

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLINGS], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Mc-

INTYRE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], are necessarily absent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senators from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. PERCY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Ken-

California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], are detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). A quorum is not present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 8, 1968, at 12 noon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COOPERATIVE EFFORT BY PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SECTORS TO ELIMINATE POVERTY

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, Winton M. Blount, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, last week predicted that the American business community, through the private enterprise system and working with Government, will be able to effectively eliminate poverty in this country.

Speaking before the sixth International Forging Conference in Washington, Mr. Blount convincingly argued that the national solution to this serious socioeconomic problem can be found only in a cooperative effort by the private and public sectors.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEVELOPMENT OF THE AMERICAN FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM BY WINTON M. BLOUNT, PRESIDENT, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES BEFORE THE SIXTH INTERNATIONAL FORGING CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 26, 1968

I bring you greetings from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and I

would especially like to add a word of welcome to the visitors from abroad. It is a pleasure to have you here. There is so much to be gained by closer international cooperation within industries, that I hope the idea will be accepted increasingly by other industrial groups.

I have been asked to talk with you this morning on the "Development of the American Free Enterprise System." It has been pleasant for me, in preparing these remarks, to pause to review the system, its problems and prospects in these changing times. I hope their presentation will be of interest to you.

Adam Smith's philosophy of a free economic order emerged in 1776, about the same time Thomas Jefferson and other American leaders were forging a new political order.

Both events were revolutionary. Both were a declaration of independence: the Americans' from the oppressive political control of George III; Smith's from the oppressive economic controls of Mercantilism.

While the Americans fought for their independence, the quiet, bachelor professor took the scholarly approach, setting down the proposals in his book, "The Wealth of Nations."

He advocated a system where government would not interfere with commerce and industry, but would let economic development follow the natural order of things. Men left free to seek what they believe to be their own good, would ultimately benefit the entire society, as well as themselves. The key words in Smith's philosophy were competition and free trade.

The book appeared in a time when prevailing thought put much faith in state control of all economic processes and the protection of chosen industries by government action.

Smith's ideas spread rapidly. It was only natural that the theme of minimum interference by government in economic affairs should have a strong appeal to the men on this side of the Atlantic, who had fought a war to throw off a paternalistic government. The concept fit neatly into the Jeffersonian philosophy that the best government is the least government.

These are the seeds from which the American economy grew, and from which it still draws its vitality, despite the fact that it has been pounded and shaped by the economic, political and social forces of nearly 200 years. Its growth has been steady, but not always tranquil. Its movement has been upward, but not always smooth. It emerges today by no means perfect, but nevertheless the most powerful economic engine ever devised. It has an unprecedented output, and has provided the greatest concentration of wealth ever known.

The greatest impact on the system over the years has undoubtedly been government. Government's role as referee in the market place began in earnest at the turn of the century with the enactment of the Interstate Commerce Act to regulate railroad and shipping rates, the Sherman Antitrust Act to prohibit monopolies, and the Federal Trade Commission Act to oversee business practices and enforce antitrust laws.

Controls were greatly expanded in the New Deal era, when the government enlarged its role from referee to active protector of the general welfare.

Today we see a changing relationship between government and business. With the growth of a more complex industrial society, large corporations and government have been compelled to cooperate more closely in the public interest.

General Electric operates a nuclear industry for the government at a small fixed fee;

The government assumes the main insurance risks as atomic energy is converted to peaceful uses, and

Government and industry join together to establish the first communications satellite system.

Science has also figured in the changing shape of free enterprise. Government, business and the university all found a profitable working relationship in the late fifties that helped bring about the technological revolution.

The French writer, Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber, describes this in his book, "The American Challenge":

"During the past 10 years, roughly from the end of the cold war and the launching of the first sputnik, American power has made an unprecedented leap forward. It has undergone a violent and productive internal revolution. Technological innovation has now become the basic objective of economic policy. In America today the government official, the industrial manager, the economics professor, the engineer, and the scientist have joined forces to develop coordinated techniques for integrating factors of production."

Despite the increasingly complex and sophisticated nature of the economy, and the changing structure of government-industry relations, the system has remained basically free and it has been possible to draw fairly clear dividing lines between what does and what does not conform to free enterprise principles.

I think the critics who claim that the free market has been virtually eliminated by giant corporations who set their own prices and control demand through advertising, have simply not looked closely enough at the facts.

Only one out of every five new products that come on the market is successful. Despite heavy advertising, many products fail. The consumer, using his dollar as ballots, makes the ultimate decision on the success or failure of all products. It is readily apparent to any close observer that market consciousness still pervades our economy and its presence still produces the efficiency, innovation and variety characteristics of the free enterprise system.

Servan-Schreiber notes in his book that this market consciousness is one of the significant differences between American corporations and those of Europe.

Despite a growing sentiment for expanded government planning of the economy among a small but influential minority in this country, I believe the vast majority realizes the benefits of the free enterprise system and still holds strongly to the conviction that more government is not the answer to our problems.

The system may be harsh, but it provides a degree of individual liberty rarely, if ever, before known. We tend to think of our political and economic freedoms in abstract, until we are reminded by the stark reality of a Czechoslovakia that our freedoms are very real and meaningful to our way of life.

This is an important fact about our system that differentiates it from many others: its concern for the individual. It is unlike some other countries which emphasize the group or government.

Further, the free enterprise system should not just be considered from a business or economic standpoint. It is a system that affords the individual the opportunity to make choices—where he will work, where he will live, what he will buy, where he will buy it, and what contribution he will make to society.

This freedom of choice and the opportunity it provides has given hope for many men, despite their poverty, to keep working be-

cause they knew the opportunity was there, and if they couldn't make it, then their sons could. The development of the American free enterprise system is really a story of the development of these millions of individuals, who sought and found achievement and growth.

The genius of our economy, I believe, is that it moves forward and takes its direction from a multiplicity of decisions made at all levels. This diversity and variety of decision-making means that our economy does not rise or fall on the basis of a few decisions basically from one source—as government-planned economies do.

The Soviet countries lately have been adapting some of the techniques of the free market in order to speed up their own economic growth. It is unfortunate, in spite of this, that many world government leaders remain convinced of the value of central economic planning.

Professor Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago touched on this in an article in Harper's magazine describing a tour he and his wife took of Eastern Europe, the Middle East and the Far East.

"In country after country," he writes, "we were deeply impressed by the striking contrast between the economic facts, as they appeared to us, and the ideas about the facts held by intellectuals.

"Wherever we found any large element of individual freedom, some beauty in the life of ordinary man, some measure of real progress in the material comforts at his disposal, and a hope for further progress in the future—there we also found that the private market was the main device being used to organize activity. Wherever the private market was largely suppressed and the state undertook to control in detail the economic activities of its citizens . . . there the ordinary man was in political fetters, had a low standard of living, and was largely bereft of any conception of controlling his own destiny. The state might prosper and accomplish mighty material works. Privileged classes might enjoy a full measure of material comforts. But the ordinary man was an instrument to be used for the state's purpose, receiving no more than necessary to keep him docile and reasonably productive.

"By contrast, the intellectuals everywhere took it for granted that capitalism and the market were devices for exploiting the masses, while central economic planning was the wave of the future that would set their countries on the road to rapid economic progress."

To illustrate the point, Friedman contrasted the economies of Yugoslavia with those of other Eastern European countries, West Germany with East Germany, Israel with Egypt, and the free-market Far Eastern countries of Malaya, Singapore, Thailand, Formosa, Hong Kong and Japan—with the planned economies of India, Cambodia, Indonesia and Communist China.

The government may have the best intentions in the world, and it may be the most beneficent of governments, but that does not make it any less difficult for the individual to deal with—for he is the one who suffers from the enlargement of government power.

It is certainly to be hoped that this trend can be reversed.

But our topic is the American free enterprise system and I think we can accurately say that our American economy is healthy and prosperous and shows few signs of weakening. To the contrary, there is every reason to hope that the wave of technological revolution and continued economic expansion will carry us forward into another world of the future, a world not only better economically, but socially and spiritually as well.

Wilbur Cohen, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, recently predicted that

we would eliminate poverty in this country by 1980. This would be a watershed achievement for the human race, and if it is possible in this country it is possible for the entire world.

I think it is true that there can be relatively few complaints about the nation's free enterprise system on economic grounds. Its performance leaves little room for criticism. We still have problems in regard to perfecting techniques to avoid recession and learning to control inflation, but we are making progress toward these objectives.

One of my first acts, after becoming president of the National Chamber, was to appoint a Committee to Consider Problems of the Dollar. We have a distinguished group of men on the committee and are well into our discussions and study. The Chamber supported the tax increase and spending cutback and other measures to insure stability.

The criticism that the free enterprise system is receiving today, in this country and in other nations, is based not on its economic performance but on its effect—or lack of it—on social conditions.

A small but vocal faction in our society is raising a clamor which is essentially anti-free enterprise and antibusiness. They generally feel the free market system cannot accomplish the objectives they believe the country should achieve, but the profit motive is unjust, and that businessmen are selfish and indifferent to the human problems around them.

Their criticisms may be broken down into several facets.

One, they consider the operation of the free market economy as haphazard and irrational. The thrust of the system being strictly economic, the kind of society which results is considered almost a by product. Under this system, man is permitting his common social destination to take care of itself. A more rational approach, they say, would be for him, through government, to take matters in hand and shape his collective destiny.

Second, many critics are people who are sincerely interested in helping others and are impatient with the system. The free market moves too slowly for them, and its benefits are indirect and not readily seen. Government action, on the other hand, is direct and visible, and therefore more appealing.

These veins of thought have been reflected in recent years in the growing dissatisfaction with our approach to social problems, and the creation of vast and expensive Federal programs.

These people tend to forget that what the free market lacks in rational, direct approach to the problems of society, it makes up in the efficiency of its indirect approach, which in the long run I believe has provided and will continue to provide more lasting solutions.

Government programs, however, even if they do prove to be a faster means of accomplishing these objectives, have a stagnating effect in the long run. Government's uniform standards can never provide the variety, innovation, efficiency and motivation that the free market does.

Dean George P. Baker wrote in the Harvard Business School Bulletin recently that between 1959 and 1965—six short years—the number of people in the United States defined as poor dropped some 20 per cent.

He said: "It has been primarily the nation's buoyant economy in recent years—the growth surge among the nation's businesses—that lifted more of these people across the poverty line to productivity, to hope and to ambition for themselves and their children by creating and expanding the enterprises that provide jobs."

Certainly the free enterprise system is the greatest antipoverty program ever launched and it is primarily through its continued

operation that we draw our hope of eventually making significant inroads on world poverty.

Americans have a streak within them which is impatient with imperfection. We tend to magnify our problems and weaknesses. Speakers, editorialists, writers and politicians tend to focus on the problems of our society to an extent that we lose our perspective. And now that, for the first time in history, we are almost within range of solving our problem of poverty, slums and discrimination, it makes us all the more impatient to get it over with.

We are apt to lose sight of the fact that our problems are the problems of success, not of defeat.

It is the new technology which is largely responsible for bringing the rapid change which requires such staggering readjustments in our society.

Our environmental problems—air, water, and nature pollution—can be traced mostly to growth and progress. So can congestion—our mass transportation and highway needs, as well as the crowding of schools and colleges.

The unrest, even the violence that has become too much a part of modern city life, are inspired by our rising affluence. As society becomes able to meet more needs, there is growing impatience to have them met, and more conflict over which shall be met first.

But certainly I know that it is not enough to counsel patience in these times, and to suggest that we give the forces of the free enterprise system time to work out these problems.

A way is emerging which I believe will enable us to deal with the problems of our society in a more direct way, and remain consistent with our beliefs in regard to government and private enterprise.

I am speaking of the increasing involvement of business in public affairs—not only to the extent that business in assuming a great deal more responsibility for the consequences of its own actions on the public interest, but also the increasing number of cases where business is taking direct action on public problems.

For example:

The life insurance industry is investing \$1 billion in ghetto housing and other facilities.

Seven New York commercial banks are providing a fund of \$7 million for low interest financing to rehabilitate 50 aging buildings on Manhattan's upper West side.

Numerous companies have programs to hire and train the hard-core unemployed.

Raytheon, Montgomery Ward and other firms lend employees to perform social services.

Eastman Kodak has established a community development corporation to assist small businesses in the inner city.

And there are many, many other examples.

The importance of this lies not in the hope that business can, on its own, successfully eradicate the major problems of society; but in the momentous fact that there is a turning, a growing awareness of a larger responsibility, of a broader purpose, for business.

I think several factors are responsible.

One is the great expansion of government programs in recent years, and the fact that we are realizing these programs are not adequate. It is becoming apparent that they are not the answer and that, in themselves, these programs can never accomplish the goals they were established to achieve.

There is also the factor that these programs are tremendously expensive and in some cases downright wasteful.

On the other hand, we have come to realize that some of these public problems, reduced to their most basic aspects, are similar

to problems business has been successfully tackling with the help of advanced management methods and the tools of the new technology.

Also, I think that there is a growing awareness that many of the problems society faces can be dealt with by business or a combination of business and government because they have a basic economic aspect. A ghetto is largely an economic problem. Some cases of civil unrest can be traced to economic origins. Training of hard-core unemployed has economic advantages. Pollution, urban blight and city congestion all have economic undertones. And there is no question but what poverty is mostly economic in nature.

Businessmen, meanwhile, have been struggling with their own consciences. The traditional belief is that the purpose of business is to make a profit and its operations should conform solely with that objective.

But businessmen are seeing their public involvement in a different light. They are seeing incentives in new forms. They are fully aware that the nature of society has a direct effect on their operations and on their future. They understand that the alleviation of poverty has an impact on consumer spending and that training the hard-core unemployed may help alleviate the manpower problem.

But most of all, I think businessmen, like most other Americans, are increasingly aware, amidst our affluence, that certain problems cannot be permitted to go unattended if our society is to have health, meaning and value.

The question then is not whether business has anything to contribute to the solution of these problems, but how to mobilize greater participation from the private sector.

Many of the firms, like those mentioned earlier as examples, have sufficient incentive. Others could possibly benefit from government action to provide direct incentives in the form of tax credits for operations in the public interest, loan guarantees, below-market-interest rate loans, real property grants and others. Such incentives need to be studied and analyzed.

If business and government do succeed in finding ways to harness the techniques and spirit of profit-making enterprise for direct public action, in a way that is consistent with the preservation of voluntary enterprise, then it may well rank as one of the most significant developments of modern capitalism.

Business cannot do it alone. It must be a joint effort of business, government, and private individuals and organizations. We are becoming a concerned society, and I believe we will be able to leave the nation and the world a better place because of it.

I might also add that as we learn new approaches to public problem solving, we will be lifting our sights beyond the borders of our own country and seeking to carry the benefits of the private enterprise system and the affluence we enjoy to other less-developed countries.

Again let me say that I think a diagnosis of the private enterprise system as it is today will find it basically very healthy. Its performance has been outstanding, and its future promises more of the same. New developments, particularly the growing public responsibility of business, offer promising prospects for dealing with social problems and provide an effective answer to critics of the system.

Indeed, I not only think the free enterprise system is relevant to our times, I think it is necessary to our times.

And I think it would be very appropriate today for us to renew our dedication to preserve the principles of this great system in the coming years.

THE ATTACK ON THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in the sound and fury of election year campaigning, while the attention of American voters has been focused on the truly important issues facing our society, a little noticed drama has been unfolding day by day. It involves the concentrated efforts of powerful groups to revise the Nation's labor relations laws in drastic ways and, at the same time, to abolish the National Labor Relations Board.

The scenario of this destructive drama has been revealed in a torrent of speeches, articles, and editorials. They have been clearly designed to discredit the Federal Labor Act and to cast ugly aspersions on the administration of the law by the NLRB, the U.S. courts of appeal, and the Supreme Court.

The weeping chorus in this drama, as in the ancient Greek theater, chants its lines over and over again:

"The law must be changed because unions are too powerful.

"The law must be changed because the will of Congress has been flouted.

"The NLRB must be abolished because it is unfair."

Dozens of editorials in the Wall Street Journal join in the chorus. Innumerable articles in publications of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the NAM, and other business organizations repeat the same incantations. Speeches, written by the pound, echo the same refrain. As was to be expected, the Reader's Digest joined this cynical chorus with a distorted and one-sided article in its August issue.

As chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Labor, I have a continuing concern with the policies and the administration of the Labor Act. This is an interest which is shared by many of my colleagues in the Congress, for this statute and its administration have made incalculable contributions to labor harmony and economic progress in the United States. Accordingly, I have made a study of the merits and the sources of these increasing attacks on the Labor Act, the NLRB, and the courts. I have concluded that these attacks do not reveal flaws in the law or its administration. Instead, they expose the existence of a highly organized, subtly conceived, and purposefully executed public relations campaign to mislead and to incite the public. On the basis of this campaign, its leaders apparently intend to make an unprecedented frontal assault on the Labor Act in the next Congress.

If there could be any doubt as to the purpose of this campaign, it was laid to rest by Peter J. Pestillo, labor relations manager of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, in a speech which he delivered on September 12. He said that the forthcoming national election has "particular significance for labor law reform," for employers have "much at stake and the time to start protecting that stake is

now." But how is this to be accomplished? The "public is the key," he said. William K. Zinke, vice president for industrial relations of the NAM made the same point last January when he told an audience:

Before we can take action to introduce legislation seeking major labor law reform, it is necessary to create the kind of favorable public climate which resulted in the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts.

What are the changes in the law which Mr. Pestillo and his fellow "reformers" propose, and what would be the consequence of their proposals? Let me comment on just a few of the key changes which Mr. Pestillo held out to his audience:

Eliminate the NLRB and replace it with a national labor court, or transfer its unfair labor practice cases—about 17,000 cases each year—to the U.S. district courts. The effect of this proposal would be to cripple and delay the administration of the law.

Reverse dozens of major Supreme Court and courts of appeal decisions on a variety of subjects which have upheld the NLRB's interpretation of the statute. For example, *Fiberboard Paper Products Corp. v. NLRB* (379 U.S. 203); *Joy Silk Mills v. NLRB* (185 F. 2d 732). The effect of this proposal would be to deprive employees of a whole range of rights and protections which Congress gave them.

Reverse a number of NLRB decisions concerning appropriate bargaining units, especially in the retail and insurance industries. The effect of this proposal would be to erect steep hurdles over which employees would have to jump if they decide to exercise the precious right to engage in collective bargaining with their employers.

Limit the remedies which the NLRB can fashion to prevent violations of the law. The effect of this proposal would be to assure the weakness of the law and to place a premium on violations of employee rights. The Special Subcommittee on Labor held hearings in 1967 which revealed the need for stronger remedies, not weaker ones.

Reverse a series of Supreme Court decisions which encourage private labor arbitration. The effect of this proposal would be to encourage contract violations and to force employees to strike to protect contract rights.

Eliminate the historical jurisdiction of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to review the NLRB decisions, except in rare cases actually arising in Washington, D.C. This proposal, which is a gratuitous slap in the face of the judges of one of our most distinguished and experienced Federal courts, is intended to deprive the parties of the judgment of a court which has had extensive acquaintance with the problems of administrative law and practice.

Mr. Speaker, these are merely a few of the drastic proposals which the labor law "reformers" have in mind. All of them, I believe, are contrary to the public interest. All of them, I believe, are

likely to create unprecedented labor strife in our country.

These are not new proposals. They are proposals which Congress has considered and systematically rejected, in a variety of forms, over the years. They are part of a fat package of antiworker and anti-union proposals which a "blue ribbon" committee of the chamber of commerce and the NAM have been working on since 1965, in the hope that there will be a change in administration and in the Congress next year. A distinguished Member of the other body exposed the history and objects of the "blue ribbon" committee, its "ripper" amendments and its well-financed public relations campaign in a perceptive speech delivered on August 2, and contained in the RECORD for that day.

I do not question the right of the chamber of commerce, the NAM, or any other group to propose legislative changes. Neither do I question their right to spend large amounts of their tax-exempt assets to try to persuade public opinion to support their views. My concern is twofold. First, the arguments of the labor law "reformers" are based on distortions, half-truths and hyperbole, calculated to mislead the public and the Congress as to the actual state of the law and the actual work of the NLRB. Second, their proposals are designed to deprive American workers of basic rights, to weaken the institution of collective bargaining, to jeopardize stable labor relationships, and to threaten the health and orderly progress of our economy.

It is anomalous that the very groups, which historically have fought every legislative proposal to improve the welfare of the American worker, have now piously cast themselves as his champion, and they assert that they will protect him against the laws which Congress passed and the Government agency which Congress created to protect him. There can be no mistake that their purpose is simply to strip the American workingman of protections which Congress has painstakingly enacted over a period of 33 years.

If the Chamber of Commerce, the NAM and Hill & Knowlton, their public relations firm, were truly concerned with the welfare of the American worker, why have they not expressed any sympathy for him in the past when his rights were being flagrantly violated by employers? Where were their articles, speeches, and editorials when the giant J. P. Stevens firm was found to have violated the Labor Act on repeated occasions?

Speaking of J. P. Stevens and its massive violations of the Federal law, as found by the NLRB and Federal courts, the Wall Street Journal reported on July 19 that the president of J. P. Stevens has been selected to serve as one of Mr. Nixon's "economic advisers." One can easily imagine the kind of economic and labor relations counsel that this gentleman will give Mr. Nixon.

Mr. Nixon has maintained a discreet silence on the subject of labor legislation during his campaign, but I wonder

whether his silence conceals a legislative program which his "economic advisers" may now be preparing. The Republican platform plank on labor is artfully veiled when it pledges "to prevent any administrative agency entrusted with labor law enforcement from defying the letter and spirit of these laws." What does this mean? Arthur Krock lifted this veil in the New York Times on August 7, observing that the "obvious target" of this plank is the NLRB.

Although Mr. Nixon has not publicly associated himself with these proposals to undermine the rights of American workers and to destroy the NLRB, he has chosen to associate himself with the proponents of these proposals. I have already mentioned his choice of the president of J. P. Stevens as one of his economic advisers. The press also reports that Mr. Nixon apparently relies upon the advice of the distinguished Republican Member of the other body from South Carolina, who has coauthored the Griffin-Thurmond bill—S. 1353—to abolish the NLRB and to create a national labor court with 15 judges who would serve for 20-year terms.

There have been other indications of where Mr. Nixon stands on these labor revision proposals. His condemnation of the California grape boycott, which is now being conducted by struggling California farmworkers, is well known. It is not widely known, however, that Mr. Nixon recently wrote a letter to the newspaper of the International Society of Skilled Trades. In this letter, which appeared in the June issue of the American Craftsman, Mr. Nixon made a number of ill-concealed attacks on the NLRB. He promised that, if elected President, he would take "such action as is required to conform the actions of the NLRB to the intent of Congress." In the background of the massive public relations campaign which I have just outlined, I believe that Mr. Nixon's guarded promise can be understood quite clearly.

Last year the Special Subcommittee on Labor held a series of hearings on the subject of remedies under the Labor Act. Although the report of those hearings has not yet been published, most of the witnesses testified that the Labor Act needs strengthening to make its remedies more effective. The proposals which I have discussed today would not only weaken the present remedies of the law but would also undercut existing rights of employees. It is for this reason that I call attention to this unfolding drama of distortion which has as its object to subvert our labor laws to the detriment of the American worker.

Several weeks ago the American Conservative Union published a booklet by Sylvester Petro in which he called for dismantling of the "entire election apparatus of the NLRB" and for elimination of the "collective bargaining principle" itself.

Mr. Speaker, such proposals should disturb every responsible citizen, for they threaten the welfare of individual workers and the very institution of peaceful, democratic collective bargaining.

CALIFORNIA NEGRO HISTORY

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on Friday, October 4, 1968, I placed the second three of 10 articles entitled "California Negro History" in the RECORD. This series was published by the San Francisco Examiner and written by Mr. Harry Johanesen.

I ask unanimous consent that the concluding four articles be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, July 30, 1968]

CALIFORNIA NEGRO HISTORY: THE BATTLE AGAINST CALIFORNIA PREJUDICE
(By Harry Johanesen)

California's black pioneers fought long and hard for the right to be accepted as witnesses in state court proceedings.

Beginning in 1856, they petitioned the Legislature many times, asking for repeal of the law that prohibited Afro-Americans from testifying in civil or criminal cases involving white persons.

The formal petitions, signed by both black and white citizens of prominence, followed three years of futile lobbying for repeal by members of the San Francisco Franchise League, a Negro rights organization formed in 1852.

After suffering an angry rebuff in Sacramento in 1856, the League set Dec. 9 of that year for the Second Annual Convention of the Colored Citizens of California and again chose the state capital as the site for the conclave. Sixty-one delegates from 17 counties responded.

The pre-Christmas meeting, unlike the restrained 1855 convention, produced strong statements revolving around the question of loyalty to country as well as some telling blasts at the white population in general.

THE POWER

But delegates Emory Waters of Nevada County probably best expressed the convention's more pragmatic feelings during an argument over use of the word "white" in a proposed plea for public support.

"It is essential to a good understanding of the matter that, in an address to the public generally, we should retain this word," said Waters. "We want to appeal to the whites specially, to let them know we mean something definite.

"They have the power. We know it, they know it. We appeal to them as whites to use that power beneficently toward us. We must appeal to them as superiors."

Waters' view was sustained. Records of the convention proceedings reflect both the mood and the high caliber of men who were in the fight for a citizen's basic rights in pro-slavery California.

RESOLUTION

Here is how Samuel B. Hyer, San Joaquin County delegate, felt about the law invalidating the testimony of Afro-Americans in courts of law:

"This deprivation subjects us to many outrages and aggressions by wicked and unprincipled white men. By it, prejudice is aroused against us that would not exist but for this statute."

The loyalty issue arose over a proposed resolution saying:

"Resolved, that we claim our rights in this country as any other class, not as citizens

by adoption, but by right of birth; that we hail with delight its onward progress, sympathize with it in its adversity, and would freely cast our lot in the fortunes of battle to protect her against foreign invasion."

Delegate William H. Newby of San Francisco objected to the statements hailing the Nation's progress and committing Negroes to rush to her defense against aggressors.

"No man can expect me to do this in a country whose prosperity and wealth have been built upon our sweat and blood," he said.

"What is the history of the past in America but the history of wrongs and cruelties such as no other people upon the face of the earth have been forced to endure? The same institutions that bless the white men are made the curse of the colored man . . ."

"Let the whites put away their prejudice and hatred against the colored man and do a just part by us. And when they do this, we shall feel we have a country—that patriotism is a virtue."

HATED THE LAW

Delegate James Hubbard of Sacramento said he loved the land of his birth but hated "the laws which sustain her slave pens and prisons, her auction blocks and the selling of human beings, the branding of men and the scourging of women, the separation of man and wife, parents and children. Fight for the protection of these, no!"

Other delegates argued successfully against altering the resolution.

Thomas Dettner, a Sacramento County delegate, delivered the most effective argument for changing the testimony law. Shrewdly aiming his remarks at the white man, he said:

"The law relating to our testimony in the courts of California is but a shadow. It affords no protection to our families or property.

"I may see the assassin plunge his dagger to the vitals of my neighbor, yet in the eyes of the law I see it not. I may overhear the robber or incendiary plotting the injury or the utter ruin of my fellow citizen, and yet in the judgment of the law I hear it not.

"The robbery may follow, the conflagration may do its work, and the author of evil may go unpunished because only a colored man saw the act or heard the plot. . . ."

"Is it not evident that the white citizen is an equal sufferer with us? When will the people of this state learn that justice to the colored man is justice to themselves?"

ELECTIONS

Nevertheless, the State of California continued to exclude Negroes from testifying for or against white persons until 1863—two years after the beginning of the Civil War.

Many opponents of Negro testimony had been defeated at the 1862 election, paving the way for introduction of a successful bill by Senator Richard F. Perkins of San Francisco.

The Perkins bill amended the law to permit Negro testimony in all court cases, but it prohibited "Mongolians, Chinese, Indians" and persons of one-half or more Indian blood from giving evidence in favor of or against a white person. The entire law was finally repealed in 1872.

Hittel's History of California, in recording the 1863 amendment, stated:

"It was one of the glories of the Legislature of 1863 that it made the first break in the illiberal and disgraceful provisions of the Legislature of 1850, that no black or mulatto person or Indian should be permitted to give evidence in any court of the State in an action in which a white person was a party."

Jubilant San Francisco leaders of the colored convention movement now directed fire at the law prohibiting Negroes from participating in elections or holding public office.

The suffrage question had been discussed at statewide conventions in a half-hearted

manner, doubtless because it was considered a hopeless issue until the right to testify had been won.

It became the major black demand in 1864, but public feeling against allowing Negroes to vote continued strong for several years—so strong that in 1867 San Francisco Democrats won an election largely on the issue of preventing Negroes and Orientals from voting.

Voters in other states eventually settled the issue for the entire country by approving a constitutional amendment granting Negroes the right to vote in U.S. elections.

The 15th Amendment, which was not ratified by California, became the law of the land after national adoption in 1869.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, July 31, 1968]

NINETY YEARS AGO: HOW SCHOOL INTEGRATION BEGAN IN SAN FRANCISCO

(By Harry Johanesen)

San Francisco had its own history-making "Little James Meridith Case" almost a century ago.

The emotion-laden episode, a remarkable harbinger of events in this century at the University of Mississippi, Little Rock and elsewhere in the South, had its beginning on September 24, 1872.

On that day a Negro child named Mary Frances Ward tried to integrate the Broadway Grammar School, a public school dedicated to the education of white children only.

On the same day the California State Supreme Court agreed to consider a petition filed on behalf of Mary Frances, whose determined father demanded that his daughter be admitted to the school, her blackness notwithstanding.

It was a test case challenging the constitutionality of California laws banning children of African, Mongolian or Indian descent from public schools.

Negro parents throughout the state financed the court action after a long and unsuccessful campaign to change the law.

In 1885, the school laws had ignored non-white children. One law simply required "50 heads of white families" to petition for establishment of a school if they wanted one. The state would then support it.

In 1860, Negroes, Mongolians and Indians were specifically excluded by law from public schools, and any school accepting them could have had its state support funds cut off by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

The law at that time regarded the children of non-white parents as "prohibited parties." It provided that separate schools should be set up for them in districts where parents of ten or more submitted applications in writing for such a school.

LET-ME-IN GESTURE

In 1866, non-white children who lived "under the care of white people" could be admitted to public schools by a majority vote of local school boards.

Little Mary Frances Ward's knock at the door of the Broadway Grammar School was a let-me-in gesture just as significant as James Meridith's was to be in his introduction of the black race to Mississippi University exactly 90 years later.

And San Francisco Attorney J. W. Dwindelle, in his 1872 appearance before the State Supreme Court on behalf of Mary Frances Ward, delivered arguments the United States Supreme Court again was to hear and act favorably upon in 1954.

"These colored children of African descent who are citizens have the right to be admitted to all the public schools of the State and cannot be compelled to resort to separate schools for colored children," Dwindelle told the court.

"We are told that by a just exercise of the police power of the Legislature these dis-

inctions of color may be lawfully made and enforced.

LAST RESORT

"The police power! Gracious heavens! This is the power always invoked in desperate cases. The police power—the last resort of the tyrant, the last weapon for the assassination of written constitutions and of free institutions."

Dwindelle contended that segregation of school children violated the Bill of Rights and the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution.

The three-member court ruled that non-white children could not be legally excluded from public schools by reason of race or color if there were no separate and equal schools for them.

Events preceding the victorious decision for Mary Frances Ward had thoroughly aroused black communities throughout the state.

In Oakland, a colored school had been closed when Negro parents who lived in the vicinity had to move out of the district to areas where they could find employment. The children had no school near their new homes.

The few remaining Negro families in the district where the school was closed managed to get their children into white schools and some white parents immediately withdrew their children in protest.

SCHOOL CLOSED

The closing of a colored school in San Francisco around the same time had been recorded in "The Negro Trail Blazers of California," a book written in 1919 by Delilah Beasley. Mrs. Beasley recounted the incident in these words:

"The Board of Education closed the Broadway School, not because there were not enough colored children attending to keep it open, but because, as one member of the Board of Education said: 'It was a nuisance.'

"When asked to explain his remark more fully, he said, 'It was too close to a white school on the same street.'"

After months of campaigning by leaders of the Colored Convention Movement, the Oakland school board finally agreed to admit children of African descent to public schools in the fall of 1872.

The board evidently had seen the handwriting on the wall. Two bills pending in the Legislature at the time provided that all children should be admitted to public schools, regardless of color, and Negro determination to take the issue to court was crystallizing.

APPALLED

The first school for Afro-American children in San Francisco was opened May 22, 1854, according to the diary of the Rev. J. B. Sanderson, a Negro intellectual who was born and educated in Massachusetts.

Sanderson came to San Francisco in 1853 and was appalled to learn that Negro children in California were "prohibited parties" to the public schools.

Surmounting great difficulties, Sanderson founded schools for the neglected youngsters of his race in Sacramento, Stockton and San Francisco.

Sanderson's diary contains the following 1854 report of the San Francisco Board of Education to the Common Council:

"A school for the colored population of our city has been established. It is located at the corner of Jackson and Virginia Place in the basement of the St. Cyprian Methodist Church.

"The lower room, which is 11 feet high and 50 by 25 feet surface, is well lighted, ventilated and has its walls hard-finished. This we have leased for one year, with the privilege of two years, at the monthly rental of \$50, payable monthly in advance."

In 1861, the school report said a new school for colored children had been erected

on Broadway at a cost of about \$5500 for the lot, building and fixtures.

FIRST PUBLIC SCHOOL

Race didn't figure in any way in the planning for California's first public school.

This keystone institution was established in San Francisco in 1848, two years before Congress admitted California to the Union. The event was recorded for posterity in Bancroft's History of California as follows:

"On the 24th of September 1847, the (San Francisco) Town Council appointed a committee consisting of William A. Leidesdorff, William Clark and William Glover to take measures for the establishing of a public school.

"A school house was erected on Portsmouth Square, dignified by the name of Public Institute, and on the 3rd of April, 1848, the school house was opened by Thomas Douglass, a Yale graduate, who received a salary of \$1000 a year.

"From this beginning has grown, with some interruptions, the public school system of California."

At the very beginning then, of what now is a multi-billion dollar educational system in the Nation's most populous state, an Afro-American played a major role.

William A. Leidesdorff, one of The City's first prominent citizens, was a part-African sea captain born in the West Indies.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, Aug. 1, 1968]

CALIFORNIA NEGRO HISTORY: THE BLACK'S CONCERN FOR ALL OPPRESSED

(By Harry Johansen)

Negroes in 19th Century California experienced some relief from prejudice against their race in the aftermath of great national calamities.

Their fortunes turned upward for a decade in the '60s as the Nation locked in civil war and then struggled to recover from the war and the assassination of President Lincoln.

They had won the right to testify in California courts during the war and their right to vote was granted in 1870 with adoption of the 15th amendment to the constitution.

Six months after Lee's surrender at Appomatox, California's Negro leaders turned their efforts toward problems of education and employment for black people.

But their concerns, brought to public attention at the fourth State Convention of Colored Citizens in Sacramento on Oct. 5, 1865, also embraced the oppressed elsewhere in the world, notably in Poland, Hungary and Ireland.

WANTED TO HELP IRISH

A formal expression of the convention sympathized with the oppressed of all nations, offered to extend American Negro aid to free them from bondage, and resolved:

"That the results of the late unfortunate and unsuccessful revolutions of Poland and Hungary to free those countries from the tyranny of Russia and Austria cause regret and commiseration to every friend of human liberty.

"That notwithstanding the opposition we receive from Irish immigrants in America, whose prejudices against us are excited by the misnamed Democratic Party, every effort to rid Ireland of English bondage and establish Irish independence meets our cordial approbation."

William H. Yates, a San Francisco delegate who had bought his freedom from slavery in Washington, D.C., told the convention:

"I would like to see 40 regiments of Irishmen defended by 40 regiments of blacks. I would gladly be one of those to go across the Atlantic and help give liberty to the oppressed of Ireland."

Yates was employed as a chief steward by the California Steamship Navigation Company of San Francisco.

The convention leaders, recognizing lack of education as a major factor contributing

to prejudice against black people, urged Negro parents to aim their children at "the same high order of education developed among the white race."

