcasting licenses from 3 to 5 years.

H.R. 16057 will amend the Communication Act of 1934.

Commercial broadcasters spend hundreds of work hours preparing applications for renewal of their licenses every 3 years. Much of the information required is a duplication of information which had been furnished to the Federal Communication Commission only 3 years before. This bill would reduce that duplication which costs time and money to the broadcaster and at the same time reduce the administrative burden and cost on the FCC. If the term of the license were greater, this burden would be reduced proportionately.

The majority of broadcasters are consistently approved by the FCC. It is my opinion that this extension will allow the FCC more time to concentrate their attention on the minority that are known misusers of their licensed trust. Under present law each broadcaster in the United States must apply for renewal every 3 years. Those governmental agencies, such as police, forestry, and fire departments who use safety and special radio service licenses must apply every 5 years. It would seem only fair that those broadcasters who have demonstrated their responsibility should be accorded similar treatment.

Mr. Speaker, the present law is unrealistic and outmoded when applied to communication needs and the integrity of the broadcasting media. For that reason, it would be my hope that there will be early consideration of H.R. 16057 to

cut down on expenses of the Federal Government and provide equitable treatment to responsible broadcasters.

For Peace in Vietnam

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the tragic issue of the war in Vietnam is becoming daily a matter of increasing concern to our people. In that connection, I want to call the attention of our colleagues to the text of an address I delivered last week before the Men's Club of the Jewish Communal Center of Flatbush, dealing with problems of peace in Vietnam. The text follows:

FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM, NOW

I am deeply grateful for the privilege of joining with you this evening. Among other things, it gives me an opportunity to express my appreciation in person to those of you who supported me and voted for me in the recent election. By the same token, it also gives me an opportunity to express my gratitude to those of you who opposed my election and voted for my opponents.

In the final analysis, those who opposed me establish the standards and criteria against which my performance as a Congressman must be assessed. To satisfy those of you who voted for me, I need only to measure up to your expectations. To satisfy those who opposed me, I must exceed their expectations. That I shall try to do.

In the meantime, I do want to thank all of you . . . friend and critic alike. I must confess, however, that I would be much more comfortable if there were fewer critics.

As your representative in Congress, I intend to become involved in a host of national issues of critical concern to all of us, and I will direct my efforts and energies intensively to secure a negotiated peace in Vietnam. In that connection I have joined with a group of my colleagues, including, among others, Congressman Morris K. Udall of Arizona and New York Congressmen Jonathan Bingham, William Fitts Ryan, Herbert Tenzer, and Lester Wolf, in sponsoring a concurrent resolution which directs the appropriate committees of Congress to "immediately consider and report to their respective bodies their determination as to whether further Congressional action is desirable in respect to policies in Southeast Asia."

Testimony by Secretary Dean Rusk, during the past two days of public hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, makes it clear that the State Department will not veer from its desolate policy which has been productive of death, destruction, and waste of American resources, while keeping humanity at the brink of thermonuclear explosion. It is a policy which has brought to an end draft deferments to graduate students . . . a policy against which I am firmly opposed. I cannot see why a commitment made to these graduate students touches less upon the conscience of the American people than a commitment made to political leaders in Vietnam so long ago that those leaders have long since passed from the scene.

The policies enunciated by Secretary Rusk will drag 200,000 additional young American people into the quagmire of a Southeast Asian military venture, at the precise moment when all America wants nothing other than to bring the boys home.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the objective of a military victory in Vietnam is the pursuit of a vain mirage. Escalation of the war effort towards that objective can result only in higher levels of death and destruction, increasing draft quotas and further call-ups of reserves and National Guard units, with the consequent dislocation of the lives of our people and our economy. Escalation will exacerbate the conditions which give rise to racial violence, crime in our streets and increased narcotic addiction.

Escalation on our part will produce nothing but the same on the part of the enemy. Indeed, if there ever was doubt on that score, it was fully established by the total destruction of the City of Hue, as tragic a loss to Eastern culture as was the capture of Paris by the Nazis to Western culture.

There is a deepening sense of frustration and malaise spreading throughout our nation stemming directly from the Vietnam War. This growing concern has developed not so much from the serious losses we have suffered there since the lunar New Year, but from events which have occurred here.

Publication just a few weeks ago of excerpts of Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reveals in glaring nakedness how the compelling drift of events shapes the destiny of man. The events in the Tonkin Gulf in August of 1964 do not in my mind, nor in the minds of many Americans, persuasively establish, beyond a reasonable doubt, the destructive escalation to which it gave rise.

The testimony given by the Defense Secretary unfolds a tale of intrigue worthy of the narrative skills of an Ian Fleming but in no way justifies the commitment of our manpower and our resources to a peripheral engagement against Communism, while its principal proponents, the Soviet Union and Red China, are spared the sufferings and burdens of actual military involvement. That very circumstance does in fact establish the imperative necessity for a negotiated peace in Vietnam.

War frequently brings out the best in man, but there is also a Gresham's Law which operates—something in which the finest in man is destroyed by his meaner instincts. In Vietnam this has meant imprisonment for Buddhist monks, for intellectuals, for political opponents, for students and for others who do not subscribe to the proposition that war is inevitable nor bow to the idea that the fate of Vietnam rests in the hands of the military clique which rules over the South Vietnamese.

In Vietnam, it has meant the failure of the pacification program, widespread corruption among its military and political leaders, and so gross a distortion of values that a prostitute earns \$500 a week while a peasant barely earns \$500 a year.

Under the circumstances it is not surprising that we have been unable to inspire the will of the South Vietnamese to rally to their own defense or destroy the will of the Viet Cong to pursue their course of aggression.

Here in the United States, the bitter sense of frustration has produced demonstrations, draft-card burning, and voluntary exile by those unable to square their conscience with the call to service of their country. The circumstances of war have so divided our people that some high public officials have begun to equate dissent with treason—a trend which is destructive of the very roots of our democratic process.

In the full sweep of human history, it is almost a moment ago when the United States exercised its persuasive influence to convince U Thant to carry on as Secretary General of the United Nations, despite the deep frustrations which assailed him because of the continued war in Vietnam. This past weekend U Thant, after meeting with world leaders, asserted that peace negotiations will begin if we stop the bombing. In my judg-

ment, we must maintain our faith in U Thant's judgment and insistent efforts for an honorable peace. We have no alternative but to take him at his word. I urgently recommend that we stop the bombing and call upon U Thant to convene a special session of the United Nations Assembly, so that all the world can participate in this peace effort, since all the world is at stake. Such negotiations will certainly require the presence of all parties, including the National Liberation Front. It will also require patience, compromise and realistic face-saving.

There seems to be a deep-seated fear within the State Department against negotiations, because of a history of Communist duplicity, involving continued aggression covered by an umbrella of negotiation. It is, of course, a fact that our experience in negotiating a truce ending the Korean War points to that prospect.

On the other hand, it seems to me that too many people in high positions in both the State and Defense Departments are unduly afflicted with the Panmunjon syndrome.

Certainly establishment of a permanent peace in Korea has been difficult. But who is there in those Departments who would turn back the clock in Korea to resume the shooting war? Our experience in Korea proves that the road to peace is a rocky one and blessed are they who choose to walk upon it. It is indeed striking that South Korea has progressed, under difficult conditions, to the point where it has been able to send 50,000 men to fight side by side in Vietnam with American troops—more troops than any other nation has sent to Vietnam.

Indeed, if Panmunjon proves anything, it persuasively demonstrates the urgent need to start negotiations now—in the interests of uniting our Nation, in the interests of advancing programs to revitalize our domestic policies, in the interests of removing the shadows of another world war and in the interest of establishing universal peace and security.

The Rising Crime Rate

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a most important report written by Francis B. Looney, commissioner of police of Nassau County. His comments contained therein are worthy of serious consideration by all law-abiding citizens:

THE RISING CRIME RATE

(By Francis B. Looney, commissioner of police, Nassau County Police Department)

Much has been said about the continuous rise in the crime rate in recent years and particularly the definite surge in criminal activity during the year of 1967. National statistics indicate that during the first nine months of 1967, an increase of approximately 16 percent in major crimes was recorded in the United States. This increase in crime has not been peculiar to any one area of the country as we in Nassau County have experienced the same type of acceleration. The fact is that the problem exists and it must be dealt with intelligently and realistically and that is obviously the primary reason we are here today.

As in the case of all serious problems, in order to find a cure, the cause must first be determined if possible. It is very easy to say, as many have, that the answer lies solely with the law enforcement establishment and to combat crime we have to have more effective

police agencies—that we have to increase the size of our police departments—that we have to have better trained and educated police officers—and that we have to devise new and more sophisticated investigative techniques. No one would dispute the advantages that can be derived from an increase in police manpower, more capable personnel, and additional enforcement tools, but, I submit, that this alone is not the answer.

Here in Nassau County we pride ourselves on having one of the most progressive and best equipped police departments in the United States. Our department is the second largest police department in the State of New York and the seventh largest in the nation, with a personnel complement of 3,664, of which 2,793 are police officers serving a Police District population of approximately 1,200,000, which constitutes a ratio of 2.3 police officers per thousand of population. Our police personnel receive 547 hours of basic training and 80 hours of in-service training annually under a curriculum which is reputed to have given us one of the most extensive mandatory instructional programs conducted by any Police Department in the United States. In addition to mandatory training, 438 of our police officers are presently actively engaged in college level study, 300 of whom are attending our own tuition-free Police Science Degree Program, with the remainder enrolled in eleven other colleges and universities located in the immediate area. The Department also has made every possible attempt to stay abreast of and deal with conditions brought about by social changes and attitudes. These efforts are evidenced by the establishment of and expansion of the activities of our Community Relations Bureau, Narcotics Bureau and Youth Division. We sincerely feel that we have been diligent in our endeavors to anticipate and meet the need for broader and more sophisticated police services by providing the high level training essential for today's law enforcement officer and performing the specialized functions necessary to cope with varied community and crime problems. Nevertheless, the fact remains that despite our intensive efforts, crime has continued to increase in Nassau County as it has elsewhere.

Perhaps those concerned with the crime problem have been looking in the wrong direction; perhaps we all have been concentrating on only one facet of a large complex situation and have only been scratching the surface and that a long hard look at the overall mechanics of our entire criminal justice system is necessary. It may be that the solution does not rest solely with law enforcement. I am not suggesting that our police agencies cannot do more, that there is not a need for additional and improved police training, increased coordination between police agencies, better facilities and equipment, a furtherance of public support and cooperation in the law enforcement effort, greater emphasis on organized crime or Federal and State responsibility in providing positive guidance and financial support to all law enforcement. Instead, I am calling attention to the fact that crime prevention is as complex as the causes of crime and the apprehension and arrest of violators is but one step in the team effort necessary to deter and prevent the commission of crime. We in law enforcement have a responsibility and cannot and do not want to shunt our responsibility, but at the same time we do not feel that the remedy is strictly in our hands. Even if it were possible to apprehend every person who committed a crime, this alone would not serve to eliminate all criminal activity as there is no deterrent unless immediate and vigorous prosecution leading to a sure and fair adjudication, coupled with swift and firm punishment is also assured. Consequently, the scope of any review or survey must be widened to include the entire orbit of the criminal justice sys-

tem, the courts, the probation and parole services, as well as our correctional services.

A study of all arrest dispositions made in Nassau County during the years of 1964, 1965 and 1966 reveals that only 8 out of every 100 criminal defendants are ever imprisoned or sentenced to a correctional institution. Further, that of 2,241 felons arrested in 1964, only 115 or 5 percent were convicted on the original charge, while 51 percent were convicted of lesser or reduced charges. Of the same 2,241 persons arrested for felonies, only 394 or 17.5 percent received prison sentences, in spite of the fact that 757 or 34 percent were "recidivists" having previously been convicted of crimes. Of particular significance is the revelation that of the 757 recidivists, 335 received sentences of imprisonment which means that only 59, or approximately 4 percent of the remaining 1,484 felony defendants were sentenced to prison.

I feel that these statistics are most revealing and I cite them to support my contention that any efforts undertaken to stem the rise in crime cannot start and stop with the law enforcement function but must also be projected to include the entire spectrum from arrest to and through prosecution, trial, conviction, punishment, imprisonment and rehabilitation of the guilty lawbreaker. It is my firm belief and I submit that a concerted and meaningful effort on the part of the legislative, executive and judicial branches of all levels of government is needed as only a complete team effort can reduce the crime rate.

**U.S. Veterans' Advisory Commission
Renders Excellent Report**

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I extend my sincere congratulations and gratitude to the members of the U.S. Veterans' Advisory Commission for the outstanding report they have submitted to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The comprehensive recommendations that they have made as a result of their yearlong study of the entire veterans benefit program will be extremely helpful to the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. The needs of the veterans as well as the capabilities of the American people to support the veterans programs have been taken into due consideration in their evaluations.

These outstanding Americans traveled throughout the Nation last year, interviewing hundreds of veterans leaders, individual veterans, and civil leaders as to their proposals for equitable veterans benefits and programs.

The Commission, appointed by Veterans' Administration Administrator William J. Driver, was the result of a directive from the President that such a study be made. Mr. Driver will, in turn, make recommendations to the President based on the report. I know that the recommendations will receive the earnest appraisal of the President and that it is possible we here in Congress may receive still another message from the President containing proposals gleaned from the Commission's studies.

There has been a need for many years for just such a study. Many of our programs for veterans have been in exist-

ence for many years, but we needed an appraisal—at the grassroots level—of how effective these programs are. In addition, today's veterans are faced with different problems, and there is no question but that new programs need to be instigated to fulfill this Nation's obligation to these men.

I commend the Commission for its outstanding work. Through their conscientious devotion to this task they have fulfilled a much-needed service to the Nation and to our veterans.

Federal Affairs Seminar

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, each year the Jaycees of Georgia hold a Federal Affairs Seminar in Washington. This year it was my privilege to be the official host of our Jaycees for their annual seminar in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, I consider the Jaycee organizations throughout the country are an action group, and they are fast becoming recognized as leaders in our communities across the country. Their approach to community problems is action oriented and that is why they have been labeled young men of action.

The emphasis today is on youth, and more and more young men are taking leadership positions in our States and our communities. And, the Jaycee organizations are preparing these young men to assume these positions of leadership.

The services which our Jaycees perform for our communities certainly make our communities better places to live.

Mr. Speaker, the Georgia Jaycees were the first Jaycee organization in the country to realize the importance of learning the workings of our National Government. It was not long before the idea of the Federal Affairs Seminar caught on in other States and now each year, thousands of Jaycees come to our Nation's Capital to view the workings of our Government firsthand.

This year's trip for the nearly 150 Jaycees from Georgia included a briefing at the Pentagon on Southeast Asia and a visit to the White House.

During the series of workshops, the young community leaders were addressed by Congressman GERALD FORD who is minority leader of the House of Representatives and by Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, of New York.

They also had a discussion session with Bill Downs, the ABC news correspondent at the Pentagon and Maj. Gen. Herman Nickerson, Jr., USMC, Deputy Chief of State, and the members of the Georgia congressional delegation.

A tour of the Vietnam Embassy was part of the program, as well as a tour of the British Embassy.

In addition to a tour of Washington, the Jaycees were given a tour of the U.S. Capitol by the reading clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to be the host for the Jaycees of Georgia. To me,

their yearly seminars in Washington are another vital step in strengthening the two-way communication between the people back home and their Representatives in Congress.

The Real Meaning of Education

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, although I didn't have the privilege of attending this meeting, I have read the remarks by Dr. Benjamin C. Willis before the National Schools Committee for Economic Education. These remarks by a man who is dedicated to the free enterprise system and who knows well the benefits of that system should be passed on to all who will read them.

Reading through this speech I feel that Dr. Willis has something to say about the real meaning of education and I include at this point his remarks in the RECORD:

LET US NOT LOSE IT

(Remarks by Benjamin C. Willis before the 15th Annual Awards Meeting of the National Schools Committee for Economic Education, Atlantic City, N.J., February 19, 1968)

It is with profound respect and admiration that I salute the members of the National Schools Committee for Economic Education. My feeling grows from the conviction we share: that the teaching of sound economic principles as integral to the American way of life has never been more urgently needed than today in the midst of sweeping changes in our country.

The free enterprise system, lifeline of the economic well being of citizens, must be understood in its total import if we are to rear a responsible and productive citizenry in our schools. Grammar school is none too early to stress the vital relationship between the competitive economy and the individual's share in the overall well being of his country.

Retreat of the young from business as a career is based on the deeper and more significant problem of a new social climate arising, in which welfare rather than well being is the overriding rationale. There are other symptoms of growing import: breakdown of authority; loss of respect for institutions and their role in society; a sweeping socialism that masks itself as "humanity"; the wielding of power without judgment, analysis, or principle; near anarchy of students in dissent—many more. The personal effects are loss of initiative, an attitude of "something for nothing" and growing dependence upon government as the sole determiner of the future.

If we consider just one phase of a growing problem, we see downgrading of values and the first stages of loss of personal liberty.

I refer to training the young for competency as opposed to mere socialization or dependence. I strongly believe that the young who find their job niche, after preparation and understanding of the relation of work to their life happiness, discover not only their self-image but their place in society. This alone makes it mandatory that the young be given liberal education in the importance of career as it relates to the fabric of the community in which they live.

I speak of applicable education that can be translated into a given job, as well as the basic attitudes so important in relation to that job.

If the young are made to understand that they must give back—in time, talents, skills,

and leadership—what their country has given them through education, then we have taken the first big step in making their lives constructive and meaningful in society.

The dissenter, the welfare-bred, the ADC recipient, or the average American student who uses instruments of force to gain monetary benefits—grow largely from the ill-tended soil of sound American economic instruction. We must teach future citizens in our schools the importance of analyzing their actions and the link between their personal well-being and education that will help them better it.

Schoolchildren must learn early the rights of labor, management, and stockholder in the American free enterprise system. They must learn to exercise their dissenting privilege within the framework of American law and order. They must learn the inter-relationship of man and the economy—and the individual responsibility that comes with the privilege of being able to work and to thrive on their own merit in that society.

The essence of our system is contained in the right of any individual of any race or creed to become all he is capable of becoming. These rights extend to the worker, who is paid adequately for his skills and contributions to the job; to the employer who has a right to fair effort for monies paid; and to the stockholder who has the right to profit from what is earned.

In the American system, with education, a young man or woman may aspire. This is what is meant by the term "raising aspirations." . . . the knowledge that personal effort, determination, contribution, may result in profit—both monetary and personal.

Under this best of all possible systems every man is thus free to pursue the best life can give him, free to achieve, free to excel. This is democracy in action. We dare not let the young be misled into thinking that rights come without work, without responsibility, without commitment of self to the American dream.

If welfare programs have any basic commitment it must be toward the eventual loosening of dependency and the thrust to remove those receiving aid into productive work, for that is the nature of our way of life.

The apathy of some students and the opposite—rebellion in demand for "rights"—is often laid to a lack of challenge. We need to counter-challenge this claim. There is upon us the most revolutionary time in the history of man: in science, transportation, communication, scientific-research oriented businesses, teaching, law, medicine, technology. There are hundreds of new job titles unheard of but ten years ago. From the unknown reaches of outer space to the wonders of the ocean floor, there are countless challenges to young minds. We urgently need those who drive the buses, repair the machines, plan the highways, construct the physical settings of cities. The list is endless. There is a job for everyone who seeks it.

From where will these workers come?

It is axiomatic that government is fast becoming the nation's largest employer. The question of who will control the future education of children is of direct concern to those involved with the pursuit of earlier and more comprehensive economic training. It is estimated that by 1975 some 82 billion dollars will be spent by the federal government for education. Out of this expenditure will come control of mass programming that can, if not analyzed and checked, contribute to the dependency of man upon government. What is needed is true government—by the people. We must not lose our liberty, either to government or any monopoly that would squelch individualism.

It has been cited that we are living in an era of social protest which has become the modus operandi of the time. I do not believe this; yet there are uncomfortable warning signs that power without discretion, bargain-

ing without principle, vested-interest dissent without conscience, are making inroads in our schools across the land.

Our high demand is to teach and teach early the basic principles, goals, and premises of economics related to individual conscience to offset the influence of the something-for-nothing climate that is seeping into our country. This means that in the early grades, traditional values of what makes an economy work in a free society must be interpreted to the young. High school is too late; by that time there are too many pressures from without vying for the youngster's attention.

The National Schools Committee stands for real progress in the recognition of good curriculum practices to achieve this goal. Creation of curriculum guides along the lines of sound, economic principles alone would make NSC's efforts notable, but, and this is the most significant, NSC's fight to preserve the American system is going to make the important difference to young minds in an atmosphere of expediency.

What higher cause for the educator in America than to give more than lip service to the cause of democratic progress. Citizens who love this country and who treasure freedom have helped make it great.

Wholesale unemployment, illiteracy, welfare rolls, delinquency, anarchy in the streets—and the grave threat to the American cities' cohesiveness from such destructive influences—these are the foes of the American way of life as we have known it.

Our human resources are our most precious wealth in the true sense of that term. We must not sell young Americans short by failure to imbue them with the philosophy behind the making and sustaining—and heightening—of a free and productive, and opportunity-filled country.

I have said I was full of appreciation for the work of the National Schools Committee. I am, not only as an educator but as a citizen. The youth of America, in their searching, want and need to understand the forces that make a country progressive, that make a country productive, that make a country the seedbed for genius, for contribution, for leadership. NSC has heard the cry and is answering it with tangible, practical, workable means.

The situation with the young is not without irony, from youthful idealism we get the urge to fight for causes. Unfortunately not always thought-out causes. From the need to hero-worship we get all manner of contemporary heroes who espouse negations of the principles that made a country in which the right to dissent is assured. Further, from the real sincerity of thousands we must match in our efforts to educate them to the realities of living.

Can we not make constructive good flow from these instincts and needs of the young? Can we not guide them to know and understand and fight for the principles of freedom—rather than selling them short by too quickly judging their actions and by becoming discouraged in the face of their demand for change?

I think we can. I think we must.

It has been said that the good values in life are not made as exciting as disruption in society is dramatized through media. Yet where is a more exciting task for the young mind than the conquering of an environment that demands creativity, knowledge, practical application, devotion? Where is a more exciting task than the inspiration of the young mind to pour his energies and talents into the reshaping of society?

I have commented in the past that the external city is often the result of the internal values held by men. Does this not suggest to us that we need to internalize those principles of freedom, and choice, within the young before they can transfer these qualities to the society in later years?

It suggests to me that we must begin

early, in the very early grades, to inculcate the youngsters with ideals. What has been permissiveness must become defined goal; what has become abstraction must become concreteness. This last relates to all education—which must become pertinent, usable, in modern times.

I might sum up by saying, as a noted social worker has stated so well, "Service is the rent we pay for the space we take up on earth."

We must help the young to know that to serve through using their education and talents and wisdom is their high calling, and we must do this in compelling, absolute terms, for our problems are compelling and absolute.

Business must not be sold to young Americans as a monster with only the profit motive to justify its existence. It must be interpreted to the young in the truly humanitarian terms that it represents. They must be made to understand that the use of human potential, the flux and flow of goods, the law of supply and demand, and the provision of jobs, money, and a standard of life, hinge on personal commitment and hard work. They must realize that all men can profit under the free enterprise system, each according to his ability, and that no agency or monopoly or system of government can give them freedom that they do not work to obtain and to treasure.

Self government implies the responsibility to be able to work to preserve it, or, put another way, true government is the collective will of the people expressing their individual capacity.

So let us look behind the threat of anarchy in the classroom, on the streets, in government machinery, to the underlying causes—and work to motivate students to take their rightful share in the shaping of society.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you, and let me leave you this thought in parting: "We should love our freedom—and defend it—or we must lose it. Let us not lose it."

Farm Policy

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a farm delegation representing the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation is in Washington this week presenting its views on several critical problems in agriculture.

In addition to talking with Ohio Congressmen, the group met today with several of my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee. At this meeting we had the opportunity to hear from Mr. D. R. Stanfield, executive vice president of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, who spoke on farm policy.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Stanfield's comments in the RECORD at this point in order that all Members of Congress might have an opportunity to learn of his views.

Mr. Stanfield's statement follows:

Our space-age technology has made it possible for fewer and fewer farmers to produce more and more for each consumer. The number of farm workers in 1967 was 5.0 million—about half the number 20 years earlier. At the turn of the century, one American farmer fed an average of seven other people. Today, one farmer feeds forty others.

Farmers as a group are efficient as producers, but have not shared adequately in

the economic growth of this country. Many programs, such as crop controls, demand expansion, land retirement, export subsidies, import controls, and others, have been tried with varying degrees of success.