SOLD FIVE TIMES

Why black people generally had little or no education was poignantly illustrated in an address by delegate D. W. Ruggles, an ex-slave who had been sold five times on the auction block in Louisiana.

While serving his fifth master, Ruggles related, he was befriended by an Englishman who was in the process of teaching him the alphabet when his master found out about this basic academic exercise.

The master reproved his English friend, telling the astonished visitor he was liable to imprisonment by the state for helping to educate a Negro in bondage. Ruggles, thereafter, taught himself to read and write by firelight.

In its final message to the state's 4086 Negro adults, the convention emphasized:

"To gain eminence in the new field of political equality, toward which our journey tends, we must prove ourselves equal in art, industry and labor, as well as in knowledge and piety, to all others. We must not be satisfied with mediocrity; we must endeavor to excel."

SOUGHT RAILROAD JOBS

In another message seeking mass employment for idle Negroes, the convention recommended the hiring of 20,000 to 30,000 "freed men" to work on the transcontinental railroad then under construction.

It pointed out to the railroad builders that Negro workers could not only build a railroad but could also "effectually settle the too frequent incursions of hostile Indians" on construction zones.

More and more Negroes came to California during the years after the 1865 convention until their total number reached 30,000 in 1893.

In July of that year, the Afro-American League of San Francisco called the first statewide congress of Afro-American Leagues to deal once again with education and employment problems besetting black people.

The congress convened July 30 at California Hall, then located at 620 Bush Street, with delegates from numerous counties attending.

That prejudice based primarily on skin color still blocked the Negro's economic and social advancement at that time was clearly demonstrated by some advertisements in the convention program.

One advertisement inserted by a fabric firm proclaimed: "The color line is not recognized by our house."

NEED FOR UNITY

The convention emphasized needs for racial unity, self-improvement, a generally higher level of jobs for Negroes, and took pride in the local league's three year old employment program.

A report to the convention said these jobs had been obtained for certain members out of employment:

One U.S. mail carrier; one U.S. gauger; two U.S. mail clerks; 13 porters; one railroad clerk; three messengers; three clerks in departments of the municipal government of San Francisco; 60 deputy U.S. marshals as election officers; one painter and one gardener in the school department; 11 laborers in Golden Gate Park and one lady attendant at the park playground. (Total hired by The City: 17.)

Some delegates deplored the "prevailing desire" of black people to be employed in menial jobs and said this should be corrected by a healthier desire to launch businesses of their own.

ESTABLISH BUSINESS

Accordingly, the convention urged Negro men and women to establish business enterprises on a cooperative basis and in competition with white-owned firms where they were denied jobs as clerks or sales people.

All the delegates pledged themselves to do everything in their power to "inspire the youths of our race to qualify for employment in the store, the factory, the counting house, the different trades and all the other industries of life."

Speakers at the congress included Mayor Adolph Sutro, J. J. Neimore, editor and founder of the California Eagle, a Negro newspaper published in Los Angeles, and Mrs. Sarah B. Cooper.

Mrs. Cooper, a prominent white woman who was associated with Mrs. Leland Stanford, Mrs. Phoebe Apperson Hearst and Mrs. Miranda Lux in educational projects for children, delivered an address entitled, "The Home—the True Foundation of the State."

A resolution adopted unanimously at the close of the convention called for annual New Year's Day celebrations of Emancipation Day by local Afro-American Leagues.

Theophilus B. Morton of San Francisco, who was elected president of the federated Afro-American Leagues, presented the resolution. Morton at that time was a messenger for the U.S. Court of Appeals. He later became the court's librarian.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, Aug. 2, 1968]

CALIFORNIA NEGRO HISTORY: WAR BROUGHT NEGRO INFLUX TO SAN FRANCISCO AND CHANGING STATUS

(By Harry Johanesen)

Most Californians swung into the 20th Century with high hopes for 100 years of prosperity for their own generation and those to come.

But these great expectations were not shared by the state's black residents, including about 1000 who lived in San Francisco at the time.

Most Negro pioneers and their offspring still were seeking a piece of the job action above the level of servant, janitor or bootblack.

Employment prospects for black people were practically non-existent, just as they were almost everywhere else in the Nation.

Nevertheless, many thousands continued to emigrate from the South, settling mostly in northern and border states. They felt practically no lure at all to the West and gave San Francisco a wide berth.

In 1910, there were 1642 Negroes in San Francisco. In 1920, after a world war had passed into history, their number had increased to 2414, a scarcely noticeable gain of 772.

This small rate of increase continued over the next two decades. In 1930 the total was 3803; in 1940, 4846.

TENFOLD INCREASE

The next decade brought a staggering tenfold increase as World War II and California's major role in the war effort generated a massive movement of Negroes to war production centers.

By 1950 there were 43,520 Negroes living in San Francisco. In 1960, 15 years after the war ended, the total had climbed to 74,383, and in 1967 to 97,000—13 percent of the total population as compared with .8 percent of the total in 1940.

But even before the war brought Negro workers to California in such great numbers, there were Negro voices demanding a better shake for black people in defense industries spending billions of dollars getting ready for the war.

One booming voice was that of C. L. Dellums, who came to San Francisco from Texas in 1925, hoping to work his way through the University of California law school.

Dellums turned to the Pullman Company for a job soon after he found out he couldn't get one in San Francisco. The results of his job-seeking efforts illustrate the situation in which Negro residents found themselves during the roaring 20s.

WELL QUALIFIED

"I applied for a waiter's job at the leading hotels," Dellums recalls. "I was well qualified, having worked as a waiter in the finest hotels in Texas, but in San Francisco they were shocked to have a Negro ask for a job other than bootblack."

"There were no jobs for Negroes at San Francisco hotels, much less a room for one."

Dellums, who founded the Western Regional Headquarters of the NAACP, joined the ranks of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters and was elected to the post of international vice president, a job he still holds today with headquarters in Oakland.

Remembering his frustrating job hunt in San Francisco, he became an effective disciple of A. Philip Randolph, international president of the union and a civil rights leader. Randolph and Dellums wanted equal employment opportunities for minorities.

The determined Negro leaders, supported by numerous and prominent white citizens in labor, the church and Jewish organizations, threatened a mass march on Washington in the summer of 1941.

President Roosevelt, long accustomed to direct action, extinguished the threat by issuing his famous Executive Order 8802, prohibiting discrimination in employment by recipients of defense contracts and by those in charge of government vocational education programs.

OPENED THE DOOR

Roosevelt's order opened the door to many thousands of jobs for Negro workers.

Four Kaiser Shipyards in Richmond employed 10,000 Negroes after the White House acted and after Dellums convinced the Kaiser interests a vast pool of minority workers was being overlooked by the war effort.

Many students of the civil rights movement regard Roosevelt's order as the breakthrough of the century in the Negro's battle for equal rights.

But others regard it as only one of a great number of events that have pulled the racial problem to the forefront of America's affairs, touching the lives of all citizens.

For example, they point to the contributions of three great athletes in riveting the attention of the Nation to minority problems long dismissed with a shrug by most Americans.

The Nation jerked to attention when Jackie Robinson integrated major league sports, when Walter Gordon, a University of California Wonder Team star, integrated the Berkeley police department, and when Willie Mays took part in the integration of Mount Davidson.

FEDERAL JUDGE

Gordon, now a federal judge in the Virgin Islands, answered the question as to whether a Negro could be an effective police officer in a predominantly white community. For several years he was the only Negro on the Berkeley municipal payroll.

Major state laws affecting the rights of Negroes and other minorities in California have been enacted in the past two decades, but they didn't stop Watts from blowing up or prevent less serious racial outbreaks in San Francisco and other communities.

Most far-reaching were the 1959 Fair Employment Practices Act and the 1963 Fair Housing Act, both of them authored by William Bryon Rumford, a former Berkeley Assemblyman.

The FEP Act declares that it is the public policy of California to protect and safeguard the right and opportunity of all persons to seek, obtain, and hold employment without discrimination or abridgement on account of race, religious creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

It recognizes equal opportunity as a civil right and empowers the Fair Employment Practices Commission to administer its provisions. Enactment came after more than 14 years of campaigning by the California Com-

mittee for Fair Practices, cochaired by Dellums.

DOORS UNLOCKED

The Fair Housing Act, also administered by the FEP Commission, declares that discrimination because of race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry in housing violates public policy. It also establishes methods of preventing and remedying violations.

Thus, Negroes in California have come a long way since pioneer days when their children were confined to segregated schools, when they were denied the right to vote or hold public office, when they were denied the right to testify in state courts and the right to participate in the homesteading of public lands.

Today they hold thousands of non-menial jobs in numerous businesses, industries and municipal government agencies; they hold public office and judgeships, they hold high level jobs by political appointment, and they are members of commissions and school boards in many communities—San Francisco, Oakland, Berkeley and Palo Alto, to name a few of the latter.

"We've removed the locks from the doors for them" says Dellums, who has been a member of the FEP Commission by appointment of former Gov. Edmund G. Brown since its inception. "If they find one locked, we can open it for them—or kick it in."

CONCERN FOR THE QUIET AMERICANS

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, we have been seeing news photos and stories filled with the unwashed, the dissatisfied, and the disloyal for some time now. It sometimes seems as if society's dropouts have managed to monopolize news coverage. But I recently read a moving letter in the Evening Star newspaper—September 26, 1968—from the mother of some of the men who are called on to protect us when dissident elements try to take the law into their own hands. I feel that this letter is an eloquent piece of testimony for the millions of silent Americans who have seen their opposite numbers gain ground, prestige, and publicity at the expense of common decency and the common good. I include it in the RECORD:

WHAT OF THE QUIET CRIES?

SIR: When I finish reading The Star these days, just as during the Democratic convention in Chicago, I put it aside with a feeling of despair. I am exhausted from the tense, fierce journalism so evident in our current newspapers.

Most people in this nation need a hint of reasonableness in their lives once more—a believable attitude on the part of the press—a less than violent approach to something—anything!

The news media, as a whole, are dragging a weary, heartsick, confused public in their wake. Most members of the press seems oblivious to the fact that they could help the nation immeasurably by striking a note of moderation—by injecting restraint into news stories—regardless of the subject matter or point of view.

"PIGS"; "DOGS"; "NAZIS"

My present husband and older son are in the District of Columbia National Guard; our younger son left college to enlist in the Army in late spring. For many months now I have listened and read and been patient; try as

I might I cannot see my husband and sons as "pigs," "dogs," or "Nazis"—or as anything other than men who have assumed the responsibilities that events at this time have thrust upon their shoulders.

The father of my sons (who is no longer living) was a Jew; he was also an officer in the U.S. Army during the Second World War. You may imagine that it is heartbreaking to me to hear the Guardsmen in Chicago (and in Washington, D.C., during last October's "Peace March") saluted as Nazis—and their function equated with that of the Gestapo.

It has been of great concern to the news media if the young demonstrator in Grant or Lincoln Park suffers from disillusionment or psychological injury; it is of equal concern to me that my sons overcome their anguish and dismay when they hear themselves described in such ugly and exaggerated terms. I can only rely on their intelligent restraint when they are baited in this manner, and hope that they can recognize the hypocrisy involved. My grief and distress at their plight are genuine; why has the press not sought to protect their feelings as young Americans? I cannot recall a single article in the local papers in the past year which was based on, or even sympathetic to, their viewpoint.

SUFFER AS PROFOUNDLY

I have outlined the circumstances in this household to point out that there are young people in this nation whose hearts and minds have suffered as profoundly as have those of the "disillusioned" protester—but who have remained less vocal, less strident; in order to prevent further strife and polarization in this nation—which they truly love. I sincerely hope my family can withstand the strain of pressures from the extremists—but the time has come when we could use support and understanding.

I cannot stress enough that reasonableness, a lack of vindictiveness and, most especially, careful reporting in our newspapers are essential for the citizens of this nation at this time.

SUSAN W. WAITTE.

ARMY SGT. JEFFREY A. DAVIS—HE
KNEW WHY HE DIED

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, a most poignant letter appeared in the September 27 edition of the Arizona Daily Wildcat, published by the University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz. It is especially moving when one considers the infantile conduct of the so-called yuppies during last week's hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The testimony in some aspects was terrifying. The most charitable description of the activities of these pre-Halloweenish clowns borders on the obscene.

So it is especially appealing to me when a student newspaper of the stature of the Wildcat runs the following letter as its lead editorial. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Army Sgt. Jeffrey A. Davis, who died in Vietnam in September, be printed in the RECORD.

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

HE KNEW WHY HE DIED

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article is the story of Army Sgt. Jeffrey A. Davis and his death. He died in Vietnam this month—but at least he knew what he was fighting . . . and dying for.)

The letter left to the bride of Army Sgt. Jeffrey A. Davis was marked "To be opened only in the event of my death."

Sergeant Davis, 20, of Brownsburg, Ind., was killed in Vietnam Sept. 4 and his bride of four months opened the letter to find it was a legacy for "the guys with the long hair and protest signs."

"It is too bad I had to die in another country . . . but at least I died for a reason and a good one," the letter read.

"I died for the guys with the long hair and protest signs. The draft card burners, the hippies, the anti-everything people who have nothing better to do. The college kids who think they shouldn't have to serve because they are too good.

"I died so those people could have a little longer time to get straightened out in life. God knows they need it.

"I died so those members of the 'young generation' could have the right to do what they do. To protest, have long hair, go to the college of their choice, wear weird clothes and run around mixed up with no direction at all.

"I died so they could protest the war I fought and died in.

"I died for the United States."

CAPPING THE RECORD

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to submit for the RECORD an editorial from the Wyoming State Tribune of Cheyenne, Wyo., of September 26, 1968.

The editorial expresses what I am sure is of the feeling of many of BILL HARRISON's friends here in the House and he has many.

BILL came to the Congress in the 82d. His service here has been brilliant, and he shall surely be missed. The editorial follows:

CAPPING THE RECORD

"I have no personal political interest in the remarks I make today," said Congressman William Henry Harrison of Wyoming in a House speech yesterday. "I will not henceforth be concerned professionally with the future of the Central Arizona Project, nor the incalculable problems which will be its progeny. My purpose in these remarks is to lay the foundation for the introduction of a bill which addresses itself to Wyoming's chief concern at this point with the Central Arizona Project."

One can hardly have been surprised at the Wyoming congressman's remarks as to his own future. At 72, defeated in his primary election for a sixth term, it was indicated at the moment of defeat that William Henry Harrison, insofar as Congress was concerned, had wound up his career in the U.S. House of Representatives. The day after the election, Bill Harrison remarked philosophically to a friend who called to offer condolences that defeat happens to people who dwell too long on fickle public gratitude.

It did not matter in Wyoming that Mr. Harrison, at 72 an energetic man, far better preserved mentally and physically than his peer group, had an exemplary public service record; his party turned him out anyway. Nor did it matter that this defeat came by

a bare 1,000-vote margin, it was defeat nevertheless.

Yet, in keeping with his personal dedication and integrity, Bill Harrison continued to do his duty where others would have sat down and said, "the hell with it."

He offered this bill, of which he spoke and in which he referred in passing to his own departure from the House of Representatives, to help shore up a legal record for some future day when it will become necessary to go to court to protect Wyoming's water rights from seizure by other states.

So once more Mr. Harrison has done his duty by this state.

In the kind of 72 years of living that Bill Harrison has managed to achieve, he remains too forward-looking and too vigorous to retire, and too healthy and vital to die. It is our hope he shall have a bright new future with a new Republican administration in Washington.

REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I have just finished writing another yearend report to my constituents in the 19th District of Illinois concerning the activities and accomplishments of the 90th Congress and my participation in them. With unanimous consent I insert that report to be printed at this point in the RECORD so that my colleagues will be advised of the contents:

DEAR FRIENDS: As the 90th Congress draws to a close, it is proper to reflect and to summarize what has been achieved and what remains as unfinished business.

ACHIEVEMENTS

This Congress has passed a 13% raise in social security benefits; a mass of consumer legislation—some of it good, some of it already needing revision, but most of it indicating a new awareness by the Congress for consumer demands—including truth-in-lending, meat inspection, poultry inspection, and raising the standards required for flammable fabrics, to name a few; and major conservation legislation, including funding of the Air Quality Act, establishment of a National Water Commission to review the water resources of our Nation, legislation providing for a National Redwoods Park, a National Trails System, a National Scenic River System, and a Great Swamp Wilderness. However, much remains to be done in the field of conservation, especially with respect to air and water pollution.

Also, the House of Representatives approved a \$72-billion defense appropriation for fiscal year 1969, which is the highest in the history of our country and of which over \$30-billion is going to the war in Vietnam; a foreign aid program that has been reduced to its lowest level since its inception; and an anti-poverty program, which was somewhat revised to provide more local government participation. In addition, two raises in the debt limit ceiling were approved to permit our government to go further into legal debt; and a 10% tax surcharge was passed as part of a package including mandatory reductions in Federal spending. Veterans' benefits have been increased, and a bill was passed to protect veterans from pension cuts as a result of increased social security benefits.

This Congress also passed an Omnibus Crime Control Act, which, I am proud to say, includes the provisions of two bills that I originally introduced, as well as an amend-

ment introduced by Congressman Bill Cahill and me which provided for the allocation of Federal funds to the States in the form of block grants to permit meaningful state participation in helping local law enforcement agencies to develop better training, research, improved communications, and other innovative projects.

Also, a Federal Housing Act was approved which hopefully will meet the tremendous demands for low income housing resulting from a multitude of causes, including a poorly administered urban renewal program through which poor people are being moved from their homes in some cities without any adequate provisions for replacement housing being made available to them.

In addition, other measures that were approved include a civil rights act which makes it a Federal offense to cross state lines for purposes of inciting a riot; a Federal open housing statute; a bill designed to protect civil rights workers in lawful pursuit of their activities; a firearms control act which bans the interstate sale of firearms and most ammunition to persons other than licensed dealers; a revised Federal aid to education program that permits more state participation, but which may not be adequately funded; expansion of a teacher corps program designed to encourage teachers to go into low income areas to teach and, which I, as a freshman observer, believe has a great deal of merit; as well as many other bills of less major significance.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

At the present time the American farmer is suffering the consequences of a terrific cost-price squeeze which has caused an estimated 2,200 farms in Illinois to close this year. In my opinion, there was no meaningful farm legislation enacted by the 90th Congress. We must come up with a program designed to permit our farmers to participate in the economic growth of the rest of the country. The farm program under which we have been operating for the past few years was scheduled to expire on December 31, 1969. Rather than extend it at this time, I would have preferred to have the Congress attempt to improve it early next year. If they were not successful, it could have always been extended, if necessary, before it expired at the end of next year. However, the Congress approved a one-year extension of the program.

There is an obvious need for electoral college reform, as well as election reform generally which would include guidelines to indicate what is proper and what is improper where campaign funds are concerned. A legislative reorganization act is urgently needed that, along with other things, will improve the present seniority system and committee system in the Congress, provide adequate minority staffing for Congressional committees, and generally streamline legislative procedures.

It is my belief that income tax exemptions should be increased to realistically reflect the great increase in the cost of living since 1948, the last time the exemption was raised to the current \$600. As a matter of fact, I introduced a bill to increase the exemption from \$600 to \$1,000, but was never able to get a hearing on it. Tax credits are needed to help parents who are sending their children to college, as well as to encourage industry to train unemployed and unskilled workers so that they can find jobs. Under present job training programs, all too often jobs have not been available after unskilled people have been trained with a particular skill. In other words, there has been no proper followthrough to see that jobs are available once the trainees have been trained. Also, I feel that there should be a mandatory retirement age for Federal judges, similar to the one in effect in Illinois, which would require Federal judges to retire at age 70. These are what I consider to be the major pieces of

legislation before the 90th Congress which did not receive final action. It is my hope that future Congresses will soon act on these important measures.

VISITORS AND EVENTS

A Congressman has many duties and responsibilities to fulfill as part of the obligations of the office. These have kept me very busy. Almost 900 residents of the 19th Congressional District of Illinois have visited me in my Washington office this year. This is in addition to the more than 1,000 persons who visited me during 1967. Also, this year I have made 29 separate trips back to the District, including the three and one-half weeks I was there during the August recess. I have attended 117 receptions, luncheons, and dinners in Washington this year, in addition to many more in the District, and have attended 57 committee meetings, including task force meetings. In addition, I have filed 7 outside speaking engagements and attended 8 conferences this year. In April I testified before the Illinois Senate Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Law Enforcement on the role of the states in crime prevention and law enforcement, as envisioned by the President's Crime Commission and the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. However, I still have maintained a 91.7% attendance record, through the end of September, on 361 record votes taken this year in the House. Also, I have introduced or cosponsored a total of 17 pieces of legislation this year.

SERVING YOU

One of the most rewarding aspects of my job as your representative in Washington has been to assist the approximately 1,500 persons in the 19th Congressional District who have asked me for help with their individual problems. In many cases we have been able to expedite or cut through the red tape for these individuals in such matters as social security benefits, military and veterans' affairs, immigration and others. Also, many municipalities and local government and community agencies have requested help in obtaining funds for much needed projects. Two of my secretaries in Washington have devoted full time to answering these requests for help from these constituents.

LEGISLATIVE RESPONSIBILITY

As I wrote you in my year-end report of last year, one of my major objectives, while in Congress, has been to reverse the trend we have seen over the past several years toward increasing the power of the Federal Government. I have been an initiator and strong supporter of legislation which is designed to increase the power of the states and local agencies, particularly in the use and distribution of Federal funds.

Also, as a member of the House Judiciary Committee and a member of Subcommittee Number 5, which handles all crime legislation, most of my efforts have been focused on combatting the crime problem that is facing the country today. It is a complex problem because it involves so many different types of misconduct caused by so many different motivations—organized crime, juvenile and adult streets crimes, and crimes related to civil disorders. All of these offenses have been on the increase and the most recent FBI statistics indicate an 89% increase in the crime rate since 1960. It is my belief that any attack on crime must concentrate with concerted attention on the law enforcement process itself. It is not enough to say that we must first determine the causes before taking action to combat the existing problem. We must continue to research the causes and at the same time we must deal with the existing problem by enforcing the present laws.

PERSONAL CONTACTS

During the last twenty-one months, we have made a practice of having periodic office

hours in each of the counties in the District. The response to this has been tremendous. It has given us an opportunity to hear and learn first-hand of the problems confronting the people in the District. It has also meant that I could give personal attention to urgent problems that required immediate attention.

In addition, during the past two years, I have had several meetings with various occupational groups throughout the District. For example, I have held five separate meetings during the past year and a half with farmers representing all eight counties in the District. These were informal, give-and-take sessions where farm problems were discussed frankly and openly, and recommendations for possible solutions were made. I personally felt that they were extremely beneficial.

I have met at various times with different groups of persons throughout the District to discuss general problems. For example, business, labor, church, youth, postal, conservationist and many other groups have asked me to meet with them and discuss such things as the tax increase, the war in Vietnam, and gun control legislation. I have enjoyed these meetings and have learned a great deal from them.

Also, each year I have sent out a questionnaire to all of the residents in the 19th District in an attempt to learn their opinions on many of the issues facing the Congress. Here again the response to these has been tremendous. Many people have expressed their opinions on the major issues facing our country today. The results of these have been of great value to me in determining how I would vote on many of the bills that have come before the Congress.

ACADEMY APPOINTMENTS

The United States Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs, Colorado; Military Academy at West Point, New York; and Naval Academy at Annapolis, Maryland, have all informed me that the 19th Congressional District will have vacancies to fill in the class entering in 1969. To be eligible for appointment, the young men must be unmarried and never have been married; and have a satisfactory prior academic record and ability to pass the entrance examinations—both medical and academic. The young men must be at least 17 years of age and not have passed their 22nd birthday before admittance to the Academy.

If you are or know of someone who is interested, please write to me as soon as possible. The Academies would like to have names submitted to them before the end of the year, if possible. Thank you.

WRITE ME

It is not always possible to meet you personally and sit down and discuss things. If there is ever anything that I can do to help you, please write me at 1122 House Office Building, Washington, D.C., 20515, or contact my District Representative, Ben Polk, at 211 19th Street, Room 228, Rock Island, Illinois. He is always more than willing to help you in anyway that he can during my absences from the District.

Best wishes,

TOM RAILBACK.

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the week of October 20 to 26, the Nation will once again observe National Business Women's Week.

This annual observance gives all of us an opportunity to salute anew the millions of women in our national labor force and calls special attention to the increasingly important role being played by women in all fields of endeavor today.

As a woman in the Congress, as well as a member of the Aurora, Ill., Business and Professional Women's Club, I am proud that women all across the country are taking such an active interest in all legislative matters affecting their homes and their communities. The more than 3,800 clubs with over 180,000 members throughout the United States are affording commendable leadership to women everywhere, and I think the legislative purposes of this outstanding organization are particularly noteworthy. As adopted by their national convention in Minneapolis last July, they are:

To elevate standards for the employed woman, to promote her interests, to create a spirit of cooperation, to expand opportunities through industrial, scientific, and vocational activities, to secure equal consideration under the law, and to establish conditions which assure both men and women the fullest opportunity and reward for the development of their capacities to the maximum potential.

To consider the place and responsibility of the employed woman as a concerned citizen in the complex democratic society of the United States, and to strengthen the role of this Nation in world affairs.

I hope all of you will join with me in applauding the achievements of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., during National Business Women's Week this month.

THE SPIRIT THAT REFLECTS AMERICA'S GREATNESS

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, recently the cost of war fell heavily upon a family in my district. A gallant marine was killed in action while on night patrol in Thua Pien, Vietnam. His body was returned to his homeland and last Saturday he was laid at rest in his native city of Rome, N. Y. He was John Tanney, the 19-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. Donald Tanney. He also left two brothers, Tom and Bob, and a sister, Cindy.

When I visited this bereaved family, I glimpsed a spirit which reflects the greatness of America. The surviving parents showed me a letter which John had left for his curlyheaded, 17-month-old brother, Bob. This letter was intended to express for all time his love for the little brother and his concern for the world in which he would live. But it says much more than that—it reveals the innermost feelings of a boy who at an early age had overcome selfishness and fear. It portrays his pride in his manhood, his love of country and his faith in his cause.

With the permission of the family, I am sharing John's letter in the hope that

its tender, but stirring, message will inspire others to live as nobly and courageously as he died. John would wish that.

APRIL 7, 1968.

DEAR BROTHER BOB ("BIRD"): I know that you won't be able to read this for awhile, but I just felt a compulsion to write to you anyway.

I'm waiting to be picked up by helicopter with the rest of my buddies, to push on to Hills 861, 881, 881 north and 689. My platoon is spearheading the assault up Hill 881 north. The enemy has many soldiers up top and they are dug in as good as we are at Khe Sanh. It will be a hard and bitter struggle, but as always, we Marines will take the objective.

You are little now and haven't the slightest idea of what is going on in the world. But what we are doing here, concerns all. It is important for you to remember, that we are fighting for freedom for Vietnam. The Bible says, "I am my brother's keeper." This is true also for our Vietnamese brothers.

Someday, when you come of age, you too will render your services to your Country. You do not have to join the Marine Corps because I did. Just fulfill your duty—your privilege. Yes, it is a privilege to fight for a noble cause. War is far, far, worse than hell. Men are torn apart like a worn out rag doll. War has a smell to it. It is the rotten smell of charred flesh. War has sounds. They are the screams of men dying. Bob—I hope that you will never have to go to war. I hope that we can stop this from spreading. I hope that the men of peace will sit down and discuss living in peace—but, alas, I hope in vain.

I am nearly going crazy thinking about assaulting that hill. But I am a Marine, and I shall not falter. I will be confident in the Lord and my training as a Marine. Bob—if anything should happen, remember this, I am fighting for what I believe in—you, Mom, Dad, Tom & Cindy. I am fighting for my children and my children's children. I am fighting for the right to choose my own religion, make my own decisions, and to be my own man. And yes, I am fighting for my flag. My Country means a lot to me and I am proud to fight for it. I know that you will be too!

You know, I am over 18 years older than you and I have spent so little time with you. But you are near me. Not so much as in my mind, as in my heart.

I hope that your generation of people, will respect what we are doing here. I hope that they will understand that we too love life. We have lost many friends and now it is time for the enemy to lose some.

We are United States Marines. We are the best troops in the world. We fight odds that are heavily against us—and win! Our spirit is indomitable, our courage is unexcelled, and our loyalty is unquestionable.

I felt like writing to you. Perhaps it sounds foolish. Perhaps it is. But you can never imagine what it is like—not knowing if I'm coming back down that hill. I wanted you to have something to you from me. I love you Bob, but you are too young to know it. Someday—you will know. I will leave now. Time is short.

Love to you.

BROTHER JOHN.

LISTING OF OPERATING FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS AS COM- PILED DURING THE ROTH STUDY

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, my listing of 1091 operating Federal assistance pro-

grams was inserted into the June 25 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the Honorable CHARLES E. GOODELL, of New York, beginning at page 18611. Since that time, I have received 22 more responses to my questionnaire, and have discovered a few errors in the original listing. As I indicated on June 25, I said I would update my listing as more of the questionnaires were answered, and here follows the 22 additional responses:

NO. 1.20—AIR POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAM GRANTS

Authorizing Statute: Clean Air Act, P.L. 90-148, Section 105.

Administrator: Charles D. Yaffe, Chief, Control Agency Development Program, National Air Pollution Control Administration.

Nature of Program: Grants are for the purpose of assisting air pollution control agencies in planning, developing, establishing, and maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution.

Eligibility: Official State, municipal, inter-municipal, and interstate air pollution control agencies.

Available Assistance: Grants-in-aid.

Funding Use Restrictions: Grant funds may be used for those direct costs specifically incurred in the conduct of an approved project. They include personnel, equipment, supplies, travel, training, and other costs such as books and periodicals, communications, maintenance and repairs, etc., necessary to the conduct of the approved project or program.

Appropriations Sought: FY 1969, \$24,300,000.

Past Appropriations: FY 1968, \$20,259,000; FY 1967, \$7,000,000; FY 1966, \$5,000,000.

Obligations Incurred: FY 1968, \$19,500,000 (estimated); FY 1967, \$6,964,000; FY 1966, \$4,968,000.

Average Assistance: \$70,000.

Assistance Prerequisites: For project grants, applicant agencies must plan, develop, or have an acceptable "workable program" which conforms to requirements of Section 56.21 of the Regulations. For maintenance grants, agencies must have in effective operation a "workable program" as described in Section 56.31 of the Regulations.

Other conditions relating to fiscal and other policy matters are contained in the Regulations and the grants manual.

Postgrant Requirements: Final narrative and fiscal reports 90 days after completion of project.

Washington Contact: Charles D. Yaffe, Chief, Control Agency Development Program, National Air Pollution Control Administration, 801 North Randolph Street, Arlington, Virginia 22203; Telephone: (703) 557-0399.

Local Contact: Regional Offices.

Application Deadlines: Applications may be submitted at any time. Applications are eligible for consideration for funds becoming available on the first day of the second month following post mark date.

Approval/Disapproval Time: 60 days.

Reworking Time: 5 days.

Related Programs: This Program provides technical assistance to control agencies, air pollution survey and demonstration grants, air pollution research grants, air pollution training grants, and air pollution fellowship grants.

NO. 1.21—AIR POLLUTION RESEARCH PROGRAM

Authorized Statute: Clean Air Act (P.L. 90-148) Section 103 and Section 104.

Administrator: Dr. Charles Walters, Chief, Office of Research Grants, National Air Pollution Control Administration.

Nature of Program: The program provides support through the mechanism of research grants to establish, expand, and improve research projects in the field of air pollution prevention and control.

Eligibility: Public or non-profit institutions or individuals.

Available Assistance: Research grants in which the grantee also participates in the cost of each research project.

Funding Use Restrictions: Funds may be expended for personnel salaries, consultant services, equipment, supplies, domestic and foreign travel, hospitalization, outpatient costs, alterations and renovations of structures, and publication costs.

Appropriations Sought: FY 1969, \$8,000,000.

Past Appropriations: FY 1968, \$7,431,000; FY 1967, \$6,218,000; FY 1966, \$5,339,000.

Obligations Incurred: FY 1968, \$7,431,000 (anticipated); FY 1967, \$6,218,000; FY 1966, \$5,339,000.

Average Assistance: \$37,500.

Assistance Prerequisites: The applicant's research activities are assessed on scientific merit, program relevance, and consonance with public policy. Projects supported in other countries must be concerned with problems of interest to both the U.S. and foreign scientists and be justified by the utilization of research resources not ordinarily found in the U.S. The applicant must be a public or non-profit institution or individual and must receive the favorable recommendation of the National Advisory Urban and Industrial Health Council, a panel of research scientists and other qualified individuals recruited from universities and other public and non-profit institutions to advise on the scientific merit of research proposals.

Postgrant Requirements: (a) Annual Report of Expenditures (PHS 421); (b) Interim Progress Report; (c) Terminal Report; (d) Invention Report and Annual Invention Statement (PHS-3945).

Washington Contact: Dr. Charles Walters, Room 601, Ballston Center Tower II, 801 North Randolph Street, Arlington, Virginia 22203; Phone (703) 557-0322.

Local Contact: Regional Representatives.

Application Deadlines: The National Advisory Urban and Industrial Health Council meets three times a year to review grant applications. The deadlines for review at these sessions are:

Deadline	Council-review
October 1	March
February 1	June-July
June 1	November

Approval/Disapproval Time: Approximately 6 months.

Reworking Time: Approximately 6 months.

Related Programs: Air pollution control program grants, air pollution survey and demonstration grants, air pollution training grants, and air pollution fellowship grants.

NO. 1.22—AIR POLLUTION SURVEY AND DEMONSTRATION GRANTS

Authorizing Statute: Clean Air Act, P. L. 90-148, Section 103.

Administrator: Charles D. Yaffe, Chief, Control Agency Development Program, National Air Pollution Control Administration.

Nature of Program: To provide financial assistance for surveys and demonstrations relating to the causes, effects, extent, prevention, and control of air pollution.

Eligibility: Air pollution control agencies and other appropriate public or private agencies and institutions.

Available Assistance: Grants-in-aid.

Funding Use Restrictions: Grant funds may be used for those direct costs specifically incurred in the conduct of an approval project. Such costs include personnel, equipment, supplies, travel, training and other costs necessary to carry out the approved project.

Appropriations Sought: FY 1969, \$2,000,000.

Past Appropriations: FY 1968, \$2,000,000; FY 1967, \$2,000,000 (includes \$525,000 earmarked for coal mine refuse pile fire demonstrations); FY 1966, \$1,850,000 (includes \$975,000 earmarked for coal mine refuse pile fire demonstrations).

Obligations Incurred: FY 1968, \$1,610,000; FY 1967, \$1,999,687; FY 1966, \$1,850,000.

Average Assistance: \$100,000.

Assistance Prerequisites: Grants may not be made to profit-making organizations. Specific conditions depend upon the nature of the project and the type of agency receiving assistance.

Postgrant Requirements: Final narrative and fiscal reports—90 days after completion of project.

Washington Contact: Charles D. Yaffe, Chief, Control Agency Development Program, National Air Pollution Control Administration, 801 North Randolph Street, Arlington, Virginia 22203. Telephone: Area Code 703-557-0399.

Local Contact: Regional Offices.

Application Deadlines: Applications may be submitted at any time.

Approval/Disapproval Time: 60 days.

Reworking Time: 10 days.

Related Programs: Air pollution control program grants, air pollution research grants, air pollution training grants, and air pollution fellowship grants.

NO. 1.23-1.24—TRAINING AND FELLOWSHIP GRANTS

Title: (a) Air Pollution Training Grants; (b) Air Pollution Fellowships.

Authorizing Statute: (a) Clean Air Act, P.L. 90-148, Sec. 103(b) (3) and (5); (b) Clean Air Act, P.L. 90-148, Sec. 103(b) (5) and (7).

Administrator: (a) James C. Cross, Chief, Training Grants and Fellowships Section, Training Program, National Air Pollution Control Administration, 411 West Chapel Hill Street, Durham, North Carolina 27701; (b) Same as (a).

Nature of Program: (a) Makes grants to universities and non-profit organizations to assist in developing programs in research, administration, technical application, teaching, and other activities related to air pollution control in order to help meet the manpower needs in this field; (b) Grants fellowships to individuals for graduate-level study in the engineering and physical sciences, biometeorology, and the bio-medicine and socio-economic aspects of air pollution.

Eligibility: (a) Academic institutions or non-profit organizations for graduate or specialists training, curriculum development, and support in air pollution control studies; (b) Predoctoral and postdoctoral candidates submitting satisfactory transcripts of undergraduate and graduate work and evidence of suitable qualifications.

Available Assistance: (a) Financial training grants for a period of seven years or less; (b) Financially supported fellowships.

Funding Use Restrictions: (a) Funds may be expended for personnel salaries, consultant services, equipment, supplies, trainee travel during training period, alterations and renovations of structures, publications, trainee stipends, trainee tuition and fees, and trainee travel to training institution; (b) Funds may be expended for student stipends, tuition and fees, travel to school, and dependency allowance.

Appropriations Sought: (a) FY 69, \$2,858,000; (b) FY 69, \$468,000.

Past Appropriations: (a) FY 1968, \$2,691,000; FY 1967, \$2,040,000; FY 1966, \$1,309,000. (b) FY 1968, \$468,000; FY 1967 \$402,405; FY 1966, \$359,479.

Obligations Incurred: (a) FY 1968, \$2,691,000; FY 1967, \$2,040,000; FY 1966, \$1,309,000. (b) FY 1968, \$466,792; FY 1967, \$402,405; FY 1966, \$359,479.

Average Assistance: (a) Graduate (1968) approximately \$103,000, Specialist (1968) approximately \$66,000; (b) \$6,650.

Assistance Prerequisites:

(a) Applications are assessed on merit, training capability, program relevance, and

consonance with public policy. They are reviewed by the National Air Pollution Manpower Development Advisory Committee composed of non-federal experts in the scientific and technical aspects of air pollution control and those favorably recommended by the Advisory Committee and/or the National Air Pollution Control Administration are funded on an established priority score basis.

(b) Must have at least a bachelor's degree and be accepted for admission by an educational or training institution offering a recognized degree. Consideration is given to the adequacy, value, and appropriateness of the course or courses to be taken as related to the general problem of air pollution and/or biometeorology, and the qualifications, interest, and potential contribution of the individual. All candidates are required to take the Graduate Record Examination and receive favorable recommendation of the Advisory Committee. Must be a citizen of the United States or have been lawfully admitted to the U.S. for permanent residence.

Post-grant Requirements:

(a) (1) Statement of appointment of trainee; (2) Reports of expenditure; (3) Interim and terminal progress reports; (4) Invention report; (5) Annual invention statement; (6) Reports on investigations involving human subjects (when applicable).

(b) None except submission of published works at conclusion of study. Expenditure reports are made annually by the Career Development Review Branch, Division of Research Grants.

Washington Contact:

(a) Dr. John T. Middleton, Commissioner, National Air Pollution Control Administration.

(b) Same as (a).

Local contact: Regional representatives.

Application deadlines: The National Air Pollution Manpower Development Advisory Committee meets three times a year to review applications. The deadlines for review at these sessions are:

Deadline	Committee review
(a) October 1	February
February 1	May
June 1	November
(b) October 1	February
January 1	May
April 1	November

Approval/Disapproval Time: (a) Six months; (b) Six months.

Reworking Time: (a) Five days; (b) Five days.

Related Programs: Air Pollution Control Program Grants, Air Pollution Survey and Demonstration Grants, and Air Pollution Research Grants.

NO. 1.265-1.267.—THE COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS PROGRAM

Which includes grants for initial staffing and grants for construction of community mental health centers.

Authorizing Statute: Staffing: Public Law 89-105, and Public Law 90-31 Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act Amendments of 1965 and 1967; Construction: Public Law 88-164 and Public Law 90-31, Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Center Construction Act of 1963 and Amendments of 1967.

Administrator: Division of Mental Health Service Programs, National Institute of Mental Health.

Nature of Program: Assists in the construction and initial staffing of mental health facilities providing a minimum of five essential services to all the residents of a designated area.

Eligibility: Any public or private non-profit agency or association able to mount a Community Mental Health Center Program which

meets the requirements set forth in the regulations applicable to the above laws.

Available Assistance: Staffing: Grants are made for a period of four years and three months. They may not exceed 75% of eligible costs for the first fifteen months, 60% for the year thereafter 45% for the second year thereafter and 30% for the third year thereafter. Construction: Grants are made to pay 1/2 to 2/3 of the cost of an approved construction, acquisition or remodeling project. The exact rate of Federal participation is determined by the state's population and per capita income.

Funding Use Restrictions: Staffing: Funds may be spent only to compensate eligible professional and technical mental health personnel whose positions have received approval for funding; Construction: To help meet the cost of construction, acquisition or remodeling of facilities in conjunction with an approved Community Mental Health Centers Program.

Appropriations sought

Staffing:		
Continuations -----	\$32,186,456	
Supplements -----	1,931,187	
New -----	30,182,357	
Total -----	64,300,000	
Construction -----	30,000,000	

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968
Past appropriations:			
Staffing-----	19,500	33,781	51,168
Available from other programs-----		+2,000	
Construction-----	50,000	50,000	30,000
Obligations incurred:			
Staffing-----	15,430	33,947	43,359
Construction-----	49,500	49,972	(1)

¹ Not available for obligation.

Average Assistance: Staffing: \$283,000; Construction: 450,000.

Assistance Prerequisites: Must present a plan for a coordinated program of at least five essential services available to all the residents of a designated catchment area without discrimination on account of race, color, or national origin. A reasonable amount of service must be made available below cost or with no charge to patients unable to pay.

Postgrant Requirements: Staffing: Quarterly report of expenditures, annual report of expenditures, continuation grant application. Centers are site-visited annually after beginning operation to determine appropriate use of grant funds and provision of services. Construction: Final audit of payments after completion of construction. Site visited when operational.

Washington Contact: All contacts should be made through the Associate Regional Health Director for Mental Health in the appropriate Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Regional Office.

Local Contact: Staffing: The State Mental Health Authority; Construction: The agency designated by the state as responsible for the administration of the state plan for construction of community mental health centers.

Application Deadlines: Staffing and Construction: Early enough to permit state, and National Institute of Mental Health staff to review and process the application prior to the close of the fiscal year. Deadlines set by individual state agencies for receipt of applications must be observed if applicable.

Approval/Disapproval Time: 1 1/2 months from original receipt of the National Institute of Mental Health Regional Office to notification of disposition.

Reworking Time: Same as above except in cases of severe deficiency when applicant is given option of withdrawing application for further development.

Related Programs: (a) Mental Retardation Facilities Construction program administered by Bureau of Social and Rehabilitative Services; (b) Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Program, Division of Hospital and Medical Facilities, Public Health Service.

NO. 2.121—SUPPORT FOR RESEARCH ON EDUCATIONAL USES OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

The Office of Education does not maintain a distinct program area on support for research on educational uses of information technology and the Bureau's administrative information system does not classify projects under such a heading.

The Office of Education, DHEW, through monies administered by the Bureau of Research, can furnish support for individual research projects concerning educational uses of information technology. Applications for support of individual projects, if approved, may be funded under one of three legislative authorizations depending on the nature and intent of the proposed project. Thus, funds could be obligated for such work under: (1) the Cooperative Research Act, P.L. 83-531 as amended by Title IV, P.L. 89-10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, (2) P.L. 89-239, Title II-B, Higher Education Act of 1965, and (3) P.L. 88-210 Section 4(C), Vocational Education Act of 1963.

NO. 2.124—LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION GRANTS

Authorizing Statute: P.L. 89-329, Title II-B, Higher Education Act of 1965.

Administrator: Frank Kurt Cylke; Acting Chief, Library and Information Sciences Research Branch/Lee G. Burchinal; Director, Division of Information Technology and Dissemination, Bureau of Research.

Nature of Program: An unprecedented demand is being placed on this country's library and information services. Student and adult use of all types of libraries is multiplying. The billions being spent for research and development are producing a body of scientific literature that is doubling in size every 8 to 10 years. Old-line methods and equipment are no longer able to handle this information workload. As a result, and at a cost of millions of dollars, many new library and information services are being set up throughout the country—often without benefit of basic studies of customers' actual information needs and the costs of satisfying them.

In response to this growing national need for better library and information services, Congress, under Title II-B of the Higher Education Act of 1965, authorized the Office of Education to initiate a research support program concerned with the use of library resources, the development of library and information services, and the training of librarians and other information personnel.

Eligibility: Grants may be awarded to school districts, colleges, universities, State governments, and other public or private non-profit agencies, organizations, or groups. Contracts are also authorized with public or private profit or non-profit agencies, organizations, or institutions.

Available Assistance: Grants and contracts. **Funding Use Restrictions:** To further the Library and Information Science fields.

Appropriations Sought: 3.55M, 1969. **Past Appropriations:** 3.55M, 1968; 3.55M, 1967.

Obligations Incurred: 1.8M, 1968; 3.55M, 1967.

Average Assistance: This has little bearing on the subject. Grants and contracts may be of any size—usual is approximately \$75,000.

Assistance Prerequisites: Proposals are evaluated according to the following criteria:

(1) Significance of the proposal to the Office of Education's responsibility in the

total library and information science research effort; that is, to provide balance with available funds, it may be necessary to forego support for one worthy project in order to finance another in a neglected area.

(2) Place of the proposed study in relation to existing knowledge, and its promise of making a contribution to the improvement of library or information science.

(3) Sound design or operational plan; indication that the proposed research will meet its stated objectives.

(4) Competency of personnel and adequacy of facilities.

(5) General applicability of local projects; they must be significant in other settings.

Post-grant Requirements: Varying, dependent upon the complexity and study time involved in each grant. Usually quarterly reports are required.

Washington Contact: Frank Kurt Cylke; Acting Chief, Library and Information Sciences Research Branch (Tel. 202 962-1365); Lee G. Burchinal; Director, Division of Information Technology and Dissemination (Tel. 202 962-6346); U. S. Office of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Washington, D.C. 20202.

Local Contact: None. See above.

Application Deadlines: None.

Approval/Disapproval Time: 4 months.

Reworking Time: 1 month.

Related Programs: National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, O.E. Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Library Programs (subject relationship).

NO. 3.82—RESEARCH PROJECTS RELATING TO MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES AND CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Authorizing Statute: Title V, Sec. 512 of the Social Security Act.

Administrator: Charles P. Gershenson, Ph. D., Director, Division of Research, Children's Bureau.

Nature of Program: Grants are authorized to public or other non-profit institutions of higher learning and public or non-profit private agencies and organizations engaged in research or in maternal and child health or crippled children's programs for research projects relating to maternal and child health and crippled children's services which show promise of substantial contributions to the advancement thereto. Effective July 1, 1969 such emphasis will be given to projects which will help in studying the need for and the feasibility, costs and effectiveness of comprehensive care programs in which maximum use is made of personnel with varying levels of training.

Eligibility: Public or other non-profit institutions of higher learning and public or private agencies engaged in research or in maternal and child health or crippled children's services. This includes public State and local health departments and crippled children's agencies, universities, and private organizations engaged in research.

Available Assistance: Grants for research.

Funding Use Restrictions: To carry out approved research projects.

Appropriations Sought: FY 1969, \$13,300,000.

Past Appropriations: FY 1968, \$5,900,000; FY 1967, 4,900,000; FY 1966, 4,000,000.

Obligations Incurred: FY 1968, \$5,575,000 (estimate); FY 1967, 4,900,000; FY 1966, 3,977,000.

Average Assistance: \$82,053.

Assistance Prerequisites: Applicant must conform to Regulations under Title 42, Chapter II, Part 205 entitled "Research Projects Relating to Maternal and Child Health Services and Crippled Children's Services."

Postgrant Requirements: Final expenditure report due 60 days after termination of grant. 35 copies of final report and 35 copies of 500 word summary of the report due on termination date of project.

Washington Contact: Charles P. Gershenson, Ph.D., Director, Division of Research,

Children's Bureau, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. 20201; Telephone, Area Code 202-963-4358.

Local Contact: None.

Application Deadlines: March 1, July 1, November 1.

Approval/Disapproval Time: 3 months.

Reworking Time: 2½ months for new project reviewed by Advisory Committee; less than a month for continuation applications.

Related Programs: Related programs are administered by: Rehabilitation Services Administration, SRS, DHEW; Office of Education, DHEW; National Institutes of Health, PHS, DHEW; Office of Economic Opportunity.

NO. 3.93—CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Authorizing Statute: Title V, Sec. 504, Social Security Act.

Administrator: P. Frederick Delliquadri, Chief, Children's Bureau, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Nature of Program: Grants are made to State crippled children's agencies to assist them to extend and improve, especially in rural areas, their services for children who are crippled or who are suffering from conditions which lead to crippling. The services provided are: casefinding, diagnosis, prevention, medical, surgical, corrective and follow-up care, as well as hospital and convalescent care.

Eligibility: State crippled children's agencies.

Available Assistance: Grants on a variable matching basis.

Funding Use Restrictions: Funds are spent for salaries or fees of physicians to conduct clinics where children can receive diagnostic or treatment services and for medical and surgical care, and for the salaries of physical therapists, nurses, medical social workers and other personnel. Funds are also used to pay for hospital care and for appliances.

Appropriations Sought: FY 1969, \$51,125,000.

Past Appropriations: FY 1968, \$40,938,000; FY 1967, \$40,938,000; FY 1966, \$36,563,000.

Obligations Incurred: FY 1968, \$40,725,000; FY 1967, \$40,556,000; FY 1966, \$35,742,000.

Average Assistance: Funds are apportioned on the basis of the child population in each State and the per capita income. Average grant 1968 fiscal year, \$744,213.

Assistance Prerequisites: Conditions of State plan approval are provided in Sec. 505 of Title V of the Social Security Act.

Postgrant requirements: These include a statistical report of services provided and expenditure reports.

Washington Contact: Louis Speker, M.D., Director, Division of Health Services, Children's Bureau, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. 20201; Telephone, Area Code 202, 963-3381.

Local Contact: State Agencies Administering Services under Title V, Parts 1, 2, and 3 of the Social Security Act.

Application Deadlines: The State crippled children's programs are continuing programs and plans and budgets are requested to be submitted annually by June 1.

Approval/Disapproval Time: Approval of State plans is carried out in regional offices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is difficult to answer this question inasmuch as approval of the State plan cannot be given until the appropriation for the fiscal year is enacted. State plans are submitted before the beginning of the fiscal year. There is, however, no interruption of payments in view of the fact that we have continuing resolutions of the Congress.

Related Programs: Maternal and Child Health Services under Title V, secs. 503 and 505, Social Security Act; Special Project Grants for Health of School and Preschool Children, sec. 509; Special Project Grants for

Dental Health of Children, sec. 510; Training of Personnel, sec. 511; Research Projects relating to Maternal and Child Health and Crippled Children's Services, sec. 512.

NO. 394—SPECIAL PROJECT GRANTS FOR CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Authorizing Statute: Title V, Sec. 504(2) of the Social Security Act.

Administrator: Louis Speker, M.D., Director, Division of Health Services, Children's Bureau, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. 20201.

Nature of Program: Of the amount appropriated annually for grants to the States for crippled children's services under Title V, Sec. 504, up to 12½% is available for special projects of regional or national significance which may contribute to the advancement of services to crippled children.

Eligibility: State Crippled Children's agencies and public or other non-profit institutions of higher learning.

Available Assistance: Grants on a project basis which do not require matching.

Funding Use Restrictions: Funds may be spent for training and for demonstrations or services which may contribute to the advancement of services for crippled children, including salaries and fees of personnel, diagnostic and treatment services including hospital care.

Appropriations Sought: FY 1969, \$13,875,000.

Past Appropriations: FY 1968, \$9,062,000; FY 1967, \$9,062,000; FY 1966, \$8,437,000.

Obligations Incurred: FY 1968, \$9,062,000; FY 1967, \$9,062,000; FY 1966, \$8,437,000.

Average Assistance: 1968, \$69,905.

Assistance Prerequisites:

A. Applicant must be a public or other non-profit institution of higher learning or state agency.

B. Applicant must submit the following material:

1. Application Form—Form CB-25, *Maternal and Child Health and Crippled Children's Training and Study Projects Application*

2. Descriptive material: with each application, a project plan must be included. The plan must specify in detail:

(a) the purpose—training or study related to crippled children

(b) the need

(c) the setting

(d) existing resources

(e) content and extent of proposed training or study

(f) qualifications of staff

(g) qualifications of any proposed trainees

(h) information relating to other programs, existing or proposed, having direct impact on or relationship to the proposed program

(i) plans for evaluating progress in achieving stated goals

3. Personnel and Position Standards

(a) a description of duties and minimum qualifications for each proposed professional or technical position must be included: these specifications must include both general and specific duties, administrative lines of responsibility, and minimum levels of educational and experience requirements.

(b) a curriculum vitae should be submitted for each professional person already employed or committed to employment

4. Budget (Form CB-26)—Institutions of Higher Learning

5. Budget Justification: (Form CB-20)—State Agency, to clarify the relationship of the various budget items to the project plan

(a) establish the need for each item

(b) explain the method or basis of payment, the calculations used in establishing amounts for various items

C. Fifteen copies of all required material must be submitted. The original and one copy of Form CB-25 must be signed by the

official authorized to sign for the grantee institution and the original and two copies of Form CB-26 must be signed by the Project Director and the Financial Officer. (State Agencies submit 3 copies of plan material and CB-25.)

Postgrant Requirements: An annual progress report is required together with expenditure reports.

Washington Contact: Louis Speker, M.D., Director, Division of Health Services, Children's Bureau, SRS, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. 20201, Telephone, Area Code 202-963-3381.

Local Contact: State Agencies Administering Services under Title V, Parts 1, 2, and 3 of the Social Security Act.

Application Deadlines: None.

Approval/Disapproval Time: 2-3 months.

Reworking Time: 4-6 weeks.

Related Programs: Special Project Grants for Maternal and Child Health Services.

NO. 7. 185—RELOCATION

Authorizing Statute: Relocation is not an independent operating program, but it is an integral part of all programs of the Department whose activities cause displacement of people or business concerns. The HUD program relocation requirements are briefly described below.

(a) *Urban Renewal:* Has a statutory provision for relocation assistance (Section 105(c) of Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended.) (Section 114 of Title I has relocation payments provisions which are effective for all HUD-assisted programs listed below.)

(b) *Public Housing:* Section 15(7) (b) (iii) of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 provides authority for relocation assistance for low-rent public housing projects, including "Turnkey" housing.

(c) *Model Cities:* Section 107 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1966 contains the authorization for relocation assistance and payments.

(d) *Other HUD programs:* Section 404(a) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 authorized relocation payments for the following federally-assisted development programs not noted above. HUD has administratively determined that relocation assistance must be provided under each of the following programs.

- (1) Public Facility Loans Program
- (2) Open-Space Land and Urban Beautification and Improvement Program
- (3) Basic Water and Sewer Facility Grants
- (4) Neighborhood Facilities Grants
- (5) Advance Land Acquisition
- (6) Concentrated Code Enforcement
- (7) Demolition Grants
- (8) Historic Preservation

Administrator: The relocation program is developed and administered at the local level, within the framework of the policy guidelines and requirements established by HUD. Each locality or local agency which submits an application under a HUD-assisted program which will cause displacement, must demonstrate that the persons to be displaced will be satisfactorily relocated, before a Federal financial assistance contract is approved.

The HUD Regional Offices maintain liaison with the local agencies participating in HUD-assisted programs, and provide advisory and technical assistance to the local relocation staffs. Each Regional Office has a Relocation Branch which is responsible for providing this assistance, and for the review of local relocation programs to determine compliance with statutory and administrative requirements, including the adequacy of relocation housing resources.

Nature of Program: The purpose of the relocation program is to facilitate the relocation of the families, individuals, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations that are displaced by HUD-assisted programs. The program seeks to minimize hardship, improve

housing welfare, to avoid the discontinuance of small business concerns, and to upgrade neighborhoods and communities.

Eligibility: All families, individuals, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations displaced by HUD-assisted programs.

Available Assistance: The program is designed to provide advisory and monetary assistance to families and individuals to relocate to decent, safe, and sanitary housing and to assist business concerns and nonprofit organizations to reestablish in appropriate accommodations.

In addition to providing assistance to families and individuals to relocate to decent, safe and sanitary housing, the relocation staff of the local agency tries to identify the social, health, employment and other economic problems of site occupants which might affect their ability to relocate successfully. Assistance to business concerns also includes counselling on space, financing and other aspects of business operations.

Through enlisting and coordinating the efforts of the local health, welfare, employment and other social agencies, the relocation staff seeks to assure that the services needed by these families and individuals are provided.

The monetary element of the relocation program includes relocation payments to families, individuals, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for moving expenses and direct loss of property. A Relocation Adjustment Payment is also available for eligible families and elderly individuals. Certain business concerns may be eligible for a Small Business Displacement Payment.

A displaced property owner may be entitled to a relocation payment for certain settlement costs and related charges incurred in conveying real property to a local agency.

Funding Use Restrictions:

(a) **Administrative costs** incurred in providing services and assistance to those being displaced are eligible under most HUD-assisted programs. One of the exceptions is the Demolition Grant program which has a statutory restriction against the use of grant funds for administrative costs.

(b) **Relocation payments:** These payments are 100% reimbursable with Federal grant funds, with the exception of moving expense claims for business concerns in excess of \$25,000. Payments for moving expenses in excess of \$25,000 may be made if a locality agrees to share the excess with the Federal government, on the same basis as other costs are shared. For example, if an urban renewal project is financed with two-thirds Federal funds and one-third local, the locality would have to provide one-third of the excess over \$25,000 and Federal funds would pay the remaining two-thirds.

Appropriations: As previously indicated relocation is not an independent operating program. Relocation costs for payments and administration are financed from funds appropriated for each specific program.

Assistance Prerequisites: Among other program requirements, if the activities under a HUD-assisted program will cause displacement, a local agency is required to provide relocation assistance as a condition for approval of an application for Federal financial assistance.

The local agency has an obligation to assure that all families and individuals who are displaced are offered decent, safe, and sanitary housing, that all displaced business concerns and nonprofit organizations are assisted in their relocation, and that relocation payments are made to all eligible displacees.

In support of its application for loan or grant the local agency must include data indicating that any individual or family displaced will have the full opportunity to relocate in housing that is decent, safe, and sanitary, that is within their financial means,

that is in reasonably convenient locations, and is available on a nondiscriminatory basis.

Postgrant Requirements: Each local agency carrying out a HUD-assisted program that causes displacement, must submit progress reports on relocation activities. For the urban renewal and public housing programs, these reports are submitted quarterly. All other HUD program participants submit semiannual progress reports.

HUD Regional Office representatives periodically inspect local agency relocation activities.

Contact: A potential beneficiary should contact the HUD Regional Office responsible for administering the program of Federal aids in his locality.

Related Programs:

(a) See *Authorizing Statute*.

(b) **Department of Transportation (Bureau of Public Roads):** The Federal Highway Act of 1962 authorized advisory assistance to individuals, families, and business concerns. Relocation Payments may be made to those displaced by highways, in states which have appropriate enabling legislation.

NO. 8.64—FEDERAL AID IN FISH RESTORATION

Authorizing Statute: Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Act (Dingell-Johnson Act) of August 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 430), as amended (16 USC 777-777k).

Administrator: Division of Federal Aid.

Nature of Program: To participate with State Fish and Game Departments in conducting sport fish restoration and management projects.

Eligibility: State Fish and Game Departments.

Available Assistance: Financial.

Funding Use Restrictions: To restore and manage sport fish populations; and, to provide benefits for fishermen and related outdoor recreationists the land acquisition, development and research.

Appropriations Sought: The Act provides for a permanent indefinite appropriation of the amount deposited in the Treasury each year from the 10 percent excise tax on fishing rods, creels, reels, and artificial lures, baits, and flies.

Past Appropriations: FY 1968, \$9,823,513; FY 1967, \$7,894,018; FY 1966, \$7,373,380.

Obligations Incurred: FY 1968, \$9,000,000 (estimated); FY 1967, \$6,966,331; FY 1966, \$6,769,781.

Average Assistance: Apportionments to States for fiscal 1968 were between \$466,500 and \$93,300, which are the maximum and minimum allowable under the Act. Average apportionment for fiscal 1968 was \$186,600. Average project obligation for fiscal 1967 was approximately \$20,000.

Assistance Prerequisites: Initially, the State must have passed legislation assenting to the provisions of the Act, and legislation which prohibits the diversion of fees paid by fishermen to activities other than administration of the Fish and Game Department. Projects submitted by the State must be substantial in character and design. Other conditions are contained in Title 50 Part 80 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Postgrant Requirements: Reporting and evaluation requirements are contained in the Federal Aid in Fish and Wildlife Restoration Manual.

Washington Contact: M. A. Marston, Chief, Division of Federal Aid, Washington, D.C. 20240; Telephone: 343-4172.

Application Deadlines: Projects are accepted throughout the year. Amounts apportioned must be obligated within two years.

Approval/Disapproval Time: 10 days.

Reworking Time: 5 days.

Related Programs: Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration, Anadromous and Great Lakes Fisheries Conservation (PL 89-304), Commercial Fisheries Research and Development (PL 88-309).

NO. 8.75—MINERALS DISCOVERY LOAN PROGRAM

Authorizing Statute: Public Law 85-701 (1958).

Administrator: Office of Minerals Exploration, Geological Survey, Washington, D.C. 20242.

Nature of Program: The Minerals Discovery Loan Program is a special loan program to encourage exploration for specified minerals within the United States, its Territories and Possessions. The program provides financial assistance to private industry on a participating basis.

Eligibility: Applicant must: (a) have right to possession of a property for the time required to conduct the exploration and thereafter to protect the Government's interest; (b) furnish evidence that funds for the exploration are not available from commercial sources on reasonable terms; and (c) certify that he would not ordinarily undertake the proposed exploration at his sole expense.

Available Assistance: The Government will contribute to the total allowable costs of exploration to a maximum of 75 percent for nine mineral commodities and to a maximum of 50 percent for 27 others.

Funding Use Restrictions: Funds may be spent for the exploration of targets considered to be geologically favorable for the occurrence of ore deposits.

Appropriations Sought: FY 1969, \$529,000 (requested \$730,000, House and Senate recommendation \$529,000).

Past Appropriations: FY 1968, \$430,000; FY 1967, \$425,000; FY 1966, \$764,000.

Obligations Incurred: FY 1968, \$1,155,003; FY 1967, \$991,576; FY 1966, \$598,877.

Average Assistance: \$35,000.

Assistance Prerequisites: Applicant must establish financial eligibility, rights to the property to be explored, geologic evidence that eligible minerals may occur in deposits of sufficient size and grade to be of economic interest, a program of exploration and availability of labor, materials, and equipment to conduct the program.

Postgrant Requirements: Monthly reports on costs incurred, results of work, maps, and supporting data are submitted by the operator. Upon completion of a project, a final report on the results and summary of work accomplished is required. If certified by the Government that production is possible as a result of the application, royalty payments based on 5 percent of the value of production are required of the operator.

Washington Contact: Frank E. Johnson, Chief, Office of Minerals Exploration, Room 4460, Interior Building, Washington, D.C. 20242; Phone 343-4460 (Area 202).

Local Contact: OME Field Officers at the Regional Offices.

Approval/Disapproval Time: 6 months.

Reworking Time: 2 to 3 weeks.

NO. 8.76—TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEYS AND MAPPING

Authorizing Statute: Act of March 3, 1879 (43 U.S.C. 31, 41); fiscal year 1889 appropriation (25 Stat. 505, 526); Act of June 11, 1896 (43 U.S.C. 38); Joint Resolution of February 18, 1897 (43 U.S.C. 42); and 43 U.S.C. 50 (with respect to cooperation with any State or municipality).

Administrator: Chief Topographic Engineer, Geological Survey, Washington, D.C. 20242.

Nature of Program: Topographic surveys result in the issue of standard quadrangle maps of the United States, its Territories and Possessions, that show with engineering accuracy the shape and form of the land surface, elevation above sea level, the course and fall of streams, and the location of important natural and manmade features. Topographic maps are basic to many activities, including flood control, reclamation, and military planning for the Nation's defense. The principal operations in the preparation of these maps

are the procurement of aerial photography, ground control surveys, office and field compilation, finishing cartographic drafting, and the reproduction of printing processes.

Eligibility: The Geological Survey does not have a grant-in-aid program. The Survey does enter into jointly financed programs with agencies of States, counties, and municipalities to carry forward the Survey's functions on a cooperative basis. A clause in the annual appropriation for Surveys, Investigations, and Research requires that cooperative programs in topographic mapping, and water resources investigations be conducted on a 50-50 financial basis.

Available Assistance: See above.

Funding Use Restrictions: See above.

Appropriations Sought: \$25,151,000 (House allowance); \$25,066,000 (Senate recommendation); \$26,545,000 (requested).

Past Appropriations: FY 1968, \$24,743,000; FY 1967, \$23,220,430; FY 1966, \$23,211,356.

Obligations Incurred: NOA and "obligations" are essentially the same each year. No "carryover" funds.

Assistance Prerequisites: See *Eligibility* above.

Washington Contact: Robert H. Lyddan, Chief Topographic Engineer, Geological Survey, Washington, D.C. 20242; Phone 343-3790 (Area 202).

NO. 8.77—WATER RESOURCES INVESTIGATIONS

Authorizing Statute: Act of March 3, 1879 (43 U.S.C. 31); Act of October 2, 1888 (25 Stat. 505, 526); Act of June 11, 1896 (29 Stat. 413, 453); Joint Resolution of May 16, 1902 (44 U.S.C. 260); Act of December 24, 1942, as amended (43 U.S.C. 36b); and 43 U.S.C. 50 (with respect to cooperation with any State or municipality).

Administrator: Chief Hydrologist, Geological Survey, Washington, D.C. 20242.

Nature of Program: The Geological Survey's water resources investigations provide water information required for economic development and best use of the Nation's water resources. The program includes determinations of the flow, stage, and sediment discharge of rivers; reservoir contents; locations and safe yields of underground waters; the availability of water supplies as related to present and future demands; the chemical quality and temperature of waters; and hydrologic research in principles and techniques. Reliable knowledge about water resources is necessary for planning and operation of projects involving irrigation, inland navigation, power generation, municipal supply, flood control, industrial processes, pollution, maintenance of fish and wildlife, and recreation.

Eligibility: The Geological Survey does not have a grant-in-aid program. The Survey does enter into jointly financed programs with agencies of States, counties, and municipalities to carry forward the Survey's functions on a cooperative basis. A clause in the annual appropriation for Surveys, Investigations, and Research requires that cooperative programs in topographic mapping and water resources investigations be conducted on a 50-50 financial basis.

Available Assistance: See above.

Funding Use Restrictions: See above.

Appropriations Sought: \$27,538,600 (House allowance); \$26,938,600 (Senate recommendation); \$29,614,000 (requested). For cooperative program (FY 1969) \$14,780,000 (requested \$15,780,000).

Past Appropriations: Fiscal Year 1968, \$26,597,600 (\$14,360,000 for coop. matching); Fiscal Year 1967, \$24,848,000 (\$12,950,000 for coop. matching); Fiscal Year 1966, \$22,619,000 (\$11,550,000 for coop. matching).

Obligations Incurred: NOA and "obligations" are essentially the same each year. No "carryover" funds.

Assistance Prerequisites: See *Eligibility*.

Washington Contact: E. L. Hendricks, Chief Hydrologist, Geological Survey, Washington, D.C. 20242; Phone 343-9425 (Area 202).

Local Contact: Walter F. White, Jr., District Chief, Water Resources Division, 724 York Road, Towson, Maryland 21204.

NO. 8.78—SOIL AND MOISTURE CONSERVATION

Authorizing Statute: 16 U.S.C. 590a, 590f (function transferred from Agriculture to Interior with respect to lands under its jurisdiction by 1939 Reorganization Plan No. IV).

Administrator: E. L. Hendricks, Chief Hydrologist, Geological Survey, Washington, D.C. 20242.

Nature of Program: Hydrologic and geologic information and advice are furnished to the land management bureaus preliminary to their taking measures for soil and moisture conservation on land under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

Appropriations Sought: \$211,000 (requested \$212,000—House and Senate recommendation \$211,000).

Past Appropriations: Fiscal Year 1968, \$210,000; Fiscal Year 1967, \$203,000; Fiscal Year 1966, \$201,000.

Obligations Incurred: NOA and "obligations" are essentially the same.

Washington Contact: No soil and moisture conservation program operating east of Mississippi River.

NO. 10.20 ON-THE-JOB TRAINING (OJT)

Authorizing Statute: Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (MDTA).

Administrator: The Bureau of Work Training Programs (BWTP), the Division of On-the-Job Training administers this program in the Department of Labor.

Nature of Program: The objective of this program is to provide jobs to unemployed persons in occupations needed by business and industry. OJT allows private industry to train workers in their own place of business with their own procedures for jobs needed by the employer. The Federal Government reimburses the company for training costs and related expenses. This function is implemented through these administrative procedures:

(a) The development of policy recommendations regarding OJT program design content, standards and procedures based on legislation and program resources.

(b) The preparation of position papers and recommendations on legislative matters including pending amendments relating to program content and standards for the OJT program.

(c) The formulation of comprehensive designs to serve as guides for the structuring of specific OJT program operations in different types of communities.

(d) The development of OJT program project models including various components of relevant supportive services to insure work experience and training commensurate with the needs of the target group and to assure appropriate linkages with other related programs.

(e) The development of standards, procedures and guidelines for the BWTP staff and project sponsors on the OJT program. The assurance of timely issuance of policies, standards, procedures and other related materials appropriately codified and indexed.

(f) The development of training materials and techniques in the OJT program to be used in training programs for BWTP field staff and sponsors.

(g) The development and recommendation of a program of research and experimental demonstration projects designed to develop new and improved program techniques and components within the existing OJT program.

(h) The provision of technical assistance to field personnel and sponsors.

Eligibility: Those eligible to participate in the program are disadvantaged individuals who are unemployed and those who are underemployed or in need of retraining.

Available Assistance: Technical assistance is available to those persons setting up OJT programs.

Funding Use Restrictions: Funds can be spent for the following functional purposes: a) On-the-Job Training; b) Supportive services such as remedial education, counseling, technical training.

Appropriations Sought: (a) \$108,412,000 was requested for 102,700, trainees at \$1,056 each. This is a decrease in trainees, but an increase in dollars because of the new Job Opportunities in the Business Sector program (JOBS).

Past Appropriations: 1968-69, \$94,372,000; 1967-68, \$115,544,000; 1966-67, \$125,000,000.

Obligations Incurred: 1968-69, \$83,486,964 (MDTA—\$81,230,791; \$2,256,173—Rural Area Redevelopment (RAR)) 11 months of 2-year program; 1967-68, \$93,712,516 (MDTA—\$90,556,924; \$3,155,592—RAR) 1 year of 2-year program. 1966-67, \$61,036,681 (MDTA—\$59,185,633; \$1,851,048—RAR) 2 year program.

Average Assistance: A contract is signed by a sponsor to train within defined criteria. It is difficult to give an average since the cost depends on the occupation in which training occurs and the number of individuals to be trained. A contract may be written to train one individual for as little as \$150 as a nurse's aide. In occupations such as automechanics (apprenticeship entry) the unit cost would be \$2,000.

Assistance Prerequisites: In order to receive assistance an applicant must be in one of the following categories: unemployed, underemployed, working substantially less than full time or will be unemployed because other skills have become obsolete or are becoming so.

Postgrant Requirements: The post-contract reporting and evaluation requirements include monitoring reports and on-going test audits.

Washington Contact: A potential beneficiary in the Washington-Delaware area should contact the following regional official: Mr. Morris Riger, Regional Manpower Administrator, Room 839, Vanguard Building, 1111 20th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Local Contact: A potential beneficiary should contact the local office of the Bureau of Work-Training Programs.

Application Deadlines: None.

Approval/Disapproval Time: 3 weeks.

Reworking Time: 1 week.

Related Programs: In addition to On-the-Job Training the Bureau of Work-Training Programs administers the following: (a) Concentrated Employment Programs; (b) Work Incentive Programs; (c) Neighborhood Youth Corps Programs; (d) Community Employment and Training Programs; 1. New Careers, 2. Operation Mainstream; (e) Special Impact.