We can understand why we have difficulty in dealing with the over-all farm program if we think first in terms of the commercial farmers who have a \$20,000 and over gross income, and those farmers who have a lesser amount. We can also think of the problem in terms of the high volume farmer and the low volume farmer.

Generally, the high volume farmer has adequate land, capital, and managerial resources. The low volume farmer may be lacking in one or all three of these important ingredients. Following is Table 1. (Percentage of cash receipts, government payments, and U.S. farms, 1966) which indicates that there are 527,000 farms in the \$20,000 and over category, and while they are only 16.2 percent of the total number of farms, they receive 68.3 percent of the cash receipts. This leaves only 31.7 percent of the cash receipts for the other 2,725,000 farms.

the capabilities to enlarge their farm unit and the initiation of programs to provide for early retirement for older farmers who are now trapped in agriculture on small units with little volume of output and who have few other alternatives.

It appears we have an agricultural plant geared to meet all our needs with around 50 to 55 million acres of land in retirement each year. This assumes that the land is of the same type that was retired during this period.

Tweeten of Oklahoma State University estimates a continued excess capacity in agriculture of some 50 million acres of land by 1980. On the basis of a U.S. population increase of 1.4 percent per year and an increase of 2 percent in annual per capita income, he estimates a 1.6 percent annual increase in the domestic demand. He estimates the foreign demand to increase at the annual rate of .4 percent which would give a total annual increase in demand of around 2 percent.

He estimates output of agriculture at around 1.7 percent annually on the same acreage as at present without additional outside inputs. With an increase in outside inputs at the rate of .3 percent per year, which he views as modest, he comes out with an annual increase in output of 2 percent and a continued surplus of crop land in U.S. agriculture.

Heady of Iowa State University, likewise, comes out with a similar excess capacity in acres ranging from 32 to 78 million acres by 1980, depending upon the particular assumptions made.

During recent years, five statistical studies have been made which attempted to appraise the impact upon net farm income in the short-run if all farm support programs were withdrawn. These studies indicate a drop of one-fifth to two-fifths in net farm income during the first five transition years. With inadequate supply response data for agriculture there is room for considerable differences in judgment regarding these conclusions. Nevertheless, it appears evident that there would be a substantial drop in net farm incomes the first years that government programs were withdrawn suddenly.

Kaldor, of Iowa State University, concludes that net farm incomes might decline around 25 percent and that per capita farm incomes might decline 15 to 20 percent. This likely substantial decline in incomes, if all support programs were withdrawn suddenly, is sufficiently recognized by nearly all students of the farm problem. They, therefore, recommend a reasonable adjustment period even though they wish to return to completely free prices.

During this adjustment period we believe that a combination of farmer bargaining and marketing cooperatives, in cooperation with government marketing orders, a national agricultural relations act, or similar approaches, could provide a reasonable price increase for farmers plus substantial favorable effects on the terms of sale. Government marketing orders would perhaps be on the commodity-by-commodity basis, based on a market area. Under this plan the government would determine the guidelines and act as a referee and not as a judge.

Farm organizations are agreed that the farmers must retain control of the bargaining process through their own associations. We have made substantial progress in Ohio in developing the Ohio Agricultural Marketing Association into the kind of an organization that can bargain effectively for farmers. However, the government does have a role to play as we have already indicated. We have had considerable success with processing tomatoes, grapes, and a number of vegetables making use of the contract method of marketing.

It has been estimated that for feed grains, wheat, soybeans, cotton, hay, and others, that we would have an expected acreage without diversion in the late sixties of about 330 mil-

TABLE 1.—PERCENTAGE OF CASH RECEIPTS, GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS, AND U.S. FARMS, 1966

Value of sales	Number of farms (thousands)	Percent of—		
		Number of farms	Cash receipts	Government payments ¹
\$20,000 and over.....	527	16.2	68.3	44.7
\$10,000 to \$19,999.....	510	15.7	17.1	22.9
\$5,000 to \$9,999.....	446	13.7	7.9	14.9
\$2,500 to \$4,999.....	356	11.0	3.2	7.4
Less than \$2,500: ²				
Part time.....	820	25.2	1.7	5.6
Part retirement and abnormal.....	378	11.6	1.1	2.4
Other.....	215	6.6	0.7	2.1
Total.....	3,252	100.0	100.0	100.0

¹ 1965. Government payments are included in cash receipts.
² Data based on distributions in 1965.

Higher prices are little help to the low volume farmer because income from sales is low.¹ Employment off the farm offers the best prospect for better incomes to the low volume farmer. The older operators usually choose to stay and do the best they can. The younger operators face one of the most difficult of all questions—should they try to do what is required to make a success of farming, or should they turn to another way of earning a living? No matter how agriculture is structured, it still must adopt new technology, use more machinery, retire some land, and cut down sharply on the labor force if it is to be progressive and contribute to the development of the American economy.

If Congress will now approve H.R. 13541, the Agricultural Fair Practices Act, it would be a significant step towards giving farmers some additional strength in their bargaining efforts.

The Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 expires at the end of 1969. Ohio farmer always have favored the Conservation Reserve.

Studies have shown it achieving a greater reduction in production per dollar than any other plan that has been tried. The retiring of whole farms has benefits beyond being efficient. We also have retired many acres through a partial farm retirement plan.

In Ohio our farmers prefer the whole farmland retirement plan because of its efficiency and because it gives the farmer greater opportunity to manage his resources and adjust to a new way of making a living. We feel that our long-range program should move in this direction. However, we realize that it is better to have some land retirement under a partial farmland retirement program than none at all. It is contemplated that in 1968 we will have a total land retirement program, including the whole plus the partial retirement acres, of about 55 to 60 million acres, and the total acres harvested will have declined from 324 million acres in 1957 to about 301 million acres harvested in 1967. The following table shows cropland diversion under specified programs and cropland harvested.

TABLE 2.—CROPLAND DIVERSION UNDER SPECIFIED PROGRAMS AND CROPLAND HARVESTED

Year	Acreage reserve	Diverted acres under specified program					Cropland adjustment ¹	Total ²	Cropland harvested (total acres harvested)
		Conservation reserve ¹	Feed grain	Wheat	Cotton	Cropland conversion			
1957.....	21.4	6.4					27.8	324	
1958.....	17.2	9.9					27.1	324	
1959.....		22.5					22.5	324	
1960.....		28.7					28.7	324	
1961.....		28.5	25.2				53.7	303	
1962.....		25.8	28.2	10.7			64.7	295	
1963.....		24.3	24.5	7.2		0.1	56.1	300	
1964.....		17.4	32.4	5.1	0.5	.1	55.5	301	
1965.....		14.0	34.8	7.2	1.0	.4	57.4	298	
1966 ⁴		13.3	32.0	8.2	5.7	.4	60.6	295	
1967.....		11.0	20.6		4.9	.6	41.1	301	

Source: Data from USDA, 1966, p. 541; USDA, June 1967, table 3.

¹ Conservation reserve and cropland adjustment represent whole land retirement; other programs represent partial land retirement.

² Total diverted including acreage devoted to substitute crops.

³ Not required to be put in conserving uses.

⁴ Except for conservation reserve, represents enrolled acreage.

Along with an adequate whole farmland retirement program, plus a partial farmland retirement program, we will still need to encourage agricultural exports and better food diets at home. It is also assumed that

greater national efforts will be made to provide the opportunity for more youth to enter college or trade and vocational schools, with particular emphasis directed at the rural youth and younger farmers. It is further assumed that educational and credit programs will be continued and improved to aid younger and middle-aged farmers who have

¹ (Volume x Price) — (Expenses) = Net Income.

lion acres. During 1965-67 our average acreage has been 301 million acres with the feed grain, wheat, and cotton control programs.

People have several objectives for commercial farm policy. Good farm incomes, ample food supply, efficiency, and freedom to make decisions are among them. The realities of markets, however, indicate that these cannot all be achieved at once under present circumstances.

High farm prices and incomes require restraint on production or large government expenditures to increase use of farm products, as by food aid to poor countries. Such measures infringe on the farmers' freedom to produce as they please or make farm income partially dependent on government. On the other hand, complete freedom is likely to mean lower net incomes than the ones farmers found unsatisfactory in 1967. If some compromise is preferred, then alternative programs should be realistically evaluated to find the best combination for income, freedom, and other objectives. The general public will need to be assured that agriculture will supply adequate food and fiber efficiently, that public funds will be put to good use, and that expenditures will not get out of hand.

Throughout the world, and in our own country, there is considerable agitation to place quotas on imports or to follow a high protection policy. The following have been referred to as "The Big Six": Steel, chemical, petroleum, textiles, beef, and dairy. Products that would be adversely affected price-wise by such a policy would be soybeans, feed grains, and wheat. These latter three have often been referred to as "The Billion Dollar Club."

The following table shows how U.S. exports exceeded imports for 1966-67:

[In billions]	
Exports:	
Nonagricultural	\$24.1
Agricultural	6.8
Commercial	5.3
Concessional	1.5
Total	30.9
Imports:	
Nonagricultural	22.0
Agricultural	4.5
Supplementary	2.7
Complementary	1.8
Total	26.5

There is a way to keep imports from seriously damaging prices of agricultural and industrial products produced in this country, but to use quotas as a method would certainly bring quick retaliation from the countries affected. In addition, increase in the price of steel, chemicals, petroleum, and textiles would certainly raise the price of things that the farmer must buy. Rather than quotas, we favor a U.S. Commission on Trade and Tariffs which could take prompt and appropriate action when industries, including agriculture, are experiencing expanded imports that are injuring that industry. The Commission would be authorized and directed to—

(1) Take immediate action to restrict imports when there is evidence of unfair trade practices such as dumping or subsidized prices;

(2) Make prompt determinations and recommendations with respect to temporary relief from import competition which is found to be injuring or threatening injury to any U.S. industry; and

(3) Consider actions under Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

This is a new proposal to establish a Com-

mission which would function with respect to foreign trade in a manner similar to the way the Federal Trade Commission operates with respect to domestic trade. When unfair trade practices are involved, it would have the power to act—not just recommend.

The Commission would be organized so that it would stay abreast of trade developments and give prompt relief when such is warranted.

Agricultural import problems such as have existed in meat and dairy products can be handled better through these improved administrative procedures than by special legislation. Experience with the Meat Import Act of 1964 is dramatic proof of this.

Mr. Ford's Move

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend you, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and your associates in the Democratic leadership in the House for your decision to seek a direct vote by the House on the Senate version of the civil rights bill. The bill represents substantially a combination of what the House of Representatives accepted in 1966 and of what we passed last year, and its speedy enactment into law would represent an inspiring reaffirmation of America's commitment to the ideals upon which this Republic was founded.

I commend to all Members, including particularly those on the other side of the aisle, the following cogent editorial which appeared in the New York Times for March 15:

Mr. Ford's Move

The House Democratic leadership has intelligently decided to send the Senate version of the Civil Rights bill directly to the floor for final approval.

Enemies of the bill have been pushing for a House-Senate conference, the chief purpose of which would be to consider weakening amendments to the bill's open-housing section. An effort would certainly be made in conference to add an amendment permitting a property owner to instruct his broker to discriminate racially in the sale or rental of his house. Such an amendment would tear a gaping hole in the bill. There is no basis in law or conscience for giving property owners the power to authorize discrimination.

Representative Gerald Ford, the Republican leader, is the key man in next week's vote as his counterpart, Everett Dirksen, was in the Senate. Because of Southern defections, the majority Democrats cannot put through the Senate version without the cooperation of Mr. Ford and his fellow-Republicans. It is not ideal legislating for either chamber to accept major amendments that its own committees have not considered, but in the give-and-take of the legislative process this procedure is sometimes unavoidable. In this instance, every member of the House is conversant with the open-housing provisions as voted by the Senate, and knows how he stands. Further committee consideration and debate are scarcely necessary.

A vote to go to conference is a vote to delay and weaken the bill. A vote to accept the Senate substitute would speed the bill to the President's desk and bring fresh confidence to all who believe in racial equality.

At a time when racial tensions in this country are acute, Representative Ford and his Republican colleagues will be assuming a grim responsibility if they refuse to open the doors of the ghetto as wide as possible.

Worcester, Mass., Lithuanian Naturalization and Social Club Commemoration of the 50th Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it was my great honor and privilege to take part in the celebration exercises of Lithuania's 50th anniversary of independence that took place in my home city of Worcester, Mass., on February 18, last, under the sponsorship of the Worcester Lithuanian Naturalization and Social Club.

At this point, I would like to include an article appearing in the February 19, 1968, issue of the Worcester Telegram, describing the events that took place at this celebration, and I have been requested to include my own address to the assembly, together with the remarks of a distinguished Lithuanian American of Worcester, Attorney Anthony J. Miller.

The article and addresses follow:

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, Feb. 19, 1968]

LITHUANIANS IN CITY NOTE INDEPENDENCE ANNIVERSARY

More than 450 members and guests of the Lithuanian Naturalization and Social Club, 67 Vernon St., attended a speaking program and dinner yesterday marking the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

Richard C. Steele, publisher of The Worcester Telegram and the Evening Gazette, spoke to the group about his recent travels through Russia, including Lithuania. He drew parallels between the Lithuanian and Polish situations behind the Iron Curtain and reported on the state of religion in those areas.

U.S. Rep. Harold D. Donohue, D-Worcester, spoke on Lithuanian participation in American life since the arrival in this country of many persons who fled Communism.

Mayor Casdin has issued a city proclamation denoting this week as Lithuanian Independence Week, and the proclamation was read to the audience. Julius Svikla was in charge of the program.

Feb. 19, 1918, was the day the Lithuanian National Council declared its independence from German occupation. Actual independence did not come until July, 1920, and then it came from the Russians. In 1940 Lithuania was again absorbed by the Russians.

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN HAROLD D. DONOHUE ON LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE, FEBRUARY 18, 1968

It is always a great honor and pleasure, as your Representative in the United States Congress and as your friend, to join with you in these exercises celebrating the annual anniversary of your native Lithuania's Declaration of Independence.

Almost twenty-eight years have passed since the imperialistic forces of Soviet Russia overwhelmed the brave people of Lithuania and incorporated your native land into the Communist empire as a slave state.

Today, however, we commemorate a happier anniversary in the history of Lithuania and recall that it was just fifty years ago that Lithuania proclaimed her independence.

It is well that we celebrate this great event. It is most fitting that we remember Lithuania's days of liberty. For the spirit of freedom, the love of liberty, the conviction that Lithuania shall one day be free once more lives on in the hearts of the Lithuanian people today just as it lived through more than a century of czarist oppression.

Let us emphasize that Lithuania became a free land four centuries before America was even discovered. That freedom was lost in 1795, only to be regained in 1918. The same Russian imperialism that enslaved Lithuania before holds her in subjugation today. The name of the oppressor's system of government is different—it is a Communist government now but the oppression is even worse.

Through one hundred and twenty-three years of czarist rule, suffering all kinds of cruel hardships, the brave Lithuanian people passed on from generation to generation their national traditions, their love of liberty, their ideal of national freedom and independence. Today's generations still remain steadfast in their determination that Lithuania shall once again know freedom.

No one can exactly foretell when the Communist empire will begin to disintegrate and Lithuania and the other subjugated nations will be freed. But we do know that atheistic communism contains the seeds of its own destruction.

We know that men are not born to willingly accept slavish oppression and persecution. No, all men and particularly the Lithuanian people were born to stand erect before their creator and to freely rule their own national and individual destinies.

We know that sooner or later whoever stands in the way of any people's divine right to freedom must and will eventually be made powerless to dominate and persecute their fellow men.

We know that any nation that must resort to falsehood as an instrument of high policy, that must enslave people in order to control them, that must use mass murder for their barbaric purposes cannot possibly survive.

The history of tyrants in this world is written in blood and infamy and always, in the end, in self-destruction.

So in celebrating today the fiftieth anniversary of Lithuania's independence we are not engaged in a futile exercise nor are we making any passing sentimental gesture.

Rather, we look confidently to the brighter future that must come to all courageous people who remain loyal to the principles of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

I believe that Lithuania cannot be forever held in Communist slavery. I believe we have a very deep obligation to encourage Lithuania and her people in these times of terrible trial and hardships.

I, therefore, introduced a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 183) in the United States Congress on February 8, 1967. This resolution provides that the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America urge the President of the United States to present the Lithuanian and the Baltic States question before the United Nations. The resolution further urges the President to ask that the United Nations request Soviet Russia to withdraw all its troops and agents and controls from Lithuania; to return all Lithuanian exiles from Siberia, from prisons and slave-labor camps; and calls for the United Nations to conduct free elections in Lithuania and the other states.

It was and is my intention, through this resolution, to inspire the people of Lithuania to keep the bright flame of freedom burning in their hearts and to let them know that their friends have not abandoned them.

It is my earnest hope that through this

and other resolutions in the Congress the people in your native land will be reassured that you Lithuanian-Americans and all their American friends will continue to exert every moral and legal resource at our command to help Lithuania get back the independence for which she longs and which she so eminently deserves.

In closing I wish to remind you and all my fellow Americans of the wise and warning words of William Allen White when he said—"whenever a free man is in chains, we are threatened also. Whoever is fighting for liberty is defending America."

Therefore, in our own national interest let us pledge that we will persevere in our efforts until we achieve and joyously celebrate the glorious occasion when Lithuania will once more take her free, rightful and proud place in the family of civilized nations. Let us together pray that happy day will soon occur.

SPEECH OF ATTORNEY ANTHONY M. MILLER

As your fellow American of Lithuanian descent, it is a special privilege for me to join with you, and with our great Congressman, Harold Donohue, in this program commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence.

In all the annals of injustice and oppression, there is none more saddening or heart-rending than the history of our native Lithuania.

For seven centuries, all the forces of evil aggression have combined against Lithuania in an attempt to destroy it.

Successive invasions by teutonic knights, tartars, czarist Russians, Communists, Nazis, and finally Communists again have made of Lithuanian history a series of terrible blood baths, each worse than the one before.

It has been Lithuania's unhappy fate that invasion has invariably been accompanied by deliberate, organized programs of mass murder, extermination, and mass deportation that are unsurpassed and probably unequalled in their cruelty and severity.

All of the extremes of brutality, all of the devices of barbaric minds, have been loosed against our native land in a ceaseless attempt to destroy its national consciousness, its religion, its love of independence and freedom.

Yet, through it all, our people have steadfastly maintained a religious faith, a national identity, and a yearning for independence that will surely be ultimately rewarded.

Through the ordeals of seven centuries, the Lithuanians have given constant testimony to the fundamental truth that man has an inborn yearning for freedom which cannot be destroyed or eliminated.

This fundamental truth, will in the end spell defeat for Communist tyranny, if we keep faith with our ideals. That is the real meaning of this anniversary.

Fifty years ago today, on February 16, 1918, the Republic of Lithuania proclaimed its independence. Two brief decades of liberty and progress followed to be tragically snuffed out by Communist treachery.

During World War II, the United States and the allies pledged, again and again, as a solemn war aim, that the independence of all peoples would be guaranteed.

We proved tragically unequal to the task of translating these guarantees into practical reality. But this failure does not end our moral responsibility to work ceaselessly toward the goal of freedom of Lithuania from the domination of Soviet Russia.

The Communist powers have now, for several years, been engaged in a major campaign to make the civilized world forget the Red atrocities of the past. Through cultural exchanges, good will ambassadors, offers of trade, and soft words, they seek to gain free world acceptance of the status quo in the world today, even while they very likely prepare for future aggressions.

The passing years have dimmed the memories and stilled the consciences of many in the free world.

Weary of war, anxious to reach accommodation with the Communists, many in important places have begun to urge policies that tacitly accept permanent Red domination of Lithuania and the other enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain.

This fiftieth anniversary of Lithuanian independence should recall to all Americans that we cannot close the door on Lithuania's just claims to independence without betraying our solemn obligations and denying our own free heritage.

I do not believe that the United States will ever abandon the moral commitment to help Lithuania to regain her freedom but I think it is well for us to continue to remind our government and our country of this obligation.

Therefore, I think we should continue to appeal to the President of the United States and our friends in Congress, like our good congressman, Harold Donohue, to vigorously promote our declared policy of the restoration of independence to Lithuania and to reaffirm the determination of the Government of this great country not to be a party to any agreement or treaty which would confirm or prolong the subjugation of Lithuania.

I believe as Lithuanian-Americans we should and must rededicate ourselves to the just cause of Lithuanian freedom. I think that we, as Lithuanian-Americans, have the duty to continue to assure the people in our native land, suffering under Soviet domination, of our unyielding ties to them and of our unyielding determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal of freedom and independence for our glorious Lithuanian nation.

May God speed the accomplishment of our just and righteous cause for our native people and the land we love.

Booming Economy Pushes Corporation Profits to Record \$85.4 Billion Rate

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the latest reports from the Department of Commerce show that profits of American corporations boomed to a record annual rate of \$85.4 billion in the fourth quarter of last year.

This is another example of our surging, expanding economy which is continuing the longest uninterrupted business expansion period in our history.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in our economy, I place the following article from the Sunday Star in the RECORD:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., March 18, 1968]

CORPORATION PROFITS ZOOM TO RECORD \$85.4-BILLION RATE: \$5.4-BILLION GAIN IN FOURTH QUARTER BIGGEST IN 3 YEARS, U.S. REPORTS

Profits of American corporations zoomed to a record annual rate of \$85.4 billion in the fourth quarter of last year, the Commerce Department has reported. The quarterly gain of \$5.4 billion was the largest in almost three years.

The fourth-quarter surge boosted corporate profits before taxes for the entire year to \$80.8 billion, below the record of \$83.8 billion set in 1966 but slightly higher than the administration had projected for 1967.

The department said the fourth-quarter advance centered in manufacturing, although earnings in the last six months of the year were depressed by strikes, especially in the automobile and copper industries.

In estimating the amount of corporate taxes, the Treasury Department figured on a 1967 level of corporate profits of \$80.1 billion. The slightly higher total will mean a little higher tax take for the government.

For 1968, the Treasury figures a corporate profit rate of \$87 billion over the entire year. Indications so far are that profits will continue to rise in the current quarter.

Profits before taxes declined for three straight quarters before reversing the trend in the third quarter of last year. The \$5.4 billion surge in the fourth quarter was the highest since the first quarter of 1965, when profits rose \$6.6 billion following settlement of an automobile strike.

Corporate taxes for the fourth quarter of last year ran at an annual rate of \$35.1 billion, while profits after taxes were at an annual rate of \$50.3 billion.

A Dammed Bill Can Result in a Dammed River

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, recently the St. Paul district office of the Army Corps of Engineers announced the completion of a study to build a flood control dam on the St. Croix River above Taylors Falls, Minn.

The St. Croix-Namekagon River system is being considered for inclusion in the so-called wild rivers legislation now before the National Parks Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

An excellent editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press, of March 17, 1968, expresses concern that unless there is rapid enactment of a wild rivers bill, which includes the St. Croix-Namekagon, the Army Corps of Engineers may succeed in inundating one of the last remaining great, picturesque river valleys of our country.

I include the editorial as part of my remarks:

A DAMMED BILL CAN RESULT IN A DAMMED RIVER

Members of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers must be direct descendants of the beaver, so persistent are their efforts to build dams.

How else to explain the continued battle of the St. Paul District of the Army Corps to build a dam on the St. Croix River when they know full well there is little public support for the project?

Yet while they are like beavers in their persistence, they are unlike them in their purposes. The beaver builds for a reason, but the Army Corps boys seem to build just for the sake of building. Oh, they say they've got to build for flood control and to provide better recreational facilities, but both these arguments hold water like cheesecloth.

Consider their proposed dam, a 100 to 120-foot-high structure somewhere near the old Nevers Dam which could back up the St. Croix over 75,000 acres, up to and beyond Grantsburg, Wis. The reservoir pool would cover 114 square miles, and as Congressman Joseph Karth said during House hearings

earlier this month, "This picturesque wilderness, one of the most beautiful spots in this country, will be at the bottom of a 40-mile-long lake."

The main purpose of this dam would be to control the potential spring runoff capable of contributing to flood damage. But studies made at peak flows between April 17 and 18, 1965, showed that the Mississippi and Minnesota Rivers contributed four times as much to the confluence at Prescott than did the St. Croix. Its flow at St. Croix Falls was between 43,000 and 45,000 cubic feet of water a second while the Mississippi at Anoka was 90,000 cubic feet, and the Minnesota at Carver was 80,000.

It would seem wiser to try to control the Mississippi or the Minnesota than to tame this smaller, more beautiful river that hasn't already suffered the bite of the Army Corps. If studies indicate that there are no suitable sites along the Mississippi above the Twin Cities for a flood control reservoir, then we ask if just because the St. Croix lends itself to dam, does that mean we need the dam?