NO. 11.10-11.12—HIGHWAY SAFETY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

(See also: State and Community Highway Safety Projects)

Authorizing Statute: Section 403, Highway Safety Act of 1966, Public Law 89-564.

Administrator: Dr. William Haddon Jr., Director, National Highway Safety Bureau, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C. 20591; Telephone: Area Code 202, 962-8125

Nature of Program: The program area is designed to facilitate and accelerate the application of research findings in operating highway safety programs. These demonstration projects seek to perfect and give visibility to new and improved techniques for improving highway safety and to bridge the gap between research and the translation of research results into actual practice. They are designed, further, to determine costs and effectiveness of highway safety systems and system components and to test, evaluate, and refine these systems in one or more demonstrations.

Eligibility: State and local communities, public and private institutions, and others.

Available Assistance: To the extent possible within the available resources these funds can be used for demonstration projects in pertinent program areas. In FY 1968, projects were funded in the following two areas: (a) Emergency medical services; (b) Use of programmed learning equipment to improve the process of driver examination.

Appropriations Sought: For fiscal year 1969, \$1,755,000 for demonstration project contracts was requested by the Department of Transportation for demonstration projects under Section 403 of the Act.

Past Appropriations: Fiscal Year 1967, None (Program first authorized in mid-1966); Fiscal Year 1968, \$1,300,000 for demonstration project contracts.

Obligations Incurred: Fiscal Year 1968—\$1,600,000 was obligated. (The difference between 1.3 M and 1.6 M was made up by re-programming funds from other research.)

Average Assistance: About \$250,000.

Assistance Prerequisites: The program is currently being administered as a contract program rather than a grant program. Therefore, the applicant must meet the normal conditions associated with undertaking of a contractual relationship with the Federal Government. He must be legally qualified to enter into a contract of this type, he must be able to demonstrate that he is capable to perform under the terms of the contract, and the terms of the proposal must be such that they meet the programmed needs of the National Highway Safety Bureau.

Postgrant Requirements: These are individually tailored to the requirements of the particular projects. Normally, periodic progress reports are required at intervals of one to three months; a final report is required upon completion of the project. The project directors are required to provide an evaluation of the elements of the project upon its completion. Further evaluation may be undertaken by the National Highway Safety Bureau or by outside groups upon invitation by the Bureau.

Washington Contact: Dr. John T. Holloway, Acting Director, National Highway Safety Institute, National Highway Safety Bureau, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, Telephone: Area Code 202, 962-8705.

Local Contact: None.

Application Deadlines: None.

Approval/Disapproval Time: This cannot be answered precisely because experience to date indicates that project proposals have to be substantially revised to meet program needs and because the limited funding available makes it necessary that action on many potentially viable projects be deferred until such time as funds may become available.

Reworking Time: See above.

Related Programs: Related National Highway Safety Bureau programs: grants to States under Section 402 of the Highway Safety Act of 1966; research and development contracts under Section 403 of the same Act. (See also: State and Community Highway Safety Programs.)

NO. 11.13—STATE AND COMMUNITY HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAM

(See also: Highway Safety Demonstration Projects.)

Authorizing Statute: Highway Safety Act of 1966, Public Law 89-564.

(NOTE.—The data furnished hereinafter relates to programs authorized under Sec. 402 of the Act of September 9, 1966.)

Administrator: Dr. William Haddon, Jr., Director, National Highway Safety Bureau, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C. 20591; Telephone: Area Code 202, 962-8125.

Nature of Program: The objective is to develop and implement a coordinated national highway safety program and to provide financial assistance to the States and their

political subdivisions to accelerate their highway safety programs.

The purpose is to reduce highway crashes and the deaths, injuries, and property damage in which they result.

Eligibility: Each of the fifty States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and their respective political subdivisions.

Available Assistance: (A) *Financial:* The Highway Safety Act of 1966 authorizes financial assistance which shall be used to aid the States in conducting their highway safety programs in accordance with various provisions of the Act.

Seventy-five per centum of the funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out Sec. 402 of the Act shall be apportioned among the several States on the basis of population and twenty-five per centum as the Secretary of Transportation in his administrative discretion may deem appropriate.

Apportionment certificates for the 75 per centum funds have been issued for the fiscal years authorized under the Act, 1967, 1968 and 1969 and the applicable amounts for each State, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are provided in Exhibit A, Exhibit B, and Exhibit C. These apportionments equal more than the total liquidating cash provided by the Congress.

The 25 per centum discretionary apportionments have not been made by the Secretary of Transportation.

(NOTE.—The Highway Safety Act provides that at least 40 per centum of the funds apportioned for programs under Sec. 402 to each State are to be expended by subdivisions for local highway safety programs. Local programs must be an integral part of the overall State program.)

(B) *Technical:* The National Highway Safety Bureau holds conferences and workshops and within the limits of its staff and budget has its headquarters and regional representatives assist States and local communities in developing and maintaining effective highway safety activities and programs in accordance with the Act.

Funding Use Restrictions: For (1) Planning and Administration to develop a comprehensive statewide highway safety program;

(2) Projects to implement Federal highway safety standards issued by the Secretary of Transportation* in the following functional areas: Driver Education, Driver Licensing, Motorcycle Safety, Traffic Records, Alcohol in Relation to Highway Safety, Periodic Motor Vehicle Inspection, Motor Vehicle Registration, Highway Design, Construction, and Maintenance, Traffic Control Devices, Identification and Surveillance of Accident Locations, Codes and Laws, Traffic Courts, Emergency Medical Services.

Appropriations Sought: For Fiscal Year 1969, a sum of \$70,000,000 was requested by the Department of Transportation for liquidating contract authorizations for State and community highway safety projects under Sec. 402 of the Act.

Past Appropriations: Funds for liquidating contract authorizations were appropriated as shown below:

Fiscal Year 1967, \$10,000,000 (Program first authorized in mid-1966.) Fiscal Year 1968, \$25,000,000.

Obligations Incurred: For State and community highway safety projects, Federal share: Fiscal Year 1967, \$899,349; Fiscal Year 1968, \$23,900,000 (From July 1, 1967 to June 30, 1968).

*See Committee Print No. 7, 90th Congress, 1st Session, Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, "A Report from the Secretary of the Department of Transportation to the Congress, as Required by the Highway Safety Act of 1966".

Average Assistance: As at March 31, 1968, the average grant of Federal funds was \$47,591.

Assistance Prerequisites: Section 402(b) (1) of the Highway Safety Act of 1966 provides: "The Secretary shall not approve any State highway safety program under this section which does not—

(A) provide that the Governor of the State shall be responsible for the administration of the program.

(B) authorize political subdivisions of such State to carry out local highway safety programs within their jurisdictions as a part of the State highway safety program if such local highway safety programs are approved by the Governor and are in accordance with the uniform standards of the Secretary promulgated under this section.

(C) provide that at least 40 per centum of all Federal funds apportioned under this section to such State for any fiscal year will be expended by the political subdivision of such State in carrying out local highway safety programs authorized in accordance with subparagraph (B) of this paragraph.

(D) provide that the aggregate expenditures of funds of the State and political subdivisions thereof, exclusive of Federal funds, for highway safety programs will be maintained at a level which does not fall below the average level of such expenditures for its last two full fiscal years preceding the date of enactment of this section.

(E) provide for comprehensive driver training programs, including (1) the initiation of a State program for driver education in the school systems or for a significant expansion and improvement of such a program already in existence, to be administered by appropriate school officials under the supervision of the Governor as set forth in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph; (2) the training of qualified school instructors and their certification; (3) appropriate regulation of other driver training schools, including licensing of the schools and certification of their instructors; (4) adult driver training programs, and programs for the retaining of selected drivers; and (5) adequate research, development and procurement of practice driving facilities, simulators, and other similar teaching aids for both school and other driver training use."

Post-grant requirements: The State shall require the responsible officer of the applicant agency to establish and maintain adequate procedures and records for accountability of funds and the administration of projects.

Monthly claims must be presented for the Federal pro-rata share of costs incurred under each approved project and a quarterly narrative progress report is to be submitted through the Governor's representative to the Regional Federal Highway Administrator.

Every project approved as part of the State's highway safety program to implement each of the thirteen safety standards shall be periodically evaluated by the State, and the National Highway Safety Bureau shall be provided with an evaluation summary.

In addition, Section 402(c) of the Highway Safety Act provides: "After December 31, 1968, the Secretary shall not apportion any funds under this subsection to any State which is not implementing a highway safety program approved by the Secretary in accordance with this section. Federal aid highway funds apportioned on or after January 1, 1969, to any State which is not implementing a highway safety program approved by the Secretary in accordance with this section shall be reduced by amounts equal to 10 per centum of the amounts which would otherwise be apportioned to such State under section 104 of this title, until such time as such State is implementing an approved highway safety program. Whenever he determines it to be in the public interest, the

Secretary may suspend, for such periods as he deems necessary, the application of the preceding sentence to a State. Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State under this section shall be reapportioned to the other States in accordance with the applicable provisions of law.

Washington Contact: Mr. Bradford M. Crittenden, Acting Director, Highway Safety Programs Service, National Highway Safety Bureau, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C., 20591; Telephone: Area Code 202, 382-4497.

Local contact: The Regional Federal Highway Administrator.

Application deadlines: The National Highway Safety Bureau is responsive to the priorities determined by the States with respect to programming and submitting their highway safety project applications. Applications, however, should be submitted as early in each fiscal year as possible.

Approval/disapproval time: About 30 days.

Reworking time: About 30 days.

Related programs: The Highway Safety Act of 1966 is the fundamental law which authorizes direct Federal assistance to the

States and their political subdivisions to develop and implement comprehensive highway safety programs embracing specific functional activities which include driver education, driver licensing, vehicle registration and inspection, traffic records, motor vehicle laws and codes, traffic courts, alcohol in relation to highway safety, traffic control, design, construction, and maintenance of highways, identification and surveillance of accident locations, and emergency medical services, *inter alia*.

The National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, P.L. 89-563, is also administered by the National Highway Safety Bureau. It provides authority for many activities, such as the setting of Federal standards for the safety of motor vehicles and equipment, and research, but does not include authority for any State and community programs other than the demonstration projects described in the associated section: Highway Safety Demonstration Projects.

Programs administered by the several Federal Departments and Agencies where activities impinge to some degree on highway safety activities are shown in Table I.

Assistance to Delaware:

TABLE I.—ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT WHICH RELATE TO THE HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAM DIRECTED BY THE NATIONAL HIGHWAY SAFETY BUREAU UNDER SEC. 402 OF THE HIGHWAY SAFETY ACT OF 1966

Department and agency	Authorizing legislation	Related functional activity ¹
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:		
Office of Education.....	Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; Public Law 89-10, titles I through V.	Driver and safety education.
Do.....	Higher Education Act of 1965; Public Law 89-752, titles I through VII.	Do.
Do.....	National Defense Education Act of 1958; Public Law 85-864 as amended.	Do.
Public Health Service.....	Public Health Service Act; 42 U.S.C. 291-291(c).	Emergency medical services.
National Center for Prevention and Control of Alcoholism.	Public Health Service Act; 42 U.S.C. 241, 42 U.S.C. 242A.	Alcohol in relation to highway safety.
National Air Pollution Control Administration.	Clean Air Act as amended.....	Motor vehicle inspection.
National Center for Health Statistics.	National Health Survey Act of 1956; Public Law 84-652.	Motor vehicle death and injury data.
National Institutes of Health.....	Various legislation.....	Research grants and intramural research concerned with a number of diseases that can initiate highway crashes; with the resistance of the head and other body parts to injury; with recovery from trauma; and, with nonvehicular injuries.
Department of Interior: Bureau of Indian Affairs.	Public Law 67-85; 42 Stat. 208; 25 U.S.C. 282, and subsequent legislation.	Driver and safety education for American Indians, on reservation.
Department of Transportation: Bureau of Public Roads.	Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 as amended.	Highway design, construction, and maintenance. ²
Do.....	do.....	Traffic control devices.
Do.....	do.....	Identification and surveillance of accident locations.
Do.....	Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; Public Law 89-4; 79 Stat. 5 as amended by Public Law 89-670, sec. 8(b).	Highway construction; development of Appalachian highway system and local access roads. ²

¹ The functional activity relates to the applicable safety standard issued by the Secretary of Transportation on June 27, 1967, which must be implemented by the States as part of their comprehensive highway safety programs.

² Sec. 402(g) of the Highway Safety Act of 1966 prohibits the National Highway Safety Bureau from obligating or expending Federal funds for highway construction, maintenance, or design other than design of safety features to be incorporated into standards.

NO. 26.21—CONSUMER ACTION AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Authorizing Statute: PL 90-221.

Administrator: Theodore M. Berry, Director, Community Action Program, OEO.

Nature of Program: Comprehensive consumer action programs are founded on the premise that reducing family expenses is an effective anti-poverty approach. The CAP consumer action program has aimed at developing and supporting local groups that seek to solve consumer problems through group action, consumer education, financial counseling and the establishment of new consumer institutions to provide choices in goods, services and credit to poor consumers. Credit unions provide poor people with the opportunity to save and to obtain inexpensive credit, financial counseling, debt handling and reduction services and long-term budgeting aid. Consumer cooperatives, such as buying clubs, help to reduce the cost of consumer goods purchased by the poor. Production cooperatives, such as manufacturing or agricultural cooperatives which promote

jobs and higher incomes, create enterprises owned and controlled by the poor. Emergency loans help to meet immediate and urgent individual and family needs, other than food and medical services.

Available Assistance: Technical Assistance under contracts with: Cooperative League of USA (coops); Credit Union National Association (credit unions); Bureau of Federal Credit unions (HEW credit unions); Emergency Loan grants to 15 programs.

Funding Use Restrictions: Credit unions and consumer cooperatives, cooperatives, buying clubs, food depots, clothing marts, low cost credit facilities, consumer protection and education, guarantee loan funds to encourage investment by private sector in low-income enterprises, neighborhood corporations, and emergency loan programs.

Appropriations Sought: No specific amount was appropriated for Consumer Action Programs within the CAP for any fiscal year. Total CAP appropriations for each fiscal year follow: FY 66—\$628,000,000; FY 67—\$819,494,500; FY 68—\$866,000,000.

Past Appropriations: See above.
Obligations Incurred: FY 66, figures not available; FY 67, \$6,995,670; FY 68, \$5,101,979.
Average Assistance: Consumer Action projects: \$250,000; Emergency Loan programs: \$95,000.

Assistance Prerequisites: Applicant must be a community action agency (or other public or private non-profit agency approved by the community action agency) which is capable of conducting the program and which agrees to Standard Conditions governing CAP grants.

Postgrant Requirement: Two reports are required of all grantees: a) a quarterly progress report, and b) a quarterly report on operation and participation. On-site evaluations are made by OEO Regional Office personnel prior to refunding of programs.

Washington Contact: Richard Saul, U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, 1200 19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20506; Phone: 382-5276.

Local Contact: Regional CAP Administrators in OEO Regional Offices responsible for community action programs in state where beneficiary is located.

Application Deadlines: No deadlines, except that community action agencies must apply prior to end of their program year.

Approval/Disapproval Time: 75 days.

Reworking Time: OEO does not keep records of this time period.

Related Programs: Economic Development Administration and President's Committee on Consumer Interests.

NO. 26.24—OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY—MIGRANT PROGRAM

Authorizing Statute: EOA.
Administrator: Office of Special Field Programs, OEO.

Nature of Program: Anti-poverty program 1. to meet immediate needs of farm workers 2. promote increased community assistance of migrants 3. equip migrants and seasonal farm workers for better economic opportunities.

Eligibility: Agencies: must be private, non-profit, public or educational institution. Beneficiaries: impoverished migrant and seasonal farm workers.

Available Assistance: Grants.
Funding Use Restrictions: Day care, education, prevocational training, job development and training, housing, counselling.

Appropriations Sought: \$30 million.
Past Appropriations: FY 1968, \$25 million; FY 1967, \$33 million.

Obligations Incurred: \$25 million; \$33 million.

Average Assistance: Ranges from \$20,000 to \$4 million.

Assistance Prerequisites: Must be viable private nonprofit, public or educational institution (agency).

Postgrant Requirements: Must submit quarterly program reports, monthly financial reports, receive at least one annual OEO evaluation and independent audit.

Washington Contact: Office of Special Field Programs, OEO.

Local Contact: None. Contact Washington directly.

Application Deadlines: 90 days prior to funding.

Approval/Disapproval Time: 60-90 days.
Reworking Time: 30-60 days.

Related Programs: None.

NO. 26.31—NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICE SYSTEMS

Authorizing Statute: PL 90-222.
Administrator: Theodore M. Berry, Director, Community Action Program, OEO.

Nature of Program: To acquire the greatest benefit from the array of anti-poverty programs and services offered by the Community Action Program and other Federal, State and local agencies, the number of poor people who participate must be as large as possible. Neighborhood Centers help to maximize participation by the poor in a number of ways.

First, Neighborhood Centers make programs and services more accessible.

Second, by being in the poor neighborhoods, the services and activities available through neighborhood centers are more likely to be known than those located in another part of the community.

Third, centers in poor neighborhoods are less likely to have an institutional atmosphere and method of operation that is so unattractive to poor people.

Fourth, because a number of services are ordinarily offered through the same neighborhood center, one visit by the poor person exposes him to a number of the programs.

Fifth, by involving the poor themselves in neighborhood centered programs, a start is made toward overcoming psychological barriers that prevent many anti-poverty programs from realizing real effectiveness: lack of self-confidence, fatalism, helplessness and indifference.

Neighborhood centers are found in the largest metropolitan areas, medium size cities and small towns. The target populations range from a few thousand to several hundred thousand. A neighborhood center might operate out of a mobile unit, store front, or much larger facilities. The kinds and methods of operation of neighborhood centers can be as disparate as the communities they serve—from centers in metropolitan areas which are open daily, in evenings and on weekends, to rural centers open several days a week on a scheduled basis.

Neighborhood centers offer a wide variety of services. A survey revealed that 48 percent of the neighborhood centers in operation offered social welfare services such as emergency shelter or public assistance information. Forty three percent of the centers offered manpower services. Health programs were offered in 35 percent of the centers, school age education programs in 28 percent, housing services in 24 percent, adult literacy programs in 22 percent, legal services in 21 percent, and cooperative enterprises such as credit unions and consumer cooperatives were located in 9 percent of the neighborhood centers.

Many Community Action Agencies establish satellite centers which act as referral stations for more comprehensive centers or offer limited services. Many other Community Action Agencies open up, in response to community "community organization centers". These centers are often the locus of self-help and community betterment enterprises operated by the poor community. In these self-help activities many poor people for the first time engage in self-expression and in actively trying to better themselves and their environment.

In implementing local anti-poverty programs, the CAP has turned to the resources of the poor themselves. The poor are employed in non-professional jobs such as "outreach" workers—working among the neighborhood center. Non-professionals also serve in tandem with professionals as aides in program areas such as health education, job development, social work and consumer action.

Eligibility: Residents of low-income neighborhoods.

Available Assistance: See *Nature of Program*.

Funding Use Restrictions: See *Nature of Program*.

Appropriations Sought: \$165.9 million planned (out of \$1.020 billion requested for CAP in the President's budget).

Past Appropriations: FY 1968, \$154 million (out of \$866 million for CAP); FY 1967, \$106,560,000 (out of \$818,867,047 for CAP); FY 1966, \$51,130,000 (out of \$628,215,000 for CAP).

Obligations Incurred: Same as above.

Average Assistance: Average grant size in FY 1968 was \$115,000.

Assistance Prerequisites: Applicant must be a community action agency (or private

non-profit agency approved by the community action agency) which is capable of conducting the program and which agrees to Standard Conditions governing CAP grants.

Postgrant Requirements: Two reports are required of all grantees: a) a quarterly progress report, and b) a quarterly report on operation and participation. On-site evaluations are made by OEO Regional Office personnel prior to refunding of programs.

Washington Contact: Jack Ciaccio, U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, 1200 19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20506, Telephone: 382-8391.

Local Contact: Regional CAP Administrators in OEO Regional Offices responsible for community action programs in state where beneficiary is located.

Application Deadlines: No deadlines, except that community action agencies must apply prior to end of their program year.

Approval/Disapproval Time: 75 days.

Reworking Time: OEO does not keep record of this time period.

Related Programs: Nearly all social programs administered by Federal agencies are related to neighborhood centers. Such programs can be operated out of neighborhood centers and/or neighborhood centers can refer residents to these programs.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, I would like to point out the following errors in the June 25 listing:

No. 6.50, at page 18648, column 3, line 40, "conversation" should read "conservation."

No. 7.156, at page 18655, column 2, line 4, "complementary" instead of "complimentary."

No. 8.13, at page 18659, column 2, under "Related Programs," "trading" should be "training."

No. 8.58, "Animal Damage Control," should point out that these funds, I am informed, are now being used as well for rat control in urban areas.

No. 10.22, at page 18679, column 2, under "Administrator," should list "Mary Keyserling."

No. 10.38, at page 18682, column 1, should have for "Administrator":

The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Labor, United States Employment Service.

No. 10.129, at page 18687, column 3, should have for "Nature of Program":

The Catalog is a collection of some 1,400 technical and economic feasibility studies and reports, considered to be useful investment information. They are collected and made publicly available from a central source to assist in promoting private investment in developing countries.

HUMPHREYISM NO. 6

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

From a Collection of Representative HENRY C. SCHADEBERG's (R. Wisc.)

"The Senator from Minnesota does not believe in a balanced budget at this hour, nor is he afraid to say so . . ." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 10, 1950.)

A COMMISSION ON NOMINATIONS FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution which I hope will lead to a thorough reevaluation of the procedures used in nominating candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States. This in-depth study would be conducted by a temporary 30-member Commission of distinguished Americans.

The resolution directs this Commission to conduct a full and complete investigation of the present convention method of nomination and to report its findings and recommendations to Congress within 1 year of enactment. The Commission is also directed to consider one specific alternative to the present system—a nationwide presidential primary election.

I am well aware that several measures have already been introduced during this and previous sessions of Congress which would amend our Constitution to provide for a national primary immediately upon ratification. I have also read the results of the Gallup poll of September 22, 1968, which revealed that 76 percent of those polled favored the primary system over the convention method. In view of the television "specials" last August, perhaps this reaction is to be expected.

While a national primary would be an ideal solution if it could be made to work effectively, it raises some difficult practical questions that need to be carefully explored. Our major national political parties are actually loose confederations of State and local parties. The convention system forces these parties to come together once every 4 years to choose a national candidate, thus serving as a unifying device for the parties. Would a federally imposed primary system eliminate this unifying mechanism?

The durability and vitality of the democratic American political system owes much to the existence over the years of two major parties competing from positions of roughly equal strength. Since minority factions within each party must rely on the quadrennial convention as the forum in which their views can be reconciled with those of the majority of their party, would the absence of such a forum frustrate these dissident factions' efforts to influence the winning candidate? Would these factions then have to find a substitute method, such as splitting off and forming a multitude of special interest parties?

At present the mainstay of the American party system is the State and local party leadership. Would a national primary system diminish the viability of the State and local organizations, thus allowing a power void which could be filled by national mass media and public relations agencies, skilled in exploiting personality appeals rather than party principles?

If no candidate received a majority or substantial plurality of the primary votes, would a second nationwide "run-off" election be necessary? Then would three national elections in 1 year tax the citizens' patience, further reducing voter participation in national elections?

Would the primary eliminate the possibility of a draft of a reluctant but qualified candidate? Would it force incumbent Presidents seeking a second term into a primary campaign? What would be the status of an "independent" voter in the major party primaries? Would voters be allowed to vote in either party primary?

Who would pay the enormous costs of campaigning nationwide for the primary, the runoff when required, and the subsequent general election? Will this merely accelerate the trend wherein only a man with access to enormous sums of money is able to run for President? How is the vice-presidential candidate to be chosen?

To my knowledge these vexing questions concerning a national primary system have not been satisfactorily answered. Therefore, I am proposing the establishment of this high-level Commission to bring together the most astute political theorists and practitioners who will be directed to report on the feasibility of the various suggested reforms in our nominating process. We must not blindly accept the traditional methods of selecting these candidates just for the sake of tradition. If these methods are deemed outdated and undemocratic by the Commission and later by the Congress, they should be changed. But at the same time we should not abandon traditional methods which have served our country well for 136 years without forming a very definite basis for such a change.

The 30-member Commission proposed in my resolution would be chosen as follows:

Six Members of the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives, equally divided between the Republican and Democrat Parties;

Six members, three of whom shall be chosen by the Republican National Committee and three to be chosen by the Democrat National Committee. This provision is very important in my opinion, since any recommendations from the Commission will obviously affect the basic functions of our two major parties. The views of these parties must be strongly represented;

Three members to be chosen by the Council of State Governments, of whom one shall be a Governor, one a State legislator, and one a State administrative official;

Three members shall be municipal officials who shall be jointly selected by the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors;

And finally, six members of whom one shall be selected by each of the three candidates who received the highest number of votes at the 1968 Democrat and Republican National Conventions. In other words one member will be selected by each of the following: Richard Nixon, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, Gov.

Ronald Reagan, Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, and Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN.

While this Commission would be charged with considering all possible alternatives to the present nominating system, for the purposes of legislative history, I would like to call attention to one specific proposal. Prof. Philip Green, a specialist in American government at Smith College, Northampton, Mass., has proposed in some detail a system which utilizes both the advantages of the convention method and the democratic reforms of the primary method. Briefly stated, this proposal would do away with the pre-convention State conventions but retain the national conventions. After the individual State primaries, each candidate would be represented at the national conventions by the number of delegates proportionately equal to his percentage of the vote in the State primaries. This would do away with winner-take-all primaries, unit rules, and unfair delegate-selection procedures, thus giving dissident factions a genuine means of registering their dissent through the authorized channels of democracy.

I offer this suggestion not as a cure-all, but as one alternative which needs to be investigated further by this Commission. In the final analysis this Commission will have the responsibility of recommending a format in which a partnership can be established between Congress and the political parties. From this partnership should evolve a nominating system which will more accurately reflect the will of the American electorate. To this end we must stimulate a full and open public discussion of the alternatives to the present system.

TRUMBULL'S PAINTING, "DEATH OF GENERAL WARREN AT THE BATTLE OF BUNKER HILL"—THE PAINTER AND THE BATTLE

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, this year's 6-cent American artist commemorative stamp honors John Trumbull, painter of the American Revolution. The stamp features a detail from his canvas "Death of General Warren at the Battle of Bunker Hill," which hangs in the Yale University Art Gallery. The stamp will be issued October 18, 1968, at New Haven, Conn.

The 25- by 34-inch painting pictures a dramatic point of the battle. The British, twice driven back with heavy losses, have attacked a third time and the Americans, ammunition gone, are being forced back. But the design of the stamp itself comes from the far right-hand edge of the painting, and as Trumbull himself described the scene reproduced on the stamp:

On the right of the painting, a young American, wounded in the sword hand in the breast, has begun to retire, attended by a faithful Negro; but seeing his general

fall, hesitates whether to save himself, or, wounded as he is, to return and assist in saving a life more precious to his country than his own.

The American is a Lieutenant Grosvenor; the Negro accompanying him is Peter Salem, a freed slave, who fought in the battle and whose shot mortally wounded Maj. John Pitcairn, British Royal Marines.

Ironically, Trumbull's painting was finished in a London art studio in 1786, nearly 11 years after the battle. English engravers had no wish to help commemorate an American victory and Trumbull had to go to Stuttgart, Germany, for the engraving to be made. The engraving was not published in London until 1798, nearly a full generation after the battle.

The stories of both painter and battle follow:

THE PAINTER

John Trumbull was very probably the last man in the entire history of world painting who was granted a privilege and task accorded a few artists, and which he could not have known were his. The time of his birth, his talents as a painter, and the circumstances and surroundings of his life all merged to make him "artist to an age," whose canvases captured and preserved a world where visual records of events and personages depended solely on an artist's skill. He was the last; when he died in 1843, at the age of eighty-eight, the new daguerreotype process has just attained its greatest popularity, and from that time onward men, women, and events would be captured by and preserved upon the impersonal photographic plate.

We have a visual conception of Martin Luther through the paintings and prints of Luther's artist friend, Lucas Cranach. 16th century England and the court of King Henry VIII live in the works of Hans Holbein the Younger. The time of the ill-fated Charles I of England, who was to die under the headman's axe at the hands of Oliver Cromwell's men, survives in the canvases of Sir Anthony Van Dyck. Napoleon Bonaparte and the sweep and panorama of his life is contained in the pictures of Jacques Louis David. And so it was with the last of these few: John Trumbull, participant in and artist of the Revolutionary War and the early years of the American Republic.

Revolutionary War Colonel himself: acquainted with the first six presidents of the United States, and close friend to the very first; diplomatic secretary to John Jay—a roster of a few of the subjects of Trumbull's numerous paintings reads like a catalogue of the young United States of America: John and Samuel Adams, Supreme Court Justice Samuel Chase, DeWitt Clinton, Benjamin Franklin, General Horatio Gates, Elbridge Gerry, General Nathanael Greene, Alexander Hamilton, John Hancock, John Jay, Thomas Jefferson, Henry Knox, General the Marquis de Lafayette, General Charles Lee, General William Moultrie, General Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, General John Schuyler, Roger Sherman, George Washington, General Anthony Wayne. He painted three of the Revolution's major battles: Bunker Hill, Trenton, and Princeton, and his canvases of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, the surrender of Burgoyne at Saratoga, the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown, and General Washington's resigning his commission hang in the Rotunda of the Capitol in Washington.

Trumbull's "Bunker's Hill" marks the 12th time one of his works has appeared either whole or in part on a United States stamp. His George Washington portraits have been used six times; Nathanael Greene and Rufus

Putnam, once each; Alexander Hamilton once (his Hamilton portrait, done posthumously soon after the Hamilton-Burr duel, is also on the \$10 bill); and two of his major canvases of Revolutionary events, The Declaration of Independence and the Surrender of General Burgoyne at Saratoga have each appeared once.

Born in Lebanon, Connecticut, on June 6, 1756, he lost the sight of his left eye at age four or five (Trumbull himself was not sure which) following a fall down a flight of stairs. He graduated from Harvard in 1773, the youngest member of his class, and regardless of the fact that he only had monocular vision, ultimately became the earliest American college graduate to become a professional painter.

On May 1, 1775, he entered active duty as Adjutant of the 1st Connecticut Regiment, and was sent to Boston. It was on this assignment that he viewed the battle of Bunker Hill, from a distance of about four miles. His drawings of plans of the British fortifications before Boston won George Washington's approval and attention, Washington appointed Trumbull his aide-de-camp, a post he held for only a few weeks, until he became a brigade major and was with the American Army when it entered Boston in March of 1776.

In June, 1776, he joined Gen. Horatio Gates as adjutant and was promised a colonel's commission. He served with Gates in Canada, at Ticonderoga and Crown Point, but in February 1777 resigned his commission in a quarrel over when it should have been effective. The Continental Congress granted it September 12, 1776; Trumbull insisted it should have been from June 28, 1776, and made so much of an issue of this less-than-three-months period that he left the army. Except for a brief period of service as volunteer in the Rhode Island Campaign of 1778, this terminated his military career, but to the end of his life he clung to the title of "Colonel."

In 1780, although the war was still going on, he went to London under a "safe conduct" granted by Lord George Germaine himself, the British Secretary of State, to study painting under another American, Benjamin West. His autobiography lists 68 different works prior to this journey but he knew he needed more training. He was jailed in England in reprisal for the Americans' hanging of Major Andre, the British spy, and took the time to study architecture. After his release he went back to America, painted a few portraits and landscapes, then went back to London and to West's teaching in 1784.

In 1789 he returned to America again and traveled up and down the eastern seaboard and spent what one biographer terms "years of feverish activity and promise." He visited battlefields, painted portraits and miniatures and planned his historical series.

In 1794 he returned to London as diplomatic secretary to John Jay and from then until going home in 1804 he traveled on the Continent, viewed the French Revolution, and speculated "... in old masters and, disastrously, in French brandy."

From 1804 to 1808 he was in New York and did a number of posthumous portraits of Alexander Hamilton, some commission work, panoramas of Niagara Falls and a few landscapes. Concerned over his falling eyesight, he went to London again in 1808 but Americans were unpopular due to rising tensions, which led to the War of 1812. In 1816 he returned to America again, heavily in debt.

From 1816 to 1837 he lived in New York and received valuable commissions for historical pictures for the Rotunda of the new Capitol Building at Washington. He had a few portrait commissions and considerable financial difficulty—again. In 1832, the Trumbull Art Gallery opened, which was the earliest art museum in the country connected

with an educational institution. His last few years before his death were spent with a relative in New Haven, Connecticut, where he made "heavy-handed, large-scale copies of earlier religious pictures." He died in New York on November 10, 1843, and was buried beside his wife in the Trumbull Gallery, beneath his full-length military portrait of Washington.

THE BATTLE

"The shot heard 'round the world" was fired at Concord Bridge on April 19, 1775. Within a week, 15,000 armed men had swarmed down on Boston, and were camped barely a musket shot from the British sentries. On May 25, 1775, His Majesty's Ship *Cerberus*, carrying Major-Generals Clinton, Burgoyne and Howe entered Boston Harbor. When they had left England in April, they thought Massachusetts was at peace, but that night they saw peering through the night like angry eyes the flickering campfires of an American army that had Boston under siege and 5,000 troops bottled up, unable to move.

General Burgoyne's reaction was immediate and direct: "What? Ten thousand peasants keep five thousand of the King's troops shut up? Well, let us get in and we'll soon find elbow-room!"

But Gen. Sir William Howe was in charge, and he began at once on a battle plan to break the siege. On June 18, 1,500 men would hit the American right wing. General Clinton would take his troops between the center and the left flank. If all went well, both forces would drive against the center. Raw Americans against seasoned troops, on an open field; no doubt of the outcome, and the peace. The rebellion would be over.

Midnight, June 16, 1776: Howe pondered a map and turned the details over in his mind. But his plan had leaked to the American Committee of Safety, and at that very moment, just across Boston Harbor to the north, 900 Americans, urged on by Colonel William Prescott and Gen. Israel Putnam, were frantically digging on the crest of Breed's Hill. On deck of H.M.S. *Lively*, riding at anchor, the middle watch thought he had heard noises from that direction and so informed his relief.

About an hour before dawn, on June 17, 1776, the marine on *Lively* standing the morning watch chucked to himself. Noises? Probably some rebel farmers cutting hay! The light increased; first the houses of Charlestown were visible, then the hills above. The marine stared, blinked, then stared again. Within seconds, Capt. Thomas Bishop was on *Lively's* quarter deck, following the pointing finger. There had been nothing the night before, but now, on the crest of Breed's Hill, was a fort, and a very professional-looking job it was, too. Bishop bawled orders to his crew.

Adm. Samuel Graves woke with a start at the first crash of *Lively's* 10 starboard guns. An aide told him the ship was firing at some rebels on Charlestown Heights. "He has no such orders!" snarled Graves. "Tell him to cease firing at once!" Fifteen minutes later a message came from British General Gage: Take a look. Graves trained his telescope on Charlestown Heights: "Order all ships to commence firing immediately!"

Within ten minutes 168 British guns opened up.

General Gage summoned Abijah Willard, American loyalist, handed him a telescope and pointed to the tall figure walking on the parapet of the fort. Willard nodded; it was his brother-in-law, Col. William Prescott. "Will he fight?" Gage asked. "I cannot answer for his men," replied Willard, "but he will fight you to the gates of hell." Gage shook his head. "The works must be carried," he muttered, and headed off for a council of war.

General Howe pointed at a map: land

troops on the tip of the peninsula; send a column of light infantry around the American left; flank them; cut off their retreat; then frontal attack. General Clinton wasn't sure. What if they choose to stand and fight? Howe brushed this aside as not likely, and, besides, they could not have had time to make a complete job of fortifying the hill.

On Breed's Hill Prescott and Putnam were driving their men on. By eight o'clock in the morning the fortifications were almost completed and the men were complaining about hunger, thirst and lack of reinforcements. A cannon ball shot away Asa Pollard's head and to the bewildered query of "What shall we do sir?" Prescott retorted "Bury him!" "Without prayers, sir?" "Without prayers!" "Yes, sir!"