The cost of this structure is estimated to be from 50 to 100 million dollars. Yet, floods the likes of which we saw in 1965, by the Corps' own estimates, happen once in 100 years. Is an expensive dam, a forever ruined wild river, and a permanent public displeasure worth it just to prevent raging waters once every 100 years? Is it worth it especially when flood damages for the most part could be prevented if the Army Corps busted themselves with stronger flood plain zoning?

Aside from the flood control argument, the Army Corps also talks about improved recreational advantages which would result from changing the upper St. Croix from a slim, fast, wild river into a dull, placid reservoir-lake. That's a little tough to buy, really, because anyone who has seen such a man-made lake knows that the water level is changing always, according to the needs for water power or normal flows downstream. This results in a lake one day and a driftwood bog the next.

The advantages of a dam on the St. Croix, then, are dubious while the advantages of the river in its present state are not. It is unique in its representation of part of the American terrain not touched by an industrious, but somewhat sacrilegious civilization. This uniqueness is attested to by the fact that the Scenic Rivers bill passed last year by the Senate includes only nine rivers in the nation, one of them the St. Croix.

A similar bill is facing the hurdles of the House. But the struggle is twofold. First, the House bill only applies to the lower St. Croix. Minnesota congressmen are trying to have the upper St. Croix and the Namekagon River included. Second the Army Corps has started to move its approval for dam construction up through channels. Preliminary studies have been completed and forwarded to the Corps' Chicago office; from there they go to Corps headquarters in Washington.

So it looks as if the fate of the St. Croix rests on the outcome of a race. Congressmen interested in saving the River have delayed probably because they've underestimated the drive of the Army Corps. But they're very eager like beavers.

Before the St. Croix is irrevocably damned, the House should amend and pass the national Scenic Rivers bill.

Chairman of Indian Claims Commission

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased that my dear friend, John Vance,

has been recommended by the President as Chairman of the Indian Claims Commission.

John's western background has prepared him well for the responsibilities of this important office and I have complete confidence he will be an effective Chairman and will do an outstanding job for our Indian citizens.

As a Montanan, I have had the opportunity to observe the fine work John has done since graduating from George Washington University Law School in 1950.

In addition to practicing law in Missoula, he has served on the safety commission of that city and on the trade commission for the State of Montana. John was later elected city attorney in Helena, the capital city of Montana.

A veteran, John served with U.S. Armed Forces in the Philippines. Active for many years in the Civil Air Patrol—CAP—he has been commander of the Montana CAP and adviser to the national CAP board.

Before being confirmed by the Senate last fall as a Commissioner of Indian Affairs, John taught as a visiting professor of law at the University of North Dakota School of Law at Grand Forks, N. Dak.

Mr. Speaker, I am personally well aware of John Vance's outstanding record of achievement for the people of my district in western Montana and for the people of this Nation. Because of my deep concern for our Indian population, I commend the President for his excellent recommendation.

Regrettable Political Maneuvering

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that so important a matter as our policy in Vietnam should become entangled in internecine partisan political maneuvering.

Yet this appears to have been the case regarding the aborted proposal that President Johnson and Senator ROBERT KENNEDY resolve their differences through appointment of a special Presidential commission to reassess our Vietnam policy.

That such a commission was not created does not diminish the adverse effect of this publicized proposal on the conduct of our foreign policy. For the very fact that discussions regarding its creation were held among high-ranking administration officials, including the newly appointed Secretary of Defense, and Senator KENNEDY, is evidence of a serious crisis of confidence in policymaking at the top level of our Government.

Certainly our Vietcong enemies could not but find encouragement in this public washing of political party linen.

If indeed the executive branch desires a reexamination of reassessments of Vietnam policy, it is to the Congress, representing that arm of Government

closest to our people, to whom it should turn.

It is to be hoped that this latest Johnson-Kennedy public dispute does not presage future such incidents in which paramount foreign policy issues are virtually made into a campaign year football.

St. Patrick

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, as the Irish people all over the world honor their patron saint on March 17, it is appropriate, I think, to consider what lesson his example offers us in the world of many centuries later. As I think over the story of St. Patrick, I am at once impressed by his deep understanding of people, and his unflinching and unsurpassed sense of diplomacy.

St. Patrick was blessed with all the natural qualifications of the diplomat. He was sincere, he was mild, he was persuasive. He prepared himself thoroughly for his task by living among the people he was to convert, learning their language, their customs, and their hopes and fears. He came to respect and love them, and thus his work among them became a joy to him.

He was no patronizing delegate from afar, come to save them and raise them to his own superior level, but a friend, ready and willing to help when and however he could. He based his work on a careful plan of action. He went to the respected leaders and gained their confidence, if not always their agreement. He always spoke first to the local leaders, never rushing in to subvert their followers, but offering himself to their service. He never antagonized, but he never gave up his gentle, firm efforts.

He knew that people resent radical changes in their way of life, and so he adapted his doctrine to the native customs, making adjustments comfortable to both. He used their pagan sites as places of worship, converting them as necessary. He adapted Christian celebrations of the pagan calendar, and he gave them beautiful and impressive litanies and hymns to replace their pagan charms and chants. He found their laws those of a highly advanced culture, stressing the virtues of justice and charity, and he simply codified them and accentuated the similarities.

He recognized the great respect of the Irish for learning, and established monasteries and schools. He saw that the tales and legends and history of the pre-Christian era were set down and preserved as cherished parts of Irish culture.

He found a land of warlike tribes, and, just a little over 35 years later, he left a land of peaceful people known throughout civilization as a nation of scholars and saints.

What a great deal we can all learn, as we deal with the people of this Nation and the world, from the example

of St. Patrick. We Irish are proud of St. Patrick, and we hope that the story of his life inspires others, as it has inspired us, for centuries.

On behalf of the Flannery and Kelly clans, I wish to extend to all who are Irish by ancestry or affection a very happy St. Patrick's Day.

Hawaii's Dr. Sam Mukaida Lauded as "Mister Okinawa"

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, a noted Japanese newspaper, the Mainichi Daily News, recently featured a warm and sympathetic article about one of Hawaii's most beloved citizens, Dr. Samuel Mukaida.

In his role as Chief of the Cultural Centers Branch of the Office of Public Affairs of USCAR—U.S. Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands—Dr. Mukaida has dedicated himself for almost a decade to increasing the knowledge of and appreciation for the culture of the Ryukyuan people among Americans stationed on Okinawa. He has also helped to promote among the Ryukyuan people a better understanding of and pride in their own multifaceted culture.

At present there are five cultural centers in the Ryukyus—at Naha, at Ishikawa, at Nago, and on the major offshore Ryukyuan Islands, Miyako and Yaeyama. Dr. Mukaida stated that well over 3 million people participated in the cultural affairs programs last year, and he is most enthusiastic over the development of his ideas for multipurpose cultural centers.

Other cherished projects initiated by Dr. Mukaida are the government museum at Shuri and the community libraries program, which he calls a "new concept of library as a community center."

Dr. Mukaida has given fully of his own unique artistic energy in his work with the Ryukyuan people, and over the years he has become affectionately known as "Mister Okinawa."

Dr. Mukaida has put his considerable talents to use in many ways for the benefit of the Ryukyuan people, including the development of the Okinawa Children's Junior Chorus, the Women and Home Life Chorus, and the Naha Philharmonic Chorus. He also helped to establish the Ryukyuan International Art League, the Okinawan Symphony Orchestra, and the Okinawa Library Association.

"Mister Okinawa" was born in Kona, Hawaii, and attended the University of Hawaii. His Ph. D. was earned at Columbia University, where he specialized in audiovisual and fine arts education.

Dr. Mukaida and I have been close friends since our student days at the University of Hawaii, and it gives me great pleasure to see one of Hawaii's native sons rendering such outstanding service to the United States and to the people of Okinawa.

I salute this gentle crusader for his contributions to international goodwill,

and I would like to share with my colleagues the story of the life of "Mister Okinawa," as it was told by the Mainichi Daily News.

The article follows:

[From the Mainichi Daily News, Nov. 26, 1967]

DR. SAMUEL MUKAIDA

(By Stuart Friffin)

There was a time when this modest, soft-spoken little man was mistaken for other than who and what he was, and is. This was at a party when, responding to those who encouraged him, the small Hawaiian donned kimono and, without too much difficulty, stepped into another role, a convincing personification of Japan's Emperor Hirohito.

Before that, and after that bit of histrionics, he was and is, just Sam Mukaida, Dr. Sam Mukaida, the very much beloved, simple and dedicated gentleman who is Chief of the Cultural Centers Branch of the Public Affairs Department of USCAR, the U.S. Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands.

Dr. Sam, for all his good works and unbending efforts, is known to many, Okinawans and Americans alike, as "Mister Okinawa."

His has been a life of lights and shadows, of much success, of bitter tragedy, an uphill life, lived resolutely, effortlessly, quietly, and with strength.

He was born in Kona, Hawaii, and attended the University of Hawaii before journeying on to continue his education in New York, working his way through Columbia University. Sam majored in curriculum and teaching, and specialized in audio-visual and fine arts education. His Ph.D. was earned at Columbia.

He was in Truk, in the Trust Territories with his wife, Marietta, toward the end of a two-and-a-half-year stint there, when tragedy struck. His wife, mother of the two boys, Allen (now 17) and Donald (now 16) gave birth to Nathan (now 13). She died during that last birth and plunged Sam and his family into grief. Twelve years ago he found himself in Japan, for two years. He was active in independent research on higher education and he was, also, as he says frankly, "on the lookout for a job." He found one, in Okinawa. Doctor Sam had been active on Truk as an education specialist. There he had taught the mid-Pacific natives how to utilize the by-products of copra, making coconut ukuleles, spear fishing with hinged barbs, casting lead sinkers and furniture from coconut logs. He was to give fuller vent to this unique artistic energy in his work with the Ryukyuan people on Okinawa. His fluency in Japanese, too, was to stand him in excellent stead. A singer in his own youthful days, a cellist in his school orchestra, Dr. Sam quite naturally became immediately interested in developing Okinawa's talents musically, chorally, orchestrally. He developed the Okinawa Children's Junior Chorus, the Women & Home Life Chorus and the Naha Philharmonic Chorus that took fifth place in a Japan-wide contest, held in Wakayama, in 1966.

Sam developed the concept of national centers—at Koza, at Kadena, on Zamami Island, and at Itoman, this just recently completed. The museum at Shuri, the Government of the Ryukyus Museum, is a cherished project initiated by this big little man, and so was the development of community libraries, as he calls a "new concept of library as a community center."

Sam Mukaida also organized the Okinawan Women's Advisory Committee to his various Cultural Centers, and he was first and foremost, too, in developing the Ryukyuan American Friendship League, with its year-round program of basketball, baseball, track and field, swimming, and soccer introduced five years ago—and with gymnastics starting up next year. "This League," explains the little

gentleman whose Ph.D. thesis was on a solid "Plan for Establishment of an Audio-Visual Productions Center in the Hawaiian Islands," "is now restricted to the high school level, but we want to broaden it to include elementary and junior high school levels, as well."

The man whose name translates into English as, "Over the Rise Paddies," has now rounded out 10 years on Okinawa, as he explained on this latest of many official trips to Japan. He is the only non-Ryukyuan in his entire vast program that relies on a total of 66 Okinawan men and women—30% veterans of training and orientation in the U.S.—for its overwhelming success.

There are five Cultural Centers in the Ryukyus—at Naha, at Ishikawa, at Nago, and on the major offshore Ryukyuan Islands, Miyako and Yaeyama. The man who established the Ryukyuan International Art League, the Okinawan Symphony Orchestra, the Okinawa Library Association, says what he does as a Public Information Officer with USCAR. "I work with the cultural centers; with guiding and assisting those individuals and organizations interested in literary work, museum work, music, cultural properties, arts and handicrafts, youth's and woman's activities, and Ryukyuan-American community relations programs; with intercultural exchange activities, and, generally speaking, with planning, directing and supervising those activities which accomplish the objectives of the Office of the High Commissioner. I try to promote," he adds—and surely the success of his efforts can be viewed on all sides—"a knowledge, understanding and appreciation among Americans stationed in the Ryukyu Islands of the Ryukyuan people, their culture and their way of life. I also try to promote the Ryukyuan people's knowledge of, and pride in, their own culture." His is a world of libraries, film service libraries, adult education programs, exhibits, recreational and musical and sports programs, Japanese and English language teaching programs, drama groups, lectures, film shows, book deposits, mobile Cultural Center activities, discussion groups and above all, hard, concentrated, effective work. The man, who, with his second wife, Yoshi, from Okinawa, has added two boys to the family in Frank (18 months) and William (3 months) builds his own home in Okinawa today, in the Ameku area of Naha.

"Well over 3.1 million people participated in our cultural affairs programs last year," says Dr. Sam, known far and wide as "Mister Okinawa" because of his many articulate TV appearances explaining the multi-faceted Ryukyuan culture, "and as they say, why change a winning game? Why not stay and see the number rise year by year, especially when my idea of a multipurpose cultural center is taking such broad effective shape as it is."

President's Message Faces up to Washington's Dual Nature

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's message on the District of Columbia clearly recognizes the problems facing our Nation's Capital and offers realistic programs to solve them.

Washington is a unique city for it is at the same time the home of 800,000 people and the Capital City for a nation of 200 million.

President Johnson's message recognizes both of these facets of Washington, D.C.

To improve conditions for the residents of the District the President offers a renewed attack on crime, an increased effort to improve education and housing in the District, and a determination to find jobs for Washington's jobless. It seeks to further strengthen and unify the District Government and to put the District's Federal payments on a sound and sensible basis.

But this message also treats Washington as the First City for all Americans and seeks to make it the beautiful and cultured city every American longs for.

Permanent status is recommended for the Commission to revitalize Pennsylvania Avenue. An addition is proposed to the National Gallery so that it can better serve the Nation's visitors and school children. And the President has urged creation of an International Center for Scholars to make Washington the educational hub of the world.

A more beautiful, a more livable, a more cultured Washington—these are the hopes of the President's message. We in Congress must make them a reality.

Human Renewal Fund

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the number of Members of the House who support and endorse the Human Renewal Fund is approaching 70. In addition, the idea that the fiscal year 1969 budget can be cut by \$6.5 billion with \$2.5 billion of that cut being fed back into top priority needs in the Nation is attracting wider and wider editorial support.

The need to identify priorities, reduce spending and to meet our pressing and urgent urban problems cannot be ignored any longer.

At this point in the RECORD I am pleased to insert an editorial broadcast by WMAL in Washington during the week of March 10, 1968.

The editorial follows:

HUMAN RENEWAL FUND

(Broadcast during the week of March 10, 1968)

A large group of progressive Republican Congressmen has proposed a \$2.5 billion Human Renewal Fund to combat inner-city desperation. At the same time, they want to cut Federal spending in non-essential areas by \$6.6 billion. This proposal deserves far more attention than it is likely to receive.

The strength of the proposal is the stress on setting priority needs. Creating jobs, educational opportunity and housing in the ghettos is given high priority. Maintaining a huge standing army in Europe, foreign aid, the farm subsidy boondoggle and the like are given low priority.

In addition, total Federal spending would be cut to hold down inflation. Inflated prices are the worst enemy of the poor.

According to Maryland Representative Charles Mathias, the President's new budget cuts \$613 million from existing urban programs. In light of the well-documented plight of our cities, we believe a priority program such as the GOP Congressmen suggest is entirely in order.

District Artist

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of being acquainted with a unique individual. He is an artist. His name is Jan Wittenber. I cannot attest to his ranking in the world of art but I can attest to his humanity and service to his fellowman. Recently he initiated an art program of sketches and murals for the Dixon State School, an institution for the retarded. This warmhearted man, with the assistance of the Chicago Tribune and the Chicago American, rallied artists from many places and put them to work providing a little color and beauty for the patients. I applaud his energy, humanity, and dedication.

The story of his efforts, chronicled in the Dixon State School Reporter, follows:

DRAWINGS FOR DIXON

Chicago artists and art students are busily engaged in preparing designs on murals to be attached to the walls of some of the buildings at DSS. The project is part of an extensive effort to brighten the atmosphere for residents of the school.

Known as "Drawings for Dixon," the project was begun by Jan Wittenber, a Chicago artist who does volunteer teaching of arts and crafts at DSS. Their artwork includes sketches of clowns, animals, figures out of ancient folklore, and other bits of whimsy to brighten the walls at DSS.

Here is how the program for "Drawings for Dixon" got started. Jean Slocum, DSS Supervisor of Volunteer Services, felt that murals would be a fine thing in one of the buildings. Wittenber agreed but wondered why one building should be a special sort of show case. It seemed to him that others could stand a little color and beauty too. In fact, he revealed, that inspired by his experience at DSS, he had painted a picture entitled "The Shut In." The picture shows a young woman behind heavy black bars, looking wistfully out into a world which she no longer shares. This, he felt was the way men, women, and children feel when they are forgotten by their relatives and friends, and condemned to spend their lives in an institution, alone and unloved.

Being a man of action, Wittenber wrote to Jack Mabley of Chicago's American. He requested that artists and art students throughout the Chicago area be appealed to in this manner. If they could not come to Dixon, he said he would furnish transportation for them, or collect material volunteered. Canvas would be available as a result of contributions by the Joanna Western Mills Company, Chicago, Illinois. The sketches would be used as part of the material for a mural and the designed figures could be permanently attached to DSS walls. Within a few days eight artists had already called him and started on their way toward bringing cheer to the shut-ins at Dixon.

In addition, the artist arranged to speak next month at the University of Illinois Circle Campus to enlist the help of advanced art students in making designs on murals that could be used permanently on walls. He has the promises of art assistance from students on the University of Chicago art staff who are working toward their art degree. In addition, other Chicago newspapers, including the Chicago Tribune, have promised to publicize the project pictorially and enlist the support of other Chicago artists and art students.

Wittenber's dedication to art has taken him to almost every state in the union. He was born in the Dutch Indies, and he was brought by his father first to the Netherlands and later to the United States. He has exhibited in the Art Institute at Chicago and was awarded first prize in a competition of independent Chicago artists.

If any area residents want to take part in "Drawings for Dixon," they may write or call the Health Educator at DSS.

**Address of Maj. Gen. Yitzhak Rabin,
Ambassador of Israel**

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of hearing a most enlightening and moving address regarding the current Arab-Israel conflict. This address was given by His Excellency Maj. Gen. Yitzhak Rabin, Ambassador of Israel, before the ninth annual policy conference, American-Israel Public Affairs Committee, here in Washington, D.C., on March 11.

Confident that my colleagues will appreciate Ambassador Rabin's remarks as much as I did, I herewith present the full text for inclusion in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY MAJ. GEN. YITZHAK RABIN, AMBASSADOR OF ISRAEL, BEFORE THE NINTH ANNUAL POLICY CONFERENCE, AMERICAN-ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 11, 1968

I would try to describe to you tonight the main problems of the Arab-Israel conflict. The day-to-day events reported in the press do not necessarily reflect the real problems. An explosion in a Jerusalem building, artillery fire exchanges along the Jordan River, a terrorist gang captured in the vicinity of Nablus—these are the by-products of the disease, not their underlying causes. As with every disease, it is far more important to get at its roots, than to treat its external symptoms. The Arab-Israel conflict goes back many years. It has been played upon and influenced by emotional factors, by baser instincts fed by religious and national prejudices.

It is not easy to distinguish between the significant and the trivial in the Middle East—unless one has an intimate knowledge of the region—unless one follows closely the course of events there, day by day, and even hour by hour. The striking characteristic of the conflict is that the opponents are totally dissimilar in their final aims. Each of the two parties to the conflict seeks entirely different goals. The aim of the Arab States is Israel's destruction. Israel's aim is peaceful accommodation of itself in the Middle East. One side strives towards a situation in which the other side is to be eliminated; and the other side seeks to secure its mere existence, in peace and tranquillity. In this respect I know of no other conflict in the world comparable with the Arab-Israel conflict. There are a great number of conflicts and wars going on in the world today. Some of these arise from territorial disputes, others from disputes over forms of government and regime. Some arise from the will of one people to conquer and dominate its neighbors. But a situation in which one nation or group of nations seeks to wipe out entirely its adversary is unique to the Arab-Israel conflict. The ultimate aim of the Arabs is extermination. Therefore, as long

as this aim has not been achieved, they have to decide on an intermediate policy. They choose the policy of non-acceptance and non-recognition of Israel. Recognition, acceptance of Israel would be fundamentally in contradiction with their declared ultimate aim. Some of their leaders still believe that this is the stage of laying the necessary groundwork for the future. For the past twenty years we have witnessed an Arab policy of deliberately ignoring Israel's existence. Some of you may consider what I have been saying at best as exaggerated, at worst as biased, subjective propaganda. You might ask, is it possible today, in the mid-20th century, to destroy a nation? How is it possible that any state in our day and age could harbor so reckless a purpose?

Ladies and gentlemen, the experience of Jewish history has previously shown us how such a thing is possible: it is only thirty years since the Jewish people witnessed what was perhaps the most awful tragedy ever in our long history. We saw how a demented dictator came to power in a great European nation, with its historic culture and traditions, and harbored just such a purpose—and carried it out. Some here tonight may remember the voices saying then that such a thing could never happen. Many, many people, Jew and Gentile alike, would not believe the reports when they first began to trickle through, of the elaborate machinery of systematic genocide set in motion. The reality turned out to be even more terrible than the reports. Six million were destroyed, methodically. Why? Because they were Jews; because as their luck had it, they did not even have the chance to stand and fight back effectively.

It might be said that this could only happen under a Hitler, in the demented regime of Nazi Germany, that it could never happen again. I shall not go back as far as 1948, only back to the second half of May, 1967. The armed forces of Egypt, Jordan, Syria, and Iraq had concentrated along the length and breadth of Israel's borders. Hundreds of thousands of Arab troops were ready for battle, armed with the latest military equipment, tanks, planes, artillery, and all the other weapons of destruction. The noose around our necks tightened. The plan was perfect, but the victim refused to cooperate, was determined to survive, to prevent his own destruction. Do we need to apologize for folling our intended assassins? Can there be any doubt about what would have been our fate if the Arab armies had triumphed?—about what would have happened to us if we had been defeated? There is no need to cite the Egyptian President's statements of May 26, 28, and 30. What he said was quite clear and unequivocal. It was said to the world at large, over radio and television. This was only nine months ago, and I am sure that you all remember it well. We all recall the wave of sympathy and compassion for the Jewish people which swept the civilized world after the holocaust of World War II. We do not want any more post-mortem sympathies. We came to Israel to reestablish an Israel society based on traditional Jewish values and progressive Western civilization. Our national and cultural self-determination have afforded us the conditions, the opportunity, and the means of self-defence. We have demonstrated that we are as capable as any other people in this world of defending ourselves.

The developments leading up to the Six-Day War were sudden and dramatic. I doubt whether anyone at the end of April 1967 could have foreseen an outbreak at the beginning of June like that of the Six-Day War. We might well ask ourselves how so sudden a development was possible, and how it came about. Its origin lies in the reality with which we have lived for the past twenty years, since our Independence. The very same developments which led up to the Six-Day

War can repeat themselves at any time, at any moment—as long as the policy of the Arab States remains belligerency, and as long as they remain unreconciled to the fact of Israel's existence, as long as their declared aim is the destruction of Israel.

Any real and sincere effort to prevent war in the Middle East must first of all address itself to this problem. Israel seeks peace, with all her heart, but the basic condition for a real peace is mutual recognition and a common understanding. These are the guiding lines of Israel's every action and policy. When we affirm our policy of direct negotiations to settle all the problems at issue, this is not some stubborn insistence on one particular course or tactic. Our insistence is that negotiations must be direct, between our neighbors and ourselves, whether it be in the presence or under the auspices of the U.N. representative. And this is no pointless obstinacy. How can real or lasting arrangements be concluded in any other way? The whole root of the evil is the Arab policy of non-reconciliation and non-recognition.

Any international approach acknowledging this Arab policy can only frustrate every possibility of getting at the roots of the Arab-Israel conflict. Any approach intimating international approval or endorsement of Arab refusal to recognize us, or allowing them to evade the basic necessity of reaching agreement with us directly, any such approach will fall to solve the tensions in the Middle East. It is not the rights of a victor that we are claiming. All we ask, and claim, is recognition as an equal party, in any solution. We have had our experience of arrangements made without direct negotiation. In 1957, the I. D. F. evacuated the Sinai Peninsula, on the strength of inadequate international arrangements. An international emergency force was established, and thirteen Maritime Powers guaranteed free passage in the Straits of Tiran. It took two days for that emergency force to vanish away. It is better to pass over in silence what became of the guarantee of the Maritime Powers. All who really and sincerely want peace must first and foremost do nothing to enable the Arabs to evade the basic essentials. Basic essentials mean Arab settlement with Israel of their outstanding differences.

We are well aware of the fact that the Arab-Israel conflict is too intricate and complex. But we have had to fight three wars in the last twenty years. While we may have come out on the winning side, it isn't wars we want but peace. I have been a soldier all my life. I know how cruel and harsh war is, with its tragedy and bloodshed. The Six-Day War may appear to have been a "famous victory", and indeed it was. Our 830 dead and 3,000 wounded may appear to have been a small price to pay. In proportion to the dimensions of the war and the forces involved, it was not a high price to pay for our survival. But this is not true in terms of any national calculation. 830 dead is a high proportion of our population. Our casualties in the Six-Day War were higher than the proportionate total of United States casualties in the Korean and Viet Nam War put together. And this was all in six days, not in fifteen years. We do not seek wars, even if we know that we are not going to be the losers. What we want is to prevent war, to deter our enemies from aggression against us, in the absence of peace.

Bitter experience has taught us that the only way to prevent war is through military, economic, and political strength. We don't want anyone else to fight our wars for us. Our citizens are ready, able, and prepared to defend their lives and protect our national existence. The fact that the Arabs are 60 million and we 2½ million does not alarm us. The only thing that we ask of our friends throughout the world is to let us have the means, the equipment, to defend ourselves.

The Arab states have the backing of a Great Power. This power has no inhibitions, moral or otherwise, in its unlimited support of the Arab States. It is pouring an abundance of weaponry, of very high quality, into the Arab States. They have thousands of their military advisors, instructors, and technicians in the Arab States. The Egyptian President has told the editor of Look magazine that there are barely one thousand. This is far from the true figure, one of the many inaccurate statements in the interview. The true figure is double and even triple that. The military presence of that World Power in the Middle East is an established fact. If Alexandria and Port Said are not described as military bases of that power, it is a mere matter of semantics. The permanent presence of the Power's naval vessels in those harbors makes them bases in fact if not in name.

The question which the world must answer is whether to support the cause of war or the cause of peace, the cause of negotiation and settlement or the cause of non-recognition of a nation's right of very existence.

I should like to take this opportunity of expressing the appreciation of my country for the understanding and help we have had from the United States. I say so especially in regard of the United States Government's efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, a policy set forward by President Johnson in his statement of June 19, 1967.

After twenty years of statehood, Israel's struggle is still for her very existence. But we hope and believe that peace will come to the Middle East. The road to it might be a long one. We know that it would entail sacrifice, suffering, and heavy burdens on us. We have no other choice. It is our belief that our cause is deserving of the support of the nations of the free world.

Freedom of Information for the District of Columbia

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to bring the government of the District of Columbia under the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act. A similar measure has been introduced in the Senate by Senator EDWARD V. LONG, of Missouri, who coauthored the public disclosure law which went into effect on July 4, 1967.

The legislation we are proposing will bring about uniformity in the application of the information law at all levels of government in the Nation's Capital, and of equal importance it will give Washington's new Mayor and City Council a long needed tool of statutory authority to disclose records and documents to the public—a positive authority they do not have at present.

I might add that the present officials of the District of Columbia, as in the case of their recent predecessors, have evidenced their desire to comply with the spirit of the freedom-of-information law, and that their cooperation in this respect has held local government information problems to a minimum.

The new bill has been referred to my Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, and will be given consideration at an early date.

Unitarian Universalist Resolution on Vietnam War

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, at the last general assembly of the Unitarian Universalist Association, the delegates adopted by greater than a two-thirds majority vote a resolution on Vietnam again urging "the United States to reconsider its policy in Vietnam and to explore solutions other than military."

I include this resolution as part of the RECORD at this point because I think it is worth the careful consideration of Members of Congress and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD generally.

The resolution follows:

Vietnam

Whereas, the 1966 (Fifth) General Assembly of the Unitarian Universalist Association passed the following resolution reaffirming the intent of its 1964 resolution urging "the United States to reconsider its policy in Vietnam and to explore solutions other than military," the Unitarian Universalist Association—

Notes again that the present war in Vietnam threatens to escalate into a world nuclear war;

Urges the Government of the United States to negotiate with any and all principals in the conflict, including the National Liberation Front, in seeking a cease-fire, the holding of internationally-supervised free elections, and in aiding in the formation of a representative government of South Vietnam; and

Transmits to the President and the Congress its continued deep concern for an immediate peace in Vietnam.

The Sixth General Assembly of the Unitarian Universalist Association reaffirms its previous resolution and further:

1. Commends the Secretary-General of the United Nations for the initiative he has taken in seeking a cease-fire and peace in Vietnam and endorses his specific proposals for:

(a) Cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam, and

(b) The scaling down of all military operations by all parties in Vietnam, and

(c) Discussions among all parties directly involved in the conflict.

2. Urges the United States government to take substantial immediate and long term steps of de-escalation without any prior conditions placed on the National Liberation Front and the North Vietnam government.

3. Urges the government of the United States to give its citizens accurate and complete information about events in Vietnam, and to recognize that responsible debate on United States policies in Southeast Asia and opposition to the war should not be equated with a lack of patriotism.

4. Encourages immediate public and private efforts to heal the wounded civilians of all Vietnam, and to reconstruct and develop the war-ravaged land.

5. Transmits again to the President and the Congress its continued deep concern for immediate peace in Vietnam.

6. Urges member churches and fellowships through congregational action to take a public position on the war in Vietnam.

7. Urges, in view of the continuing difficulty in inducing any unilateral steps toward peace by any of the parties to the conflict that there be a reciprocal de-escalation, including the progressive removal of all foreign troops and the grounding of all foreign aircraft in North and South Vietnam and that

the use of terrorism and murder by all parties against the people of Vietnam be terminated.

Status of Firearms Legislation

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the RECORD the excellent summary of the firearms legislation pending in the Congress put out by the National Shooting Sports Foundation, Inc.

That newsletter points out that the antigun faction in Washington is deliberately blocking passage of legislation which will control passage of firearms into the hands of mental incompetents, fugitives, drunks, narcotics addicts, and other persons similarly unsuited. The reason, as that excellent article points out, is that those pushing legislation like S. 1, the Dodd bill, seek not control over firearms passing into the hands of these unfortunate categories of people, but seek rather to strip law-abiding citizens of their right to own firearms for legitimate sporting and defense purposes.

The article follows:

SUMMARY OF THE STATUS OF MAJOR FIREARMS LEGISLATION PENDING IN CONGRESS

The anti-gun faction in Washington is blocking passage of gun control bills.

The Dodd-Administration bloc has been unable to pass its own bills but at the same time has blocked passage of sportsmen-backed bills which would tighten up the National and Federal Firearms Acts.

Apparently the attitude of this group is that if they cannot pass their own bill, S. 1, Amendment 90, they do not want anything else to be passed. The Dodd bill is now in its seventh version over a five-year period. Each time the Dodd bill has not passed, it has been changed to be more restrictive. Instead of compromising, the anti-gun forces have made successive bills more objectionable.

The anti-gun forces have never offered a reasonable compromise. Apparently they would rather have an issue than a law.

They have refused to allow passage of any bill which would amend the National Firearms Act to include bazookas, cannons and heavy military ordnance. The National Firearms Act, passed in 1934, controls "gangster-type" weapons such as machine guns and sawed-off shotguns.

No organized group, representing any interests, has ever testified against putting bazooka-type weapons in the National Act. In fact, all of the major sportsmen organizations in America have favored passage of Senator Roman Hruska's S. 1854 which would do just that and take care of heavy weapons once and for all.

Despite the predictions of riots this summer, the Administration forces have blocked the Hruska bill, and others, which would give law enforcement authorities the controls they need for bazooka-type weapons.

The Administration has instead mixed heavy ordnance with sporting firearms in its current version of S. 1 to amend the Federal Firearms Act. They have used the threat of heavy military ordnance as propaganda to help passage of their bill on sporting firearms.

If the anti-gun forces really wanted a bazooka bill, they could pass it tomorrow by simply putting it in the National Firearms Act, where it logically fits. Sportsmen have

not only never opposed this control but have repeatedly endorsed it.

The essential difference between the Administration's bill to control sporting firearms in their S. 1 and Sen. Hruska's S. 1863 is one of basic philosophy.

The Dodd-Administration bill is based on total bans. The Hruska approach is based on regulation.

If the National Firearms Act, which regulated machine guns and does not ban them, can work for 34 years on the basic theory of regulation, sportsmen feel that controls on sporting firearms can work through regulation.

If the Administration forces really wanted legislation, they could swing their support in a reasonable compromise to the two Hruska bills and get them passed easily.

The current deadlock gets back to the question of whether the anti-gun faction wants an issue or firearms controls.

A Tribute to Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Gardner

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, most Members of Congress know John W. Gardner, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare from July 1965 through February 1968, as a highly capable, experienced, and truly dedicated public servant who can look back on his service in the Federal Government with a justified sense of accomplishment, a feeling which I am certain is widely shared in this body. But to the staff of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, he has meant even more than this; he was a leader who stood out among his colleagues in commitment and in dedication. Few tributes can equal the farewell message signed by a representative group of HEW employees and presented to Secretary Gardner last month prior to his departure from office. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

FEBRUARY 21, 1968.

DEAR SECRETARY GARDNER: The recent announcement of your resignation as Secretary of HEW is met with both despair and admiration. Perhaps by some this news was received with surprise, but not by us who shared your concepts and desires, for we also shared your frustrations and disappointments.

Many new employees were attracted to the Department because they sensed your commitment and wished to be a part of the revitalized HEW which welcomed its responsibilities and believed in its missions. Many older employees also recognized and welcomed that HEW's gait had changed from plodding to prodding. Obviously, you were aware of this, Mr. Secretary, for in your January, 1968 report to us you said:

"People react strongly to the 'climate' of an organization. If an organization is to accomplish great things, it is essential to create an atmosphere conducive to such accomplishment. Thanks to the responsiveness and good spirit of people throughout the Department during this period, we have had such an atmosphere . . .

"We have had a climate conducive to innovation. Many of the new initiatives that emerged during this period are traceable to that climate."

Your sudden resignation substantiates our feeling that an unfavorable climate now exists.

Mr. Secretary, those who stay will miss you. They will miss your leadership, your emotional commitment, your intellectual grasp of the importance of HEW as the principal agent for the fulfillment of the promises of our democracy. Under your guidance HEW blossomed for the first time and our mission was a proud and important one. In our democracy, missions—priorities—have changed. Therefore, in sympathy with your resignation we acknowledge our deep trouble. We know, as do you, Mr. Secretary, that all casualties of war do not occur on battlefields. We abhor the direct loss of life, as well as the loss of opportunity to wage a battle against poverty and disease in this country. Yet, as most Americans, we can reach no consensus about the political and moral justifications for war. But we are unanimous in seeing no justification whatsoever for permitting "Too many children and too many adults in this free society (to) still live under the subtle but powerful tyrannies of ignorance, disease, want, discrimination, physical handicap or mental illness. Those tyrannies keep them dependent. We want to be free and strong."

We deplore the unconscionable and unnecessary waste and loss of life wrought by domestic tyrannies.

The recent announcement of your resignation as Secretary of HEW is met with both admiration and despair.

Sincerely,

Pasadena Marine Dies in Vietnam

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Donald E. Jones, a young marine from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this fine young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD.

PASADENA MARINE DIES IN VIETNAM: PFC. DONALD JONES IS KILLED ON HILL NEAR KHE SANH

A Pasadena (Md.) youth has been killed in Vietnam while defending Hill 861 near the besieged Khe Sanh military base, it was announced yesterday.

Pfc. Donald E. Jones, 19, was killed March 8 from fragmentation wounds from enemy mortar fire in Quang Tri province, according to a Defense Department telegram received by his wife, Mrs. Linda G. Jones.

Private Jones had been in Vietnam since January and was assigned to the 3d Marine Division in Khe Sanh before being sent to Hill 861.

Private Jones attended Northeast High School in Pasadena. He was an apprentice brick mason before enlisting in the Marines last August. He had his basic training at Parris Island, S.C., and was sent to Camp Pendleton in California before leaving for Vietnam.

According to his mother, Mrs. Mary Jones, her son said in his letters that "conditions were horrible" and complained of irregular mail delivery.

Before enlisting he lived with his wife at 4402 Donna drive in Pasadena.

Besides his wife and mother, he is survived by his father, Jack R. Jones; two brothers,

Gary and Paul Jones, both of Pasadena; a stepbrother, Ray Wilson, of Pasadena; and three sisters, Mrs. Mary L. Lehman, of Pasadena; Mrs. Jackie Austin, of Glen Burnie, and Miss Brenda Jones, of Pasadena.

How a Free People Conduct a Long War

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Gus Tyler is extremely timely and will be of particular interest at this time to the Congress and to the people of our great country:

HOW A FREE PEOPLE CONDUCT A LONG WAR (By Gus Tyler, ILGWU Assistant President, is a national board member of Americans for Democratic Action)

Late one night, a friendly Senator discussed the war with the President at the White House. The conflict was running wrong, and too long. The fighting was going into its third year with no end in sight. In recent weeks, the enemy had shown new strength, putting the great and powerful United States on the defensive. From the anguished bowels of the nation arose the cry for "peace." It came from the opposition and from the President's own party. But the man in the White House was obdurate.

The press did not spare him. They reminded him of the many men who had died in the uniform of the United States, and they reminded him again as the number mounted. They charged him with despotism, with a brutal draft, with suppression of dissent, with strangling civil liberties. They charged that the President's insane obsession with the war was bringing the country to ruin: internal rebellion, riots, inflation, outrageous taxation. They charged him with lying to the country, getting it into a limited war on one pretext and then waging an extended war for his own crazy, crusading purpose. They charged that he had allowed his generals to take over the running of the war.

Within his own party, leaders were looking around for a candidate to run against him for the nomination. Challenging his conduct of an unconstitutional war, Congressional leaders were preparing impeachment proceedings.

The President himself was weary and without friends. Those who should have rallied to his support accused him of incompetence, faintheartedness, and even a sneaking sympathy with the foe. He was being pecked to death by doves and hawks alike.

These were the things that Senator Orville Hickman Browning mused about with the President of the United States. The slow-speaking Chief Magistrate reached for a pamphlet that had apparently been his bedside companion in these difficult days. He commended it to the Senator as proper reading for men laden with the responsibilities of carrying on the most unpopular war in the nation's history. The booklet was entitled, "How a Free People Conduct a Long War," and was written by a Philadelphian, Charles Janeway Stillé.

On that night of December 29, 1862, Mr. Lincoln read to Browning from the document for an hour or more. But he was reading for himself, too. The President was going through an ordeal other Presidents had experienced—Washington during the Revolution, Madison during the War of 1812. He was confronted with the fact that a freedom-loving people are also a peace-loving people, who consider it their right—indeed, their duty—to resist any ruler seeking to drag on

the populace into a war that is too pointless or too painful.

Things had not gone well for Lincoln in December of 1862. On the 13th of that month, General Ambrose Burnside saw the flower of his Army of the Potomac wither under the fire of Lee's veterans at Fredericksburg. In the West, the Army of the Cumberland was stalled in its tracks at Murfreesboro. Sherman was having difficulty at Vicksburg.

Lincoln sensed still more trouble ahead. And when spring followed winter, Lee moved his armies north into Pennsylvania, threatening Meade at Gettysburg. The conquest of the South seemed far, far away in a never-never land of Lincoln's fantasy.

Bad as the military situation was for Lincoln, the political situation was worse. When a military appropriation bill came before Congress on December 18, the Midwestern Democratic delegation pointedly abstained—almost to a man. They never wanted the war and were now doubly bitter at the thought that the President, who had said it was a war to preserve the Union, had turned it into a war to liberate the Negro.

In January 1863, the handsome, brittle, brilliant spokesman of the Midwestern Democrats, Clement Vallandigham, spoke the heart of the peace people on the floor of the House:

"Defeat, debt, taxation, sepulchres, these are your trophies. In vain the people gave you treasure, and the soldier yielded up his life. . . . The war for the Union is, in your hands, a most bloody and costly failure. The President confessed it on the 22nd of September, solemnly, officially and under the broad seal of the United States. . . . War for the Union was abandoned; war for the Negro openly begun, and with stronger battalions than ever before. With what success? Let the dead at Fredericksburg and Vicksburg answer.

"And now, sir, can this war continue? Whence the money to carry it on? Where the men? Can you borrow? From whom? Can you tax more? Will the people bear it?"

Vallandigham slashed at Lincoln's endless appetite for more and more men, for his endless escalation of the war. "Seventy-five thousand first . . . then 83 thousand more were demanded; and 310 thousand responded. . . . The President next asked for 400 thousand, and Congress gave him 500 thousand; and, not to be outdone, he took 637 thousand. Half of these melted away in their first campaign; and the President demanded 300 thousand more for the war, and then drafted yet another 300 thousand for nine months. The fabled hosts of Xerxes have been outnumbered."

Although a lame-duck Congressman, Vallandigham was no man to be pushed aside. The descendant of a conscience-driven Huguenot and a Scotch-Irish mother, he spoke for the "butternut" counties of the Midwest and for the "peace" Democrats. He ended his speech with the warning that "popular uprisings" are being readied in the North, and a new civil war is in the making between New England and the West.

Vallandigham was arrested on the order of General Burnside, as were others, for seditious utterances likely to interfere with recruiting. The ex-congressman was sentenced to jail for the duration; Lincoln commuted the sentence to exile to the Confederacy. In protest, the Democratic party of Ohio named Vallandigham unanimously as its candidate for governor.

The Illinois convention of the party adopted the following resolution: "That the further offensive prosecution of this war tends to subvert the Constitution and the government, and entail upon this nation all the disastrous consequences of misrule and anarchy."

The Iowa convention resolved "that our Union was formed in peace, and can never be perpetuated by force of arms, and that a re-

publican government held together by the sword becomes a military despotism."

In Connecticut, the platform declared that "the time has now arrived when all true lovers of the Constitution are ready to abandon 'the monstrous fallacy' that the Union can be restored by the armed hand alone; and we are anxious to inaugurate such action, honorable alike to the contending sections, and unite all the States upon terms of equality as members of one Confederacy."

And in New York City, Democratic party leader Fernando Wood told an overflow meeting at Cooper Union: "This war of the General Government against the South is illegal, being unconstitutional, and should not be sustained if we are to regard the Constitution as still binding and in force."

Through the winter of 1862, Lincoln feared that the enemy was not the military foe without but the political foe within. "These are dark hours," wrote Senator Charles Sumner to a friend. "The President tells me that he now fears 'the fire in the rear'—meaning the Democracy, especially at the Northwest—more than our military chances." Before the next summer was ended, the "fire in the rear" came not only from the Northwest but more ominously from New York City.

When Lee attacked Gettysburg, Lincoln drained several Eastern states, including New York, of all ready soldiery as a stop-gap prior to securing new troops through a draft. The conscription call raised a storm of protest all over the country.

"For the nation as a whole," wrote a contemporary, "the Civil War reached its darkest military day and its point of greatest unpopularity in the spring of the year 1863. Every description of discontent and disaffection towards the Lincoln Administration controlling the National Government was at its climax in the early summer of that year. At no time before or afterwards was Mr. Lincoln himself so grossly underrated or so outrageously libeled by all his critics, patriotic or reverse."

New York City was up in arms—not against Lee but against Lincoln: "The people would have none of the despised and despotic draft, especially at this moment when Honest Abe, at the nadir of his rule, was viewed as one of the most dishonest men of all times; killer, despot, abolitionist, liar, jokester. The ugly volcano of hatred for the war and the President that had long been seething under the city now exploded. Opposition to the draft turned into a riot, bringing New York to near ruin. More than a thousand people were killed in three days; other thousands died later of wounds. Whole blocks were burned to the ground. Much needed troops were brought in to restore order.

Disaffection, however, was not limited to New York nor to the draft. In six months, Illinois arrested 2,001 deserters. In Mississippi, the Illinois 109th regiment got so involved with fraternization and was so depleted by desertions that the entire regiment was disarmed and placed under arrest. "They were disgusted with Lincoln and the Emancipation Proclamation, said they had enlisted to fight for the Union, not Negro freedom," records Sandburg in his long Lincoln study.

The peace theme was put to music:

"Abram Lincoln, what yer 'bout?
Stop this war! It's all played out—"

Nasty poems appeared regularly in a hostile press:

"How changed—how strange is everything
We had a Union once—
A Statesman for a President,
But now we have a dunce."

Or more heavy-handed invective, such as:

"May Heaven's curses, dark and dire,
Commingle with Almighty fire,
Fall on your head and press you down,
With dreadful torture to the ground."

While he was under attack from both doves and Democrats, the President's own Republican Radicals launched a dump-Lincoln movement. *Tribune* publisher Horace Greeley made it clear how he felt: "I can't trust your 'honest old Abe.' He is too smart for me." Greeley feared for the future of America in a protracted conflict. "During the next two years of war, the country, saddled with Lincoln, would be ravaged so that it would hardly be worth saving. But the Republican leaders had their backs up; he had talked with them; they would fight till Doomsday rather than consent to disunion. Every prominent Republican he had conversed with thought the only hope lay in defeating a re-election of Lincoln. Some suitable candidate should be at once decided upon."

Behind Greeley stood "Thaddeus Stevens, Senator [Benjamin F.] Wade, Henry Winter Davis, David Dudley Field, Governor [John] Andrew of Massachusetts and," according to a close associate of Greeley's "about all the more prominent Republican leaders."

When Greeley read the bitter news from Chancellorsville, where "130,000 magnificent soldiers [had been] cut to pieces by less than 60,000 half-starved ragamuffins," he was sure Lincoln was betraying the cause. Greeley insisted that the party leaders must get General William Rosecrans to run against Lincoln. To an emissary, he wrote: "If you find Rosecrans the man that is needed, I will go personally to Lincoln and force him to resign." Rosecrans was flattered by the offer to run but flatly turned it down, being convinced Lincoln was the right man in the right place.

In the winter of 1862-63, a quiet move was launched to impeach Lincoln. "There were Radical Republicans," notes Sandburg, "who wanted a man obedient to their wishes. There were reactionaries in both parties who hoped that the confusion of an impeachment would slow down the war, bring back *habeas corpus* and other civil rights. . . . They knew that in any final vote to impeach they could count on a large block of Ayes from the political opposition."

The success of the Confederacy gave rise to rumors that there was a Southern spy in the White House. The finger pointed at Mrs. Lincoln. A Congressional committee was appointed to investigate the matter. Hardly had the committee been called to order, when the doorkeeper announced a caller: the President of the United States, who had come uninvited and unawaited. All six feet four inches of the harassed Lincoln loomed over the committee as he solemnly intoned: "I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, appear of my own volition before this Committee of the Senate to say that I, of my own knowledge, know that it is untrue that any of my family hold treasonable communication with the enemy." Having spoken, he turned and left.

In these days of despair, Lincoln frequently read Stillé's "How a Free People Conduct a Long War." The 40-page booklet, subtitled "A Chapter from English History," drew its "lessons" from a conflict vastly different from the Civil War: England's Peninsula War of 1807-12.

Fought not on native soil but in a far-away place, the Iberian Peninsula, the conflict was almost irrelevant to England's well-being, since its sole object was to repel Napoleon's aggression into Portugal and Spain. The war was geo-ideologic, an effort to contain the Napoleonic epidemic sweeping Europe.

At the outset, all "parties in Parliament and the country vied with each other in demanding that England should aid the [Iberian] insurrection with the whole of her military power." But with the very first failures, the mood changed. They "now spoke openly of the folly of any attempt of England to resist" Napoleon in the Peninsula. There was a mounting cry for unilateral withdrawal.

The ministry, however, "had sense enough to perceive that their only true policy was perseverance. They were strong enough to resist the formidable opposition . . . in Parliament and the country, and, undismayed by the experience of the past, concluded a treaty with the Provisional Government of Spain, by which they pledged England never to abandon the national cause until the French were driven across the Pyrenees."

The first year went very badly, largely because Wellington leaned on native troops. "Dependence upon the Spaniards was certainly, as it turned out, a fault . . . in which Wellington, made wise by experience, was never again detected." He anglicized the war.