In the streets of Boston the British were preparing to move out and by 11:30 a.m. were ready to embark. Howe himself was in the first boat that grated ashore on the peninsula. Lines were formed, artillery came ashore, and in twenty minutes the beach was secure. Then, on Howe's left, shouts and curses, and five would-be deserters were prodded in front of Howe. "I would like to hang all five of you, but I need men. Hang these two." Ten minutes later their lifeless bodies dangled from trees nearby.

The American lines on Breed's Hill were lengthened; 200 Connecticut men were stationed behind a 200-yard long rail fence on the American left, where Howe planned his flanking movement, and by 2:15 that afternoon they were joined by John Stark and his New Hampshiremen. Other Massachusetts forces appeared on the field, and into the redoubt on Breed's Hill came the glittering figure of Joseph Warren.

Splendid in pale blue waistcoat with silk fringes, laced with silver, his breeches were white satin with silver loops, and he wore a white ruffled shirt. Made a major general in the Massachusetts army three days before, he was also president of the Provincial Congress, chairman of the Committee of Safety, and friend of Sam Adams and John Hancock. Prescott saluted and asked for orders. "I have none to give. I am here as a volunteer." The young farmers took heart, and by now a line of 2000 Americans was in place.

Back to Howe, on the beach, where 2600 officers and men were ready. Grenadiers and regular infantry to go straight across the fields; light infantry to circle and head for the rail fence; light infantry cut across the American flank and rear; confusion; charge on all fronts by British; American retreat.

The lines moved; Howe's artillery support from the beach ceased, where cursing gunners struggled helplessly with ammunition that would not fit their guns.

In the American lines on Breed's Hill, General Israel Putnam squinted at the advancing British and gave his men the order first used by Prince Charles of Prussia, fighting the Austrians at the Battle of Jaegerndorf, in 1745: "Don't fire until you see the whites of their eyes." On the American left flank, John Stark jumped over the fence and hammered a stake into the sand of the beach, forty yards in front. "Fire when they cross this."

Down the beach towards Stark and his men pounded 350 British light infantry, on Howe's flanking move, with orders to use the bayonet. They passed the stake; the American lines exploded in their faces and the front rank blew apart. Right behind them came the King's Own and second volley cut them down. Yet behind them came the Tenth Regiment; still a third volley, and there were not enough British left to form a solid line. Now the Fifty-Second surged forward; another volley; ninety-six men were dead on the sand, and a white-faced aide bearing the news caught up with Howe and his grenadiers, struggling over the rail fences leading up the hill. Howe clenched his jaw. "Attack all along the line!"

One hundred yards; seventy yards; "The bayonet! The bayonet!" roared Howe. He could not see there were 1500 muzzles leveled at his men, whose opening charge was led by only 350 men in ten companies. In the redoubt, a grey-haired farmer prayed aloud:

"I thank thee, O Lord, for sparing me to fight this day. Blessed be the name of the Lord."

British accounts say the first American volley was at less than fifteen paces. Down by the fence with the New Hampshiremen young Ralph Farnum was to remember to his dying day, eighty years later, at the age of 105, the last American survivor of the battle, that the hideous screams of the grenadiers as they were torn apart by the musketry was the most frightening sound and the most vivid memory he had of the whole battle.

In ten minutes the Americans fired about 30,000 bullets; the forward British units took eighty per cent casualties.

On the British left, a double line of marines and infantry headed for the south wall of the American redoubt. At twenty yards the Americans opened fire and the red lines tumbled 200 yards back down the hill.

The British lines formed again, and with Howe once more at their head, pressed up the hill. This time at thirty yards; again the hall of bullets; the attack swirled to a halt; Howe stood alone.

"Once more, men, once more!" and once more they went up—into another American volley, and the survivors turned and headed for the beach.

Of Howe's 750 grenadiers and light infantry, 450 were dead or wounded. Howe looked up the hill. "We will go forward once more, gentlemen."

And they did. But in the American lines, ammunition was almost gone; there were few if any bayonets and it would be rocks and clubbed muskets. The British lines came closer. Peter Salem, one of the freed Negro slaves in Prescott's regiment and one of the seven whose names have come down as having fought that day, heard British Major Pitcairn shouting and cursing at his marines. He thrust his immensely long duck gun over the parapet and squeezed the trigger. Pitcairn went down; his Marine Lieutenant son ran to his side and with the help of two marines carried the dying Major back down the hill.

Powder was running out; there was desperation but no retreat. Prescott was parrying British bayonet thrusts with his sword. Lieutenant Richardson of the Royal Irish jumped to the parapet. "The day is ours," he shouted, and the next instant, Captain Ebenezer Bancroft, one shot left in his musket, rammed his bayonet into Richardson's shoulder and pulled the trigger. Richardson toppled backwards, his shoulder shattered.

In the next instant Bancroft's gun was torn from his hands. He snatched another from a grenadier and killed him with his own bayonet. That gun went, too; he plunged over the wall, landed beside a British soldier and started to run. Then he realized he would be shot in the back, so he wheeled and hit the soldier with his fist. Bancroft was followed by Cuffee Whittemore, another freed Negro. With a true American passion for souvenirs, Whittemore paused long enough to grab up the splendid sword of a dead British officer before running on down the hill.

Now the Americans had been driven out of the redoubt and were backing slowly down the reverse slope of the hill. Joseph Warren summoned some men to make a last stand; a volley came from the British lines, and Warren was hit behind the ear as he turned to call encouragement to his troops. He flung a hand to the wound and fell without a sound.

Major-General Burgoyne watched the withdrawal:

"The retreat was no flight; it was even covered with bravery and military skill."

Then it was over. 2300 British had gone up the hill; 1,054 were killed or wounded. One-eighth of all British officers to be killed in the entire Revolutionary War had fallen that day. The Americans had lost around 500 killed, wounded and missing.

Sir William Howe had won an utterly useless peninsula, but His Majesty's forces in America had lost forevermore the daring and brilliance, the dash and skill, that had marked Sir William's career up until that day. "There was a moment I never felt before," he was to say, reflecting on those horrible moments when his troops had been slaughtered in one of the most costly, bloody frontal attacks in the entire history of warfare. Howe was to receive much of the blame for failure to win the Revolutionary War, and his brother officers would point to his experience that hot June day as the one factor that was to make him slow, hesitant and overly cautious, letting the Colonial troops escape him again and again.

Benjamin Franklin, in Philadelphia, had spent the last ten years working harder for peace than any other man on both sides of the ocean. He picked up his pen and wrote to an old friend in London:

Mr. STRAHAN: You are a member of Parliament and one of that Majority which has doomed my country to destruction. You have begun to burn our towns and murder our People. Look upon your Hands! They are stained with the Blood of your Relations! You and I were long Friends. You are now my Enemy.

"And I am,
"Yours,

"B. FRANKLIN."

CONGRESSMAN DURWARD G. HALL REPORTS ON THE 90TH CONGRESS

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD my end-of-session report on the 90th Congress which I send to my constituents:

END-OF-SESSION REPORT

The 90th Congress is now history and there will be many interpretations of its deliberations and actions. In this "end of session" report, I'll try to identify a few of the problems it dealt with, some of which were solved, some of which were only compounded, and others which were not faced at all.

Under our system of government, the Majority Party controls the legislative machinery which includes the scheduling and consideration of all bills. There were 247 Democrats and 187 Republicans in the House; 63 Democrats and 37 Republicans in the Senate.

Although the computers are still tabulating the results, it appears the total amount of money appropriated by the Congress will exceed one hundred and thirty billion dollars. The "planned" deficit (the difference between expenditures and revenues) may run in excess of six billion dollars.

Obviously, any state, any city or county, any local school board, or even your own family, which so profoundly overspent its revenues would be in serious trouble. The nation's financial troubles are reflected by a 4½ percent increase in the cost of living in a one year period, the highest interest rates since the Civil War, and a continuing drain on our gold supply, and balance of payments.

The "average" wage earner is receiving \$13.85 a week more than he did in September, 1965. But, after adjusting for the increase in the cost of living, and deductions

for higher Social Security taxes, the real pay increase amounts to only 23 cents a week. Many persons living on fixed incomes, especially those living in retirement (who saw fit to try and secure their own futures), actually have lost purchasing power in this same period.

The 1939 dollar is now worth less than 41 cents in real value, and should the present rate of decline continue, would be worth only a "nickel" in 1982. Clearly, inflation is one of the Nation's most serious domestic problems!

The Administration sought, and obtained, a 10 percent tax surcharge, to which the Congress added a mandatory six billion dollar cut in Federal spending. But, while no one has been exempted from the tax hike, the dike was broken on the spending cut and numerous exceptions were forced through.

A year ago, as the Vietnam war of gradualism continued, the claim was made that the Nation could afford both "guns and butter". The results have shown it could not, and that there was blood in the butter! Between 1961 and 1968, defense spending rose by 65 percent, and domestic spending rose nearly 90 percent!

At long last, Congress took note of sharply rising crime rates, and passed the Omnibus Anti-Crime Act of 1968. Much of it was directed against the appointed Attorney General, Ramsey Clark, head of the Department of Justice—who often seems to be saying that "society has failed the criminal", instead of the other way around. After the devastating Washington riots of last April, Attorney General Clark, in response to a newspaperman's question, said he "was looking into reports" that Stokely Carmichael had helped incite the riot by making inflammatory statements. He promised action, if appropriate. Today, five months afterward, he presumably is still "investigating". To direct queries by mail he has no reply.

The Anti-Crime Bill also included provisions intended to offset several Supreme Court decisions which many believe have made it increasingly difficult for local law enforcement authorities to carry out their responsibilities to maintain law and order. These provisions primarily affect (a) reasonable time for arraignment of criminal suspects, (b) admissibility of confession, and (c) admissibility of eye witness testimony. A measure tightening up restrictions on the mail-order sale of guns and ammunition, rejected registration and licensing on the basis that the criminal would ignore them at no risk. It was pointed out that the Supreme Court had ruled in a decision earlier this year that a person whose ownership of a firearm was illegal, because he was a convicted felon, could not be forced to register it, because this would violate his rights under the Fifth Amendment against self-incrimination (one who joined in this decision was Justice Abe Fortas!)

The House did include in the bill a mandatory minimum prison sentence for persons convicted of committing a felony with a firearm.

Foreign Aid has been a controversial issue for at least 15 of the last 20 years. This year, Congress made the deepest reductions in Foreign Aid in the history of the program. In view of our own fiscal situation, I think the cuts should have been even deeper, especially since there is a large carryover of unexpended funds even if no new monies were approved. No program is so sacred that it must go on forever, and by now we surely have learned that American dollars are not the answer to what ails much of the world. Our own citizens have been asked to tighten their belts, while Foreign Aid Administrators proposed to continue business as usual. This time Congress properly said "No."

One of the toughest responsibilities facing every Member of Congress is the task of assigning spending priorities to the Nation's needs. The Administration budget failed to

lead by saying "Yes" to every Administration request, the dollar would be in even greater trouble around the world, and at home. In assessing those needs and priorities, here are a few of the programs I felt were deserving, and on which I voted "Yea":

Vocational education (H.R. 18366)—*This year's bill was truly a landmark in this field. The technological age in which we move will flounder if skilled manpower is not available to sustain it. Our technological advances and the increased number of skilled fields profit us little, if we continue to lose young people to the ranks of the unemployed. The fiscal level for this measure, which is primarily aimed at young people without skills, was set at five hundred and sixty five million dollars. This program has proven itself in Southwest Missouri, and I testified in its behalf.*

Higher Education Act (H.R. 15067)—*The bill approved this year marks the 10th Anniversary of the National Defense Education Act, and is intended to help our colleges and universities cope with mounting student enrollments through a program of matching funds and loans for construction of academic facilities. It will also enable more qualified students to continue their higher education even though they have limited financial resources of their own. One important amendment would deny Federal assistance to any student who is found guilty of participating in riots or other forms of violence on the campus.*

Removal of admission fees at Federal reservoirs—*We were successful in attaching an amendment to the Public Works Bill (S-3710) which will almost certainly have the effect of removing admission fees at our Federal reservoirs in 1970. Although I argued that the fees should be taken off now, I feel this was a moral victory in view of the Administration's opposition to any action removing the fees.*

Manpower Development and Training Act (H.R. 15045)—*Properly administered this measure can utilize the training resources of private enterprise to provide meaningful training for jobs that are waiting to be filled. In the past, a major problem has been duplication and waste with fifteen major Federally supported manpower programs administered by five different agencies.*

Some of the other measures I supported included bills dealing with Meat and Poultry Inspection, School Lunch program, Library Services Act, Military Pay increase, Railroad retirement insurance and benefits act, Narcotics control bill, Veterans pensions, the Older Americans Act, and Narcotics Control.

Hearings were held in the House Committee on Agriculture on my cropland and water restoration bill, but Agriculture Secretary Freeman did not submit a report on the measure, and the Committee merely proposed a one year extension of the present farm program. With farm prices falling and farm costs continuing to spiral upward there is certain to be renewed demand in the 91st Congress to develop a new approach to the problems of the farm economy.

Hearings were held in the House Committee on Public Works on my bill to reform Federal land acquisition policy. I believe a clear record has been made of the need to provide fairer and more equitable methods of acquiring property under threat of condemnation, and I look forward to new legislation being adopted in the next Congress. Remarks by Members of the Public Works Committee showed clear support for this much-needed reform.

I have touched on only a few of the issues that were before the 90th Congress. There were many others dealing with the whole range of problems before the Nation and indeed the world. Much unfinished business remains for the new Congress and the new Administration that will pick up the reigns of leadership next January.

It has been a rare opportunity for me to

do this, and if Congress had followed that serve you, by trying to fulfill the duties and responsibilities of the office I am privileged to occupy. As nearly as I can determine, about 15,000 citizens in our District communicated with this office on legislative issues during the past year, a sure sign that our people are vitally interested in the affairs of their government. I have faith in their informed judgment! Almost that same number had occasion to write me on personal problems that involved some function of the Federal government. In doing my best to render service, I'm grateful to the members of my staff who have worked tirelessly to help me help you!

DURWARD G. HALL,
Member of Congress.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, at the end of July I sent out some 130,000 copies

of a questionnaire to the people of the 35th Congressional District of New York, which I represent. Some 15,000 replies have been received thus far, and in accordance with my standard practice I would like to incorporate the results in the RECORD.

The questions and a tabulation of the answers follow:

	Percent
1. Which course do you favor for Vietnam?	
(a) Escalate the fighting to seek a military victory.....	21.0
(b) Seek a negotiated settlement at Paris, but defer further U.S. deescalation until North Vietnam also deescalates.....	42.5
(c) End our operations and withdraw even though North Vietnam refuses to agree to any honorable peace terms.....	16.7
(d) Other.....	16.4
Undecided.....	3.4
2. On gun controls which do you favor?	
(a) No additional legislation.....	33.9
(b) Extend present mail-order ban to rifles and shotguns.....	30.2
(c) Alternative (b) plus registration of all firearms.....	30.7
Undecided.....	5.2

[In percent]

	Too much	Too little	About enough	Undecided
3. How well do you think Congress has spent money for:				
Defense.....	33.5	13.0	42.9	10.6
Space.....	48.4	13.1	30.4	8.1
Agricultural supports.....	45.6	15.8	27.0	11.6
Foreign aid.....	75.9	4.9	13.7	5.5
Education.....	16.6	36.7	39.1	7.6
Housing.....	27.3	31.4	30.7	10.6
Antipoverty.....	37.5	30.8	23.0	8.7
Medical care.....	36.2	19.3	36.0	8.5
		Yes	No	Undecided
Do you favor:				
4. Withdrawing U.S. troops from Europe unless other NATO countries carry more of the common load?.....	69.3	22.2	8.5	2.2
5. Ending Government aid to students participating in campus rioting or disorders.....	88.0	9.8	2.2	11.3
6. Stiffer limits on cigarette advertising?.....	61.9	26.8	18.4	11.2
7. Making the Post Office a nonprofit, semipublic corporation?.....	59.4	22.2	18.4	11.2
8. Banning sale of imitation milk in packages resembling milk?.....	65.1	23.7	5.5	5.4
9. Giving 18-year-olds the right to vote?.....	47.0	47.5	5.4	5.4
10. Guaranteed annual income, whether people work or not?.....	7.1	87.5	5.4	5.4
11. Legislation strengthening right of farmers and farm organizations to bargain for improved prices?.....	66.2	19.0	14.8	12.0
12. Generally, the present operation of the draft?.....	46.8	41.2	12.0	12.0

Summarizing the figures above, the people of our district would appear to oppose unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam by a margin of better than 3 to 1, and registration and licensing of guns by better than 2 to 1. Too much money, they feel, is being spent for space, agricultural supports, foreign aid, and antipoverty, especially foreign aid. Spending for defense, education, and housing is about right. Medical care is virtually a stand-off between too much and just enough, and the same was true for the 18-year-old vote.

Those who replied in favor of withdrawing troops from NATO unless our partners provide more help were better than 3 to 1, although a large share of these replies came in before the Czech invasion; they favor withdrawing aid from rioting students by a margin of 9 to 1; stricter limits on cigarette advertising, a private postal corporation, restrictions on imitation milk, and provisions for farmers to work together for higher prices by margins of better than 2 to 1. The draft ekes out approval by a narrow margin, and a guaranteed annual income loses by better than 12 to 1.

MILESTONES IN THE LIFE OF BISHOP CHARLES P. GRECO

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, this year, 1968, marks the 50th anniversary of the ordination to the priesthood of His Excellency, the Most Reverend Charles P. Greco, bishop of the Catholic diocese of Alexandria, La.

Bishop Greco has been my close personal friend for many years. In fact, during my tenure of office, I have assisted His Excellency on a number of occasions. One time that I clearly recall was when His Excellency was interested in obtaining the admission of an Order of European nuns to teach in the Catholic schools in his diocese under the provisions of the Immigration and Naturalization Act. I was able to obtain the admission of these nuns under that section of the act which provides for the admission of foreign nationals who possess special skills. Of course, everyone is aware of the outstanding teaching ability that

nuns possess so the special skill requirements are more than satisfied.

I am, therefore, very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to extend to Bishop Greco my best wishes and kindest regards on this most momentous occasion in his fruitful life.

As part of my extension of remarks, I am including some of the milestones in the life of Bishop Greco:

MILESTONES IN THE LIFE OF BISHOP CHARLES P. GRECO

Born in Rodney, Miss., October 29, 1894.
Twice met St. Frances Cabrini in New Orleans, and received her promise of prayers in 1904 and 1905.

Grade and high school—Jesuit College in New Orleans and St. Joseph's Preparatory Seminary, St. Benedict, La., 1905-1913.

Major seminary—University of Louvain, Belgium, 1913; University of Fribourg, Switzerland, 1914. Remained here during war years.

Ordination—Academy of the Sacred Heart, at New Orleans by Archbishop Shaw, July 25, 1918.

Assistant pastor—St. Mary's Church, New Orleans, La.; St. Francis de Sales' Church, Houma, La., 1918 to 1923.

Vice Chancellor and Chancellor—Archdiocese of New Orleans, 1923 to 1926.

Defender of marriage bond and presiding judge—Matrimonial Court, Archdiocese of New Orleans, 1926 to 1945.

Administrator and pastor—St. Maurice Church, New Orleans, 1926 to 1945.

Archdiocesan counselor—Appointed 1935.

Domestic prelate—Named by Pope Pius XI, 1937.

Silver jubilee—of Ordination, 1943.

Columnist and editor-in-chief—Catholic Action of the South, 1933-1945.

Presiding judge of Pontifical Tribunal—investigation miracle used in Beatification of Mother Seton.

Pastor—Our Lady of Lourdes Church, New Orleans, April, 1945.

Vicar General—Archdiocese of New Orleans, June, 1945.

Bishop—Appointed Bishop of Alexandria by Pope Pius XII, Jan. 15, 1946.

Consecrated Bishop—St. Louis Cathedral, New Orleans, February 25, 1946.

Installed—Bishop of Alexandria by Archbishop Rummel in St. Francis Xavier Cathedral, March 19, 1946.

Regional CCD—U.S. Bishops' Committee of CCD, November, 1948.

State chaplain—Knights of Columbus of Louisiana since July, 1954.

Chairman—Bishops' Committee CCD since November, 1959.

Dedication sermon—National Shrine of Immaculate Conception, Washington, D.C., December 20, 1959.

Supreme chaplain—Knights of Columbus, United States, Canada, Mexico, Philippine Islands, Puerto Rico, etc., since January 14, 1961.

Ecumenical Council—Consultor, January 23, 1961. Bishop Greco was named to one of the Council's 10 Commissions, December 1961, and helped prepare the Constitution of the Life and Ministry of the Clergy, and other Constitutions. He was also on one of the pre-Council Commissions which helped to prepare material before the actual opening of the Council. He did not miss a single meeting during any of the sessions throughout the entire Council, nor any of the votes taken.

Established St. Mary's School for Retarded Children, in Clarks, La., September 15, 1954, and Holy Angels School for Retarded Children in Shreveport, March 1966. A third school will be established as soon as Federal funds are available through Mental Retardation Act.

Radio fireside chat—on KALB weekly uninterrupted since 1947.

STEEL IMPORTS MUST BE CURTAILED

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have mentioned to our membership the major threat of crippling the operation of our largest American industry—steel production.

Employment in our steelmills support a great segment of our American families.

This annual increase of foreign steel importation into our country is rapidly jeopardizing our Nation's economy. Something must be done, and immediately, to greatly curtail this threat to employment and the buying power of the employees of this major industry. If our Government continues to allow this condition to proceed it will greatly contribute to another depression throughout the land.

Under unanimous consent I include in my remarks a letter I received from Mr. John P. Roche, president of the American Iron & Steel Institute.

AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL INSTITUTE,
New York, N.Y., October 4, 1968.

HON. RAY J. MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MADDEN: In the first eight months of 1968, approximately 11.8 million tons of imported steel mill products entered the United States, an increase of 64.4% over the comparable period in 1967. Instead of tapering off after the settlement between the steel companies and the steel workers' union, imports rose to a new high in August when they accounted for nearly one-third of all steel delivered in the United States.

In the period 1963-1968, capital expenditures of the American steel industry will have totalled approximately \$11 billion. Continued massive capital commitments in latest technology, plant and equipment have helped the industry to maintain its lead in the use of less man-hours per ton of steel produced than any other major steel producing country in the world. Technological advances in steel making now available, however, have not enabled the domestic steel industry to reduce man-hours per ton sufficiently to match foreign steel price advantages. These advantages stem directly from lower hourly employment costs, which for European steel producers are less than one-half those in the U.S. and for Japanese producers, about one-fourth our comparable costs.

Thus, steel imports continue to increase, threatening not only the economic viability of the steel industry, but at a rate which will produce a steel trade deficit in 1968 of at least \$1.4 billion, causing deep concern over the impact on our balance of payments, and on our national security.

We hope that you and other members of the Senate and House of Representatives will note the unprecedented increase of imported steel in U.S. markets, and take action before the steel industry is irreparably damaged.

Sincerely,

JACK ROCHE,
President.

REVIEW OF ACTIVITIES

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1968

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, representing the people of San Bernardino County in the 90th Congress has been a rewarding and challenging experience. The job has been made easier by a dedicated staff of assistants who man my offices in San Bernardino County and in Washington. With their help, I have answered over 75,000 constituent letters and dealt with the pressing problems of countless citizens who in one way or another needed the personal attention of their Congressman.

I owe many thanks to my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat, who have worked with me in the House and to the county board of supervisors and the city officials in San Bernardino County. It has been a particular pleasure to serve on the Science and Astronautics Committee under GEORGE MILLER, Democrat, of California, the chairman, and JAMES FULTON, Republican, of Pennsylvania, the ranking Republican member of the committee.

I have been especially gratified by the recognition my congressional colleagues have shown on the importance of San Bernardino County's military installations. As a result, all of the Air Force, Marine Corps, and Army installations have grown. The additions are new, permanent installations that are vital to the defense of our Nation.

To keep better informed about the problems facing the people of the 33d District, I have visited my district over 50 times in the past 2 years to meet and talk with individual citizens. I believe these visits are an important and vital method of keeping in touch with the ever-changing problems of San Bernardino County. I have tried to inform the people through newsletters, news releases, weekly columns in the newspapers, and radio messages. In turn, I have solicited their advice and ideas by the use of questionnaires.

A Congressman's duties are many; his committee work, assistance to his district, the introduction of legislation, voting and speaking out in behalf of his constituents upon the vital issues that face our Nation are rewarding indeed. I would like to review with you some of these activities.

SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker, the success of the American way of life and the future of our civilization may well depend upon the ability of the scientific community in these United States to solve social and technological problems. And, if we are to avoid world war III, it is certain that our scientific achievements in the military and space fields must remain superior to any nation that might threaten our way of life.

As a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, I have repeatedly warned my colleagues in the Congress and my countrymen of the grave

challenges we face that are of a scientific nature such as rocket power. Illustrative of my "call for action" are the following brief excerpts taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NERVA, OR ANOTHER "PEARL HARBOR" IN SPACE

Mr. Speaker, it appears that some reflection upon the hard lessons of recent history in the exploration of Space is in order. I need not remind this House of what happened to this Nation on October 4, 1957. It was embarrassed before the World as it had never been before. This was the Nation, the acknowledged leader in technology, that was going to place a spacecraft in orbit as part of the program of the International Geophysical Year. We dismissed as nonsense the Russian statement that they, too, would launch a spacecraft into orbit before we could. We were not only deeply embarrassed by Sputnik I, but were also deeply shocked by the Soviet capability. . . .

Now we are considering the NERVA, the nuclear rocket research and development program. Now we are deciding irrevocably whether we are going to be caught short again—the world is watching us. Where will we be 10 or 15 years from now? This is not just a matter of ego in the scientific community—it has to do with the distinct possibility that the Russians will—with Nuclear propulsion capability in space—be able to blackmail us from a military standpoint. Now we are deciding whether we are going to concede to the Soviet Union another tremendous advantage in space over the United States, one which we will probably not be able to offset. . . .

The Members of the House have to make up their minds today. We are either going to support, a program, indispensable to our future in space, or we are going to cut it to the point of shameful impotence. . . .

I would like to use this opportunity to again urge this body to consider seriously the tremendous need this country has for a nuclear reactor built for a space rocket.

This Congress has treated this idea a little bit as it treated the concept of the Polaris submarine some years ago when it was first suggested. I hope that our negligence will not lead us into a second-place position with any other country in the world, because this could lead to disaster.

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SHARES "SCIENTIFIC INQUIRY" RESPONSIBILITY

It is with pride that I note that in our own San Bernardino County of California, more than \$35 million were spent this past year on a variety of scientific investigations and projects—both classified and unclassified—designed to keep our Nation strong in the face of our enemy. These "special" activities are under the purview and budget of my committee on Science and Astronautics.

It is with equal pride that I salute the Goldstone Deepspace Tracking Station, located in the northwest corner of San Bernardino County in the Mojave Desert, because it is by far the world's most successful station of its kind and is vital to the United States in many sophisticated projects.

OTHER MAJOR ACTIVITIES

Mr. Speaker, San Bernardino County is the largest in our Nation, with over 25,000 square miles in the area. Problems of city growth, agriculture, mining, Indian reservations, recreation areas, unemployment and industrial growth face the people of my district. Working together with local officials and individual citizens, we have endeavored to meet these challenges.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECTS

Following are brief excerpts as taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. Speaker, by the adoption of S. 20, which calls for a comprehensive review of national water resources problems and programs and the Colorado River Basin Project Act, whose object is to provide a program for the further comprehensive development of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin and for the provision of additional and adequate water supplies for use in the upper as well as the lower Colorado River Basin, we have set the stage for solving one of the nation's vital and critical problems—the problem of water, which is as important as life itself.

This legislation will also serve the purposes of regulating the flow of the Colorado River; provide for the storage and delivery of the water of the Colorado River; provide for reclamation of lands, including supplemental water supplies, and for municipal, industrial and other beneficial purposes; improve water quality; provide for basic public outdoor recreation facilities; improve conditions for fish and wildlife and the generation and sale of electric power as an incident of the foregoing purposes.

We will have also established as a policy of the Congress that we shall continue to develop, after consolidation with the affected states and appropriate Federal agencies, a regional water plan which will serve as a frame work under which projects in the Colorado River Basin may be coordinated and constructed with proper timing to the end that an adequate supply of water may be made available to all our people.

We will have clearly indicated to the Secretary of the Interior that he not only has the authority, but the responsibility for planning the best possible use of this nation's water resources west of the Continental Divide for meeting the future water needs of our western states. . . .

When the water needs of the Colorado River Basin and the time schedule have been established, all possible sources of water must be considered including water conservation, salvage, weather modification, desalination, anti-evaporation measures and importation of water from areas of surplus.

MINING SEMINAR

To assist the individual mine owner and to stimulate the increase in mining activity in San Bernardino County, I joined with the city of Barstow and members of county government in sponsoring an annual mining seminar each October. The objective of the Western States Mining Seminar is to promote the mining industry in the western United States by illuminating the capabilities of governmental agencies, the academic community, related professions and industries toward the development of mining.

The first seminar was attended by over a thousand interested miners from throughout the Southwest.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

Working with the Fort Mojave Tribe and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, agreement has been made to allow the tribe to negotiate 99 year leases to develop their land instead of the original shorter term leases which caused many developers to shy away from Indian land.

With the aid of private citizens, the County Health Department and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, we were able to provide good drinking water to the San Manuel Reservation after years of neglect.

Successful completion of the struggle

to reorganize the Chemehuevi Tribe and final recognition by the Indian Bureau appears to be at hand.

ONTARIO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

The final approval by the Civil Aeronautics Board to designate Ontario International Airport as a coterminal with Los Angeles International Airport will provide not only better airline service to our county, but should speed industrial growth, which means more jobs for our citizens.

JOB TRAINING AND UNEMPLOYMENT

During the last 2 years, new federally assisted job training programs for the hard-core unemployed have been started at our junior colleges. Also, training programs are being undertaken by private industry with Federal help. These programs and the many new businesses coming to our county have reduced unemployment to a 10-year low.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is plagued with attack from without and within. Crime and lawlessness are keeping us from solving problems at home. At the same time, Communist aggression attacks us abroad.

AMERICA'S NO. 1 PROBLEM—CRIME

The people of my home district have indicated they consider crime the major problem facing our Nation today. In discussing this with my congressional colleagues, I find the reaction is the same virtually everywhere in our country.

California, and counties such as my own San Bernardino County, have adequate anticrime laws and well-trained and dedicated law enforcement officials. Unfortunately, in many cases, they are hamstrung by those who seek to protect the criminal from society's justice.

The FBI reports crime is increasing nine times as fast as our population. Each of us should ask: "Can we afford to ignore this? Can we sit by as the American dream is beaten, murdered, and twisted into a hideous nightmare?"

It is not very pleasant to think about. But unless we start thinking and coming up with sound, workable solutions, our children will bear the full weight of our irresponsibility.

They may well ask of us in the years ahead, "Where were you when our country cried out for leadership? What was more important than the future of America?"

What is needed most in the fight against crime is leadership—an example which stands up to this menace and openly, forcefully speaks out against it.

Facing this problem is half the answer to defeating it. Burying our heads in the sand and trying to ignore it is half the way toward surrendering to it.

The two words, "law" and "justice" have been linked together ever since men first dreamed of freedom. Destroy one and the other becomes meaningless. There can be no law without justice and no justice without law.

I, for one, pledge myself to stand for law and justice. And, I firmly believe that what America needs today, more than ever before, is leadership committed to law and justice.

RELATIONS WITH COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

As I said last August, until the Communists demonstrate that they are will-

ing to sit down and discuss an end to the arms race, it is imperative to the security of our Nation that we maintain a strong defense posture.

If any doubt that communism pursues its ungodly goals through aggression, let them but look to what took place in Czechoslovakia recently. Let them remember that a small candle of freedom started to glow and was crushed quickly under the treads of Soviet tanks.

I term "shocking" the failure of the Department of Defense to show any concern over the growing nuclear submarine threat of Soviet Russia. Communities located near coastal waters, such as my own San Bernardino County, could be devastated by a single nuclear submarine attack. The loss of lives by such an attack would run into millions.

And, Mr. Speaker, the Russian submarine threat is but one area in which we must strive to keep ahead or at the very least, abreast of a potential enemy.

As I related last July, by the time the new American President takes office, the Soviet Union will have a ballistic missile force equal to our own.

Not only has the Soviet Union come near matching American's nuclear striking power, it has also forged ahead in the field of ballistic missile defense.

In this time of explosive technological change, our efforts to modernize and balance our defensive and offensive forces cannot slacken without gravely impairing world stability and the prospects for genuine peace.

When the Russians backed down during the Cuban crisis, they did so because we had the backing of an overwhelming force.

If such a nuclear showdown were to occur today, I wonder who would be forced to back down and I wonder if bargaining from a weakened position might not lead to a nuclear holocaust.

America is entering a period of unprecedented peril—we must act now.

FEDERAL LOANS, GRANTS AND CONTRACTS IN THE 33D DISTRICT

Mr. Speaker, the people of San Bernardino County, Calif., are among the Nation's major contributors to the financial foundation of the Federal Government through business and personal taxes. Therefore, I believe they are entitled to know the amount of tax moneys expended in the 33d Congressional District by the Federal Government.

Set forth below is a partial list of Federal loans, grants, awards, and contracts approved for San Bernardino County during the 90th Congress. The listing is not complete as certain figures for the fiscal year 1968-69 are not yet available.

Some items are on a regional basis and therefore benefit areas in addition to San Bernardino County. It should be noted that the amounts quoted are subject to amendment by various Government agencies.

Not included are Government contracts to individuals for projects done in and around the county, nor payments to individuals under such programs as Veterans' Administration, Social Security Administration, Farmers Home Administration, Civil Service Commission, and Small Business Administration.

The list referred to is as follows and includes in addition to Government contracts, educational and training programs, aid to municipalities, flood control projects, and so forth:

Educational grants, including job training programs, research, construction, and student loans

Alta Loma: Chaffey College.....	\$579,781
Barstow: Barstow College.....	42,986
Etiwanda: Job training.....	38,255
Barstow: Barstow Unified School District.....	64,673
Fontana: Rehabilitation workshop.....	28,177
Ontario: Job training and cross age teaching.....	65,236
Patton: Handicapped children.....	85,000
Redlands: Redlands University....	2,511,881
San Bernardino:	
Job training, teaching projects..	548,335
California State College.....	1,870,583
Valley College.....	1,243,276
Victorville: Victor Valley College..	37,038
San Bernardino County, job training, Headstart, and teaching programs.....	4,901,437

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 AS AMENDED FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOLS IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

School district	Estimated entitlement	
	Fiscal year 1967-68	Fiscal year 1968-69
Victorville.....	\$104,121	\$115,287
Adelanto.....	424,342	495,884
Victor Valley Joint Union High.....	159,095	194,958
Wrightwood Joint.....	7,464	10,834
Upland.....	58,412	73,894
Ontario.....	137,649	165,846
Chino Unified.....	43,403	55,917
Chaffey Union High.....	124,766	130,735
Central.....	7,858	12,084
Apple Valley.....	29,206	45,142
Fontana Unified.....	27,509	65,841
Morongo Unified.....	330,418	378,823
Hesperia.....	20,431	24,168
Oro Grande.....	3,405	3,055
Alta Loma.....	9,429	12,778
Barstow Junior College.....	23,295	24,168
Cucamonga.....	3,143	1,250
Victor Valley Joint Junior College..	43,288	40,007
Chaffey Union Junior College.....	28,635	26,383
San Bernardino Valley Joint Union Junior College.....	70,248	86,069
Redlands Unified.....	223,131	276,911
Yucaipa Joint Unified.....	29,649	39,211
San Bernardino City Unified.....	653,876	950,760
Rialto Unified.....	167,807	213,275
Colton Joint Unified.....	119,207	150,111
Barstow Unified.....	804,278	946,980
Needles Unified.....	5,861	32,920
San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools.....	5,487	17,505
Mount Baldy.....		8,750
Total.....	3,665,411	4,599,546

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION EXPENDITURES

Payroll and goods and services procured by the following military installations will exceed \$500 million in the year past. Most of these moneys are spent in the Inland Empire—most of which is the 33rd Congressional District:

Fort Irwin.....	\$941,000
George Air Force Base.....	13,114,000
29 Palms Marine Corps Base.....	6,704,000
Barstow Marine Corps Supply Base.....	1,290,000
Norton Air Force Base.....	5,622,000

Flood control projects

Mojave River Dam.....	\$5,020,000
Lytle and Warm Creeks.....	762,000
Deer, Day, Etiwanda and San Sevaline Creeks.....	79,000
Santa Ana River.....	470,000
Big Bear Lake.....	68,000
San Bernardino: Storm drains....	1,083,000
Yuca Valley.....	99,000
Victorville: (Oro Grande Wash over a million).....	

The Congress authorized \$26.3 million for construction of the Cucamonga Creek flood Control project.

Water district assistance

Chino.....	\$560,000
Colton.....	68,000
29 Palms.....	113,000
San Bernardino.....	51,248

Grants to county and city government (including planning, parks, highway construction, dependency prevention commission, etc.)

Chino.....	\$34,000
Montclair.....	38,000
Rialto, Municipal Airport, and Miro Field.....	602,000
Redlands.....	280,000
San Bernardino.....	1,602,449
Upland.....	81,000
Victorville.....	14,000
San Bernardino County.....	17,792,192

Urban renewal projects

Colton.....	\$378,787
San Bernardino.....	16,864,102

Sanitation district grants

Barstow.....	\$550,490
Big Bear Lake.....	34,020
Chino.....	1,658,580
Lake Arrowhead.....	82,210
Running Springs.....	15,000
San Bernardino.....	135,000

Government contracts for job training, material and manufacturing products

Fontana: Kaiser Steel.....	\$44,815,695
----------------------------	--------------

REGIONAL PROJECTS

April 3, 1967: \$100,000 for urban planning. San Bernardino County is one of six counties to benefit.

August 2, 1967: \$2,672,786 for on-the-job training for Mexican-Americans. San Bernardino County is one of many counties to benefit and share this amount.

September 7, 1967: \$70,304 to provide for personnel to assist Headstart Child Development Programs with in-service training. San Bernardino County is one of ten counties to benefit.

October 4, 1967: \$125,000 to create job opportunities. San Bernardino County is one of sixteen counties to benefit.

July, 1968: \$120,000 for advance preparation for the 1970 Census within urbanized and urbanizing portions of five counties, which includes San Bernardino County.

July 19, 1968: \$233,334 for urban planning assistance program to assist in preparation of a regional airport system plan. San Bernardino County is one of ten counties to benefit. Total: \$3,321,424.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Mr. Speaker, as Representative from the 33d Congressional District, my first responsibility, when I arrived in Washington, was to seek ways to best represent the citizens of San Bernardino County. Therefore, I would like to mention those bills introduced specifically for the benefit of our county.

H.R. 5091, "Needles mineral rights": To help desert communities to convert useless and unproductive land into valuable and taxable property. Signed, November 15, 1967. Public Law 90-138.

House Concurrent Resolution 413, "world farm center": provides for the establishment of a nongovernmental, non-profit organization to gather within the Ontario area, the world's experience, knowledge, and tools in the line of agriculture. Signed, June 26, 1968.

H.R. 14835, "Colorado River Basin Project Act": For the authorization of construction, operation, and maintenance

nance; to insure adequate water for nearly 30 million people living in arid Southwestern United States. Signed, September 30, 1968. Public Law 90-537.

H.R. 2573, "Veterans' hospital": To provide for the construction of a VA hospital of 1,000 beds in the San Bernardino-Riverside area.

H.R. 5473, "National cemetery": To provide for a national cemetery in San Bernardino County.

H.R. 10342, "Fort Irwin compensation Pay": To authorize the payment of allowances to defray commuting expenses of civilian employees assigned to duty at remote work sites. Hearings held on July 15, at which time I testified. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee favorably reported the bill, September 5, 1968.

H.R. 10724, "Lake Havasu lands": Provides for possessory interest, consisting of ownership of structures on land leased by the Secretary of Interior near Lake Havasu. Should this become law, summer cabin owners would be protected if they improved on the land. June 8, 1967, Department of Interior issued new regulations on cabin sites.

H.R. 11198, "Uniform Relocation Act": To establish a uniform policy for the fair and equitable treatment of owners, tenants, and other persons displaced by the acquisition of real property in Federal and federally assisted programs. Hearings were held on September 11, 1968, at which time I testified in behalf of our San Bernardino County citizens.

H.R. 14481, "Circuit judges": Provides for the appointment of additional circuit judges to relieve overburdened Federal judges. Signed, June 18, 1968. Public Law 90-347.

H.R. 11484, "Common varieties of minerals": Revises the meaning of the term "common varieties" of mineral materials to include deposits of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, and cinders suitable for use only as fill and to allow exploitation of other minerals on public lands having special value. This bill will untie the hands of our miners in exploring for additional sources of minerals and open up new opportunities for economic development in our county.

H.R. 19316, "Civilian Aviation Academy": To insure training in the profession of flying and related aviation skills. Cadets would be selected through competitive examination and such training would be comparable to training received at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy. I feel that Barstow College could be used for basic training in science and mechanics and the Barstow Daggett Airfield for flight training.

H.R. 20206, "Chemehuevi Indians": To provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Chemehuevi Tribe of Indians.

Mr. Speaker, I have also cosponsored several other bills which will not only affect our own county, but will affect citizens throughout the entire United States. They are listed as follows:

CRIME AND VIOLENCE

House Joint Resolution 761, "Neighborhood action crusade": To organize local programs developed by local citizens on a voluntary basis in order to lessen civil strife within our communities.

House Joint Resolution 777, "Crime Committee": To create a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime—to study the effects of crime and measures of reducing and preventing crime. This bill passed the House on July 12, 1968, and is now awaiting action in the Senate.

House Joint Resolution 1441, "TV violence": To direct the Federal Communications Commission to investigate the effects of the display of violence in television programs.

EDUCATION

House Resolution 1286, "School assistance": Requesting that, since the President would not release the \$90 million for school assistance in federally affected areas, the managers on the part of the House during the Conference on the Foreign Assistance Act should agree that no funds shall be appropriated for Foreign Assistance until these school moneys are released.

H.R. 5092, "Educational tax credit": To allow a credit against income tax to individuals for expenses incurred in providing higher education.

H.R. 17580, "Educational tax credit for teachers": To allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees.

EMPLOYMENT

House Joint Resolution 252, "Equal rights for men and women": Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

H.R. 4652, "Human Investment Act": To encourage job training by providing a 10-percent tax credit to employers for expenses incurred in training their employees in job skills.

H.R. 16304, "Manpower Development and Training Act"—Job creation bill: To authorize a community service employment program wherein private enterprise has the responsibility to provide job training and employment through education, training, job development, upgrading skills, and so forth, and that the Federal Government encourage and complement private effort.

H.R. 9275, "Postal increase": To raise the first four levels of the postal field service to a higher grade and salary. My bill was partially included in the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967. Signed, December 16, 1967. Public Law 90-206.

H.R. 10094, "Civil service annuities for widows": To provide annuities for surviving spouses without reductions in the annuities for retired employees.

H.R. 12186, "Reimbursement for Government transfer": To provide a period of 2 years instead of 1 to claim reimbursement for expenses incurred for a Government employee transferring to a new job.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

House Concurrent Resolution 326, "Halt trade with Communists": That the United States should not further trade with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites unless there is evidence that their actions and policies on Vietnam have been redirected toward peace.

H.R. 10824, "Halt foreign aid": To provide that American foreign aid shall be

suspended with respect to any country which has severed diplomatic relations with the United States. Our bill was included in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967. Signed, November 14, 1967. Public Law 90-137.

House Concurrent Resolution 533, "Cuba": For the Government of the United States to formulate a program for the immediate curtailment of hostile activities of the Castro-Communist regime in Cuba which threatens the freedom and security of the people of the world.

House Concurrent Resolution 630, "France's war debt": Requesting the United States to collect France's \$6.8 billion World War I debt.

House Joint Resolution 1047, "Territorial sea": The President should consider steps toward a uniform recognized boundary for all coastal nations.

H.R. 7641, "Dairy Import Act": Since the United States is importing 12 times as much milk equivalent as is allowable under present quotas, imports of milk and dairy products must be regulated. The Tariff Commission has been holding hearings on this which began on July 22, 1968.

H.R. 14178, "Steel imports": Since increased imports of pig iron and steel mill products have contributed substantially to reduced employment opportunities and have adversely affected the U.S. balance of payments, we must have a steel import quota. On June 18, 1968, I testified before the Ways and Means Committee as cochairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Steel.

IMPROVE GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY

House Resolution 276, "Committee on Standards of Official Conduct": To conduct standards for Members, officers and employees of the House of Representatives and to investigate violations. The committee was established on April 3, 1968.

House Concurrent Resolution 661, "Committee for Budget Priorities": To create a committee as an auditing arm of the Congress to examine the efficiency of Federal programs and activities. To see that funds authorized and appropriated are most effective and that budget priorities are established.

H.R. 11385, "War on waste": To establish a commission to organize the programs of the executive and legislative branches and all Federal agencies to see that duplication and waste are eliminated.

H.R. 18114, "Catalog of Federal assistance programs": To create a catalog which would list and provide needed information about every operating Federal assistance program for use by the State and local officials, educators, private individuals, and so forth.

H.R. 10493, "Automatic data processing system": To set up such a system within the Library of Congress which would greatly increase Government efficiency.

H.R. 5983, "Prohibit political influence in Post Office": To prohibit politics within the postal field service, to revise the laws governing appointments so that employees are chosen on merit.

H.R. 12618, "Limit political activity in OEO": Would ban the OEO from any involvement in political activities. This

bill was included in the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967. Signed, December 3, 1967. Public Law 90-222.

MILITARY

H.R. 8761, "Military equalization retirement pay": Equalizes the retirement pay for a member of the uniformed services by providing that it be computed on the basis of the monthly basic pay to which he would be entitled if he were on active duty in his retired grade.

SOCIAL SECURITY

H.R. 7581: To permit certain individuals who are forced to retire at age 60 under Federal law or regulation to continue to pay social security taxes and receive appropriate benefit credit until they reach the age of 65.

H.R. 7582: To permit the payment of full retirement benefits at age 60 in the case of certain individuals who are forced to retire at that age under Federal law or regulations.

H.R. 7672: To provide an across-the-board Social Security benefit increase and subsequent increases based on rises in the cost of living.

H.R. 9501. To permit payment to Medicare patients without first requiring that the patient submit a paid receipt from his doctor. This was included in the Social Security Amendments of 1967 as signed into law on January 2, 1968. Public Law 90-248.

H.R. 11636: To provide an interim across-the-board increase in monthly Social Security benefits retroactive to January 1, 1967 which could be provided without increasing taxes and without impairing the actual soundness of the trust funds.

H.R. 12568: To provide disability insurance benefits for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage.

TAXES

H.R. 6820, "Tax credit for pollution facilities": To allow an incentive tax credit for an amount equal to 20 percent of all costs of buildings, improvements, equipment, land, machinery, and so forth incurred by the taxpayer for constructing water or air pollution facilities.

H.R. 7579, "Reimbursed moving expenses": Excludes from the IRS as gross income of a taxpayer, any amounts of which he was reimbursed by his employer to cover moving expenses under certain provisions.

H.R. 7673, "Tax deduction for medical expenses": To restore the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to permit the deductions of medical expenses incurred for the care of individuals 65 years of age and over.

H.R. 9792, "State income tax": No State may impose a tax on the income of persons working in one state and electing to be taxed in another—home—state.

H.R. 12720, "Small Tax Division": To establish a Small Tax Division within the tax court of the United States whereby taxpayers, without hiring a lawyer, can informally present their grievances in disputes with the United States IRS.

MISCELLANEOUS

H.R. 6426, "Public cemeteries": To increase the maximum amount of public

land which may be sold to a religious or fraternal association for cemetery purposes from 80 acres to 160 acres.

H.R. 7640, "American Indian Day": To designate the fourth Friday in September as American Indian Day as a day of educational and cultural observance.

H.R. 8762, "Federal Maritime Administration": To create such an administration as an independent agency in the executive branch. This legislation passed the House on October 17, 1967 and is now awaiting action in the Senate.

H.R. 9791, "Desecration of the American flag": To prohibit contempt to our flag, and whoever publicly mutilates or defaces it shall be punished by imprisonment and fined. Signed, July 5, 1968. Public Law 90-381.

H.R. 13049, "Food and drug—Vitamin Act": To protect the right of the citizen to buy food supplements in the potency and combination desired without a prescription.

H.R. 20201, "Railroad Study": To establish a Railroad Study Commission to determine what should be the railroads' role in the transportation of persons and goods.

Mr. Speaker, these have been 2 eventful years and I am proud to have played a part in helping San Bernardino County to grow and prosper.

I thank the good Lord and the people of San Bernardino County for giving me this opportunity to serve them as their Representative in Congress.

LANDMARK ELECTION—1968

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of my speech at a recent DePauw University convocation in Greencastle, Ind.:

LANDMARK ELECTION—1968

1968 is the political year of our discontent. Election years are seldom fun for politicians, but 1968 is especially distressing for us.

Americans are disgruntled, restless, uncertain—even angry. 1968 has been a year of tragedy:

Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy are dead—murdered.

The war casualty lists grow.

Bearded rioters hurl filth and obscenities at policemen who retaliate with clubs, while television cameras grind.

Students defile and destroy the office of the president of a great university, while faculty members draft protest petitions and the police storm the mathematics department.

And pickets even form in Atlantic City and lustily sing anti-Miss America songs.

Something is wrong in our country—none feel it more deeply than young men and women like yourselves. Magical cure-alls of every description are offered:

"America—Love it or leave it." Turn on, tune in, drop out." You can name dozens of slogan solutions.

But the future will not be determined by a slogan. It is made up of countless decisions, and no one of these is more important in defining the future than the election of 1968.

The November election is not merely a referendum on Vietnam or a chance to register support for law and order. It is an election about a new design for our people in a troubled nation, and a new design for our nation in a troubled world.

This election may not be Armageddon. We will survive the presidency of either Humphrey or Nixon. The temptation of every politician is to hear the crack of doom, when often it is only the crack of a popgun. But in my judgment, 1968 is no ordinary election, and it may be one of those landmark elections which defines the future for decades to come.

We confront today:

A dirty, tragic war.

Arbitrary and unjust barriers to individual fulfillment.

Institutions unresponsive to the people they serve.

Modern cities plagued with ancient enemies—disease, hunger and ignorance.

And in rural America, lagging development and inadequate income.

An angry young man said to me one day not long ago, "America may be the best place in the world for 175 million Americans, but for the other 25 million, it's hell."

We are rich, yet we are poor;

We are powerful, yet we are humiliated;

We are high-principled, yet we are viewed with suspicion.

Our minds cannot accept these contradictions. Our consciences will not justify them. And our public policies do not eliminate them. So we are frustrated and discontented.

Optimism about the future of our country, the trademark of Americans, seems to have wavered.

I find America, then, in 1968:

Proud of its accomplishments, but discouraged by expectations unfulfilled.

Grappling with the titanic tensions of our time, wanting to meet them, but unsure of the direction to stability and continuing progress.

Not so much stumbling, as struggling, not lost, but knowing there is a better way.

And, I find America in 1968 standing on the front edge of climatic foreign and domestic policy decisions.

FOREIGN POLICY

How to organize a peace has been the central concern of U.S. foreign policy since World War II. The strategy we have adopted to meet that concern is the concept of *collective security*. Throughout the world, nations have joined with us, and we with them, in an elaborate system of bilateral, regional and multi-lateral treaties and alliances:

To contain the Communist world.

To defend ourselves from attack.

To achieve the vital goal of maintaining an international balance of power.

It was an unshakeable American belief that collective security could best organize a durable peace. But that was before Vietnam.

The single most important global consequence of the United States' involvement in the war in Vietnam will be the resulting reappraisal of the risks, requirements, and results of our strategy of collective security.

As the political leadership after 1968 seeks peace in Vietnam, it must also create a foreign policy that will keep that peace in Southeast Asia and around the world.

To do this we must ask ourselves:

Should we *adjust* or *reject* the system of collective security?

If we adjust it, *how do we adjust it?*

If we reject it, *with what do we replace it?*

And if we replace it, how do we assure that *our substitute will be better?*

When, and to what extent, should America become involved in the affairs of other nations.

Of course, *this is an old, not a new, debate*. We are really asking ourselves the in-

ternationalism—isolationism questions all over again.

Although the tug of nostalgia for a simpler past is strong, our political leadership must know, that given the fact of American power, isolationism is not possible.

Like it or not, we are involved. *The question is not whether to withdraw from our position of world leadership.* We cannot. Any widespread disturbance threatens us. The security of the United States does depend on a tolerable stability throughout the world. *So we must take the lead in maintaining stability.* If we do not, no one will—because those who once did, no longer can.

So the question is how do we exercise our position of power.

But we must be careful. *Although every event may affect us, not every event will vitally affect us,* and our leadership must be able to distinguish between the two. As hard as the lesson may be to learn, American power and resources are limited, and global interventionism is not possible.

A steady and measured American foreign policy will shun both isolation and global intervention.

It will maintain preeminent political, economic, military strength.

It will define our national interests carefully and use our preponderance of power selectively.

It will maintain a minimum of commitments by committing us to protect only our vital interests.

It will recognize that global involvement, unchecked, can divert our resources from peaceful uses, both domestically and internationally.

It will encourage regional and international cooperation as an expression of, not opposition to, the new nationalism of developing countries.

It will pursue *detente* with the East, including arms limitations.

It will aid developing nations, but without giving them any more aid than their own bureaucracies can administer, and without substituting our personnel for theirs.

It will take all necessary steps to make a liberal trade policy work without creating undue burdens on American manufacturers and producers.

DOMESTIC POLICY

There are climatic decisions at home, too, the vocabulary of the 1968 campaign will be "law and order" and "crime in the streets." Some will use those phrases so often that you will begin to believe this campaign is to separate those who are for law and order from those who are against it.

And that is demagoguery. The underlying domestic question of the fully and use our preponderance of power 1968 election is: *Can America be lawful and just?*

The man who speaks only of law and order states only half the ancient task of a democratic society. The whole task is to achieve both justice and order.

To paraphrase Teddy Roosevelt: Order without justice and justice without order are equally destructive.

If then we resolved to seek to be just and lawful, how do we do it?

Must the Federal government grow larger and larger, pyramiding Federal programs on top of Federal programs?

What can State and local governments really do?

Are block grants, tax incentives, loan guarantees, Federal revenue sharing plans real alternatives to Federal assistance programs?

The devastating new domestic reality of the 1960's is that America's expectations and aspirations are outrunning its administrative abilities and its organizational capacities. The problems of Appalachia, Chicago, and the Ninth Congressional District of Indiana are just too diverse to be solved

from Washington. But are other governments and other enterprises and other people capable, committed and funded to do the job of the 1970's.

So our political leadership chosen in 1968 must decide whether, and to what extent, and how the resources of this nation will be used to improve and enhance the quality of American life.

I do not have all the answers, but a steady and reliable domestic policy would, in my judgment, include these principles:

A national commitment to social, economic and political justice for the poor, the black and the underprivileged which is at least equal to our commitment to law and order.

A commitment to justice that begins with jobs for the poor, not new welfare handouts.

A commitment to enlist private enterprise in the business of solving social problems, but a realization that federally insured bank loans, tax incentives for industrial corporations and the like, by themselves are not enough.

A commitment to strengthen State and local governments and to develop new and vital centers of power, both public and private.

DEMOCRATS VERSUS REPUBLICANS

That is America as I would like it to be—and believe it can be—at home and abroad.

And the immediate question is? *Which political leadership in this country can best lead us there.*

It will come as no surprise to you that I believe the future course of this Nation will be steeper if Americans elect Hubert Humphrey to the Presidency and a Democratic majority to the Congress.

I hope my profession as a practicing Democratic politician does not blind me completely to the faults of my own party.

We Democrats have not performed flawlessly. A list of our sins of omission and commission brings joy to a Republican and disturbs even a Democrat.

Marse Waterson used to say: "Things have come to a pretty pass, if a man can't cudgel his own jackass."

No one can be absolutely certain which party or which man would provide the best leadership for this country in the days ahead. So elections are gambles. And your vote is a wager, not that one party is always right and the other always wrong, but that *one party will be more right, more of the time.*

I like the Democratic Party odds. Why? I could harangue you with party platforms and endless statistics (of my choosing) extolling the merits of the Democratic Party. But you'll hear enough of that in the days ahead.

Both parties will praise all that's good and damn all that's bad. Both parties will advocate tax incentives to involve private enterprise in job-retraining—because no party can fail to advocate an idea everyone likes. Both parties will attack current welfare programs—no party can defend programs nobody likes. And both parties will advocate an honorable peace in South Vietnam—because neither party can really say anything else.

Don't be deceived by the similarity of rhetoric from the parties in this campaign: Remember that this country has rarely produced two politicians who differed more than John Kennedy and Richard Nixon—yet when they met for debate in a campaign year they disagreed primarily about Quemoy and Matsu, two tiny islands we have all forgotten.

Rhetoric doesn't matter. It's what the parties do that counts. What they do and why they do it—and not what they say—reveals their basic instincts and principles. A political party's talk may change, but its principles don't change all that much. The party's image may change, but its attitude and instincts are more constant.

I want to emphasize two attributes, among others, of the Democratic Party which make it better able to deal with the challenges ahead of us.

First, the Democratic Party believes in the positive use of limited government. America's problems are big enough that they are not going to be solved without Government action.

The Democrats have always shown themselves more willing than Republicans to use limited government as an instrument of change. It is not that the Republicans harbor deep suspicions that Government has become too big and impersonal. We all suspect that. Rather, without regard to size, Republicans tend to suspect Government itself as an instrument of change.

The potential threat to freedom government poses cannot be denied, but limited government is a valuable tool to modify and eliminate undesirable social conditions.

It can:

Help pay the staggering medical bills of Americans over 65.

Enable one of four college students to pay the spiraling costs of higher education.

Permit a Negro to buy any house he can afford—not just one in the Negro section of town.

The Democrats, more than the Republicans, understand that government too limited in power to respond to human need denies freedom to its citizens, even as unlimited government does.

In the four years I have been in Congress, time and again, the Republicans have refused to support legislation to solve the most pressing problems, refused even in some instances, to admit the problem exists.

93% of the House Republicans voted against Medicare.

70% against the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

80% against model cities.

70% against civil rights.

72% against minimum wage.

97% against rat control in city slums.

I can remember how vigorously each of these pieces of legislation was fought, and the predictions of dire consequences from the Republicans if they were adopted. Parenthetically, I have observed with some amusement that none of my Republican friends is mentioning his opposition to any one of them in his 1968 campaign.

Surely it is not reasonable to expect a party which has massively and consistently opposed this historic and now widely praised legislation to lead a country in finding solutions to the new challenges.

I believe that the remarkable legislation of recent years gives the Democratic Party a clear title of right to claim that it knows how to move this nation forward.

Today, Republican candidates too often try to sell us the belief that private enterprise and volunteer work can effectively replace the public sector efforts to deal with the problems of the ghetto and rural poor.

That is like believing the Red Cross could have won World War II.

The private sector can help in America's domestic problems. In many cases it can do the job best. The auto companies recent employment program in Detroit and the insurance consortium on housing are models of what business can really do in urban and rural America.

But:

When 20 million Americans live in substandard housing, endangering their health and safety,

When 10 million school children have no library services as in 1965, and 140,000 of our ablest high school graduates cannot continue their education because they do not have the financial resources,

When 95 million Americans drink water which is below federal health standards or is of unknown quality,

When 64% of this nation's poor children have never seen a dentist and 14,000 of them suffer rat bites each year, the work of America is undone. And it is time to use every resource at our disposal—people, corporations, profit and non-profit organizations of every kind and description, and every level of government to get on with the job.

The issue is not whether the Federal Government should act, but how can it act efficiently and effectively?

What we need is not more Government, it is better Government. I do not believe that a party which, in its heart of hearts, does not believe in Government as one instrument of change can effectively meet the most critical tasks of the 70's.

A second attribute of the Democratic Party which enables it to deal better with the challenges of the decade ahead is its openness to new ideas.

It is no surprise that the Democrats vigorously and sometimes bitterly debated the Nation's Vietnam policy in an open convention, and that 5 or 6 Republicans handled it at an oceanside resort and it was later adopted in Miami without debate. While I do not condone the conduct of the anti-war protesters in Chicago, it comes as no surprise to me that they did not even bother to go to Miami.

It is no surprise that the debate on urban America is most often heard in the Democratic Party. Because the Democratic Party has become the traditional American political outlet for debate, discussion, and new ideas.

The Democratic Party's spirit and instinct for creative new ideas has put it in the vanguard of the historic legislative battles to expand the franchise, accept immigrants, enhance the opportunity of the common man to a decent life, and protect the civil rights of all Americans. It was no accident that, under Democratic Presidents the Nation first began to use the full range of economic tools to promote economic expansion and prosperity.

I argue that the Democratic Party—open as it is to the amazing diversity and variety of the urban dweller, the poor, the working man, the hard luck farmer, the immigrant, the Negro, the most educated and the least educated—is the party with a better chance of solving the problems of a restless nation.

The Republican platform says America must think and act anew. I think they're right. But Republican history offers us Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Goldwater, Nixon—and yes, even Eisenhower—many fine, capable, decent persons. But, heaven knows, they have not distinguished themselves by bold vision and the courage to act creatively to find new solutions to meet new problems, and that is what America needs now.

The Democrats are more likely to supply it than the Republicans.

We ignore at our peril the differences between the Democratic and Republican parties which I have discussed.

John Kennedy said:

"The record of parties can be told from the record of the past . . . candidates are not frozen in ice. We are like two rivers which flow back through history, and you can judge the force, the power, and the direction of the rivers by studying where they rose, and where they ran throughout their long course."

May I make two observations in closing.

First, I want to say that young people have had a profound impact on the year 1968.

One Congressman told me the other day that young people have caused a President to retire and a nation to change its Vietnam policy.

His judgment is open to question, but certainly the young were among the first, and surely the first in any number to show disenchantment with the order of things in the 1960's.

Young men and women marched into New Hampshire and Indiana with McCarthy, I will not forget the courage and determination of a young college co-ed whom I met on a street corner in Lawrenceburg, Indiana. Without money, without knowing a single person in the county, without even a car, she had come to Dearborn County to organize it for McCarthy.

Young Americans have been the pacesetters in the public opinion polls and have experienced the satisfaction of seeing public opinion swing toward their view. In a real sense, the young have led and the leaders have followed.

You can rightly take a measure of pride in being in that generation.

The second observation is this: Young people are often sharply critical of the establishment, the leadership, and of things as they are. It is good that you are, but you cannot have the pleasure of overthrowing one establishment without the burden of putting something in its place.

That burden falls heavily on those who would criticize.

If you want a better world, come make a better world.

I am disturbed by those who want to be professional professionals—uncommitted, unentangled, unencumbered, uninvolved.

I am disturbed by those who want to become rich and famous, while ignoring the nation's problems.

Too many of our ablest young people, those who should be taking a hand in running this society, aspire only to secure lives in tidy suburbs.

John Gardner—

This nation is producing the most educated, articulate, and brilliant sidewalk superintendents the world has ever seen. And it cannot survive on your advice, offered from the 19th hole of the Country Club or the bridge table.

Far too few have the motivation and the stamina to come and do battle with the domestic problems we find so deplorable.

Far too many get too quickly discouraged and indulge in self-pity, if their efforts aren't immediately successful.

So come to the fray. For if you don't, who will?

CAN WE CONTROL WEAPONS OF DEATH?

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues and the country an excellent analysis of the position of gun-control proponents, which appeared in the September 1968 issue of *The Jewish Veteran*, a publication of the Jewish war veterans. The article, by Monroe R. Sheinberg, traces the progress of restrictions on firearms. He points out that the legislation now in conference committee does not go far enough in imposing reasonable requirements on the use of guns. The author's justification of registration and licensing of these weapons confirms my belief that such measures are not a cumbersome infringement on the liberty of gunowners.

Just as the assassination of three great political figures in the last 5 years led Congress to recognize the dangers inherent in the unrestricted sale of guns and ammunition, so new tragedies resulting from continued violence will lead Con-

gress to adopt far more sweeping limitations on the availability of guns.

CAN WE CONTROL WEAPONS OF DEATH

(By Monroe R. Sheinberg)

Since 1900, three-quarters of a million people have died in the United States by guns—through murder, suicide and accident. This is 200,000 more than the number of Americans killed in all of our wars. Every two minutes a gun is used to kill or wound an American citizen.

Those Justice Department figures show, and the tragic assassinations during the last five years grimly underline, the United States has, as President Johnson said, "a record of violent death and destruction that shames our history."

Overwhelmingly, most Americans want to do something about this grim and tragic drain of life. A Gallup poll in 1967 showed that 85 per cent of all adult Americans were in favor of firearms control legislation, including the registration of all guns. This high percentage has remained fairly constant during the last thirty years. Yet the wishes of the majority for a sensible control of firearms sale have been stymied by the powerful lobbying led by the National Rifle Association and various gun manufacturers.

Gun control legislation, requiring registration and licensing of weapons, would sharply decrease the deadly weapons available to criminals, drug addicts, mental incompetents and minors, without diminishing the proper availability of guns to those entitled to them, including hunters, members of shooting clubs, and other mature and responsible citizens who should not be averse to simple licensing and registration. Just as car registration and driver licensing is universally recognized as necessary and proper in the public interest, so should gun registration and licensing.

Opponents of gun control legislation usually put forward three arguments: (1) The claim that the right to "keep and bear arms," guaranteed in the Second Amendment to the Constitution, would be violated by such legislation. (2) They are afraid that gun control laws would hurt the responsible sportsman who uses guns for hunting and marksmanship. (3) They claim that the legislation would not lower crime rates, as criminals would still be able to obtain firearms illegally.

These arguments are unfounded. (1) The Second Amendment states: "A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." This obviously was written in order to guarantee each state a militia, and the Supreme Court has stated many times, in upholding the constitutionality of gun control laws, that it does not apply to individual citizens bearing arms. In 1939, the Court held (*U.S. vs. Miller*) that "The Second Amendment applies only to those arms that have a reasonable relationship to the preservation or efficiency of a well-regulated militia." Furthermore, the courts have established that rights given by the Constitution are not absolute, and have recognized the government's power to limit such rights in the interests of the general welfare and domestic tranquility. The right to bear arms must be subordinated to the right to life. There may be a constitutional right to own an automobile, but the automobile must still be registered and anyone who wants to drive it must be licensed.

(2) Sensible gun control legislation would not interfere with the legitimate use of guns by the responsible hunter or marksman in any way. In nations with strict firearms laws, hunting still thrives. During the two years since the enactment of the law controlling the purchase of guns in New Jersey, the sale of hunting licenses increased. Legislative measures which help eliminate the irresponsible firearms owners and set standards of

competence for firearms usage should indeed increase the prestige, and certainly the safety, of gun sports. The purpose of gun control legislation is not to prevent legitimate ownership of firearms, but to keep such arms from those who would misuse them.

(3) No one claims that gun control legislation is the panacea for violence and crimes. But the fact is that it does cut down both the incidence of crimes in which guns are involved and the general rate of violent crimes. In states with strong firearms laws, the percentage of homicides in which guns are used ranges from 30-40%; in states with weak laws, the range is from 60-70%, and the rate of murder is two to three times higher than in the former group. A comparison of our country with other nations is even more revealing. In countries which require registration and licensing, the rate of gun murders is 5 to 50 times lower than ours; 2.7 per 100,000 population in the United States, as against .52 in Canada, .12 in West Germany and .05 in Britain.

Estimates of the number of firearms owned by private citizens in the United States range from 50 to 200 million. Each day the papers carry stories of personal tragedy caused by someone who should not have been allowed to own a gun. Each year brings new national horror at political assassinations which threaten the foundations of the American system of government. The situation deteriorates, the rate of gun crimes increases as a small minority blocks the remedy.

What is the status of legislation efforts at gun control? The House, notwithstanding urgent recommendations from the President for effective gun controls, passed a bill shot through with loopholes. While the House bill bans mail-order out-of-state purchases of rifles and shotguns and prohibits interstate shipment of handgun ammunition, amendments that would require Federal gun registration and licensing of gun owners were rejected. Moreover, it was further weakened by an amendment permitting individuals to obtain \$10.00 licenses as "collectors" permitting purchases in interstate commerce from other "collectors." Despite earlier controls voted on handguns in the Crime Control Law, no progress at all has yet been made toward registration and licensing. The Senate bill is being bottled up by the Senate Judiciary Committee chairman Eastland, who is strongly opposed to any gun control legislation. Senator Tydings, an outstanding proponent of gun control, is fighting to have the Senate consider it and threatens to do so, if necessary, by amendment to other bills.

At present, realistically, so effective is the NRA and the rest of the gun lobby that chances for passage are not encouraging.

What is needed: a citizens revolt! JWV's official policy is clear—we strongly urge and support effective gun control legislation, including registration and licensing.

Let your lawmakers, your newspaper, and your public officials hear from you!

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, large numbers of American voters are reported to be incapable of distinguishing between HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and Richard M. Nixon as claimants to the Presidency of the United States.

To me, there have always been com-

pellent differences, but until the New York Times of Sunday, October 6, 1968, endorsed Mr. HUMPHREY for election, I had never seen these differences so cogently expressed.

The New York Times correctly asserted that "Mr. HUMPHREY has superior claims to the Presidency in three critical areas"—foreign affairs, domestic affairs, and the perplexing question of American involvement in Vietnam.

The record that the New York Times editorial laid out is an unequivocal, and I believe, irrefutable demonstration that by every significant yardstick, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY is the best candidate for this Nation's highest office.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the New York Times editorial, entitled "HUMPHREY for President," at this point in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of those who wish to keep this Nation moving toward peace and justice for all:

HUMPHREY FOR PRESIDENT

In 1960 many independent voters could not see much difference between John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon, two seemingly cool, calculating, ambitious young politicians. However, this newspaper believed that there were significant differences in conviction and outlook. We endorsed Mr. Kennedy.

In 1968 many voters assert that they cannot see much difference between Mr. Nixon and Hubert H. Humphrey, but, again, this newspaper believes that there are significant differences in conviction and outlook. We endorse Mr. Humphrey.

Mr. Humphrey has superior claims to the Presidency in three critical areas. The first of these is foreign affairs, specifically arms control and the search for peace. The most important international issue today is a slowing of the nuclear arms race. The competition in these deadly weapons is once more spiraling upward and threatens to slip out of human control. No subject will be more important for the next President. For nearly twenty years Mr. Humphrey has devoted himself tirelessly to this problem. He was the author of the bill establishing an independent Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in 1961. In season and out he worked to stop the nuclear tests which were poisoning the atmosphere, efforts that finally resulted in the limited Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty. President Kennedy was indulging in no exaggeration when he said to Mr. Humphrey: "This is your treaty."

Mr. Humphrey is now actively working for the ratification of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, which would commit the existing nuclear nations not to distribute nuclear weapons to other countries. He would, we believe, dedicate himself wholeheartedly to the search for practical ways of lessening the overwhelming nuclear danger. As the original proponent of the Peace Corps and of the Food-for-Peace Program, he has the talent and the active concern needed to strengthen the United Nations and to build new international institutions.

In contrast, Mr. Nixon took no initiative on disarmament when he was Vice President and showed much less interest in the subject. He is now urging a delay in the ratification of the Nonproliferation Treaty. Even worse, he has resurrected the "missile gap" argument misused by President Kennedy and insists that he will not enter into arms negotiations with the Soviet Union until sometime in the future when this country has reached new and unspecified superiority in nuclear strength. He is busily promising to

outstrip the Russians in space and to build a nuclear Navy "second to none." The United States does not need a President intent on speeding up both the arms race and the space race.