Immediately, the "opposition in Parliament took advantage of this feeling to rouse public opinion to . . . compel the termination of the war in the Peninsula and drive the ministry from office." Weary of the badgering, the ministry "boldly challenged their opponents, if they were in earnest, to make a definite motion in the House of Commons, that Portugal should be abandoned to its fate. This move completely unmasked their game, and for a time silenced the clamor, for it was perfectly understood on all hands, that deep in the popular heart, undisturbed by the storms which swept over its surface, there was a thorough and abiding conviction of the absolute necessity of resisting the progress of Napoleon's arms, and that the real safety of England herself required that that resistance should then be made in Spain.

"Still this noisy clamor did immense mischief; it weakened the government, it prolonged the strife, it alarmed the timid, it discouraged the true, and it so far imposed upon Napoleon himself that, thinking that in these angry invectives against the government he found the real exponent of English sentiment, he concluded, not unnaturally, that the people were tired and disgusted with the war, and that the privations which it occasioned were like a cancer, slowly but surely eating out the sources of national life."

It took three long years for Wellington to clean out Portugal and reach the Spanish frontiers, where he set up a holding operation. "People talked of 'barren victories,' because [the battles] brought no territorial acquisitions." Said Sir Francis Burdett: "No man in his senses could entertain a hope of the final success of our arms in the Peninsula. Our laurels were great, but barren, and our victories in their effects mere defeat." General Tarleton "wished for the pencil of a Cervantes to be able to ridicule those who desired to enter upon a continental war."

"The following description of the opposition of that day," wrote Stillé in 1862, "bears so striking a likeness to the peculiarities of the leaders of an insignificant but restless faction among us, that omitting the old-fashioned drapery of the proper names, they seem to have sat for the photograph." Stillé then quoted the annual Register for 1812.

"Those persons in this country who profess to have the greatest abhorrence of ministerial tyranny and oppression, look with the utmost coolness on the tyranny and oppression of Bonaparte. . . . They are almost always ready to find an excuse for the conduct of Bonaparte. The most violent and unjustifiable acts of his tyranny raise but feeble indignation in their minds, while the most trifling act of ministerial oppression is inveighed against with the utmost bitterness."

"There is such a thing as public opinion, falsely so called," concluded Stillé, "which is noisy just in proportion as its real influence is narrow and restricted. One of the most difficult and delicate tasks of the statesman is to distinguish the true from the false opinion, the factious demagogue from the grumbling but sincere patriot, and to recognize with a ready instinct the voice which comes from the depths of the great heart of the people, in warning it may be some times, in encouragement, often, but always echoing

its abiding faith in the ultimate triumph of the good cause."

"The only possible hope for the South," ended Stillé in a return to the Civil War, "is in our own divisions."

On this note Lincoln concluded his reading on the Peninsula War to Senator Brown- ing. Although the account dealt with another time when a great power sent troops to a far- away land to contain a hostile and aggressive ideology backed by a dedicated army, Lincoln found its "lessons" somehow relevant for his time.

Maybe he needed them to renew his courage. Someone had taken a shot at the President while he was riding in the woods. Thereafter he began to watch his personal movements more carefully.

Student Reporters in Vietnam

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, once again I am reprinting in the RECORD articles on Vietnam written by student reporters from Queens College who are now reporting their on-the-scene views of the tragic and brutal war there.

The dispatches of Lee Dembart and Ralph Paladino have been of consistently high quality. Their latest reports describe in painfully clear detail the current agony in Khe Sanh, as well as the less dramatic, though equally appalling situations in Chu Lai.

The articles follow:

(By Lee Dembart)

DANANG.—"These were just American boys. They did not want that valley or any part of its jungle. They were ex-grocery clerks, or ex-highway laborers, ex-bank clerks, ex-schoolboys, boys with a clean record and maybe a little extra restlessness, but not killers.

"They had volunteered; they had come into the Marines with their eyes open. Yes, but they had joined the Marines to see the world, or to get away from a guilt, or most likely to escape the draft, not knowingly to kill or be killed."

So wrote John Hersey 25 years ago in his story of a World War II patrol, *Into the Valley*. He could have been describing today's Marines.

More than half of all American combat troops in Vietnam are here in I Corps, comprising the five northernmost provinces of the country. It is here that a guerrilla war is fast becoming a conventional war as two armies face each other, and it is here that American military leaders expect the Big Battle to be fought.

I approached I Corps, or Marineland as it is sometimes called, with trepidation. Surely I would have trouble talking with these Marines, hardened on Parris Island, taught to kill, imbued with a hatred that was to last them through a year's battles in Vietnam.

"You'd better get your hair cut before you go up north," I had been told in Saigon. "The Marines, they don't like guys with long hair." I dutifully got my hair cut.

"———" said the Marine corporal in Phu Bai when I told him about my haircut. "We'd love to see a guy with longer hair; would make him look like a civilian."

It was the beginning of my awakening. "Just between you and me," a Marine sergeant told me after we had split a chicken-and-noodles C ration, "there's no reason for

us being here. I can't see it. A lot of the men can't see it. This is the gook's war and it shouldn't make a ——— of difference to us who wins."

They want to know everything about the States, the land of the great PX. Had I heard the new Beatles album? What were all the students going to do about the new draft rules? Is it true that everybody is smoking pots? What is Bobby Kennedy up to?

Cards are the great pastime. Not poker, but hearts. And they pass the queen of spades off on each other with a flourish, a smile, and a friendly dig.

Some have kind words for the Marine Corps. Others would rather be out than in. All express contempt for "lifers," the not-too-endearing term for career military men.

What is most astonishing is that in or out of uniform, it is impossible to distinguish the Marines from any group of 20-year-olds in the States. Only when they pick up the M-16 and scan the road ahead for VC do they look or talk or act distinctively.

It is much easier to condemn them from the States than to condemn them from here. The various draft-dodging ploys were unknown or unopen, pressure from family to "make something of yourself" built up, political concerns never existed, so they joined the Marines.

"What a jerk I was to get involved in this crap," said one private. "Sure, I had to get away, but now all I want to do is get back and get to school and learn to do something."

The sentiment was echoed by others. "Never should have quit high school," a corporal lamented. Should have stuck around and moved to the Village and had a grand time and let some other sucker come over here to get his ——— shot at."

The intensity of last month's fighting, especially around Hue, has turned some of the Marines somber. "Sometimes I look at them zipping up 18- and 19-year-old guys in body bags, and I wonder what in hell we're doing here," a sergeant thought aloud, gazing into a warm glass of beer. "Other times it just makes me so mad I want to go out and kill every lousy Commie around."

They are a complex breed and any attempt to characterize them falls flat. That's just the point. The remarks quoted here are far from hypocritical, but they were said, and they were said with that puzzled conviction that marks a man who has just discovered a world he never before knew existed.

There are many who are straight out of the Westbrook Pegler school. Others know little and care less, love to fight, and make up the standard collegiate view of the Marine Corps.

Most are the proverbial "average guy," burying petty and not-so-petty annoyances at the scowl of society and the demand to fit in.

The vast majority at least say they are interested in finding out why Stateside protesters are protesting. They call them names, but they don't dismiss them.

Within those broad outlines is found every kind of human being from apple-polishing valedictorian to acid head. "I became an Existentialist a number of years ago," said a 40-year-old sergeant who reenlisted last year after a long stint out of the Corps. "I do all the protesting I want, but I don't tell anybody about it."

"That's the trouble with you kids. You think it's not real protest, real sacrifice, unless you go and tell everybody what you're doing."

"You know," said another, awarded a purple heart after being shot through the arm and chest three months ago, "even when you're in contact with the enemy and all hell is breaking loose, you figure, 'hell, no bullet can hit me'."

"But, Christ! That time I heard six shots and felt pain and started throwing up my guts."

They don't talk of their dead or of anybody's dead. Sometimes they will tell you of how they narrowly escaped death themselves, or of who was killed in their place, but they never dwell on the subject. No "he was a great guy" routine. No Ensigns Pulver mourn the deaths of Masters Roberts.

Cruelty may be the way of war, but cruelty is not the way of their lives. One soldier says the only person in the world he hates is his commanding officer, and that's because last week he suggested he cancel his subscription to *The Evergreen Review*.

It used to be a lot easier to tell the good guys from the bad guys, the war profiteers from honest men, sincerity from sham.

What is becoming increasingly clear is that no one deserves to be judged guilty and no one deserves to be judged guiltless. We are all in this thing together.

(By Lee Dembart)

HUE, SOUTH VIETNAM.—It used to be a beautiful city, untouched by the war, living in a dream and believing it would never be awakened.

Tree-lined streets and parks and gardens set the tone. It its hub, just off the Perfume River rolling listlessly through the center of town, the Citadel, ancient Imperial capital of a never-to-be-recaptured Vietnam.

Now all that is left is the chirping of the birds, and even they are scarce. Every house, every building, every shack, every tree shows signs of the three-week struggle that made Hue just one more battlefield in a country of battlefields.

Inside the battered walls of the Citadel, broken glass reflects the sun in a kaleidoscope of colors and brightness. It crackles underfoot with every step, and sticks in your boots and clothing.

In the museum next to the Imperial Palace, shattered display bases are the only remnants of Oriental art that dated back to the 6th Century. Only the objects too large and cumbersome to carry away have been left behind.

The museum's curator, a small man with a jungle hat and a powder blue suit and a vest, reluctantly unlocks the gate to allow a visitor to walk through the building. Bullet shells are on the floor, covering the cards that once identified the objects on display.

He opens empty boxes to show that the silver and gold pieces they once contained are now gone. Broken silvers of Hue blue, a distinctive 500-year-old ceramic style, litter the area. A small teacup of Hue blue used to sell in Saigon for \$40. Now there is a blot on the market. There isn't a piece intact throughout the museum.

The curator is asked who ransacked the place. He will say only that three armies occupied the building at one time or another, and he doesn't know who took what. Half-eaten and empty cans of American C rations are strewn along the floor.

There are few objects left. Two large flower vases, two and a half feet high and two feet in diameter, stand beside the wall. One has been moved several feet, but it was too large to walk off with easily. A throne chair with satin curtains and four gold handles occupies the center of the room. On a table rests the guest book, thick with names, testifying to the one-time popularity of the museum.

Outside, thick trenches along the Citadel walls attest to the tenacity of the Vietcong defense. A slipper lies beside one trench, its owner either dead or escaped. ARVN soldiers stop and inspect every Vietnamese coming into the Citadel, some several times. The fortress was too hard in winning to be given away.

A visitor wanders through the city, amidst the rubble, past fresh graves, across a pontoon bridge, and his mind returns again to the empty museum. It was not a victim of battle; it was a victim of greed.

American Marines say some of the treasures

wound up in their barracks, brought there by fellow Corpsmen returning from the Citadel. Most blame the Vietnamese soldiers, a group that has amassed a reputation for looting since the Tet assault. Some hold the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese responsible.

Odd that in a city that has suffered so greatly one small item, one semicolon, should stand out so much.

Perhaps it is because in the midst of all the Allied claims that the destruction could not be avoided, here was something that could have been avoided.

(By Ralph Paladino)

KHESANH, SOUTH VIETNAM.—There is no longer a Khesanh in Vietnam. The city is only a flattened ruin under which lies the command post from which the North Vietnamese commander will direct the attack on the Marine installation which has adopted its name—if indeed such an attack ever comes.

Once a popular vacation area on a regular aircraft run from other parts of Vietnam, there are no vacationers at Khesanh now, and few planes land here. The World War II C-123, which is the only fixed-wing aircraft flying into the base, has been modified with two additional jet engines for rapid climb in the face of enemy fire. On its second run the day of this writing, one plane carried cargo destined for Khesanh, ammunition, radios, and weapons, as well as a pallet of three-week-old mail.

We are jovial at first, five civilian reporters, a Marine going to his assignment, the three man crew. As we approach the base, a tenseness replaces the feeble humor of a few minutes earlier. We know that small arms fire can pierce the thin hull and us, that mortars and rocket fire will be our greeting. We also can still remember the sixteen bodies that had been unloaded from this plane in its first return from Khesanh that day.

The instructions are simple: wait for the cargo to unload, then run out the back after it, turn left, and jump into the nearest ditch. Wait until the plane is long gone before venturing out. Only an idiot could get the directions wrong; a fellow with us ends up with shrapnel in his buttocks and legs.

The plane does not stop, but lands in a dive, taxis, jettisons its cargo as it turns, its passengers as it begins its takeoff, and continues on its way as returnees scurry aboard. Only then do the mortars begin to fall. The plane is safe.

Khesanh is brown; brown dirt, brown tents, brown sandbags. Little is left intact above ground, buildings with sides ripped off, tents with holes, the sides of bunkers, the air tower, supplies. The weather is cool and misty, the mountains obscured by the low, heavy clouds. But the clouds and mist are a blessing in some ways, for they provide cover necessary to move across the base.

There are no interlocking trenches at Khesanh. One continuous, circular trench rings the perimeter. To go from any point to nearly any other, one must move across the open ground. In the fog it is possible to move leisurely and upright. When the fog lifts, one crouches, jumping hurriedly from cover to cover.

We run to the press office, a ditch with a metal cover and two layers of sandbags. After a quick briefing, we split up to seek lodging for the night. The Navy Seabees' bunker near the flightline has become the unofficial press center because it is the deepest and strongest on the base. They do not resent constant intrusion, if only because the nights are long and dull.

The fog has begun to lift. I move quickly to the perimeter and jump with relief into the artillery bunkers. Live ammunition is piled to one side, protected only by a thin layer of wood and sand. With the lifting fog, the air war goes into high gear, but little of it can be seen on this side of the ridges, where the fog still hangs.

A Marine Sergeant answers my questions, most of them unspoken. "It's tough, man. We keep waiting for them to attack and they never do. Mostly you're not scared, just bored. Until someone gets hit with the 105 (mm.) like our neighbor next door did. Then you figure, man, one of those things could land on you next. No one was killed, but they could have been. I was talking to a brother [the Sergeant is black] who was hit bad, and it just makes you want to go out and kill them with your bare hands. I wish they'd attack and get it over with." We talk a little longer about his wife and a child he has not yet seen. He invites me to come back when the fog lifts further to watch the air strikes.

It is the pressure that is most noticeable, the sense of waiting, of impermanence all around. The base is strewn with garbage, broken planes and helicopters, shelled jeeps and trucks, litter from the hundreds of holes in the ground the men must live in.

Khesanh is ringed by barbed wire, a mine field, more barbed wire, a field of electronically-set off claymore mines, more barbed wire, a ring of ARVN marines, more barbed wire, the American perimeter, barbed wire, and then the artillery on the inside. The North Vietnamese troops cross the minefield, tunnel under the barbed wire, steal the claymores or turn them around, and splice their own wires onto them. As often as not they die in the process.

The fog has lifted. An ARVN private leads me through the claymore field to the wire. On the other side, six bodies lie in the center of the minefield. No one will venture in to remove them. "They don't smell this far away," he says in proper English. I begin to stand to see into the deep grass. A shot rings out. We don't know if it is aimed at us or not, but we jump instinctively into a nearby hole.

Later we crouch to a further part of the perimeter. In the near distance we can see a Marine patrol checking out a trench where bodies were seen during the night, killed by an exploding artillery shell. We hastily join them. The bodies are gone, removed by their comrades before dawn when the flares had died. Bits and pieces, though, lie behind, covered with dirt, red showing through, to attest that indeed some men died here. We return to the lines.

As I approach the air strip, a C-123 begins its ascent.

A mortar lands behind it. The plane, 20 feet off the ground, begins to lean to the right, the end of its wing scraping along the ground. The wing crumbles, then tears, the plane swerves into the soft dirt on the side of the strip. The engines burst into flame. People begin to scurry out of the small emergency exits, cutting their arms and legs on the sharp edges. The fire-trucks, those that have not been destroyed, arrive quickly and begin to pour chemical fire suppressors on the flames. Spectators begin to congregate.

There are a few wounded from the plane, none seriously. It takes a long time for the enemy to notice what has happened, but eventually artillery begins to fall. One shell lands near an ambulance. Men fall to the ground, and it takes a few moments to sort out those who fell instinctively and those who fell wounded. The shelling stops and the injured are carried away. The plane sits on its side, its broken wing in the air, between two other aircraft that met similar fates. Soon there will not be enough room on the side of the runway for any more accidents.

A dead NVA soldier is brought into the graves section. He was killed in the early morning inside the perimeter. The wound is small and hardly noticeable, a slight bulging of the eye, a hole only slightly larger than the pupil should have been the only indication of damage. A private in a tee shirt is called out of his bunker. He lifts up the corpse's head by the hair. "Come on, get up

will ya." He bounces the head a few times on the bed of a truck and repeats himself, "come on, get up, it ain't siesta time yet."

The private looks disgustedly over to me. "Now I've got to bury the son of a bitch." He pulls the body until it falls face down on the brown dirt, takes a large canvas bag, and, with help, stuffs the body into it. The bag has a succinct, complete description of its contents on its side: "Dead."

It is not pleasant to be a Marine at Khesanh today. Most have not had a shower facility in five weeks. Water is in too short supply to be wasted, or is too far away. The men's clothes are brown as are their faces. The wind blows a constant, fine dust that covers everything; their skin, hair, clothes, the floor, the bed, everything. The bunkers are damp, and since there are few generators working now, mostly dark. There is little variety in C-rations, but they have been eating them three meals a day for six weeks, cooked in pierced cans over heat tabs. There is little to do once the work is done.

There are incongruities here also. The Navy Seabees, whose primary job is to maintain the air strip, have by default also become the base electricians and mechanics. They have the only shower left, complete with hot water, patched together after each attack. They have the only washing machines left, made from pieces of dozens of others destroyed in the attacks.

The Seabees have one of few generators left. Made to run an electric saw, it now provides power to the camp headquarters as well as to the Seabee's bunkers. The PX still operates, though irregularly and with little to sell. There are enough stewed prunes in stock to last forever.

What will happen to Khesanh? Six thousand Marines, sailors, and soldiers lay surrounded by two enemy divisions, twelve thousand to 14,000 men. Sometime soon the Viet Cong must decide whether to attack or fade away. If the NVA can overrun Khesanh it will be considered a significant defeat for the Allied forces. Perhaps the North's leaders believe that like the French the United States will grow weary of the war and go home, that America will agree to negotiate from weakness. But the troops here now are not the French, and if the North's leaders have not come to this realization of themselves, the Russians surely have told them. A defeat here for the Allies would only result in a widening of the destruction of the North by US airpower.

And if the NVA does not overrun Khesanh, it will be a clear defeat, one that no amount of propaganda will be able to mitigate. Heads will roll in the North.

Khesanh is not well dug in. Perhaps the Marines do not believe in it. The air strip is very vulnerable. The entire US strategy depends on air support and the power of big guns.

Could Khesanh be taken? The troops think not. They are confident they can throw back anything the NVA can pour at them. But privately their officers are not so sure. A Lieut. Colonel put it this way: "If the NVA is willing to pay the price, they could take Khesanh. It would be as expensive as hell, but they could take it."

A company commander added this: "Three days of bad weather in a row and we would lose Khesanh. We have to have the air support. It all depends on the weather."

A plane lands quickly in the late afternoon. The weather has not cleared, but the plane can wait no longer. Mortar rounds had earlier hit the turning pad, but for the moment it is quiet. The waiting passengers crouch in a nearby ditch until the plane is sighted, then quickly move closer, hiding behind abandoned vehicles and cargo not yet picked up. Mortars begin to rain down, the plane opens its huge tail, the cargo slides out, and we rush in the open rear. The plane is already on its way as we struggle to strap

ourselves in. It spent less than three minutes under fire. The Marines have spent 52 days.

(By Ralph Paladino)

CHU LAI.—Certain subjects are not discussed in Vietnam. The people would not understand, they would misinterpret, world opinion would be unfavorable, and it is easier to ignore the people than explain facts to them. The existence of American-run detention camps for Vietnamese is one of these subjects.

Ask any Information Officer from Saigon to the demilitarized zone if the American Army runs camps for Vietnamese civilians for any reason, and he will tell you that only the Vietnamese government runs such places. Ask him about Prisoner-of-War camps, and his answer will be that only the Vietnamese government runs them. Find one that has heard of either of the two types of camps, and he will be unable to explain their purpose or say where any are located. In simple fact, they are not lying. They just don't know.

One such camp exists at the Americal Division Headquarters in Chu Lai. It is not a very large affair, a few large open huts, a shower, latrines, a kitchen, and six small interrogation booths. The entire compound is surrounded by high, barbed-wire fences and armed guards. It is a highly restricted area, no visitors allowed, no photographs, no reporters.

It takes a great deal of time to break through the considerable barriers which surround the camp, red tape and permissions no less formidable than its guards and fences. Only the two-star Division Commander can reverse the refusals at all other levels of military hierarchy. He is difficult to persuade, dubious at the least, but permission is granted.

The requirements remain: no interviews with guards or detainees, no photographs, and no access to the separate PW compound that makes up a part of the camp. A Lieut. Colonel conducts the tour.

There are only eight inmates in the compound, two of whom are prisoners of war who will be turned over to the South Vietnamese government. The South Vietnamese PW camps have been penetrated only once by news media. The Red Cross, however, has not protested treatment or conditions in them, and apparently the Geneva Conventions are rigidly adhered to. The other six inmates are in the process of interrogation.

After interrogation they will be categorized as either innocent civilians (IC), prisoners of war (PW), or civilian defendants (CD). Their fate depends on their final designation. If they are innocent civilians, they will be returned as quickly as possible to their home villages or to their point of capture. It is seldom a long process. Most of these people will be returned to their homes within 24 hours of being picked up. Few will remain in the camp over 48 hours.

PW's, on the other hand, face an extended stay in American hands while Intelligence conducts a full interrogation. These prisoners are immediately separated and placed into the nearby PW compound.

The last category, CD's, include paramilitary types, terrorists, and VC supporters.

Traditionally, it has been easy to determine the difference between those enemy men who fell in the categories covered by the Geneva Convention and those that did not. A uniformed soldier was a PW, a non-uniformed one a spy or terrorist. But this war is different. What is a guerrilla in his black pajamas, a Viet Cong wearing a red armband, a uniformed terrorist? The American interrogators must decide, for CD's are turned over to the Vietnamese government for criminal trial, and may be hanged or shot.

If not luxurious, the camp's facilities are adequate to the needs of the detainees. Prisoners share a hut which provides sufficient shelter from the sun and rain. Jerry cans of water sit in the shade. There is no floor and no furnishings. Each hut is separated from each other by a fence and barbed wire. Two sheets of paper are posted on the wall of each hut with some simple translations and some blunt warnings.

The warnings tell the prisoners that those who attempt to escape will be shot, no talking between huts, no exchanging things between huts, and in case of riots, gas will be used. If the prisoner needs something and no one who speaks Vietnamese is available to translate, he can simply read the English from the second list (assuming he can read), "I have something to tell you," and then, "I need an interpreter," or "I need to use the latrine," or "I am sick and need a doctor," or "We are out of water."

The detainees keep their own areas clean, cook their own food, and do odd jobs around the compound. There is a shower which they can use during certain times of the day, an indoor latrine that they must be taught how to use (otherwise they will stand on it and squat instead of sitting). There is a kitchen in which selected prisoners cook the camp's meals of rice and shrimp or chicken. There is a supply room from which they are issued soap, candy, pajamas, and cigarettes. In the evening they are issued a cot and a blanket which will be taken away at 5 a.m. the next morning, unless they are ill.

There is little opportunity for the prisoners to be mistreated. Thirty military police guard the compound, and in fact live next to it. A separate Military Intelligence unit conducts the interrogations. The six interrogation huts are lighted and have only half walls. An MP views the procedures from a guard tower, with instructions to notify his commander if he hears verbal abuse or sees evidence of physical abuse.

The interrogations are low keyed, even friendly. The prisoners are usually very young, hardly more than 16 years old, and do not seem to be fighting the interrogators verbally.

During the five-day Tet offensive, 279 Vietnamese were processed in the collection center. Most were picked up in enemy-held villages after a battle, or in sweeps of areas from which mortar and rocket fire came. Out of the 279, 33 were designated CD's and turned over to police authorities, 27 were declared PW's, and after interrogation were transported to one of the Prisoner of War camps operated by the Vietnamese army, and 219 were found to be innocent civilians, and were returned home. The average stay at the camp was four days. The average stay for innocent civilians was just under two days.

The camps stand as one of the less comfortable aspects of the war. Innocent people caught in the crossfire between two enemies find themselves taken at the point of a gun far from home. Often their wives and families will be unaware of their plight. The farmers do not understand where they are going or when they will be home again. They will be treated correctly, but probably not kindly by an alien people. But within the confines of the situation the field commander is faced with, there seems to be few alternatives to the continued existence of the camps, and they are, for the moment, a necessary evil.

(By Ralph Paladino)

CHU LAI.—With the military the most prominent American presence in Vietnam, it was inevitable that the responsibility for distributing a large part of the total American aid budget should fall to it. Anyone familiar with military manners and ways will recall the peculiar military propensity for becoming

over-enthusiastic about nearly everything it does. Any questioning of United States Army Aid Officers concerning the scope or effectiveness of the U.S. aid program results in what must be a preplanned recital of statistics, complete with necessary charts and graphs, that would dazzle any computer.

The Army has three sources for aid funds and materials: division funds allocated expressly for aid purposes (and which probably form a padding somewhere in the defense budget); aid resources provided by the many private and public agencies operating in Vietnam; and private sources of various types, such as company and unit funds, donations, and captured enemy materiel.

Division funds vary from unit to unit, but generally fall somewhere in the vicinity of 200,000 piastres (\$1,700) per month. Added to this is a large amount of surplus material, scrap wood and metal, mess hall food declared unfit for human consumption by veterinary officers (such food is seldom actually unfit for eating), and anything that can be scrounged or stolen by enterprising aid section (G-5) officers.

Aid resources from the various agencies, as well as those provided by the South Vietnamese government, are distributed by the military in cases of large-scale emergencies which make rapid and efficient distribution essential, and in areas which are definitely unsafe for unarmed aid teams.

Funds raised through troop donations play a large part in the military aid program, often equalling allocated funds for the purpose. Most units maintain a running campaign for carrying out their own projects, such as supporting a particular school, hospital, or orphanage, or for addition to the division fund. There is little question of the existence of a great amount of sheer generosity among the soldiers in Vietnam.

But, when one has to be generous, it is always more satisfying to be generous with someone else's supplies. All resource, rice, corn, and livestock found in areas considered to be totally under Viet Cong control, are transported to military warehouses for future distribution in friendly areas. In cases where a food cache cannot immediately be moved, it is usually destroyed, but not before such destruction is personally approved by the Division Commander. The Americal Division alone captured over one million . . . rice in an eight-month period.

At one time, stores were distributed through local government channels either at the district or province level. Now only the approval of the particular level of government is sought. The stores do not leave Army hands until their actual distribution takes place. The official reason for this change in policy is greater efficiency, but a few candid officers who were stationed in Vietnam before the change will admit other motives; it is the only way that the Army can be sure that needed stores won't be sold to the people or stolen.

This seemingly justifiable fear of letting anything out of sight permeates the methods by which all supplies are distributed. Cement and sheet tin are only given in daily usable quantities, and that quantity is carefully computed beforehand. If more than a one day supply is delivered at one time, it would likely be gone on the second day.

The Tet offensive has reduced the scope of the Army's future plans, although nowhere near as drastically as the pacification and rural development programs in general. The greatest effort for the near future must go into rebuilding a large percentage of the completed projects that were destroyed by the Viet Cong, who exercised great selectivity in most villages, only demolishing schools, marketplaces, and wells that were built with American help or material.

The school in the village of Khuong-Nhon, for instance, was blown up for the third time. Only one wall still stands, but the local

teacher, threatened with death if he continued to teach, still conducts his classes, now in a temporary shelter. He has, however, prudently moved out of the village to a home immediately adjacent to the Army installation.

Often it is difficult to determine whether a particular officer is simply distorting the truth, or whether there is a simple lack of communication between the local Vietnamese officials and their military counterparts. Dozens of new villages have sprung up in "pacified" areas as a result of VC harassment. The villagers, along with all their possessions, have been moved by the Army from VC-controlled areas and resettled where some degree of protection and control can be afforded. The local District Chief, his American advisor, and the Americal Division Commander insist that the moves were completely voluntary.

American soldiers in the process of moving villagers from one area to another have strict orders not to take anyone against his will. Undoubtedly no one is lifted, kicking and screaming, into waiting trucks and helicopters.

It is no easy task to get an opinion of American or GVN policies from local villagers. They are frightened that anything they say will be reported to local officials and that reprisals will be taken against them. A direct question is doomed to a foggy answer. Through an interpreter, however, dozens of residents of the newly resettled villages of Son-Tra and Khuong-Nhon expressed dissatisfaction with their new homes. Alternately they expressed the fact that they had moved voluntarily and they had been forced to move. In a sense, at least, both statements are simultaneously true.

The villagers were told by the GVN that the territory in which they were living was to be declared a free-fire zone, and that they would be killed either by VC or friendly attacks if they did not move. Voluntarily, and to escape what must have sounded like imminent death, they moved.

They are content in their new homes, or so they say. But the condition of the land makes that most unlikely. Khuong-Nhon is a village of sand, the land useless for anything but growing potatoes and miraculously a few tomatoes, squash, and tobacco. Rice will not grow. The farmers will readily admit that their old land was far superior, and some complain of the difficulty of making a living in their new homes. But asked if they are happy in the new location, they always answer a definite yes.

The Army now finds itself doing a job for which it was not designed. It has become in many cases a servant to GVN policies, expected to carry out those policies regardless of its own feelings on the subject. Aid is sporadic and dependent many times on the whims and interest of the particular Division Commander at the time. Communication with the Vietnamese people is often non-existent, reports are glowingly optimistic, the results often non-apparent. With all these disadvantages, however, it is the Army which still stands as the only effective agency for the distribution of large-scale aid in the aftermath of the Tet offensive.

The "Pueblo": How Long, Mr. President?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 57th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

The Census, Religion, and the Right of Privacy

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, in recent months I have received several inquiries relating to the proper scope of questions on the 1970 Decennial Census, with particular emphasis on invasion of privacy and religious freedom.

The Congress should address itself to the subject of protection of the right of privacy in the census as well as on other Government questionnaires. Failure to respond to the census questionnaire carries with it penalties of fines and imprisonment.

The appropriate committees of the Congress should not only review the propriety of the proposed 1970 census questionnaire form, but if necessary should enact legislation dividing the questionnaire into two categories—the first category to include questions on population, which would be mandatory, and the second a limited category of general questions, response to which would be optional.

Mr. Speaker, the right of privacy is constitutionally protected. This right should not be tampered with, nor should this right be invaded and subject to the whims of those who draft questions for the census. Some of the questions proposed for the 1970 census constitute invasions of privacy and the response to such questions should be optional:

"Do you share your shower?"

"How many babies have you ever had?"

"What is your rent?"

These are questions of a personal nature and failure to answer them should not be punishable by fines and imprisonment.

The very length of the 1970 census form—with more than 70 subject items—is an invasion of privacy. Many persons will have difficulty completing the form and many will fail to return the questionnaire. Such a situation will have a bearing on the accuracy of the census and may seriously affect statistics upon which to base Federal grant programs and congressional redistricting. That is why this subject deserves the attention of Congress.

The difficulty in answering the census questionnaire will be even more apparent in low income and disadvantaged areas—the inner cities where statistics are most important. The very length and detail of the census will defeat its main purpose.

As to the inquiries I have received about the possibility of the census including questions on religion, I had a conference with Dr. Conrad Taeuber, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Census, who informed me about the present policy on the subject. Dr. Taeuber said that the press release issued by the Department of Commerce on November 16, 1966, states the present policy of the Census Bureau on the matter of asking questions about religion in the census.

For the information of my colleagues in the House, I am including in the RECORD the full text of the Department of Commerce press release of November 16, 1966:

THE 1970 CENSUS WILL NOT CONTAIN QUESTION ON RELIGION

The 1970 Census of Population, following past precedents, will not include a question on religion, A. Ross Eckler, Director of the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, announced today.

The Bureau has been considering a number of requests from individuals and organizations which proposed that a question on religion be added to the nationwide census which is to be taken beginning in April 1970. The decision not to add this question is based on the fact that a substantial number of persons again expressed an extremely strong belief that asking such a question in the Decennial Population Census, in which replies are mandatory, would infringe upon the traditional separation of church and State.

Persons who proposed the religious question stressed the importance of religion in many aspects of American life and called attention to the fact that such a question is included in a number of national censuses, including those of Canada and Australia. Similar reasons both for and against were presented during the planning of the Censuses of 1950 and 1960.

The issues again were widely discussed at a series of public meetings held in all parts of the country and were also reviewed in recent hearings before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives. Since there appears to be no basic change in the nature of the arguments pro and con, there seems to be no reason to delay the decision.

The Director of the Census called attention to the fact that some of the needs for data might sometime be met in a manner that is open to fewer objections, by including an inquiry on religious affiliation or preference in one of the sample surveys conducted by the Census Bureau. In such a survey, response would be voluntary.

Mr. Speaker, I am also placing in the RECORD at this point an interesting speech delivered by Dr. Taeuber entitled "The Census and a Question on Religion" delivered at a conference sponsored by the Synagogue Council of America, the National Community Advisory Council, and the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, in New York City, October 23, 1967:

THE CENSUS AND A QUESTION ON RELIGION
(By Conrad Taeuber, Assistant Director,
Bureau of the Census)

The Constitution of the United States calls for an enumeration of the population to be taken within three years of the adoption of that instrument and within every subsequent term of ten years. The initial count was required to show the respective numbers for apportionment of the representation in the House of Representatives. The totals were to be secured by "... adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons."

In taking the Census of 1790 it was necessary, therefore, to distinguish between slave and free persons. The Act providing for the census also required the Marshals to distinguish the sex and color of free persons and to establish the number of free males 16 years of age and over. Presumably this latter provision was intended to give a measure of the military and industrial strength of the country.

Some persons had urged that the count of the population should provide additional in-

formation which the newly independent country needed, but the final decision was to limit the enumeration to the subjects listed.

In the debates on the inclusion of items in the census, which were not specifically required for the purposes of apportionment, James Madison dealt with a number of objections. When it was observed that the additional items might create alarm on the part of some persons who would be suspicious of the government's intentions in this matter, Madison replied that he: "... thought it was more likely that the people would suppose the information was required for its true object, namely, to know in what proportion to distribute the benefits resulting from an efficient General Government."¹

In 1800, when the Congress was considering the provisions for the Census of 1800, they received a memorial from the American Philosophical Society, signed by its president, Thomas Jefferson. By virtue of his position as Secretary of State, Jefferson had served as director of the Census of 1790. The memorial said that it considered the new census of the United States "... as offering an occasion of great value, and not otherwise to be obtained, of ascertaining sundry facts highly important to the society."² The memorial urged that the population be classified according to age for the purpose of calculating the duration of life, the chances of life, and the rate of increase in the population in the several age groups.

They suggested that the age groups include: "births, two, five, ten, sixteen, twenty-one, twenty-five years and every term of 5 years thence to one hundred." The population was also to be divided into native citizens, citizens of foreign births and aliens. In addition, they suggested that free male inhabitants of all ages be classified by occupation: "... under the following or such other descriptions as the greater wisdom of the legislature shall approve, to wit: 1st, men of the learned professions, including clergymen, lawyers, physicians, those employed in the fine arts, teachers and scribes in general; 2d, merchants and trades, including bankers, insurers, brokers, and dealers of every kind; 3d, marines; 4th, handicraftsmen; 5th, laborers in agriculture; 6th, laborers of other descriptions; 7th, domestic servants; 8th, paupers; 9th, persons of no particular calling, living on their income; care being taken that every person be noted but once in the table, and that under the description to which he principally belongs."³

Another memorial, from the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences was signed by Timothy Dwight, its president. It stated: "... that to present and future generations it will be highly gratifying to observe the progress of population in this country, and to be able to trace the proportion of its increase from native Americans and from foreigners immigrating at successive periods; to observe the progress or decline of various occupations; the effects of population, luxury, mechanic arts, the cultivation of lands, and the draining of marshes on the health and longevity of the citizens of the United States."⁴

To accomplish these purposes they recommended that the next census should classify the population by age and sex, by whether born in this country or abroad, and by occupation, and that account be taken of the number of married persons and of unmarried

persons above 30 years of age, and of widows and widowers.

Apparently the Congress was not impressed with the need "to furnish a curious and useful document of the distribution of society in these States, and of the conditions and vocations of our fellow citizens. . . ." There is no record of any discussion of these memorials in the Senate. The Census of 1800 called for the same items of information as that of 1790, but it increased the age categories which were to be used and specified that they were to be applied to free white males and females.

Although the population items included in the Census of 1810 were to be the same as those in the Census of 1800, the Congress directed that there be a supplemental inquiry which would give an "... account of the several manufacturing establishments and manufacturers within their several districts, territories and divisions." This inquiry was the forerunner of what today is a quinquennial census of manufactures.⁵

In subsequent years the Congress was more ready to secure needed information through the periodic enumeration of the population. The methods used changed and gradually evolved to those which are the hallmarks of a modern census. The subjects to be included changed from time to time, depending on the needs of the country. Some questions were added, others were dropped when the need no longer existed, when other sources of information became available, or when it had been ascertained that the census was not a suitable means of securing reliable information about a given topic.

Other periodic censuses were added from time to time. The Quinquennial Census of Agriculture is the modern-day successor to some questions on agriculture which were first asked in connection with the Census of 1840. A Census of Housing was instituted in 1940 to be taken in conjunction with the Census of Population. A Quinquennial Census of Business is the present-day successor to a census first taken for 1929. A Quinquennial Census of Governments is the modern version of a census which was begun in 1850.

Among the other censuses are Irrigation and Drainage (taken every ten years with the Census of Agriculture), Mineral Industries, and Transportation.

The Bureau is directed to take each of these censuses. The Census Act lists one other census which is not required, but "may" be taken, namely the Census of Religious Bodies. From 1850 to 1890 the Bureau of the Census had asked in connection with the Census of Population for information concerning the recorded membership of local churches, value of edifices, and number of clergymen. In 1906 it began the conduct of a separate Census of Religious Bodies by means of a questionnaire which was mailed to the pastors and clerks of the parishes or congregations. This was repeated at 10-year intervals through 1936. A similar census was begun in 1946 but the Congress denied the funds needed for its completion. The Administration did not request funds for such censuses in 1956 and 1966 and there was no Congressional drive to have such censuses taken.⁶

The Census of Religious Bodies did not supply information on the social and economic characteristics of the members of the several religious groups. Such information is considered important by a number of social scientists, by representatives of some religious organizations and by other persons. Interested persons have for some time

¹ Dorothy S. Thomas, "Prefatory Note," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Volume 111, Number 3, June 22, 1967, p. 134.

² Dorothy S. Thomas, *Ibid.*, p. 133.

³ Dorothy S. Thomas, *Op. Cit.*, p. 133.

⁴ Carrol D. Wright and William C. Hunt, *History and Growth of the United States Census, 1790-1890*, Washington, D.C., 1900, p. 19.

⁵ Carroll D. Wright and William C. Hunt, *Op. Cit.*, p. 22.

⁶ Benson Y. Landis, "A Guide to the Literature on Statistics of Religious Affiliation with References to Related Social Studies," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Volume 54, June 1959, pp. 335-357.

debated the relative merits of a Census of Religious Bodies as over against a question on religious affiliation or preference to be asked in the Census of Population. Late in the 1940's the Bureau received a number of suggestions that a question on religion be included in the 1950 Census. After some discussion the Acting Director of the Bureau issued an announcement stating that such a question would not be included. The statement said, in part:

"It is our conclusion then that in view of the controversial nature of the question, the intense opposition to it in certain quarters, and the doubtful reliability of the information collected, it therefore seems unwise to jeopardize the success of the whole decennial census in order to obtain the admittedly useful information on religious affiliation. It seems that the issue can be faced more squarely in the proposed Census of Religious Bodies for 1956, in which there is not the additional complication of a general census and in which at least some objective criteria of affiliation are possible."

Early in the 1950's, proponents of including such a question renewed their pleas. In 1956, the Director of the Bureau announced that a question on religion was under consideration for the 1960 Census, and stated the conditions under which such a question might gain acceptance. It was hoped that the announcement would help bring the subject into wide public discussion. One concrete proposal came in an editorial in the Catholic magazine, *America* which recommended three questions: With what religion are you affiliated? Do you regularly attend church or synagogue? Do you believe in God? The last of these three was immediately ruled out by the Bureau, as it had been when it was proposed prior to the 1950 Census. The second question was also ruled out as unsuited to a statistical inquiry such as a census.

One element which entered into discussion was the fact that replies to census questions are mandatory. It was suggested by some of the proponents of a question on religion that this one should be exempted from the mandatory provisions in the belief that voluntary response to such a question would remove much of the objection which had been raised. Such an arrangement would have required Congressional action to amend the Census Law. The position of the Bureau of the Census was that having part of the census on a mandatory basis and another part on a voluntary basis would create administrative problems of so serious a nature that no such amendment should be sought. The Census of Population had been taken under laws which required respondents to give the information since 1790, and there were good reasons why such a requirement should be continued.

That the public by and large was willing to reply to a question on religion on a voluntary basis had been demonstrated in response to the question: What is your religion?—which had been included in the Current Population Survey in March 1957. This is a voluntary survey, which at that time involved about 35,000 households. There was almost no opposition to the question on the part of the respondents. This experience is consistent with that of private survey organizations which have asked such a question on numerous occasions. Press reactions to the Bureau's survey were mixed, as were the reactions from spokesmen of interested organizations.

Public discussion continued and by late 1957 it seemed clear to the Director of the Census that it would not be feasible to include a question on religion in the 1960 Census. In December of that year an official announcement was issued stating that the 1960 Census of Population would not include an inquiry on religion.

The primary reason given was: ". . . (The

recognition that at this time a considerable number of persons would be reluctant to answer such a question in the census where a reply is mandatory. Under the circumstances it was not believed that the value of the statistics based on the question would be great enough to justify overriding such an attitude. Cost factors also were a consideration."

When work began on the plans for the 1970 Census, consideration was again given to the inclusion of a question on religion. Among the proponents was the Committee on Population Statistics of the Population Association of America. In transmitting its recommendations to the Bureau it reiterated the report of a task force of that Association, which had prepared its report in 1957. It had concluded in favor of such a question in terms of the research uses of the data. The statement cites the following:

"Research uses of census data on religion. A census inquiry on religion would be of great value to social research. From a sociological viewpoint religion is perhaps the most significant social characteristic that is not now included in the census.

"Thus, with reference to the major social groupings usually covered in sociological analysis, the census now includes information on the population of political divisions; the size and structure of the community; age and sex categories; marital and family status; racial and ethnic groups; educational achievement; occupational and professional groups; and a whole range of materials on socio-economic status. The size and distribution of political groups and political preferences are determinable from the elaborate machinery of registration and election. In this galaxy of information data on religious groupings are conspicuously absent.

"Among the types of institutions that have indicated need for religious data for research and administrative purposes are the following: religious bodies; health and medical insurance organizations; public health agencies; hospitals; charitable and other community services; school authorities; administrators of colleges and universities; metropolitan and city planning agencies; marketing research, social survey, and public opinion polling agencies; and official commissions on discrimination.

"To give a specific illustration: Scientific data strongly suggest that there are marked variations in health and medical care with religio-cultural patterns of the population. It has been shown that there are variations in the frequency of cancer and of coronary disease among religio-cultural groups and that the frequency with which a doctor is consulted also varies among such groups.

"Knowledge of the socio-religious characteristics of the population would contribute greatly to research in these areas. It would aid in the formulation of hypotheses concerning the etiology of disease and in distinguishing between biological and environmental factors contributing to the production of disease.

"There are parallel uses for religious data in many other fields. While it is impossible to forecast all of the myriad uses to which census data on religion might be put, the following may indicate some of the principal and more frequently expressed needs:

"(a) Analysis of size and geographical distribution of religious denominations, especially with reference to such matters as the degree of ecological concentration.

"(b) The study of differences in the characteristics of the population with respect to religion, in relation to occupation and economic level, years of schooling, racial and ethnic background, mobility, etc.

"(c) Analysis of fertility by religion. The importance of religion as a factor affecting differences in fertility, and in social and psychological attitudes regarding family size, has been indicated in a number of recent important studies.

"(d) Provision of information for drawing sample areas in surveys in which the religion dimension is important. The accuracy of many public opinion surveys and social surveys could be improved if better information on the size and distribution of religious denominations were available.

"(e) Establishment of a base line for determining future changes in the size and geographical distribution of religious groups."

The National Catholic Welfare Conference has been one of the strong advocates for a question on religion in the census. Its General Secretary, Paul F. Tanner, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in August 1966, said in part:

"First, statistical information about religious affiliation is helpful to both commercial enterprises and public and private welfare agencies in projecting services to the citizenry. As such this information would serve a valuable public purpose.

"Second, a sense of the history of preparing for the decennial census leads to the expectation that there will again be a public discussion on the inclusion of a question on religion. It is my hope that these observations will help to contribute to a reasonable discussion.

"Many commercial and welfare interests can be served by statistics about religious affiliation. In industrial and commercial circles it is well known that markets are influenced by the religious affiliation of prospective customers. The construction industry is an obvious case in point. So too the advertising industry, food processors, and the media of communications. Market analyses in these and other areas would be more complete—and better suited to the needs of the citizenry—if they incorporated projections based on statistics on religious affiliation.

"In the field of welfare services religious organizations play a significant role. For example, they provide medical and health services in their hospitals, social work services to the indigent, special training for the retarded and handicapped, and general education to children at all levels of instruction. These services benefit the common-weal and relieve public agencies of many burdens, but the significant factor here is that the existence of these services directly affect the welfare services of public agencies. It is by no means an uncommon practice at the present for civic administrators to obtain information about the plans and projections of church administrators. Consider particularly the construction and staffing of hospitals, assistance to the poor, marriage counseling, working with youth. A knowledge of the service rendered by religious agencies has resulted in better utilization of public resources.

"The current War on Poverty is another example of public service. The presence of religious resources is directly related in the denominational character of the neighborhood. Yet, because these religious agencies serve the public at large, irrespective of religious affiliation, public agencies are better enabled to direct their resources to other areas of need.

"This pattern of coordination in long-established neighborhoods appears even more important in the ever burgeoning suburbs. Projections on the religious affiliation of the residents of these new communities will definitely be indicators of the resources private agencies will provide to those communities. It is a matter of common sense, as well as fiscal prudence, that realistic projections of welfare services, public and private, will foster maximum utilization of resources and more widespread benefits to the citizenry.

"In effect, therefore, a census on religious affiliation has as its purpose the securing of

information that will benefit the people as a whole."

During early 1966 the Bureau held a series of meetings with users of census data throughout the country to discuss needs in connection with the 1970 Census and receive reactions to proposed new questions and tabulations. Members of the Bureau staff also participated in meetings with organizations which had an interest in the census. Consultations were held with regular and special advisory committees. Comments were received from many other sources, including editorial comment, resolutions of interested organizations and letters from individuals.

It became clear that while there was strong support, there was also strong opposition. Some religious organizations vigorously supported the inclusion of such a question while others opposed it just as vigorously and still others were uncommitted. It was concluded that the question might jeopardize the success of the census. On November 16, 1966, the Director of the Bureau announced that the 1970 Census will not include a question on religion. In this announcement, he pointed out that:

"The Bureau has been considering a number of requests from individuals and organizations which proposed that a question on religion be added to the nationwide census which is to be taken beginning in April 1970. The decision not to add this question is based on the fact that a substantial number of persons again expressed an extremely strong belief that asking such a question in the Decennial Population Census, in which replies are mandatory, would infringe upon the traditional separation of church and state.

"Persons who proposed the religious question stressed the importance of religion in many aspects of American life and called attention to the fact that such a question is included in a number of national censuses including those of Canada and Australia. Similar reasons both for and against were presented during the planning of the Censuses of 1950 and 1960."

Proponents of the question had argued that religious affiliation or preference is an important variable in explaining much of social behavior. Recent studies of the fertility of American women, for example, had demonstrated a major relationship of religious affiliation and practice to fertility. The information would be of value to religious leaders, sociologists, demographers, educators, and historians, as well as other scholars and research workers. Recently enacted laws to assure equal opportunity for all specifically mentioned religion, and information on this subject would be needed to measure how effectively the intent of these laws was being met. It was argued that religion is a significant characteristic of the population and that any meaningful descriptions of the population needs to include it. The information was needed for effective planning for educational, health, welfare and other community services; it would be of value also to religious leaders, politicians and certain business groups. It was pointed out also that the question is asked in the censuses of many countries, including Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Although technicians might debate the meaning to be given to the answers to the question: What is your religion?—the respondents apparently had no such difficulty. The fact that in most instances the persons identifying themselves with a religious group were more numerous than the claimed membership was not viewed as a serious limitation on the utility of the resulting data.

Article VI of the Constitution, which prohibits the Congress from requiring a religious test as a qualification for any office on public trust under the United States, is not deemed relevant to the issue, for the information collected in a census cannot be used for or against the individual to whom it relates.