In addition to being an internationalist with a broad and imaginative outlook in foreign affairs, Mr. Humphrey is a proven activist in domestic affairs. He was the original sponsor of Medicare and the skillful parliamentary manager for much of the social reform legislation enacted during the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations. He fully understands that the desperately urgent needs of the nation's cities for better housing, higher quality education, cleaner air, improved hospitals and mass transit facilities can only be met if there is vigorous Presidential leadership and coherent public planning.

While Mr. Humphrey attempts to get to the root of urban problems, Mr. Nixon is promising, in effect, to attack the surface signs of social unrest by more energetic use of police measures. His modest proposals for encouraging "black capitalism" through tax incentives are all right as far as they go, but they do not go very far. His is an essentially conservative economic strategy involving deferment of costly new domestic programs for years. This strategy is full of danger, threatening decay and congestion for the nation's hard-pressed cities.

The third area in which Mr. Humphrey is unquestionably preferable to his opponent lies in the quality of his political leadership and in the character of his political support. Mr. Humphrey is the only candidate in this election who has substantial backing in both the white and the Negro communities. He has earned Negro trust because no man in public life has worked harder or longer to achieve equality of opportunity for all citizens. It is a matter for considerable concern whether the next President will be able to communicate effectively with black as well as white citizens and whether in his capacity as a national party leader he sees himself primarily competing with George C. Wallace for reactionary segregationist votes or as heading a liberal-and-moderate coalition drawn from both races.

An endorsement of a candidate is in this instance also a favorable judgment on the personality and character of one man and an adverse judgment on his rival. Mr. Humphrey is a warm, generous, idealistic, open man. Mr. Nixon has gradually risen above the personal abuse and the narrow partisanship of his early campaigns, but he remains slick and evasive on some of the central issues.

We have left until last the perplexing question of Vietnam. As we have made clear in many previous editorials, The Times does not find the statements of either candidate satisfactory on the war issue. But Mr. Humphrey has given unmistakable signals that he intends, if elected, to move away from the errors of the past. It is our judgment, based on an appraisal of the character and public record of the two candidates, that Mr. Humphrey would be more inclined than his opponent to seize the initiative for peace.

It must be borne in mind that the Vice-Presidency is a uniquely awkward office. No man has ever been seen at his best in it. A Vice President is in a weak position because he has no personal mandate from the people separate from that of the President on whose ticket he was elected. Yet he has a constitutional responsibility to serve as the President's stand-in, a responsibility which he cannot relinquish as easily as a Cabinet officer or lesser official can resign an appointive office.

Like most of his predecessors, Mr. Humphrey has resolved the ambiguities of his

office in favor of defending the President's policies in public and trying to influence them in private. Not until the memoirs of the Johnson Administration have been written will it be possible to assess Mr. Humphrey's role in the international policy struggles of this Administration over the "bombing pauses" and other Vietnam decisions. But it is significant that the former members of the Johnson Administration who are rallying to Mr. Humphrey's support include its best-known doves.

Looked at in the perspective of his 23 years in public life, Hubert Humphrey is a humanitarian, an authentic and effective liberal, and a man of proved character, courage and judgment who can be depended upon to lead the nation in the ways of peace.

In the span of the present campaign, proof that his judgment is superior to that of Mr. Nixon has been provided by their respective choices for Vice President. Senator Edmund S. Muskie has experience, dignity and moral force. He is in himself a cogent argument for preferring the Democratic ticket, especially when it is recalled that four Vice Presidents in this century have succeeded to the Presidency on the death of the incumbent.

In the brief period since nomination, Gov. Spiro T. Agnew has already proved from his injudicious, intemperate remarks that he is utterly inadequate.

The sole persuasive argument offered for Mr. Nixon's election is that he might produce a period of calm and consolidation. But this presupposes that he is a popular and widely trusted figure like General Eisenhower, which he manifestly is not, as his divisive and partisan record over the years makes clear. Moreover, the strenuous demands upon America's leadership both at home and abroad do not permit four years of rest and passivity. This critical era calls for a leader with ideas, enthusiasm, energy and a clear moral commitment.

This newspaper believes that Hubert H. Humphrey is such a leader, and in the truly critical situation—foreign and domestic—in which this country finds itself, we strongly urge his election to the Presidency of the United States.

WHAT THE SERVICE MEANS TO ME

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago I had the honor of crowning winners in a "Miss Navy" contest among San Diego-based servicewomen, sponsored by the South Bay Cities Council of the Navy League of the United States.

The winner, S. Lillian Marie Vinluan from Paauhaw, Hawaii, attached to the Navy Regional Finance Center in San Diego, addressed the league dinner in National City, taking as her theme, "What the Navy Means to Me."

Her remarks follow:

Life in the service, just like any other profession, is what you make it. The most difficult part is making the transition from civilian life into the military. It takes some time to really understand and become adapted to the military way of life, but in the process of learning, I've found it to be quite an experience.

When I was sworn into the Navy, in Honolulu, Hawaii, I felt that I had become a

part of a great tradition. One that has shown me—discipline, vigilance, courage and many other things, and it has made me proud. The day I put on my uniform for the first time, I felt good and proud to be what I consider a real part of my country—a representative of the United States Armed Forces. I have engaged myself to the chain of courage and devotion to duty. This uniform that I wear does not entitle me to special privileges, but instead obligates me to set high standards of good conduct and performance of duty. Whether at home, on leave or on distant stations, I will always be under constant observation. I will make sure no careless act of mine brings discredit to my uniform or country.

During my time in the service, I have had many opportunities, which I have long desired, to meet new faces, see new places, and make new friends.

To me, being in the service is somewhat of a challenge. I want to be more of a part of this nation, and I feel it can be accomplished through my years in the service. Yes, a challenge to fulfill a personal desire.

What I consider to be my special privilege is service to God and country, with honor.

TWO FROM MARYLAND DIE IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, SP4 George M. Cox II and Pvt. Philip D. Reeder, two fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

TWO MORE MARYLANDERS KILLED IN WAR

Two more soldiers from Baltimore have died in Vietnam.

Spec. 4 George M. Cox 2d, 25, was killed last Thursday when the truck in which he was riding came under enemy fire near Pleiku in north central Vietnam, the Defense Department announced.

Drafted into the Army 11 months ago, Specialist Cox served as an acting squad leader in the 8th Infantry Division, 2d Battalion, Company B. He had been in Vietnam 6 months.

A former student of graphic design at the Maryland Institute, he frequently wrote home about his plans for graduate training, according to his mother, Mrs. Harriet P. Cox, of the 600 block North Rosedale street. "I received a five-page letter from him last Saturday," Mrs. Cox said, "and all he talked about was his coming home."

Besides his mother, survivors include his 15-year-old sister, Angela L. Cox, a student at Eastern High School, and several aunts and uncles.

Pvt. Philip D. Reeder, 19, was killed in action last Friday, his parents, Mr. and Mrs. George S. Reeder, Jr., were told by the Defense Department last Saturday.

In Vietnam for 18 months, Private Reeder served in the 173d Airborne Brigade. He was born in Baltimore.

Survivors include, in addition to his parents who now live in Hockessin, Del., his sister, Mrs. Susan Yates, of New Haven, Conn.; two brothers, George S. Reeder 3d, of Fort Bragg, N.C., and Douglas Reeder, of Hockessin, and his grandmother, Mrs. Susan Smeak, of Hagerstown, Md.

LETTER DESCRIBES CHICAGO CONFRONTATION

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as a youth I spent many pleasant months visiting relatives who lived in Mazomanie, Wis., near Madison.

One of those acquaintances of my youth who has remained a firm friend to this day is Mr. Merton J. Walter, who is now a member of the Dane County Board of Supervisors.

Recently I read a letter from Mr. Walter which was published in the Madison, Wis., Capital Times. In this letter to the editor, Mr. Walter discussed the clash between protestors and police in Chicago during the Democratic National Convention.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend Mr. Walter's letter to my colleagues for its intelligent, unemotional appraisal of the Chicago confrontation. I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE: QUESTIONS MEDIA'S JUDGMENT AT CONVO

MAZOMANIE, September 2.—What is going on here?

For the past week the American people have been exposed to a barrage of "news" about the excessive use of force and brutality by the Chicago police force. This barrage was supported by 90 per cent of the radio and television media and nearly as high a ratio of the press. Yet today according to a report by the research firm of Sindlinger and Co. as reported in your newspaper, only one American in five believes that the Chicago authorities did in fact use excessive force.

Is it any wonder that one should ask, what is going on here?

There can be no question about the American people having the "truth" in this matter yet only one in five will buy it. If one has to make a choice between the judgments of the policy makers of the news media and those of the American people I will go with the American people. Who do you go with? After all, it is your newspaper that has for years complained about the unfairness of the press. Do you complain on this matter?

One could argue forever about who baited who and the ensuing actions but it seems to me that the following are self evident—even Walter Cronkite grudgingly accepts them: There was an assemblage of persons formed for the purpose of meeting at Chicago during the Democratic convention and one of its purposes was to force a confrontation with the Chicago authorities; the Chicago authorities reacted with their massive show of force.

Along with this it should be remembered that one of the main points of the Kerner report was that a large show of manpower should be used instead of firepower.

The two main concerns of the Chicago authorities were, or should have been, the protection of human lives and the protection of the Democratic convention from outside disruption. In this they succeeded. No shots were fired, no lives were lost. Could any other American city, in the present day climate have done as well—or better?

The news media unanimously agrees that the confrontations were brought on by the illegal acts of the demonstrators. Their criticism is not that the police reacted, but that

they over-reacted. It seems to me that when large numbers of police are exposed to taunts, unprintable name calling and physical acts of violence the result will always be some degree of overreaction. To expect otherwise would be to expect superhuman reactions of human beings.

The convention undoubtedly showed the need for many changes. Some were made during the proceedings and it seems safe to assume that others will follow. There is some agitation to abolish the convention system altogether. This would be a tragic mistake for to do so would, in effect, abolish the two party system. It should be remembered that some degree of discipline must be inherent in any organization including political parties.

The results of the convention should have surprised no one. The only really controversial plank in the platform was on Vietnam. The minority report was defeated by the delegates in about the same proportion as it would if it had been submitted to the American people. The nomination of Hubert Humphrey was surely not unexpected. George McGovern was never a serious contender. Who could reasonably expect the nomination of Gene McCarthy? Only eight months ago the American people were having difficulty distinguishing him from the long deceased Joe McCarthy and even the news media erred in this on occasion. He was, in fact, an unknown until he chose to climb aboard the ready-made and highly emotional issue of Vietnam. This was his one and only issue and he rode it to his political death. His actions after losing the nomination were much the same as were Richard Nixon's upon being defeated for Governor of California. Both showed that they lacked the stability necessary to serve as President of these United States of America.

Finally the statement, so often repeated by the news media, that the American people have been left with no choice between the Democratic and Republican nominees is simply not true. If the differences between Richard Nixon and Hubert Humphrey are not many and great, then evil is good, black is white and night is day.

MERTON J. WALTER,
Supervisor, Dance County District No. 47.

TRIBUTE TO EDNA F. KELLY

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1968

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in their tributes to the charming distaff Member of this body, EDNA F. KELLY, who is retiring at the end of this Congress.

My association with EDNA KELLY during the brief time we have served together is one which I shall long treasure. Her legislative record will be admired by all long after she has gone on to other ways of helping humanity. Her leadership abilities, as shown by her record as chairwoman of the Subcommittee on European Affairs of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, are vast. I am certain that all Members of the House will agree that the retirement of EDNA KELLY, while it will free her for other worthy efforts, is a source of regret for all of us.

During the 19 years she has served this body, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] has ably, intelligently, and constantly exhibited her deep concern for the Nation's welfare, as well as that

of her constituents. She has been willing to be of assistance to all who are in need, be it a resident of her district, or a colleague in the House of Representatives. Her ability to guide, her willingness to share of her experience and expertise has been well appreciated by many of her colleagues, and will not be forgotten.

I feel a deep personal loss in knowing that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] will be leaving these Halls permanently at the close of this session, and I wish her the very best in the future; health, happiness and success in her future activities, which I am certain will continue to be in the service of humanity and her country.

THE OEO AND EXTREMISTS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out before, some of those who advocate large Federal funds to eliminate poverty in this country are strangely silent when such funds are used to distort the goals of the program. On October 1 I inserted in the RECORD a column by the veteran columnist, Victor Riesel, which dealt with anti-poverty program abuses. On October 1, the Wooster, Ohio, newspaper, the Daily Record, carried a later column by Riesel on the same subject. In this later column, Riesel starts out by saying:

Openly, defiantly and aggressively, in this asphalt jungle, executives of the federal anti-poverty headquarters are cheering, supporting and directing the black militants' war on the labor movement, the municipality and the weary establishment.

Columnist Riesel is describing here the role played by the anti-poverty officials in the conflict over decentralization of the school system in New York City. According to Riesel, the Office of Economic Opportunity apparently "sees no danger, issues no appeal to reason, disciplines no regional officials." As in other cases, the New York situation might well turn out to be another wholesale misuse of Federal funds, thus diverting from the needy the assistance for whom the program was intended.

I include the above-mentioned column by Victor Riesel in the RECORD at this point:

OEO OFFICIALS ARE CHEERING EXTREMISTS' STRATEGY IN CITIES

NEW YORK.—Openly, defiantly and aggressively, in this asphalt jungle, executives of the federal anti-poverty headquarters are cheering, supporting and directing the black militants' war on the labor movement, the municipality and the weary establishment.

Federal and civic money is paying the bills for the revolution, as it's boastfully called. This is not a black revolt. This is open rebellion by brilliantly organized bands of militants, which the nation's most influential labor chiefs now, in cold anger, call "vigilantes" who "must be stopped."

Grim stories leak through the closed doors of meetings in high places. City officials talk of using "bayonets" if needed. Anti-poverty officials, approved by the government's Office

of Economic Opportunity (OEO), publicly cheer the extremists' strategy, calling for opening struck schools, one by one... "whatever it takes, by whatever means—"

Directors of the city's Council Against Poverty (OEO) openly and publicly demand that leaders of the striking United Federation of Teachers and the school supervisors organization be jailed and fined; that the police be used to open schools; that the union be smashed. And then the Council blasts the police on general principles.

As I come in from the campaign trails, I note in city after city that the story of the New York commune gets less notice than a Detroit Tigers pitcher's ligaments. That's unfortunate. New York's the best stadium for the biggest social and racial world series in the century.

Except for a report or two buried in the local prints, a meeting of over 700 union chiefs, speaking for 555 locals with 1.2 million members (almost 10 per cent of the national labor movement) went unreported.

They came at the call of Harry Van Arsdale, president of the Central Labor Council. In the packed and sweated Hotel Commodore's East Ballroom, there were cries of "Harry, let's shut down the city... Harry, let's strike."

They came, ostensibly to support 53,000 school instructors belonging to the United Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO).

This massive strike is in protest against the firing of 110 teachers, without due process of legality, by a militant Ocean Hill-Brownsville ghetto decentralized school board.

Through the jammed hall ran reports no labor leader could ignore. Building and construction trades union chiefs were told of openly contemptuous warnings by black militants that there would be no construction in this city until "thousands of white workers were fired and replaced by ghetto residents."

Skilled employees of the Central Board of Education, carpenters, electricians, plumbers, operating engineers, drivers, et. al., who had passed civil service examinations, were warned that, after the teachers, come they.

In another auditorium across town, thousands of militants, with their own uniformed security guards, shouted loud defiance of the labor movement.

On the stage with the Panthers' leaders, with the extremists, with the local ghetto officials, were the men who spend millions of federal and municipal dollars in the anti-poverty program. They were for smashing the strike.

Back across town in the Commodore, one of labor's high command—a veteran of many labor wars—wept out of sheer frustration.

"This will change the face of the labor movement," he muttered dolefully. "We cannot sit around and watch the movement be liquidated."

"There is sentiment for a city-wide strike. It is growing strongly. We controlled this meeting. But there's a fury. I don't think we can handle another under such provocation."

"Our people now see this as a matter of life and death for what we've built over the decades."

The enemy now includes the national, as well as the local, OEO headquarters. Protests flow from here to the national AFL-CIO building across from the White House.

A spokesman for the national labor headquarters put it bluntly this way:

"If there is anything Harry (Van Arsdale) thinks the national office can do, he has only to pick up the phone. He gets George (Meany) and he gets what he wants. George has great confidence in him."

Thus, the war flares from these stone canyons to the capital's byways. Thus, this becomes a national struggle, an explosive civil war.

Apparently the Office of Economic Opportunity sees no danger, issues no appeal to

reason, disciplines no regional officials. Nor do they come up with answers from newsmen, this newsmen anyway.

What are they waiting for, bayonets in the streets?

CONVEY ARMY TERMINAL IN BROOKLYN WITHOUT COST TO NEW YORK CITY

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the Army terminal in Brooklyn has been declared surplus property by the Federal Government and the city of New York plans to acquire that property for industrial development and for the creation of jobs urgently needed to replace those lost when use of the property was abandoned by the Army.

Apparently the Defense Department looks upon the city of New York as a fertile area for economy and retrenchment. First, they closed the Brooklyn Navy Yard and callously forced the removal of highly skilled and trained workers from our city to Philadelphia and other areas whose efficiency and economy in production never measured up to the performance standards maintained at the Brooklyn Navy Yard. This serious loss to Brooklyn's economy has since been followed by the closing of the Army terminal in Brooklyn.

The felonies perpetrated by the Defense Department against the people of our city and our borough have since been compounded by the arrogance of the General Services Administration. First, the General Services Administration extracted \$23.5 million from the pockets of the taxpayers of our city for the Brooklyn Navy Yard. Now the General Services Administration proposes to drain the city taxpayers of an additional \$18 million for the Army terminal.

This demand by the General Services Administration is immoral, outrageous, and the contemporary equivalent of highway robbery. The development of this property, under municipal auspices, will be a boon not only to the city of New York but also to the Federal Government in creating business and industry which will contribute to Federal tax revenues and by creating new job opportunities for workers who will pay Federal taxes and reduce the burden of the Federal Government for welfare costs.

The Federal Government presently owns in the city of New York properties assessed at \$556,505,200 exclusive of the new multimillion dollar complex just completed in the Foley Square area of Manhattan. At current real estate taxes, taxable revenues from these properties would yield just under \$30 million annually to the city of New York. However, these properties are tax exempt and yield the city nothing although they receive the full benefit of city water and sewage services, police and fire protection and a host of other services without which the Federal properties would be unused and unusable.

Although the people of our city through

this tax exemption in effect contribute \$30 million annually, we get none of the Federal grants and aids extended by the Federal Government to federally impacted areas. The people of our city get only the privilege and the pain of paying the bill.

Year in and year out the people of our city thus contribute to the Federal Government almost twice as much as the General Services Administration is demanding for the Army terminal. Such a demand is unreasonable and immoral. We urge the General Services Administration to turn this property over to the city of New York without charge so that it can be imaginatively and constructively developed in the best interests of the people of our city, State, and Nation.

I am taking the liberty, Mr. Speaker, to append to my remarks the text of a letter I received from the mayor of the city of New York and a former distinguished Member of this House, the Honorable John V. Lindsay:

THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
New York, September 5, 1968.

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PODELL: New York City has begun negotiations with the General Services Administration to obtain the former Army Terminal in Brooklyn. This property, like the former Brooklyn Navy Yard, has been declared surplus by the Federal Government. The City intends to acquire the Terminal to develop industry and jobs to replace those lost when the Army moved out. We are disturbed to find that the Navy Yard history is being repeated in the Army Terminal negotiations. Once again we are being asked to pay millions of dollars to acquire surplus property in order to restore the property to the economic life of the City. Having reluctantly agreed to pay \$23.5 million for the Navy Yard, the City is now faced with an inflexible demand that it pay \$18 million for the Army Terminal. In both cases the purchase price is only the beginning, for many more millions must be spent before the properties can contribute to the City's economy.

New York City has been badly hurt by the abandonment of these properties. Thousands of men have been thrown out of work. It is unfair for the Federal Government, having imposed on the City the responsibility for obtaining employment at these sites, to demand in addition that the City pay for the surplus property.

This policy must be changed. The Brooklyn Army Terminal must be transferred to the City without cost, so that development can proceed without delay and without unnecessary outlay of City funds.

I urge you to support whatever action in Washington is necessary including the submission of new legislation. My office is ready to assist you in this effort.

Sincerely,

JOHN V. LINDSAY,
Mayor.

THE "PUEBLO"—HOW LONG, MR. PRESIDENT?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 259th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

CONGRESSMAN LONG KEEPS IN TOUCH WITH HIS CONSTITUENTS, AIDS THEM WITH PROBLEMS

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, CLARENCE LONG, has for the past 6 years kept in touch with his constituents by holding office hours at post offices throughout his district. I should like to insert in the RECORD an article from the Baltimore Sunday Sun describing this activity, along with Congressman Long's announcement that he now is holding office hours at shopping centers, as well as in his new office on wheels:

WHAT HELP DO PEOPLE SEEK FROM A CONGRESSMAN?

Congressman Clarence D. Long (D., Second) has been making the rounds of the post offices in his district "to find," as it says in his newsletter, "what help people seek."

He has been at it for years and on a recent Saturday he was in the Bel Air post office in Harford county, where about 25 people were lined up to see him. Inside the air-conditioned office of the postmaster, the Congressman was seated under an autographed picture of Harry Truman, listening to a man who had with him a retired Navy chief. In one corner of the room a secretary took notes.

The chief had been mustered out of the service in 1959 because he was thought psychopathic. He had "blown his stack" a couple of times, and under subsequent examination by psychiatrists had been asked questions which confused him ("I've been confused myself sometimes," said the Congressman) and to which he gave, psychiatrically speaking, the wrong answers.

The man had a good combat record. Because of his early discharge he had missed getting retirement pay by only eight months. Would the Congressman introduce a private bill to aid the former chief? He would, said Long, if he couldn't get the Navy to reverse the decision.

A woman entered. She was worried about her son, who had recently been inducted into the Army. The son, it turned out, had a heart condition, so serious, from her description, that Long expressed wonder that he had been inducted at all.

The woman was concerned because she thought the work that her son would be doing at boot camp would be too strenuous for his heart. Her husband, she said, had just a few weeks ago died as a result of a heart condition. She turned her head and there was an embarrassed silence.

"All right, don't worry now," said the Congressman. He directed his secretary to write to the doctor at the base, and find out what type of work the son was doing.

The procession continued. A woman was looking for a job with the State in Bel Air; (the Congressman referred her case to his secretary, who heads his job desk). She was followed by an irate Baltimore countian who for several months had been fighting a losing battle with county administrators. She said they had been illegally using her property for drainage from adjacent ones.

The morning wore on. A fire chief from Edgewood Arsenal was being forced to retire, a woman disabled by disease thought she should be getting more social security benefits, and electrical contractor hadn't been paid for his work by the General Services Administration.

Long conducts the interviews with business like efficiency, punctuating the narration with his own comments, asking pointed questions, cutting short long-winded expla-

nations. As a result he has seen up to 60 people in a few hours in one of his Saturday morning sessions. All of the cases are followed up by his staff.

Many of those he encounters are poor, many of them are uneducated, many of them want jobs. But jobs are becoming harder to find for such people in an increasing technical employment market. "The great problem of age," says Long, "is that it's correlated with lack of education." Even so, he has had considerable success in finding both Government and civilian employment for his constituents.

To some, the Congressman represents a "court of last resort." The parents of Radmila Lomsky, who were forced to leave their 11-month-old daughter with relatives in Czechoslovakia when they came to this country in 1948, had tried ever since to get her out. They finally came to Long, their Representative, who wrote letters to everyone from President Novotny to the then Russian head of state Nikita Khrushchev, and finally succeeded, after eleven months of effort, in reuniting Radmila with her parents.

To others, the Congressman serves as "ombudsman." This is a position filled in certain Scandinavian countries by persons familiar with the ponderous mechanisms of government who act as go-betweens for the individual citizen who must deal with a huge and sometimes senseless bureaucracy. A recent case involved a constituent of the Congressman on Route 40 who had a house and a motel both of which needed improvements. The Small Business Administration wouldn't make a loan on the motel because the property contained a house; the Federal Housing Administration refused money for the house because of the motel. Congressman Long arranged a conference between representatives of the two agencies: the result was a loan from each, and hopefully an agreement for future communication.

From the bizarre, such as the man who hauled out a towel labeled United States Army Supply Depot, said it had recently been removed after having been part of his interior plumbing for several years following an Army operation and wanted to sue the surgeon (the case had already been to the Supreme Court) to the pathetic, an alcoholic electrical worker who thought that local firms were blacklisting him (they were, evidently with justification). Representative Long sees them all. At the same time that he is making friends, he is cannily keeping a finger on the pulse of his constituents gauging their interests and concerns.

The great majority are just people who need some sort of guidance. "Many," he says, "without automobiles or even phones, cannot reach the Capital. Then there's always inertia," something that obviously seldom plagues the only Representative in Washington who offers curb service to his constituents.

See me next, in my new Office on Wheels, Saturday, Oct. 12: Middlesex Shopping Center—10 a.m.; Middle River Post Office—11 a.m.

CLARENCE D. LONG.

HUMPHREYISM NO. 7

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

From a collection of Representative HENRY C. SCHADEBERG'S (R. Wisc.).

"Insofar as I am sorry for anything, it is not because I am a liberal, but it is because I am not more liberal than I am." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 9, 1957.)

THE AMERICAN FARMER— FORGOTTEN MAN

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, last week the Congress approved a 1-year extension of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. In so doing, we have postponed total review and consideration of the entire farm situation in our Nation.

This must surely be one of the first and most important tasks of the 91st Congress. There is an urgent need to examine the complete farm picture and its many complexities realistically. We cannot rely on simple solutions. It is with this thought in mind that I set forth the basic outlines of the farm problem as I see it and suggest some possible solutions.

Mr. Speaker, the American farmer continues to be the forgotten man of the American Government. He pays more for everything he uses and receives less than at any time since the great depression in the thirties.

He has more than tripled his efficiency and productivity and has been rewarded by prices so low that they can barely meet his production expenses. Inconsistent and ineffective Federal farm policies have resulted in a crisis which reaches across the Nation into every farm and rural home. I believe it is time for a change, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that the American farmer agrees with me.

The plight of the farmer is well illustrated by the fact that more than 4 million people have left the farm since the start of this decade. American farmers in 1968 will absorb a \$1½ billion pay cut. Farm debt has risen alarmingly—a startling 90 percent since 1960. In short, the American farmer has his back to the wall.

The plight of the farmer is frequently ignored, I suspect, because he retains only 6 percent of the national vote. Yet Congress must recognize that our farmers and rural people are the backbone of the Nation. The farming industry employs 5.2 million workers—more than the combined employment in the steel industry, the automotive industry, transportation, and public utilities. If half the steel industry was in trouble; if half the employees in automobile plants throughout the Nation were threatened with losing their jobs and their investments; if half our transportation were to come to a standstill; these would be considered national disasters and would result in immediate Federal action. Nothing less is demanded for an industry which is larger than all the others combined.

I have consistently spoken out on behalf of the farmer since I first came to Washington. The very first piece of legislation I introduced upon becoming a Member of the House of Representatives was one which urged that the disastrous policies of the Secretary of Agriculture and the present administration be investigated and immediately altered. I also introduced legislation to protect our dairy farms from unfair competition

from imports and testified before the Tariff Commission in support of action to halt disastrous increases in such imports. I met with representatives of the Mexican Government in an effort to work out better arrangements on the bracero program to provide badly needed farm labor. I introduced legislation which would provide far more accurate agricultural statistics so that farm marketing can be stabilized.

But, while we have worked to improve our farming programs, we have also recognized that there are inherent problems in the present system. Fundamental changes must take place in our policies.

The first and most basic change which must take place for the farmer, as well as the rest of society, is a return to sensible fiscal policies. The massive inflation our Nation has experienced has been particularly disastrous for our farmers.

The cost-price squeeze felt by the farmer is evident from every angle in examining the agricultural situation.

Prices received by the farmer averaged about 5 percent lower than in 1966.

Farm income declined almost 12 percent from 1966.

On the other hand, farm production expenses rose to a record high of \$34 billion.

Production expenses ate up two-thirds of all cash received by farmers from the sale of farm products. Only one-third remained as income for the farmer and his family.

While estimated annual income from non-agricultural sources rose by 8 percent from 1966 to 1967, annual personal income from farming dropped by 16 percent.

No segment of the American population has been required to suffer a more unfair burden because of the inflationary policies of our Government.

Inflation has hit the farmer in yet another way. Total farm debt last year went up by 15 percent—an average of more than \$1,200 per farm. Since their entire operation is very deeply dependent on credit, farmers are hit particularly hard by fiscal policies which promote high interest rates—and interest rates in the past year have been higher than at any time since the Civil War. Interest rates are prohibitively high for farmers and in many cases loans are not available at any price.

In short, Mr. Speaker, it is vital for the American farmer that the Nation return to noninflationary monetary policies. This most basic change in Government policy is one for which I have fought for many years. I have consistently opposed excessive Government expenditures. I have strongly urged the full study of our Government to cut out waste and inefficiency. We need to increase our activities in this field. No one will be better rewarded by a stable economy than our agricultural sector.

But other changes must take place as well. We cannot be content to let the American farmer continue to struggle within farm programs that have been basically unsound. The Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 surely must be described as the least successful farm program of the century. One needs only to look at the statistics indicated above to

acknowledge the failure of this program. Thousands of farmers have left the farm, income has dropped at an increasing rate, the escalation of farm debt has been sharp—there is no bright spot on the horizon.

Many other basic and fundamental changes must take place in our agricultural system. Time does not allow for a detailed discussion of each concept. Yet, I should like to paint a broad outline of the programs that can and must be undertaken.

EXPANSION OF MARKETS

First, rather than rely on farm subsidies, we must make tremendous efforts to expand our markets at home and abroad.

The greatest potential for expanding American farm markets lies in the expansion of foreign demand. The need for food throughout the world is great. It must, however, be translated into effective economic demand if it is to absorb America's productive potential. American agriculture is already heavily tied to export production—one in every four cropland acres cultivated in the United States is exported. Farm exports provide employment for one out of eight American farmworkers. Exports are a more important factor in agriculture than in any other major industry. Yet Federal policy seems to be almost ignoring the needs of the American farmer in participating in international agreements.

The administration has often taken steps which have frustrated the participation of the American farmer in the export market. In 1967, the administration called for increased acreages to meet foreign aid requirements. Farmers responded with production increases. The administration then decided that aid shipments would be decreased, instead, and the excess supply which resulted forced farm income to fall almost 12 percent.

The administration has forced the American farmer to pay twice for the Nation's foreign policy. He pays once in taxes and again in depressed prices.

Steps can be taken to expand the foreign market for agricultural products:

Better coordination of foreign policy and agricultural programs is necessary. Although the Department of State may benefit from low prices in its effort to provide supplies for the cold wars in India, Indonesia, Brazil, and goods for Vietnam, its policies must not be at the expense of the American farmer.

More realistic and accurate export demand estimates are needed.

A fully utilized food-for-peace program is necessary.

Our foreign aid program must be re-oriented to focus on the development of farming and farming technology in the recipient nations. Since most areas aided would be in tropical zones they would not compete with the United States in commodity productions. Their improved economy, however, would expand paying markets for U.S. products.

At home, major expansion of markets can come as well. Major improvements can be made by:

Improved access to markets through better roads. In many parts of our Na-

tion, including the Second District of Michigan, the secondary roads are woefully inadequate for ready marketing of products. This is certainly a key to any rural development.

Improved marketing facilities and increased assistance to farmers in uniform grading.

Increased agricultural research—especially in the area of industrial uses for farm products. I am convinced that if the scientific genius and technological ingenuity of our country are brought to bear in the conversion of farm products into new services to mankind, the results will be tremendous and the entire world will benefit.

Expansion of the food distribution programs and improvements in the programs which provide milk and other food to schools and needy people. There is no excuse in this land of abundance for any person to starve or for any child to go to school hungry every morning. Concentration of our welfare programs on essential programs such as nutrition will not only benefit the Nation—but will provide an increased market for American farm products. I introduced legislation creating a Commission on Hunger which has been approved and which should make broad recommendations in this field.

REVITALIZE RURAL AMERICA

Rural America is the backbone of the Nation. The family farm and the small rural community have provided the Nation with the basic values of American life. The atmosphere of community spirit, neighborly concern, and religious faith that has undergirded the American way of life remain strong in our rural communities. We must devote major national effort to preserving those communities.

The deterioration of our rural areas has a disastrous effect on the Nation as a whole. Not only does it deplete this great national reservoir of strength, but it can only add to the overcrowding and complication of our strife-torn cities. The truth is that many of our city problems are rooted in rural decay. Neither urban or rural people can be benefited by our present lack of concentration on rural problems—and both can reap rewards from strong action along these lines.

I have introduced legislation to create a Balanced Economic Development Commission would recommend methods of the ways and means through which rural areas can be revitalized. Such a Commission would recommend methods of attracting industry to rural areas. Industry in such an area is not meant to take away from the rural character of the environment, but to provide job opportunities for those who wish to leave farming—to provide attraction so that young people are not required to leave the rural area to find employment. In many parts of the Nation, including Michigan's Second District, a high percentage of farm family income is derived from off-the-farm employment. The location of industries in rural areas would go far in stabilizing farm income.

Improved transportation facilities, better schools, more extensive public

utilities, and imaginative and comprehensive land-use plans can open the way for redevelopment. I have stressed the importance of tax incentives for businesses which locate in poverty areas—in rural America as well as in the core cities. Vocational education must be intensified and increased and should give greater emphasis to agriculturally related businesses and other opportunities in rural areas. Public buildings and Government contracts should be attracted to rural areas.

Michigan's Second District is an excellent example of the action which must be taken. There is an urgent need for balance between the expansion of cities and the stability of farms. The green, open spaces of our farms, as well as their economic contributions, are vital to maintaining a balanced life for all our citizens.

GOVERNMENT IN AGRICULTURE

Government should never be allowed to dominate agriculture. The interests of a bureaucracy must never be put ahead of the interests of the agricultural community itself. Government must aid, rather than control, the agricultural economy.

We simply must develop a Department of Agriculture that is devoted to the interests of the farmers rather than the consumers. We need not be reminded of the incredible and callous example of the lack of interest the present Department displays in the plight of the farmer.

The New York Times of April 4, 1966, said:

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman expressed *pleasure* today with the fact that prices of farm products had dropped recently. It was the first time in the memory of Federal farm officials that a Secretary of Agriculture indicated that he was pleased with a decrease in farm prices.

The Wall Street Journal of May 16, 1966, stated:

Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors cites as *welcome* evidence of a slowdown in economic growth the recent turndown of pork prices.

Clearly such disregard of the interests of the American farmer in the highest levels of government must be corrected.

There must be improvement and standardization of procedures for the collection, evaluation, and dissemination of agricultural statistical data. Early this year I proposed legislation which I believe would go a long way in improving our agricultural estimates. The price that the farmers pay for inaccuracy in Federal estimates is a high one—amounting to several million dollars each year in depressed prices.

There must be better management of the Commodity Credit Corporation's inventory of grains and other farm commodities to improve farm prices, not depress them. All too often in recent years, the administration has gutted the market with commodities in order to force the price down. Such action must not be tolerated.

Numerous other proposals must be considered. They include:

Sympathetic consideration of proposals to encourage farmers, especially small

producers, to develop their bargaining position.

A truly two-way export-import policy which protects American agriculture from unfair foreign competition.

Improvement of credit programs within the farm credit system and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to meet the capital requirements of modern agriculture, especially for young farm families trying to get a decent start.

Effective plant and animal disease control and the control of pests to protect our food supplies and farm production.

Support for agricultural education and experimentation through the land-grant college system, while extending the helping hand of the Extension Service to more Americans.

A sound Federal crop insurance program.

Vigorous expansion of soil and water conservation programs.

Mr. Speaker, the farm problem facing our Nation is not one of statistics—of mere acres and abstract production figures. It is a problem of people. All too often in the past our farm programs have been directed solely at commodities. It is now time that we emphasize the human dimensions of the problem and that we take steps to assure that America's farmers have a continued opportunity to partake of our national wealth.