Similarly, the First Amendment to the Constitution does not appear to apply, for it refers to the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and makes no reference to the collection of information about religious preference or affiliation.

The arguments against the inclusion of such a question revolved chiefly around the apparent violation of the doctrine of the separation of church and state and the correlated issue of the invasion of privacy. In a pamphlet issued by the Synagogue Council of America and the National Community Relations Advisory Council, the opposition was stated in the following terms:

"(1) The asking of such questions by census takers would be in violation of the constitutional guaranty of freedom of religion. The United States Supreme Court has expressly declared that, under the freedom of religion provision of the Bill of Rights, no person may be compelled to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. Persons questioned by census takers are subject to conviction and punishment as criminals if they refuse to answer. However, even if the element of compulsion be eliminated, we would regard the asking of questions about religious affiliation or belief as violative of the Constitutional guaranty of religious freedom.

"(2) The asking of such questions would violate the constitutional guaranty of the separation of church and state; for it would, in effect, make the federal government an agent of religious groups and employ government instrumentalities for church purposes.

"(3) The asking of such questions would constitute an unwarranted infringement upon the privacy of Americans. In a totalitarian society no interest of the people is deemed outside the jurisdiction and concern of the state. In a democracy on the other hand, the state has only such powers and such jurisdiction as are freely granted to it by the people; certain aspects of the people's lives are held inviolable; chief among these is the relation of man to his Maker. In a democracy committed to the separation of church and state the religion of the people is not a proper subject of government inquiry.

"(4) The asking of such questions would create a dangerous precedent, the consequences and implications of which cannot be anticipated. For 170 years our government has refrained from including questions concerning religion in the census. Abandonment of this tradition would inevitably lead to further encroachments upon the liberties of Americans."

At least one denomination has a doctrinal position against providing statistics about its members. Some opposition was based on the belief that the information would be of value primarily to religious organizations and would thus constitute improper use of government resources in behalf of religious organizations.

Another line of argument which was in the background of some of the discussion related to the possibility of abuse of the confidential nature of census returns. Although all individual information in the census returns must be held in confidence, in accordance with the law, some critics have expressed the fear that under conditions of stress the law might be altered and the information on the religious affiliation or preference of individuals might be used to their detriment. The statement that such fears are unfounded and that the historical precedents from outside the United States, which are cited, are not relevant has not been sufficient to dispense of this concern.

So far as the 1970 Census is concerned, the issue is now closed. The need for the information remains; the objections to having it collected in the Census of Population remain. What further developments may come in relation to a later census cannot be foreseen at this time.

Following the conference of October 22 to 24, 1967, the Synagogue Council of America and the National Community Relations Advisory Council issued their statement on "Religion in the Federal Census," the text of which follows:

THE 1967 STATEMENT BY THE SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA AND THE NATIONAL COMMUNITY RELATIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL ON RELIGION IN THE FEDERAL CENSUS

We are opposed to the inclusion in the federal census of any question regarding religious affiliation or belief for the following reasons:

(1) The asking of such questions by census takers would be in violation of the constitutional guaranty of freedom of religion. The United States Supreme Court has expressly declared that, under the freedom of religion provision of the Bill of Rights, no person may be compelled to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. Persons questioned by census takers are subject to conviction and punishment as criminals if they refuse to answer. However, even if the element of compulsion be eliminated, we would regard the asking of questions about religious affiliation or belief as violative of the Constitutional guaranty of religious freedom.

(2) The asking of such questions would violate the constitutional guaranty of the separation of church and state; for it would, in effect, make the federal government an agent of religious groups and employ government instrumentalities for church purposes.

(3) The asking of such questions would constitute an unwarranted infringement upon the privacy of Americans. In a totalitarian society no interest of the people is deemed outside the jurisdiction and concern of the state. In a democracy, on the other hand, the state has only such powers and such jurisdiction as are freely granted to it by the people; certain aspects of the people's lives are held inviolable; chief among these is the relation of man to his Maker. In a democracy committed to the separation of church and state the religion of the people is not a proper subject of government inquiry.

(4) The asking of such questions would create a dangerous precedent, the consequences and implications of which cannot be anticipated. For 170 years our government has refrained from including questions concerning religion in the census. Abandonment of this tradition would inevitably lead to further encroachments upon the liberties of Americans.

The subject of protection of the right to privacy includes the proper uses of information properly gathered. It has been estimated that the data from census questionnaires is sold to Government agencies, private businesses, and anyone else who wishes to purchase the statistics for more than \$24 million. If block-by-block information on housing and population characteristics is available, the question arises as to whether this information can be used to exploit the privacy of the individual. If ZIP codes are also included, it would seem relatively simple to pinpoint information to a particular household. This certainly was not the intent of Congress in authorizing the Decennial Census and therefore the entire subject calls for reexamination.

The inquiry and investigation into invasions of the "right of privacy" has centered on such matters as wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping. The scope of the congressional investigation should be broadened and I urge my colleagues to support early hearings on the scope of the census and related "right of privacy" questions.

Imports Threaten Entire Textile Industry**HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the need is urgent and imperative to extend the long-term textile agreement to cover imports of wool and manmade fibers, filaments, and filament yarn.

The volume of woolen and manmade textile imports pouring into our country is threatening the entire textile complex and its 2,000,000 employees.

The following is an excerpt from an article by Mr. Larston D. Farrar which appeared in the January issue of Textile Bulletin which I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and to the people of our country:

IMPACT OF IMPORTS

E. Fontaine Broun, president of the Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, testifying before the Tariff Commission in its investigation of the impact of imports on the textile industry, made these seven points:

Establishments producing man-made fibers are part of the textile industry complex, which is the subject of the investigation. To evaluate fully the impact of imports on the man-made fiber sector of the textile industry, it is necessary to consider the man-made fiber content of both primary and secondary products. So considered, it is evident that imports of man-made fiber textile materials are now close to, or are destined to move above, the 10% level of market penetration in a relatively short time.

The interchangeability of use of man-made with natural fibers on existing textile equipment throughout the world has made the textile markets of the world interdependent, from a fiber point of view. It is impossible to evaluate the impact of foreign trade developments upon the domestic industry, or to achieve an adequate regulation of foreign trade in textiles, on a single fiber basis. It must be done on a multifiber basis.

The world, and especially Japan and the less developed nations, have a rapidly rising capability to produce man-made fiber textile materials. This capacity is being used on an increasing basis to produce goods for export to the U.S. The attempted regulation of textile imports on a single fiber (cotton) basis in the Long-Term Cotton Textile Arrangement has accelerated the shift by foreign producers from cotton to man-made fiber textile materials.

Large increases in the new supply of man-made fiber textile materials from abroad threaten the economic stability of the man-made fiber textile industry of the U.S., and the jobs associated with that capacity. The tariff cuts to which the U.S. agreed in the Kennedy Round will worsen this threatening situation.

Imports of man-made fiber textile materials have risen more rapidly than the growth in the domestic market, to a level disruptive of the domestic textile market. At the same time, U.S. exports have declined in relation to imports. A serious erosion of the nation's once major favorable trade balance in textile materials has taken place.

Rising imports have caused economic injury to the man-made fiber producing sector of the U.S. textile industry, as shown by the idling of productive facilities, an absolute loss in employment, a drop in domestic prices, and a sharp drop in earnings.

The use by other developed nations of quotas, frontier taxes, or antidumping measures to control imports of man-made fiber textile materials from less developed nations,

and the combination of man-made fiber producers in Japan and Europe into production, marketing, and export cartels increase the threat of economic injury to the U.S. man-made fiber producing sector of the textile industry. This is especially critical in the research and development and capital investment program, which has been the principal factor in the expansion of consumer demand for textiles and the strengthening of the economic activity of the U.S. textile industry.

A Tribute to Senator Joseph S. Clark's Labors**HON. JOSHUA EILBERG**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, as conscientious legislators, we labor long and diligently through the legislative process for legislation which we believe is good and necessary. The epitome of the diligent legislator who works hard for what he believes is right is the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, JOSEPH S. CLARK. For a long time now, Senator CLARK has sought realistic action on the disclosure of the private incomes of public servants.

Senator CLARK's long and arduous campaign has reached the first stage of fruition in the report of the Senate Ethics Committee. The Senator deserves recognition for his efforts, and recognition is given in the March 18 issue of the Evening Bulletin of Philadelphia.

In order that my colleagues may have the opportunity of sharing in this ably written tribute, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at this point, the story written by Lawrence M. O'Rourke, Washington correspondent of the Evening Bulletin:

HOW RICH?—SENATORS MAY OPEN THE BOOKS
(By Lawrence M. O'Rourke)

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Senate has started to clean its own house, and among those who can take credit for it are Senators Joseph S. Clark (D-Pa) and Clifford P. Case (R-NJ).

When Clark several years ago started his campaign to require senators to disclose their financial holdings, few of his colleagues took kindly to it.

For one thing, many senators are rich men by ordinary standards. Most of them have had successful careers in law or industry before entering public life. In fact, the majority could not have entered public life without a substantial personal wealth to fall back on.

Senators are like everybody else. They consider their personal wealth to be a private matter, not gossip for the neighbors.

NOT LIKE EVERYBODY

But senators are in at least one respect not like everybody. They have to vote each year on legislation costing more than \$100 billion. They are in a position to do favors, for the little constituent and the big contributors.

It is because senators have the opportunity and bear the temptation to let private interest influence public decisions that they should be carefully watched.

Clark argued from the beginning that while he was not accusing any senator of betraying the public trust, he thought sen-

ators could relieve themselves of that suspicion by a voluntary disclosure of assets.

Clark made his own holding public, and the voters discovered he was a millionaire.

The voters also bestowed on Clark a second term in the Senate, perhaps demonstrating that disclosure of such facts not only does not hurt an honest politician, but can help him.

Senator Case also found voluntary disclosure to be a political asset. He has been able to challenge opponents to reveal their holdings, and Case has been the winner in those comparisons.

When the scandal involving former Senate Democratic Secretary Robert G. (Bobby) Baker erupted in 1964, Clark was given new ammunition. The Senate was badly embarrassed by the Baker scandal. And it was hurt further by the forced investigation into the finances of Senator Thomas J. Dodd (D-Conn), who last year was censured for converting campaign contributions into personal funds.

Clark's effort to add a disclosure amendment to the congressional reorganization bill last year was narrowly defeated. And the handwriting was on the wall.

The Senate Ethics Committee, headed by Senator John Stennis (D-Miss.), began to work up a financial reporting system that could take the heat off the Senate by giving the public a peek at the wealth of individual senators.

The recommendations issued Friday by the committee do not go as far as Clark and Case might like, but they are progress.

The committee recommended that each senator file for public inspection a statement listing political and other contributions and honorariums in excess of \$300 for speeches, television appearances and so on.

MORE DISCLOSURE

Then each senator would file a secret report with the U.S. comptroller general including federal income tax returns, legal fees in excess of \$1,000, corporate or professional ties, property holdings worth over \$10,000, interests in trusts, liabilities of \$10,000 or more, and the source and value of each gift.

Senator John Sherman Cooper (R-Ky.), a committee member, said the recommendations were not broad enough. He said he favored public disclosure of financial interests and the amount of public funds necessary for the expenses of operating senators' offices.

Stennis said the committee sought "to achieve a reasonable balance between respecting the privacy of the individual and compelling a wholesale disclosure of all private interests."

It appears certain that the recommendations will become part of the Senate rules. Reasonable efforts to make the rules stronger, perhaps along the lines of full public disclosure advocated by Clark, should be supported.

The more the public knows about its senators, the more likely will there be support and acceptance of the collective judgment of Congress.

Fireman's Prayer**HON. LESTER L. WOLFF**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 16, it was my privilege to attend the annual All-Faith Communion Breakfast of the Williston Park Fire Depart-

ment. At this wonderful gathering I was presented with a copy of the "Fireman's Prayer" and I feel it is a message my colleagues would appreciate and I commend it to their attention:

FIREMAN'S PRAYER

When I am called to duty, God,
Wherever flames may rage;
Give me strength to save some life
What so ever be its age.

Help me embrace a little child
Before it is too late;
Or save an older person from
The Horror of that fate.

Enable me to be alert
And hear the weakest shout,
And quickly and efficiently,
Put the fire out.

I want to fill my calling and
To give the best of me;
To guard my every neighbor and
Protect his property.

And if according to Your will
I have to lose my life,
Please bless with Your protecting hand,
My children and my wife.

To Honor Dr. Enrico Fermi

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, this Nation will mark the 15th anniversary next year of the death of Dr. Enrico Fermi. Dr. Fermi is widely remembered as one of the fathers of our atomic age, and as a man whose great love for his adopted United States was reciprocated by all Americans who knew him.

Today, I rise to honor the memory of this Nobel laureate by introducing a resolution authorizing the Postmaster General to issue an Enrico Fermi commemorative stamp.

Dr. Fermi was born in Rome, Italy, in 1901. He taught physics at the Universities of Florence and Rome, where his researches in nuclear physics were of critical importance in the later development of American nuclear fission capabilities. Dr. Fermi received the Nobel Prize in physics in 1938, and in the same year, he fled Fascist tyranny by coming to the United States.

From 1939 to 1945, Dr. Fermi taught physics at Columbia University, and it was at this time that he was centrally involved in the Chicago project that developed the first self-sustaining nuclear reactor.

Throughout his life, Dr. Fermi exemplified the best in the scientific and humanistic traditions of Western civilization. His unique contributions to this Nation, and to the world, were recognized by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission when he was honored by its first special award, now known as the Fermi Award.

Mr. Speaker, it is thus most fitting for us to honor the achievements of this great scientist, whom we are all proud to call an American, by passing the resolution which I am introducing today.

Xavier University Marks 50th Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Reverend Gintautas Sabataitis, S.J., Xavier University, delivered a moving address marking the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, and noted the significance of that event for us today. For the information of my colleagues, the following transcript of his address and an article from the February 22, 1968, Catholic Telegraph, are included in the RECORD.

LITHUANIA AND THE GLOBAL THREAT TO FREEDOM

(Address delivered at the special program to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence in Dayton, Ohio, by the Reverend Gintautas Sabataitis, S.J., Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio)

On February 16, 1918, when on the East, the Marxist revolutionary marches were accompanying the disintegration of the Czarist empire, and on the West, Germany lay prostrate in defeat at the hands of allies, the small, but brave Lithuanian nation set as its goal the restoration of its national sovereignty and complete independence. It was not an easy task, since hundred and twenty years of Russian oppression had strongly weakened the national fiber. Yet the Lithuanians rallied to the spirit of the past, when Lithuania, in the 13th century united as a nation, stretched its greatness through three centuries and an area that encompassed all the lands between the Baltic and the Black Seas. Today we honor that moment of Lithuania's national greatness, pay tribute to the courage of those who died for it, and show our respect to the national heroes who grasped at liberty as the most treasured possession.

Yet, is this moment to be only sentimental, commemorative and rather insignificant in this age of the future when dozens of nations have sprouted up throughout the world? The achievement of Lithuania's Independence of 50 years ago has a great significance for us today. It is very relevant for us today because the process of realizing liberty and independence is not over. As many nations rose to national maturity through the achievement of the national independence since the turn of this century, with a similar swiftness the Communist revolution has been seeking to dominate, enslave and destroy entire nations. If this century is marked by the end of colonialism giving rise to the independence of many sovereign nations, this century is more characteristic by the enslavement of significantly greater numbers of world's sovereign nations. If any historical fact has clearly emerged during the past fifty years, it is the sad and lamentable fact that the Communist forces have spread throughout the entire globe in quest of oppression, terror and death. This struggle continues today in Lithuania, who is a clear victim of Soviet tyranny. And she has been for the past twenty four years. Our late President Kennedy had once said: "We shall never be afraid to negotiate, but we will never negotiate out of fear." I ask you today: What good will have the Communists shown in Lithuania? How can negotiations be meaningful with them, when they broke every treaty that they signed and violated every commitment that they have made! We, free citizens, Lithuanian Americans, are challenging today the Soviet Union to give back to Lithuania its most precious gift of

freedom, liberty and national independence. Let this be the test of their good will! Our voice today should be: "Let the millions on the Baltic Shores in Eastern Europe go free!" Let them show a sign of humanity by permitting thousands of forcefully separated families for more than quarter of a century be united.

Let us face the struggle in which we as Americans are engaged in today. If we pour billions of dollars every year in South-East Asia and expose more than 500,000 of our best American youth to the brutal danger of violent death in South-Vietnam, then I say that our struggle is greater than we realize. Every graduate school will face during the next year the loss of some of its best students because they will be drafted into the Armed Forces. Is this sacrifice necessary? Let us look at what enemy we are facing and let us be realistic about the global threat to freedom that Communism poses all over the world. Do we remember those tense moments when Russia was stock-piling intercontinental missiles in Cuba, only ninety miles away from our shores. Suppose that President Kennedy was not able to force Khrushchev to withdraw them. Suppose Russia had started to bombard our cities in the South and had invaded our shores. Would we not fight back with all that we have at our disposal. Then, how can we be silent when Soviet Russia has not only occupied but has oppressed Lithuania for 24 consecutive years. Let Fulbrights, and McCarthys and Kennedys put themselves in the place of tens of thousands of Lithuanians who were deported to Siberia simply because they loved freedom. Let these misguided pseudo-intellectuals find out what it means to be Catholic and free in South Vietnam.

What we are fighting today is what this country fought almost two centuries ago, when it declared its Independence from Great Britain. We are fighting for the survival of freedom. The threat is global. If you feel this threat is meaningless then put yourself in the place of a 19-year-old American College student a few miles away from the DMZ, whose leg was blasted off by communist mortar fire. No one has all the answers, but the threat is clear. We need a spirit of calmness, of stability and of a strong sense of purpose. There is no room in such times for extremism or witch-hunting. Let us support, therefore, our President in his determination to defend freedom from the enemy who has avowed to subvert it. Let us not give up the conviction that freedom is precious, for if the Communists would succeed in eradicating the notion of freedom from our own convictions, then their victory would be complete.

We, Lithuanian Americans, have a mission today. We must contribute our knowledge and experience about Communism to the calm, reasonable and wise decision of our government. Many of us can be living witnesses to the evil intent and destructive power of Communism.

Let us not give up hope today that Lithuania will be free. Let us not abandon any nation whose liberty is threatened by insidious subversion, guerrilla infiltration and all-out invasion, whether it will be elsewhere or in our own hemisphere. If we compromise with liberty elsewhere, it will engulf us eventually at home. Let us ask the Almighty to give us guidance, wisdom and strength and trust in his power.

[From the Catholic Telegraph, Feb. 22, 1968]
FREEDOM FROM TYRANNY STILL LITHUANIAN GOAL

U.S. Lithuanian Catholics were called on to help build unity in this country and to combat world Communism at ceremonies last week on the Xavier university campus marking the 50th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Speaker was Father Gintautas Sabataitis, S.J., of Xavier, who is director of the Lithu-

anian Information center, Chicago. He gave the sermon at a Mass celebrated for Lithuania by the Very Rev. Paul L. O'Connor, president of Xavier.

"The wisdom which we acquired from being the victims of wars and bombings must be contributed creatively to the better solution of our problems in the strained fiber of American society," Father Sabatatis told the congregation.

"We pledge today, with the blessing of the Almighty, to devote our best efforts to overthrow the already too long Communist oppression," he said. "Let us be convinced that Lithuania shall be free again. But let us also speak out to the conscience of the free world for those of our brethren who are oppressed and who cannot even speak of liberty."

"We must use all our resources and powers to make better the society in which we live today," he continued. "Our inherited Lithuanian culture is not limited to the yearly exhibitions of national customs and costumes on nationality days . . . We shall give the best account of our Lithuanian heritage when we shall direct our creative efforts toward solving the mysteries of tomorrow . . . We must be a constructive and powerful force in our society, building rather than destroying . . ."

"Many of us have known Communism by living under it and tasting its tyrannous oppression," he said. "We can understand the tens of thousands of South Vietnamese who are the victims of guerrilla warfare, insidious subversion and direct aggression by the Communists . . . If we will be silent, then the very bones of millions of the victims of Communism will speak out."

"We offer our prayer to the Almighty," he said, "that Lithuania may be free again, that we may invest our Lithuanian heritage to serve the needs of a better tomorrow, and that we use our knowledge and experience of Communism to build a stronger and better America, that she will continue to be a constant hope for those who wish to be free and a vital inspiration for the oppressed."

A New Status Quo in the Middle East

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the dramatic events of the last few weeks in Vietnam and here at home ought not blind us to the continuing crisis in the Middle East. Almost a full year has passed since the start of the series of events that culminated in the 6-day war. Real peace there seems not one bit nearer than it was last June.

It appears increasingly clear that a dangerous stalemate has arisen in the Middle East to replace the one that existed prior to last June. I fear that this stalemate is every bit as prone to violent upset as was the previous one. In any case, we must try to understand the full implications of the new stalemate now apparent in the Middle East.

An article in the current issue of Commentary by Prof. Shlomo Avineri of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem is a splendid effort in this direction. Professor Avineri, senior lecturer at the Hebrew University and currently teaching political theory at Yale University, makes an incisive and lucid argument for the newness of things in the Middle East. His article, titled "The New Status Quo" is one of the most persuasive pieces of in-

formed scholarship that I have yet seen about the Middle East.

His article follows:

THE NEW STATUS QUO

(By Shlomo Avineri, senior lecturer in political theory at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Author of the book "The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx," which will be published this spring by Cambridge University Press)

Most of Israelis were proved wrong by the Six-Day War. They had been wrong before the war, when most of them minimized the dangers of escalation; and now, nine months later, those among them who thought in June that victory would have the effect of establishing, once and for all, a lasting peace in the Middle East, have been proved wrong again. In each case, a closer acquaintance with the realities of political power in the Arab world might have prevented a good deal of frustration.

Prior to the rapid political deterioration, and the equally rapid military escalation of late May and early June 1967, most Israeli observers were convinced that although the basic tensions of the Israeli-Arab conflict were far from having been resolved, a more or less dependable, long-term stalemate had emerged in the Middle East. Ever since the Sinai campaign of 1956, according to these observers, an undeclared, pragmatic normalization had set in, as a result not of negotiations and treaties but of mutual recognition based on a balance of terror similar to the one prevailing between the United States and the Soviet Union. The Syrians, of course represented a constant irritant, utterly unpredictable and fundamentally bellicose, but all the other Arab states bordering on Israel had behaved since 1956 according to what seemed an intelligible pattern—one, moreover, that was aimed at avoiding a head-on collision with Israel. Lebanon was the quietest of all, never having been keen on radical politics. King Hussein of Jordan, well aware that any eruption of pan-Arabism might cost him his throne, had jailed Syrian-trained anti-Israeli terrorists, outlawed Ahmed Shukeiry's Palestine Liberation Organization, and, by avoiding friction along the border with Israel, was trying to consolidate his precarious hold on the West Bank and integrate the two disparate halves of his kingdom into one nation. In Tunisia, President Bourguiba had survived his call for realism and moderation in dealing with Israel. Even Nasser was slowly and astutely changing his order of priorities in an effort to curb both the Syrians and the radicals; while Radio Cairo exhorted the Arabs to unite and reform in order to push the Jews into the sea, relaxed Nasserologists in Jerusalem were patiently pointing out that such rhetoric should not be interpreted as a call to a Holy War against Israel; rather, it represented a shrewdly calculated act of statesmanship on the part of Nasser, who, it was argued, was shifting his position toward a greater concentration on internal issues and was not about to plunge into precipitate foreign adventures. Most Israelis, then, felt that even though the day was still distant on which swords could be beaten into ploughshares, the Arab world nevertheless was slowly, painfully beginning to recognize Israel as a fact of life. Israeli politicians and intellectuals, journalists and military men, seemed to agree that a precarious yet long-term, non-violent coexistence was slowly emerging.*

* It should, however, be pointed out that at least one prominent Israeli never believed in the ultimate deterrent value of the balance of terror in the Middle East: this was Moshe Dayan. Years ago Dayan argued that Nasser might unpredictably close the Gulf of Aqaba at any time; confronted with such a situation, the UN would utterly fail and Israel would be left totally exposed. The events of May 1967 proved Dayan right in this

And then suddenly, toward the end of May 1967, everything collapsed, and within a fortnight the Middle East was plunged into the third Arab-Israel war in two decades. What went wrong?

So many instant histories of the Six-Day War have already been written that it would be unprofitable now to make yet another attempt to sum up the reasons for the breakdown. But there is one element that should be pointed out, precisely because it is unique to the Middle Eastern situation and has sometimes been overlooked in discussions of policy decisions: the independent force of rhetoric in the Arab world. Nasser, it is true, played a very cautious political game in his relations with Israel in the period from 1956 to 1967, but his caution was unaccompanied by any diminution in the violence of his anti-Israeli rhetoric; and it seems that when the chips were down, the Arab world was found lacking in the internal societal mechanisms necessary to prevent the takeover of politics by rhetorical outbursts. If, for instance, Nasser's demand for the withdrawal of the UN Emergency Force was aimed at bluffing his way out of a difficult situation, then it can also be argued that when the move misfired, Nasser was trapped by his own strategy, and by the rhetorical substance of what passes for politics in the Arab world.

Israeli spokesmen have found it useful to cite the wild statements of Ahmed Shukeiry as indicating the basic mood of the Arab leaders *vis-a-vis* Israel. This, to be sure, is an obvious oversimplification; under normal circumstances, leaders like Hussein and Nasser would be astute enough to ignore the rhetoric of genocide preached by Shukeiry. When, for example, Shukeiry was quoted before the war as saying that, "When the Arabs take Israel, the surviving Jews will be helped to return to their native countries; but I figure there will be very few survivors," most Arab leaders understood that such talk only bolstered Israel's case before world opinion; it is for this reason, indeed, that Shukeiry has been recently replaced by the more soft-spoken Hammuda (a man whose final goal, however, is not much different from his predecessor's). Yet during the crisis, when moderation in word and deed might have been most helpful to their cause, none of the Arab leaders found it practical, or possible, to stop Shukeiry. And whereas Shukeiry's tiny Palestine Liberation Army hardly constituted a threat to Israel, his rhetoric became a threat to the whole Arab world, for nobody was able to stand up to him, stop him, shut him up, or shut him in. As tempers began to rise, one feat of rhetoric followed another; pro-Western Jordan became as belligerent in egging Nasser on as "leftist" Syria; nobody was able to prevent Shukeiry from granting TV interviews in which he invited all concerned to be his guests for coffee "next week in Tel Aviv." Under this kind of stress, the distinction between "moderate" and "radical" Arab governments evaporated (as Cecil Hourani pointed out in his thoughtful essay, "An Arab Speaks to the Arab World," reprinted in the November 1967 *Encounter*). One of the tragic consequences of this may be that in the future, few Israelis will lend credence to any moderate Arab stance—moderation has proved to be a fair-weather phenomenon. One should not overlook the fact that during the crisis of May-June 1967 there was not a single voice in the Arab world calling for moderation, not a single leader or intellectual was heard urging the Arabs not to upset the precarious equilibrium.

To take but one example: whatever his other virtues, King Hussein certainly did not

diagnosis; the presence of his political insight, as well as his moderation in dealing with the occupied areas after the war, may help to explain why Dayan is now receiving support in Israel from people who have never been his traditional admirers.

act as that moderate voice during the crisis; it was, indeed, Radio Amman that castigated Nasser for hiding comfortably behind the UN Emergency Force. Since the war, to be sure, Hussein has been quite successful in presenting a favorable image to the West. Nevertheless, the paradox still remains: of the three Arab countries directly involved in the war, Jordan was the only one that started an unequivocal assault on Israeli territory—and this, despite repeated Israeli assurances that the Jewish State was not seeking a quarrel with Jordan.

There is, thus, very little evidence to sustain the view now prevalent in the West that those Arab governments whose posture is fairly pro-Western will also act in a more "reasonable" or "moderate" manner when it comes to negotiating a settlement with Israel. Certainly the history of the last nineteen years will not support such a view. For the truth of the matter is that the Middle East conflict has never, despite all appearances, been polarized on a pro-Western/pro-Communist axis. In fact, in the war of 1948 all the Arab governments then attacking Israel (Egypt, Transjordan, Iraq, Syria) were "pro-Western," their armies trained by the British and the French and in one case also commanded by British officers.

Unfortunately, it is precisely the attempt to comprehend Arab political realities in terms of the Western historical experience—or in terms of current American ideology—that leads so many observers astray. All in all, it is as ridiculous for State Department officials to talk about a constitutional monarchy in Jordan as it is for the New Left to enthuse over the "socialism" of the Syrian military regime. Spokesmen for both these viewpoints rely on a romantic Western tradition of wishful thinking, each person finding what he is looking for in order to sustain his belief in the universalizing capacities of his own ideology. Both propaganda and incomprehension gave rise to such contradictory and simultaneous descriptions of Nasser's regime, for example, as a quasi-Fascist dictatorship, a socialist system, and a "modernizing" state. Only a handful of observers have suggested that the sort of military government now prevailing in Egypt, Syria, and Iraq (and indirectly also in Jordan, through Hussein's ultimate reliance on the Arab Legion) has very little to do either with Fascism or progressive modernization but may rather represent simply the traditional form of government common to the Arab world until the end of World War I, when the British and French imposed parliamentarianism on the territories that had fallen to their mandate.

Under the Mameluks in Egypt, under the Ottomans in the rest of the Middle East, Arabs have been ruled for centuries by military governments; civil administration in these countries has traditionally been handled by just one department of what was essentially the military establishment of a conquering power. This sort of government, in fact, may be more familiar, more autochthonous, and hence more legitimate, prestigious, and functional within the traditions of Arab society than any other model—be it democratic or Communist—imported from Europe. And though it would be simple-minded to dismiss Nasser as nothing but a latter-day Mameluk, there is little doubt that what makes his form of government so acceptable to the vast majority of Egyptians is neither its military prestige nor its supposed administrative efficiency; rather, it is simply that form of government which is most familiar to Arab society and which operates within accepted historical traditions. After a short and inglorious interlude of foreign parliamentarianism, Arab society may again be discovering its true identity. This has very little to do with modernization; paradoxically, the most "modern" Arab state is the feudal oil emirate of Kuwait; anyone,

on the other hand, who has seen the incredibly plush luxury of the Syrian officers' Club at Kuneitra, together with the hovels for enlisted men which stand next to it, would be hard put to explain the sincerity of the socialist rhetoric issuing from the Syrian government, or—for that matter—the relevance of its efforts at modernization.

The traditional, reactionary structure of Arab society has remained unaffected by the successive political upheavals that have taken place in the Arab countries; the same Arab social class which today sends its sons to the officers' corps in Syria and Egypt did so under Farouk in Egypt and the old politicians in Syria. Algeria is an exception to this rule, both because the ruthlessness of direct French rule had the effect of pulverizing the old Arab social order and because of the Algerians were after all the only Arabs who really fought for their independence and achieved it by a revolutionary struggle; hence their army represents the toughness of a revolutionary mystique and not the routine soft-job elitism of all other Arab armies. Curious as it may seem, Algeria and Israel represent the only two revolutionary societies in the Arab-Israeli orbit.

But if Arabs have historically identified with military forms of government, they have paid a stiff price through their inability to react on an adequate level to political crises and international conflicts. For the fact is that in the modern world the traditional Arab form of government is totally irrelevant. Nor can the Arab malaise be traced back to the trauma of European imperialism on which most Arab intellectuals blame their social and political ills. In harsh truth, it was not the British and French who in most cases put an end to any purely Arab form of self-government in the Middle East. For at least six centuries prior to European penetration, the Arabs were ruled not by themselves but by a variety of nomadic military conquerors whose adherence to the Islamic religion made it easier to gloss over their foreignness. The Arabs were ruled by Seljuks and Ottomans, by Tartars and Mameluks; their commercial classes over the centuries consisted of Greeks, Armenians, and Jews. The basic malaise of Arab society has been its inability to evolve an overall social structure—the precondition of national identity. Their failure in the confrontation with Israel is thus not to be blamed merely on poor leadership or on defective policies: it is a failure that goes deep into their history. In the same way that Zionism, as a movement of national and social revolution, began with a critique not of Gentile society but of the lopsided nature of the Jewish social structure in Eastern Europe, so a parallel Arab renaissance may have to be predicated upon a prior rejection of some of the traits which have become associated with the traditional Arab consciousness. There is, however, very little evidence that such a structural rethinking is taking place among Arab intellectuals.

All this leaves Israel with a terrible dilemma. Many Israelis are experiencing severe frustration over the fact that despite the Arab military defeat the old political leaders, who were responsible for plunging the Arabs into their present catastrophe, still enjoy popularity and general esteem. That is, no rethinking of any kind seems to be going on in the Arab world, and the consequence may be yet another calamity when Arab leadership is again overtaken by its own rhetoric. But while everyone is now discussing the possibilities of peace, or negotiations, or non-negotiations, in the Middle East, and in Israel hairsplitting arguments are to be heard concerning the nature of the future negotiated boundaries of Israel, it may very well turn out that future developments will not depend at all on the outcome of an agreed-upon solution. Now, after the war, everyone is a rationalist; everyone expects that the due process of international relations will bring about the preferred result of negotiated set-

tlement. But unless something very extraordinary happens in the near future—unless, that is, the Arab governments show themselves prepared to undergo the agony of rethinking their relation to Israel—there seems little chance that any Arab government will negotiate. As for Israel, her insistence on negotiations is not a mere formalistic pedantry, but is predicated upon what seems, under the circumstances, a reasonable assumption—that only an arrangement publicly acknowledged by the Arabs will be worth more than the paper on which it was written.

But if this is the case, and if the chances for negotiations are slim, Israel will be faced with the task of settling the future of the newly acquired territories by herself; and this is a responsibility for which she may not be as fully prepared as she was for war. It may be, in other words, that the future boundaries of the Middle East will be determined not by any conscious decision, but rather will develop as a consequence of drift, of *force des choses*, in a manner similar to the post-1945 partition of Germany, which did not come about as the consequence of an intended policy but which was a necessity imposed on all concerned by a common inability to achieve a negotiated settlement. One does not have to be excessively cynical to remark that the unnatural status quo in Germany has proved to be more durable than all the Wilsonian rhetoric of the Versailles Treaty. Similarly, in the absence of a formal peace treaty, the present cease-fire lines in the Middle East may—frightening as it may sound even to most Israelis—solidify into semi-permanent borders. In that eventuality, political philosophers would be hard-pressed to differentiate between the legitimacy of such boundaries and that of the old 1949 armistice lines, which became solidified in precisely the same way and remained so for nineteen years. In the absence of a negotiated settlement, the status quo becomes the only tangible reality imposed on victors and vanquished alike, sometimes to their mutual detriment.

The old Israel, the Israel of pre-June 1967, is, in a way, a thing of the past. Jerusalem is a case in point: it has been "reunited," but it is also a very different city now, with a mixed Jewish-Arab population. Christmas this year in Jerusalem became a reality for the first time to Israeli children, who for the most part were used to thinking of this holiday in connection with some distant and unpleasant memories their parents had brought over with them from Eastern Europe. Israeli officials and intellectuals are already diligently learning Arabic, in order to deal with a social reality radically different from the one they had all come to regard as the norm. Even the Jerusalem Orthodox understand that along with the Walling Wall they have also become the recipients of a rather more ambiguous blessing: public transport in East Jerusalem on the Sabbath. All in all, the Israelis have made a remarkable adjustment, but even this is perhaps not so surprising as might at first appear. It is true that traditional Zionism was wont to underestimate the political significance of the existence of an Arab population in Palestine, and the Arabs have a valid claim when they suggest that some Zionists preferred to pretend that there were no Arabs in Palestine, or that ultimately these Arabs would not represent a problem. Yet despite all this, Zionism never envisaged a Jewish state which would not include a sizable Arab population among its citizens. After all, the UN partition resolution of 1947 assumed that about 45 per cent of the inhabitants of the projected Jewish state would be Arabs; it was only after the Arab attacks in 1947 and 1948 that Israel was left with a state with only a marginal Arab population. Now the challenge of living with Arab neighbors within the frontiers of Israel has become relevant again.

The state of Israel, as it emerged through the *force des choses* of the 1949 armistice lines, had learned to live with many anomalies, to internalize and rationalize them. For nineteen years Israelis considered it a perfectly normal and permanent state of affairs that their capital should be a city divided in half, linked to the rest of the country by a single narrow winding highway, right under the nose of Jordanian artillery, and that a strip of land ten miles wide should constitute their major industrial and population center. The Six-Day War has done away with the claustrophobia of the old borders; it has also bequeathed a legacy of new perspectives which may prove to be as much of a trial as the old anomalies.

In 1948, the Arab countries tried to frustrate a UN compromise resolution calling for the establishment of a Jewish state in a part of Palestine. As a consequence of the war of 1967, all of Mandatory Palestine is now in Israeli hands, and most of the 1948 refugees are now under Israeli jurisdiction. The Israeli-Arab confrontation may now revert to what it was originally, before the other Arab states intervened in 1948: a confrontation between Jews and Arabs in Palestine. The issue then will be whether Jews and Arabs can evolve some kind of coexistence within the country which both consider to be theirs. Israel has a duty to prove her readiness both to acknowledge and to fulfill the legitimate claims of the 1948 refugees for rehabilitation; the Arab governments are no longer in a position to veto such a possible accommodation, and Israel's sincerity in the matter is hence about to be severely tested. But the major consequence of the 1967 war may transcend even this, in that the final outcome may be a country very different from the bi-national state so naively advocated by some Western observers. Whenever two peoples are at each other's throat, one always hears it advocated that they be thrown together into one body, of course with due constitutional guarantees; the catastrophic outcome of such naive solutions has recently been all too tragically illustrated in Nigeria and Cyprus. But the new reality, though miles away from the chimeras of such well-intentioned but hardly well-informed prescriptions, may nevertheless have the effect of localizing the central issues involved, and thus of neutralizing some of the thornier aspects of the Israeli-Arab conflict. As such, Israel will then have little to quarrel over with the Arab countries surrounding her. That she is now in control of all of Palestine and of the majority of Palestinian Arabs is as much of a shock to Israel as it is to the Arabs. What must be realized is that six days in June of 1967 have changed the political realities in the Middle East as radically as the six years of World War II changed Europe. Unfortunately, few seem to realize this; because of the swiftness of events, consciousness, on all sides, lags far behind the facts.

What, then, of the future? Israel has to guard against a position of romantic chauvinism (a position, incidentally, which was recently repudiated by a most impressive statement signed by outstanding figures in the academic community here). What is more important, Israel has to face a reality which is so incongruous as to require completely new political and social vistas. It is not generosity that Israel needs, but a combination of hardheaded realism with a tolerance for different customs and cultures, political astuteness coupled with a readiness on the part of Israelis—as much as on the part of the Arabs—to do away with some of the sacred cows of the immediate past: a recognition that not all the idiosyncracies of the last nineteen years are to be taken as universal criteria or eternal verities. All this will be tough going, on both sides, but there is nothing in Zionist ideology—or in Arab history—to prevent the emergence of a solution within the new realities. It will soon be

a year since the war, yet few have recognized how fundamentally the Middle East has changed. All of us go on looking for solutions, hoping for negotiations to begin, for a rational pattern to emerge, openly arrived at by reasonable and soft-spoken diplomats. Few seem to realize that the new reality is already being formed by day-to-day decisions. Awakening from the euphoria of victory and the humiliation of defeat will be a slow and painful process, for the Israelis no less than for the Arabs. Yet the process has already begun, and its development must be closely watched.

The State Department Fumbles Again on Greece

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in this morning's New York Times calls attention to the "unseemly haste" with which the United States has responded in a friendly manner to the announced September 1 referendum on a new constitution for Greece.

The editorial, highly critical of our Government's seeming willingness to provide the undemocratic military regime in Athens with "prestige and respectability," follows:

APPEASING THE GREEK JUNTA

Greece's military junta had barely announced plans for a Sept. 1 referendum on a new Constitution when Washington volunteered an official "welcome" for this news. "We are further pleased," said the State Department, "to note that comments from the Greek people and the press on the draft of the constitution are being encouraged."

Washington neglected to point out that "debate" on the constitution will be carried on under conditions of marital law and that general press censorship will be lifted only for comments on the draft. With considerable courage, the leaders of Greece's two strongest democratic parties, George Papandreou and Panayotis Canelopoulos, have spoken openly in Athens against the whole bizarre procedure.

Nor did the State Department say anything about the content of the draft, much less indicate what it would take to assure the United States that the projected "return to constitutional rule" was more than an exercise for consolidating the colonels in power.

This blessing, bestowed with such unseemly haste, is simply the latest in a series of moves that point to one conclusion: Washington has decided to do everything it can to provide the Athens junta with the prestige and respectability it has hungered after since its *putsch* of last April.

The reasons given for this course are dreadfully familiar: The United States cannot risk a vacuum on NATO's southern flank at a time of expanding Soviet influence in the Mediterranean; the colonels are a fact of life and Washington will get more moderate performance out of them by displays of friendship than by maintaining correct but cool relations.

It is questionable, however, whether the Greek armed forces, purged of more than 200 experienced officers, could fill any meaningful NATO role. And it is ridiculous to argue that the United States needs the colonels more than the colonels need the United States.

To go along with the fiction that the colonels intend to restore democratic constitutional government is to fly in the face of

impressive testimony from Greek democratic leaders. These leaders may differ on many things, but they agree that resistance to military dictatorship is inevitable in Greece.

The United States will be risking not only its reputation and goodwill but an element of its long-run security if it becomes involved in the unsavory business of helping to maintain that dictatorship in power.

We Need Debate, Not Just Oratory

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the publishers and editors of Newsday for their courageous policy of addressing themselves to those issues and events uppermost in the minds of most Americans. The editorial of Monday, March 18, is another example of this kind of honest journalism and I commend it to my colleagues, as follows:

WE NEED A DEBATE, NOT JUST ORATORY

The 1968 presidential campaign is building up a head of steam. Sen. Robert F. Kennedy (D-N.Y.) has decided to run against President Johnson for the Democratic nomination; Sen. Eugene McCarthy (D-Minn.) is already in the race, thanks to his remarkable New Hampshire showing; and Gov. Rockefeller is debating whether to oppose Richard M. Nixon for the Republican nomination.

So far, most of the campaign discussion has centered on the Vietnam war, the inconclusive nature of which worries Americans regardless of party. While Vietnam is the major problem facing the nation, there are many other subjects that must be discussed by potential candidates if the party conventions—and later the electorate—are to have a clear understanding of each man's position and program.

America is faced with a vast number of difficult problems. Campaign bombast and oratory designed to win votes by playing on passions will do no service to the nation. Thoughtful and informative discussions on the issues can help rally the nation to the challenges which confront us. And, of course, the President himself must take part. He cannot wrap himself in the mantle of his office and stand to one side.

What are the issues that require serious and rational discussions?

First, of course, the war. U.S. battle deaths have reached the 20,000 mark and Vietnam has become the fourth bloodiest conflict in U.S. history. How are we to resolve Vietnam: by escalation, by de-escalation, by withdrawal to enclaves, or by a total pullout? It is not enough for any candidate to say "Let's negotiate." Everyone, including the President, wants to do that, but Hanoi does not. The candidates must provide specific alternatives and possible solutions, not just vague promises.

RACIAL CHALLENGE

Second, the problem of dealing with racial unrest. How is the richest nation in the world to eliminate the festering pockets of poverty in its ghetto communities? How is the country to provide equal opportunity and a decent life for the poor of whatever color? What needs to be done? How much can we afford to do? How quickly can we do it?

Third, the problem of crime. Month by month the statistics show a national growth in crime. Citizens demand safety on the streets and in their homes. How can protection be provided? How does crime prevention

mesh with the rebuilding of the slums where so much crime is spawned?

Fourth, strikes. Labor-management disputes have reached a point of no return. The giants of industry and labor test each other while the public suffers. Work stoppages have spilled over into the area of government employes, from teachers to garbage men. There is, of course, an answer. Newsday and former State Supreme Court Justice Samuel I. Rosenman have pointed the way by recommending the creation of labor courts to hand down binding solutions in cases involving the public interest. Now it is up to the candidates to discuss this problem and take a stand on the problem of strikes.

Fifth, youth's desire and drive to participate in public affairs. Today's young people are the best educated and most knowledgeable youngsters in American history, but they require guidance and preparation to help them share fully in the great challenges of the day. How to give them this special type of guidance and how to give them a meaningful role in our society represents a challenge to all candidates.

Sixth, the preservation of our environment—the protection of air, water and open space; the creation of adequate sewage and waste disposal facilities; the improvement of rapid transit and highway transit; the enhancement of the quality of education. To what degree can we meet these rising expectations? How will we be able to pay for these demands?

Seventh, the maintenance of the nation's financial integrity. The gold stampede has given the dollar a rude shock. Our spending by far exceeds our income. The fiscal stability of America must be preserved. But how? By tax increases? By spending cuts? By the creation of priorities?

These are the issues for which answers are needed. The candidates for President must provide the answers.

Freedom's Challenge

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of Members of the House the following speech entitled

"Freedom's Challenge." This speech, prepared and delivered by William Joseph Nadeau, "A" Company, 1st Special Forces Group, Abn, APO San Francisco 96331, son of M. Sgt. Conrad Joseph Nadeau, U.S. Army, presently stationed at Fort Bunkner, Okinawa, and a resident of my congressional district, was the winning entry from Connecticut in the Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary.

I have had the pleasure of working with this young man relative to his interest in being appointed to a service academy. It is heartening to see a young man with such deep insight into the problems confronting our Nation desire to serve his country. I am pleased that he has received a nomination to the U.S. Naval Academy through Senator Dodd and has also been authorized to take the examination to qualify for a presidential appointment to the U.S. Military Academy.

Let me take this opportunity to commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary for its outstanding service to our Nation through its sponsorship of the Voice of Democracy contest. This program encourages young Americans to learn about their Government and inspires them to exercise their rights and responsibilities within its framework. The speech follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

As a citizen of a democratic nation, I have inherited the liberty to determine the course of my own actions, which are subject to restrictions that are the same for all and are as few and liberal as the public safety permits. Thus I have the obligation to ensure the survival of this system as the major factor in this world. I owe allegiance to this form of government and am entitled to protection by this same government. In this modern democratic state, personal liberty exists as a recognition of the right of each individual, within limits, to do what he pleases without the constraint of his fellows, to go where he pleases, to work at whatever trade he pleases, and to own whatever property he can purchase. Restrictions on the individual by the state should not be more oppressive than necessity demands.

It is being realized that the modern nation demands citizens who understand peoples and cultures in every part of the world. It is my duty as a citizen of the United States to appreciate better the role of the American system in the international scene, and in order to gain such knowledge, I need to study other governments and varying economic systems, other societies, past and present, and the relationship between man and his environment.

It is my responsibility to add to the liberty, prestige, prosperity, and power of my nation. I have a deep sense of belonging to my nation and a desire to contribute to its welfare. My loyalty to the nation is exceeded only by my loyalty to God and my parents. I have a pride in its achievements, a belief in its excellence, and a respect for its superiority over all other nations. I am to understand the ties which hold our great nation together: political, racial, religious, cultural (including language), and historical. I must have the determination to work with my fellow citizens toward the betterment of my country.

My involvement in the affairs of the Union is needed to form a more useful federal government. My participation can be realized by different acts such as voting and presenting my ideas on matters that pertain to the country as well as to myself to the proper government officials. These men always welcome constructive criticism.

I strongly feel that one of my major duties as a citizen is to attempt to find out all that is possible about our federal government: how it functions, its benefits to me, and what I can do to make it a more effective body. Its effectiveness depends upon the political intelligence of its citizens. If I am ignorant about the affairs of the nation, I am not contributing anything towards the welfare of my nation, thus I am a useless and weak point in the proper functioning of the nation.

Voting for or against any measure, law, or the election of a person to office is not only a right and a privilege but also a duty. As a citizen, I must never let my emotions interfere with my selection. I must consider all candidates and issues carefully and deliberately before making my decision. And most important, I must believe that my decision is correct.

In conclusion, the freedoms that I have inherited through citizenship are too valuable to be neglected, so it is my duty to participate to the fullest of my capabilities whenever possible.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 20, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

In the day when I cried to Thee, Thou didst answer me and didst increase the strength of my soul.—Psalm 138: 3.

Eternal God, our Father, who art the God and Father of us all, grant that by the tides of Thy spirit we may be lifted into the blessed assurance that Thou art with us, that Thy grace is sufficient for every need and that by Thy living presence in our hearts we may meet our responsibilities with patience, manage our moods with creative faith, and master our temptations with confident strength.

Make us ever sensitive to the needs of our people and ready to dedicate ourselves to worthy endeavors that minister to the welfare of our Nation.

Bless those who struggle for freedom

across our world. Crown their efforts with resounding success that all men everywhere may ultimately be free.

In the spirit of Him who sets men free we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on March 18, 1968, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14743. An act to eliminate the re-

serve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, TO SIT TODAY DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works may sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

VIETNAM WAR POLICIES

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