By their very nature our farmers are individualists. They are farmers because they want to work for themselves and control their own destinies. Their individualism and freedom is a basic characteristic of our national heritage. In our effort to assist the farmer and create a better program, we must never override that freedom with Government control. Government must develop a program that will help—not rule and overpower him.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, S. 355 contains many important features for improving the operation of the Congress. It was passed by the Senate on March 7, 1967. It has been languishing in the House since that time. The only answer seems to be that the leadership does not want these reforms. Evidently they do not wish to see the minority party accorded the increased legislative staff which it needs. They evidently do not wish the other streamlining of procedures which would help eliminate these uncertain, lengthy, disorderly sessions such as we are now enduring.

Accordingly, I have today taken the rather drastic procedure of signing the discharge petition designed to bring this measure to the floor for full and open debate. It appears that this is the only way in which this can be done, if it is to be done at all. At any rate, it is all that can be done at this stage of the session.

For months various Members have urged the leadership to move this bill along. These efforts have been rebuffed. Our last effort was on September 24, when 134 Members addressed a letter to the distinguished Speaker urging him to take action. Regrettably he has not seen fit to do so.

So we take the route of a discharge petition and hope we can blast this measure loose before the end of the session. In the event that we fail, the loser will be the American people. Unless our House changes to reflect the new demands and new pressures upon it, it will cease to have any major importance at all and, like the Senate of Rome, descend to being a mere decorative background for the all-powerful executive.

REFORMS NEEDED NOW

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the editorial from this morning's Milwaukee Sentinel which I include below as part of my remarks reflects not only my position, the position of many of our colleagues, and the Sentinel itself, but also, I am convinced, the position of the American people. I believe it is imperative to take action immediately on both the congressional reform and election reform bills.

The need, the demand, the propriety of congressional and election reform has been debated at length and in detail by Congress. Now is the time for action.

I call the attention of the House to the Sentinel editorial and again urge that these bills be considered before the 90th Congress adjourns.

The editorial follows:

IMPORTANT REFORMS

In its rush to adjourn, congress should take enough time to clear two vital pieces of legislation, the congressional reform and the election reform bills.

The senate already has passed the two measures. The bills are now in the house rules committee. They should be brought out and passed this week.

The legislative reorganization act would modernize congressional procedures, something that sorely needs to be done. If the house acted, the legislative reforms could be put into effect in the new congress convening next January. If the house doesn't act, reform efforts will have to be started all over again.

The election reform act would completely overhaul the federal election laws pertaining to campaign fund raising and spending in federal elections, something else that sorely needs to be done. If the house doesn't act, election reform efforts likewise will have to be started all over again in the new congress.

Rep. Donald Rumsfeld (R-Ill.) has been leading a drive to have the house take up these two measures. But the Democratic leadership has turned a deaf ear. If the house Democrats fail to deal with these two vital matters, it will be yet another reason to turn them out of office and to give the GOP a turn at the controls.

AFRICAN TERRORISM FINANCED BY INDIA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, apparently the Indian disciples of Mahatma Gandhi have overcome their nonviolent means of revolution and now seek to replace Satyagraha with terrorism.

Perhaps this explains the dire need for U.S. foreign aid to India—not to feed Indians but to free Indian money to subsidize murder and violence in South Africa.

Does India seek liberty or colonialism in Africa?

Under unanimous consent I submit the Associated Press Release from New Delhi for September 24, 1968, for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate, Sept. 24, 1968]

INDIA SUPPORTS AFRICAN DRIVES OF "LIBERATION"

NEW DELHI, INDIA.—India is quietly supporting a handful of movements aimed at supplanting existing governments in Africa.

India's assistance is mainly limited to medicine, books and clothing plus "moral support in the Commonwealth and the United Nations," says M. R. Thadani, head of the Foreign Ministry African desk.

"We are not in a position to give any arms because we do not sell any," Thadani adds.

"These movements manage to get arms from other sources."

India steers among the faction-ridden politics of African "liberation" movements by supporting whichever movement the Organization of African Unity backs in any given case. All these movements are armed guerrilla undertakings—and most of them have rivals in the business of taking over such areas as Mozambique, Angola, Portuguese Guinea and Rhodesia. India urges the rival groups to unify. Thadani said.

The only training India gives is to about 25 Angolans who are learning to become policemen at the Indian Military Academy. The worth of medicines, books and clothing sent to Africa is several thousand dollars per movement, Thadani said.

The largest recipient of help is the African National Congress of South Africa—partly because of Mohandas Gandhi's early association with that country and also because the congress is a pioneer among liberation movements, Thadani said.

"The late Mahatma Gandhi got his political baptism in South Africa," said Alfred Nzo, head of the African National Congress' New Delhi office, recalling Gandhi's first non-violent campaigns, between 1906 and 1914, on behalf of Indians in South Africa. He later led India to independence.

The African National Congress itself took inspiration from Gandhi and practiced non-violence from its beginning in 1912 until 1960 when "peaceful means were abandoned," Nzo said.

Thanks to its association with Gandhi, the African National Congress has the entire expenses of its office here, about \$10,000 a year footed by the Indian government.

The congress also has offices in England, Algeria, Egypt, and Zambia. Its headquarters is in Tanzania. Its activities are under ban in South Africa.

"We think the African National Congress

is representative of the majority aspirations of South Africa," a spokesman for India's Foreign Ministry says.

CLEVELAND AREA RALLY TO PROTEST SOVIET ANTISEMITISM

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House of Representatives to the great concern being expressed in my community among Jewish families and the general public over the "cultural and intellectual" genocide against the Jewish population which is widely felt here to be present in the Soviet Union.

Numerous protests have been made to the Soviet Ambassador over the years from Cleveland area residents. New and additional petitions resulting from a protest rally which will be held in Cleveland, Ohio, on October 12 are soon to be forwarded to the Soviet Embassy in Washington.

It is my sincere hope, notwithstanding the current attitudes being expressed by the U.S.S.R., that there can be some public sign that the Jewish population within the borders of the Soviet Union can again be intellectually and spiritually free.

The world cannot condone any form of repetition of the human disaster which it witnessed during World War II. Jewish history is filled with too many examples of such tragedies.

In the past I have protested the actions of the Soviet Government against the Jewish population within its borders. It is my hope that the indignation and sorrow felt by so many Americans regarding the status of Jews on the Soviet Union can be formally expressed by the Congress of the United States. Such a resolution of support for freedom of religion everywhere in the world should be one of the very first orders of business in the next Congress.

I am convinced that such a resolution has the wide and deep-felt support of the American people. It is my hope that citizens concerned with the on-going persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union will make their feelings known to the Congress.

As a model of the resolution which the Congress should adopt, I would like to include in this point in the RECORD a copy of a resolution which I have introduced in the past:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas the Congress of the United States deeply believes in freedom of religion for all people and is opposed to infringement of this freedom anywhere in the world; and

Whereas abundant evidence has made clear that the Government of the Soviet Union is persecuting Jewish citizens by singling them out for extreme punishment for alleged economic offenses, by confiscating synagogues, by closing Jewish cemeteries, by arresting rabbis and lay religion leaders, by curtailing religious observances, by discriminating against Jews in cultural activities and access to higher education, by imposing restrictions

that prevent the reuniting of Jews with their families in other lands, and by other acts that oppress Jews in the free exercise of their faith; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has a clear opportunity to match the words of its constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion with specific actions so that the world may know whether there is a genuine hope for a new day of better understanding among all people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that persecution of any persons because of their religion by the Soviet Union be condemned, and that the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses, and fully permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders.

I would also like to include in the RECORD, at this point, a copy of an article on the coming protest rally which is to be held in Cleveland on Saturday, October 12, 1968. The article appeared in the Cleveland Jewish News, October 4, 1968:

Cleveland teenagers and all the members of their families have "a date with Soviet Jewry" on Saturday, October 12th. A mass community wide rally will be convened on that night for the purpose of protesting Soviet anti-Semitism. Mrs. Michael Blumberg, General Chairman announces that the event will begin at 8:00 P.M. at the Taylor Road Synagogue.

Youngsters from religious schools all over the city are now writing letters of protest to Russian Ambassador Anatoli F. Dobrynin, which will be collected at the rally and will be forwarded to the Soviet embassy in Washington.

The rally is to be held just prior to Simhat Tora, in recognition of the manner in which Soviet Jews by the thousands have demonstrated their solidarity during this holiday.

The mass rally will be addressed by world-renowned actor and singer Theodore Bikel. Mr. Bikel, a national vice-president of the American Jewish Congress, is a noted fighter for human rights and has been a principal figure in national protests against Soviet anti-Semitism.

Other program participants will be Dorothy Reuben Silver, noted dramatic artist who will present staged readings. Cantor Saul Meisel of the Temple on the Heights will present a program of songs beloved by Russian Jews.

Following the rally at Taylor Synagogue, a torchlight procession will form with the entire assemblage proceeding to adjacent Cain Park. Torah scrolls will be borne in the procession as young and old climax the evening with Israeli folk dancing and singing.

"Every year at Simhat Tora time the Jews of the Soviet Russia demonstrate their solidarity by a tremendous rally before the Great Synagogue," Mrs. Blumberg declared. "Just as Soviet Jews seek to express their longing to remain Jews under adverse conditions, so must we American Jews show our sympathy with a great rally at this holiday time!"

All Cleveland religious schools and Sunday schools have been alerted to the significance of the massive rally. Students are now preparing protest letters which will be deposited in large receptacles at the Synagogue prior to the rally.

Henry Margolis, chairman of the Educational Directors Council of the Bureau of Jewish Education, announced that during the coming weeks all schools are planning to devote at least one session to discussing the situation of Jews behind the Iron Curtain.

The entire community—young and old—is invited to participate in the momentous

rally, which will be part of a nation-wide expression of American-Jewish solidarity with their brothers in Soviet-dominated countries.

REPORTS ON CRIME CONFERENCE

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, in August of this year, I cosponsored a crime prevention and control conference in my district, which brought together many distinguished panelists from the Buffalo, N.Y., area to discuss the causes and prevention of crime. The results of the conference and the conclusions reached are included in my latest newsletter in addition to other news for the people in my district.

Since many of my colleagues have inquired as to the outcome of the conference and the conclusions reached, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD my recent newsletter:

REPORTS ON CRIME CONFERENCE—CRIME CONFERENCE HEARS CALL FOR CITIZEN PARTICIPATION TO STRENGTHEN LAW ENFORCEMENT

A distinguished American recently declared: "The people will get observance of the law and enforcement of the law if they want it, insist on it and participate in it."

This basic idea was a central theme at the Crime Prevention and Control Conference which I Co-sponsored with the State University of Buffalo's School of Law and Office of Urban Affairs on August 8.

The panels participating in the Conference were made up of distinguished citizens: judges, attorneys, civic leaders, law enforcement officials, psychiatrists, social workers and clergy. The topics discussed ranged from the lack of respect for law in our society and juvenile crime to citizen apathy and non-involvement in preventing crime. Also discussed was the new Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act which was just passed by Congress and its favorable impact on law enforcement in our community.

I found the discussions very enlightening and I'm happy to note from the mail I've received from those who attended the Conference that most people felt the meeting to be worthwhile.

Concluding the conference I pointed out that enactment of the Safe Streets Act marks the start of a massive, concentrated, sustained assault on crime at all levels of government. Riots and crimes which flow from riots are as intolerable as every other kind of lawlessness. They are as hopeless as the causes which so often and as tragically breed them.

"We can build a better America by building better families" was the note on which Father Alan A. Zielinski, Director of the Monsignor Carr Institute, opened the first panel chaired by attorney Paul I. Birzon and this was a recurring theme throughout the day.

One of the most appalling trends discussed was the alarming increase in juvenile crime. The Conference was informed that over 50% of all crimes in this country are committed by young people between the ages of 10 and 18 years.

Judge Mary Ann Killeen, Family Court Judge, and other panelists felt that this increase was due in large measure to parental neglect and lack of respect for parental authority. The importance of the family, the home and the presence of a father in helping

to prevent crime was stressed again and again by judges, clergy and welfare officials.

Since one out of three arrests in the suburbs involves a juvenile, the problem is not one confined solely to the inner city. The Conference was told that in the suburbs, the father often does not spend much time with his family, or is too preoccupied with his career. The panelists agreed that children need a home they can be proud of, where they can bring their friends, a place for study and homework. They need parents who care enough about them to talk to them, listen to them and teach them respect for law and order and the responsibilities of living in a free society.

The conclusions of the panelists were reinforced recently when the F.B.I. released a report on crime showing that in 1967 one out of every two persons arrested for "index crimes" (murder, rape, robbery, assault, burglary, larceny and auto theft) was under 18; one out of every four was under 15 and one out of every 29 was under 11. The report also showed that since 1960, arrests of those under 18 years of age increased by 68.5% while arrests of those 18 and over increased less than one per cent.

Gaps and Injustices in our Legal and Penal Systems: Another theme of the Conference, especially among those familiar with our courts, was the injustices of our court and penal systems.

Rev. Carl Burke, Chaplain of the Erie County Jail, spoke of the demoralizing effect that long waits for trials have on prisoners. Because of the backlog in our court system, he said, many accused persons who can not raise bail are forced to wait from seven to thirteen months or longer in jail before they are tried. Often, the individuals involved are found not guilty or are given a suspended sentence. Yet they have already spent many, many unnecessary months in jail while awaiting this verdict and often, no longer have jobs.

Charles S. Desmond, retired Chief Judge of the N.Y. State Court of Appeals, emphasized the need for more judgeships and more court personnel to expedite court cases and to make this type of treatment outmoded.

Judge Desmond and Dr. Armand DiFrancesco, psychiatrist and medical director of Baker Hall, a home for distressed boys, stressed the need for reform in our prisons and for the need to make them more rehabilitative. "Crime has always been treated by punishment", said Dr. DiFrancesco, "but punishment has never been proven as a deterrent to crime nor does it reform the criminal." Statistics were cited proving that the longer a person spends in jail the more likely he is to return to crime.

These conclusions again seem to be borne out by the F.B.I. Report on Crime. In a special study of those arrested in 1966 and 1967 for murder, rape, assault and robbery, the F.B.I. found that 75% had previously been convicted of some crime, and 49% of these had served jail sentences. It also showed that of those under the age of 20 who were released in 1963, 70% were rearrested in the next four years. Obviously, as our panelists and the F.B.I. concluded, our prisons are failing in their job of rehabilitating prisoners to take up their responsibilities as citizens.

Role of Federal and State Government: With the passage and signing into law of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, the Federal government has embarked on a new program of aiding states in developing answers to crime.

Mr. Richard Braun of the Criminal Division of the U.S. Department of Justice outlined what the new law would mean to law enforcement officials in Erie County.

Under this law, federal funds will be available to the states to develop new and innovative crime control and prevention programs. For example, Buffalo Police Chief Frank Felicetta was informed that this money would cover the cost of installing a

computer and training computer personnel in the Buffalo Police Department if this was included in the comprehensive state plan. If the proposed consolidation of the police departments in Erie County into one law enforcement agency is agreed to on November 5, it too would be eligible for planning funds.

According to Mr. Peter Preiser of the N.Y. State Crime Control Council, a comprehensive state-wide plan will be submitted to the federal government within the next few months and an action grant should be awarded to New York by April of 1969.

Failure of Citizen Concern: In conclusion, the panels and participants decided that the failure of citizens to become involved, their apathy and wish for more control rather than participating in the prevention of crime was a major factor in the increase in crime. The feeling that crime is the business of the police department, that it is something that happens to other people, that "somebody" should do "something" about it, seem to be prevalent attitudes on the part of the public. People, communities, schools and churches, the panelists agreed, must become involved in preventing crime and the conditions that breed crime.

I've received many letters from people in the District since the Crime Conference containing suggestions or asking what they can do to combat crime. Following are some proposals for action which evolved at the Conference. Many of them are not new but perhaps at this time we need to take stock of ourselves and to resolve anew to act to prevent crime in our home and community.

Pay attention and supervise your children and their activities (such as what television and movies they are watching.)

Be a good example for your children, teach them respect for law and order by showing your respect for these precepts and by obeying every law, no matter how minor, to show your regard for it.

Be willing to stand up and be a witness in court if you observe a crime or serve on a jury if called.

Find out and participate in your community's activities to prevent crime.

Do your schools have courses in good citizenship?

Is your church or club involved in helping those less fortunate to improve their housing, to find jobs, to get a better education?

Volunteer a few hours of your time each week to help tutor some child, teach some skill you possess to underprivileged teenagers, be a Big Brother to a fatherless youngster.

Watch the dispensation of justice in your community and make your opinion known if you feel the causes of justice have not been served.

Support plans to increase police pay: improve training and professionalism among law enforcement officers.

The government can legislate against crime, court systems can be improved, money can be made available for more sophisticated methods of crime detection and all of these improvements will help, but in the last analysis, the first defense against crime is the individual and the degree he is involved in his family, school, church, community. It is really up to each of us to inform ourselves and to work to prevent the conditions that foster crime. If in each community we can rise to this challenge and begin to take constructive action, we will have made a great achievement.

New legislation: *Gun Control*. On July 24, the House of Representatives passed a gun bill by a vote of 304 to 118. Since so many constituents have written to me concerning this legislation, I would like to summarize the provisions of the bill for your information.

Limits on Gun Sales: *Bans*:

Over the counter sales of rifles and shot-guns to nonresidents in a state except to those persons from adjoining states.

Long gun sales to persons under the age of 18 years.

Persons who have been convicted of a felony, drug addiction, or mental incompetents from purchasing a gun.

Mail-order sale of ammunition for handguns.

The sale of hand guns and pistol ammunition to persons under the age of 21 years.

Penalties: Provides for a mandatory prison sentence for federal felonies in which a gun is used. One to ten years for a first offense and 5 to 25 years for repeaters. This sentence would be served in addition to the sentence for the basic felony.

Registration and Licensing: Amendments to require federal registration of all guns, of hand guns only and to require that all gun owners have permits were defeated by margins of 3 to 1 or more.

Effect on Sportsmen: The effect of this legislation on law abiding sportsmen will be negligible. A hunter can still buy any gun he wants in his home state and take his gun into any state and purchase ammunition over the counter. He can also purchase a gun to replace a lost, broken or stolen firearm while hunting or competing out of his home state. I met with many sportsmen while I was home with my family in August. I didn't talk with one who didn't endorse the mail order ban. I assured them of Congress' sincere desire not to harm or hamper honest, law-abiding people like themselves. The President and the Congress are simply trying to help keep deadly firearms out of the hands of children, drug addicts, chronic alcoholics, maniacs, murderers and other criminals.

Policemen and Firemen: Last spring Congress passed a new law, which I supported, extending the benefits of the Federal Employees Compensation Act to police officers injured during the enforcement of federal law and also to their survivors.

Since then, I have co-sponsored legislation to extend these benefits to all policemen and firemen killed or totally disabled in the line of duty whether or not a specific federal criminal law happens to be involved.

My theory in extending the act is that we are a nation of travellers. The criminal who shoots a policeman or sets a fire that injures a fireman in West Seneca may just have arrived from Chicago. On the other hand, the would-be victim who is protected by Buffalo police and firefighters might be passing through from Los Angeles.

In short, when a public safety officer dies for law he is dying for America and I believe the American Government has a responsibility to help compensate.

If my bill becomes law, a widow would receive 45% of the monthly wage rate for her deceased husband if she is the sole survivor and this compensation would continue unless she remarried.

If there are dependent children, the widow would receive 40% and each child would get 15% up to a total of 75% of the monthly wage rate of the deceased husband.

In cases of total disability, if there are no dependents, benefits would equal two-thirds of the monthly wage while with dependents, benefits would equal three-fourths of the monthly wage.

Tax Bill: In July of this year, I introduced legislation to increase the personal exemption allowed each taxpayer and dependent from \$600 to \$1200. Since the cost of living has risen at least 50% since 1948 when present exemption went into effect, I feel now is the time to increase the amount to \$1200 to better reflect the times in which we live and to assist the long neglected middle income taxpayer. Support for this bill is building among my colleagues in the House and

I am hopeful that action will be taken on it in the next Congress.

Dollars For College: My staff and I have recently updated our student guide to financial assistance in attending college or vocational school. It outlines federal and New York State loans, grants and scholarships primarily for the undergraduate student in need of financial assistance. I am mailing a copy to each high school senior in the 39th District. But if anyone else wishes a copy, please write and I'll be happy to send you one.

Grants and Contracts: Secretary Robert C. Weaver of the Housing and Urban Development Department recently visited Buffalo to attend a dinner sponsored by the Frontier Housing Development Corporation. I attended with Mr. Weaver and was delighted to be present for his announcement of an award of \$400,000 to develop sewer and water facilities in Angola and the lake-shore area of the Town of Evans. This money will enable the Evans-Angola area to build facilities that will promote increased growth of the area.

In recent weeks my office also announced the award of the following grants and contracts:

An advance to the Town of Clarence in the amount of \$39,060 for a preliminary study of the town's water distribution system.

A contract to Scott Aviation in Lancaster from the Department of the Navy in the amount of \$4.41 million to develop, design and construct a swimmer life support system for deep sea divers. The system will include every device needed by a swimmer for independent existence under the sea and the total package will be developed by the Lancaster firm.

A \$41,650 advance from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Erie County Water Authority to help finance the planning of a water transmission main to serve Evans and Brant.

A 158,900 project for remodeling and new construction of intensive care units at Veterans Hospital. The newest equipment and specially trained personnel will be installed.

A contract to Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory from the Department of the Air Force for \$1,000,000 for the analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of penetration aids.

A \$235,431 grant to the Towns of Evans and Hamburg for the development of recreation areas and a wildlife sanctuary under the Open Space Land Program.

A grant to the Erie-Niagara County Planning Board in the amount of \$86,566 for a regional airport study.

A grant to Immaculata College, Hamburg, N.Y., in the amount of \$25,567 for construction of academic buildings.

A \$579,411 water and sewer facilities grant to the Town of Evans from the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the construction of water distribution lines.

A grant to the Erie County Department of Health in the amount of \$206,982 to intensify tuberculosis control services in Erie County.

A U.S. Army contract to Sylvania Electric Products, Inc., in Williamsville, in the amount of \$1,200,000 for debugging of helicopter radio sets.

A grant from HEW to the Niagara Frontier Vocational Rehabilitation Center for \$175,359 to continue and add new courses for training handicapped people for gainful employment.

A grant from the Public Health Service to the Erie County Health Department for \$204,012 for continuation of a project to establish an air pollution program in Erie County.

Sincerely,

RICHARD D. MCCARTHY,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESSMAN BILL GREEN SALUTES AN AMERICAN HERO

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed and able colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM J. GREEN, of Pennsylvania, was the principal speaker at Philadelphia's Steuben Day celebration, Sunday, September 22, at Independence Square.

In his stirring speech, Congressman GREEN paid tribute to Baron von Steuben not as a gifted German who fought to make America free, but as an American who fought to win independence for his adopted country.

Steuben's devotion and service, Congressman GREEN said, should remind us that—

All of us are Americans, regardless of our national origin. All of us share the common goals of freedom and independence.

Congressman GREEN used Steuben's example to demonstrate that the social turmoil in America today is neither new nor alarming, and that change and struggle are woven into our Nation's history.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert Congressman GREEN's excellent Steuben Day address at this point in the RECORD, and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

STEBUEN DAY SPEECH, SEPTEMBER 22, 1968

Ladies and gentlemen: We meet here today—in the shadow of freedom's birthplace—to commemorate the great deeds of an American hero.

It is true that Baron Von Steuben was German by birth—and proud of it.

But his cause was the cause of America's freedom.

It is true that he was trained in the military discipline of Frederick the Great.

But he put that discipline to work here in America, transforming the dispirited patriots of Valley Forge into an effective army.

It is likewise true that he was a German soldier who fought valiantly for his native country in the Seven Years' War.

But his greatest deeds were saved for the American Revolution.

"When I drew my sword," he said, "I made a solemn vow that only death could compel me to give up before Great Britain would recognize America's independence."

It is also true that most foreign officers who aided America returned to their countries when the war was over.

But Steuben remained.

He became an American citizen.

His vision shaped the military academy at West Point.

His discipline—which was the backbone of the colonial army—became the foundation for a new national army of a young and energetic democracy.

Yes, Steuben became an American, and remained one until his death in 1794.

Honored by his adopted country, he enjoyed the friendship and esteem of his companion in arms, General George Washington.

Proud of his German heritage, he helped build a new nation.

Strengthened by the discipline of his youth, he helped to bring independence and individual freedom to a promising but struggling land.

And so, it is appropriate that we refer to him today as an American hero.

For all of us are Americans—regardless of our national origin.

All of us share the common goals of freedom and independence.

Times have changed but the basic human concerns of every man have not. The ideals which Steuben held in common with Washington, you and I hold in common today.

The cause which united Steuben from Germany and Barry from Ireland unites every American, regardless of his birth or ancestry. And John Barry, whose statue across this park presides over this celebration today, would testify to the justness of the cause which united him with Steuben, Washington, Lafayette and Kosciuszko.

And together, you and I can look back—although we may be of different national origins—to the same heroes and the same principles which made our Nation great.

Steuben—and the other great heroes of the Revolution—mean something today, not only to those of German origin, but to all Americans regardless of origin.

His achievements sum up the experience of all the German people who migrated to America.

And the experience of the German immigrants is the experience of America itself.

That experience began when Franz Pastorius, the first German to set foot on American soil, saw the promise of the new land.

His vision of what America could be prompted him to bring the first thirteen German Mennonite families here to Philadelphia two hundred and eighty-five years ago.

They came for the same reason that others came.

They came to live in freedom and peace, to "escape from tyranny" and religious persecution.

They came to uplift themselves from poverty in a new land of opportunity.

They came because they were adventurous in spirit, self-reliant, and eager to meet the challenges of a new civilization.

And they gave of themselves unselfishly when their new home was in danger.

During the revolutionary war, no group was more solid for independence than the Germans. . . . and none fought better.

As a new nation grew, more Germans came to America, many of them among the first to cross the mountains, to pioneer the Midwest and to settle the vast midland of this country.

And again, when the union was threatened, it had no stauncher ally than its German American citizens.

The Civil War brought hardship and tragedy to everyone.

But more German Americans enlisted in the Union Army than any other segment of the population.

And when the Union was saved, these brave and determined people returned—quietly and peaceably—to their private lives.

But all was not always peace and quiet.

The German people, too, have known what it is like to suffer intolerance and hatred, suspicion and humiliation.

It was not easy, during the first World War, to be German American in this country—just as it is not easy now and was not at times past, to be of other extractions.

And yet, the German people have become—and have always been—an inseparable part of American life, good artisans, good farmers, good businessmen and, above all, good citizens.

This has been your experience.
This has been America's experience.
This has been the story of all people who have migrated to America.

And so, in light of this experience, let us rededicate ourselves today to those things for which our ancestors fought.

Let us ask ourselves today, what would a great hero like Steuben expect of us?

I believe that he would first ask all of us to remain true to the things for which he fought.

I think that he would want us to defend—with our lives, if necessary—the freedoms which were written into the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States . . .

The freedom to speak our minds . . .
The freedom to worship as we please . . .

The freedom to live and work as our inclinations and our talents dictate.

I think he would have us remember the words of the Declaration of Independence as written by Thomas Jefferson just two blocks from where we stand today: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

I feel that he would tell us that this is what America is all about.

Further than that, I think he would demand that we be men of individual courage and integrity.

He would warn us that, if we are to keep our freedom, we must be prepared to fight for it, as he did . . . that we must be prepared to risk our individual comfort or security in behalf of the rights which we cherish.

He would remind us that many others have died so that we can be free.

And he would ask us, I am sure, to instill in ourselves the sense of discipline which he possessed and which he brought to those demoralized troops at Valley Forge.

All of these are lessons which we learned long ago.

Perhaps we are inclined, at times, to take them for granted, to forget them or to look upon them simply as the lessons of childhood.

But they are not.
They are the lessons of today.

They are written in the headlines of tomorrow's newspapers.

The story of the Revolution is as real as a Soviet threat to the stability of modern Germany.

Past threats to freedom are as real as the depressing sight of the Berlin Wall and the constant reminders that millions of our fellow men are not free and do not have our opportunities.

These are harsh realities that all of us must face.

But the Revolution too was a harsh reality.

It was not some distant romance enshrined here at Independence Hall as if blood was never really shed for our freedom. Steuben did not exist in marble.

He was a man of flesh and blood, courage and valor, with ideals and motivations.

And if he were alive today, he would issue the same challenge to us which he met nearly two hundred years ago.

And so, today, let us honor Steuben but, better than that, let us follow his example.

Let us recognize his great deeds but let us make his great deeds our own.

And finally, let us admire his ideals and the freedoms for which he fought. But, above all, let us strengthen our own ideals and defend our freedoms, as he did.

In so doing, we shall be better men and better Americans.

In so doing, we shall make a better world.

And, in so doing, we shall pay to Steuben—and to the other heroes of the Revolution—their greatest tribute.

We shall, in effect, be telling them, that we understand what they did for our country

and that we intend to keep freedom alive—both in this country and throughout the world.

FIREARMS LEGISLATION

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent resolution adopted by the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners regarding firearms legislation, as well as the text of a September 11, 1968, press release in which the association's views on firearms registration proposals are stated.

In view of the panic and hysteria abroad in the land, it appears to be most appropriate that careful consideration be given by these responsible managers of the Nation's fish, wildlife, and natural resources.

I am pleased to note that this outstanding group of Americans has joined many other groups of responsible Americans in opposition to unwise firearms control legislation, of which a large amount is now pending before the Congress. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 2: FIREARMS LEGISLATION

Whereas, the Bill of Rights assures that the right of law-abiding citizens to bear arms shall not be infringed; and

Whereas, the 17 million persons possessing and using firearms for management and utilization of the nation's wildlife resources constitute a major economic and recreational value and provide the dominant financial support for protection and management of the nation's wildlife resources; and

Whereas, the degree and type of firearms control needed vary considerably among the states because of differences in population density, social attitudes, law enforcement capabilities and other factors; and

Whereas, legislation is now pending before the Congress of the United States for individual gun registration which will cost billions of dollars to administer; and

Whereas, the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners is deeply concerned by proposed legislation that attempts coercion for passage of firearms registration by the states with threats of withholding moneys derived from the federal tax on arms and ammunition:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners urges the Congress to limit additional federal controls to strong penalties against the use of firearms in committing federal crimes, and the prohibition of interstate transportation in violation of state law, leaving any further restrictions to be established by the states.

Adopted by the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, Tucson, Arizona, September 13, 1968.

RELEASE BY THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GAME, FISH, AND CONSERVATION COMMISSIONERS, DIRECTED FROM TUCSON, ARIZ., TO ATTORNEY GENERAL RAMSEY CLARK AND SELECTED MEMBERS OF THE U.S. SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners read with shock and dismay the statement of the U.S. Attorney General to the U.S. Senate yesterday in which he strongly urged registra-

tion of all firearms and licensing of all gun owners.

President of the International, Walter T. Shannon, today at the annual meeting at Tucson, Arizona promptly wired Attorney General Clark the deep concern of the International Association to his stated position advocating unrealistic firearm legislation.

The International, representing the 50 state wildlife conservation agencies of the Nation has long advocated the control of crime with vigorous and prompt enforcement of existing firearm laws without breaching the precious rights of law abiding citizens to own firearms. President Shannon, after reading the press story of the Attorney General's statement, observed that statistics show that of all the millions of law-abiding gun owners in America, less than 1% have ever been convicted of a criminal violation with the use of a gun. He stated further "We are as deeply disturbed as anyone else about lawlessness in our land. Additional gun legislation as advocated by Attorney General Clark would endanger the rights of law-abiding citizens with no proof or positive assurance it would accomplish the control of crime which we all seek."

"Registration of all guns and licensing of gun owners would cost the taxpayers millions of dollars that would give the enforcement agencies little more than a listing of the law-abiding gun owners of the country. Criminals will not register guns or apply for a license to own guns."

"Many law-abiding people contend that registration and licensing of guns is the first step toward confiscation of firearms and eventual disarming of law-abiding citizens. When that happens, only the criminals will have guns," Shannon said.

NOMINATION OF U.S. ATTORNEY CECIL POOLE TO BE A U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1968

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 29, 1968, President Johnson did the State of California the high honor of nominating U.S. Attorney Cecil Poole to be a U.S. district judge for the Northern District of California. In doing so he proposed to give California not only the services of a brilliant and distinguished lawyer but also the opportunity to claim the first Negro Federal judge west of the Mississippi.

I joined at that time in the general hope and belief that Cecil Poole would be promptly and overwhelmingly confirmed by the Senate.

That, Mr. Speaker, was over 4 months ago. Not only has there been no final action upon this nomination, but there has been no action at all. The nomination has been bottled up in the Senate Judiciary Committee. The obvious question, which demands an answer, is "Why"?

On the day Cecil Poole's name was submitted to the Senate it was accompanied by three other nominations to the Federal bench. All three were confirmed within a few weeks.

Since then 17 additional nominations have been sent to the Senate. All 17 have had their hearings. And 11 have been confirmed.

Mr. Speaker, of the 21 nominations

submitted to the Senate since May 29 only one—that of Cecil Poole—has been pigeonholed without even a hearing.

What is the reason for this discriminatory treatment? Why has Cecil Poole been singled out from the other 20 nominees?

So far as I can determine, there is only one difference between Cecil Poole and the other nominees. He is a Negro. There has already been considerable comment to the effect that this is the reason his nomination has been held up. Unless some other explanation is forthcoming, what other conclusion can be reached?

Cecil Poole cannot be faulted upon his qualifications. As one of the Nation's outstanding U.S. attorneys, as a former counsel to the Governor of California, as a former assistant district attorney for San Francisco, and as a successful private practitioner, he possesses in abundance all of the qualifications and credentials necessary to serve in the Federal judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, it is particularly deplorable that Cecil Poole has not received even the courtesy of a hearing. Why not simply schedule a public hearing and invite anyone who opposes the nomination to appear, out in the open, and state his objections? Why the secretive procedure which denies the nominee his day in court and an opportunity to hear and respond to any objections?

There is still time to rectify the wrong that has been done to Cecil Poole. There is still time for the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the Senate, to act. It is imperative that they do so. A cynical rejection of this nomination, without any consideration of its merits, would not only be an affront to the nominee but a grievous breach of faith with an entire generation of young Negroes.

Consider, Mr. Speaker, how long we have been urging young Negroes to prepare themselves for positions of leadership and responsibility. Consider how long we have urged them to get good educations and become qualified to assume high offices and take their rightful places in society. And consider what their reaction will be now if a man who has heeded our urgings and worked his way up the ladder through years of hard work and able service is denied a position in the Federal judiciary without so much as a chance to be heard or to respond to anonymous accusers.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Senate to consider this nomination upon its merits and promptly give its advice and consent.

HUMPHREYISM NO. 8

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

From a Collection of Representative HENRY C. SCHADEBERG's (R. Wis.):

"All these small-town two-bit editors don't publish the true facts. I get tired of having them pick on me." (Granite Falls Tribune, September 22, 1960.)

HIGH-DENSITY-TRAFFIC AIRPORTS

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Aviation Administration recently held hearings on the controversy surrounding its proposed rules for high-density-traffic airports. Due to crowded conditions at many major airports, the rulings would have the effect of excluding small private aircraft from use of these airport facilities.

I would like to share with my colleagues a copy of a letter I received from a constituent, Mr. James F. Busch, of Milton-Freewater, Oreg. Mr. Busch owns a small private plane and also makes use of commercial airlines.

There are many ways in which one may express dissatisfaction with an impending Federal regulation. Mr. Busch has chosen a very humorous, satirical style as his vehicle of expression, and I wish to insert that letter in the RECORD at this point:

READYMIX SAND & GRAVEL Co., Inc.
Milton-Freewater, Oreg.,
September 18, 1968.

ALAN S. BOYD,
Secretary, Department of Transportation,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are in the concrete, gravel, asphalt, and block business. In the operation of our business we operate 34 trucks and one airplane.

In the past few years the private car traffic on the interstate highways that we must use has become so heavy that we experience much delay and expense that would be avoided if these private cars were forced to use secondary roads. This is particularly true during the rush hours of 7 a.m. to 10 a.m. and 3:30 p.m. to 6 p.m. Also, there is a great element of danger that could be much reduced by eliminating the private vehicles. As you well know, these private vehicles are operated by non professional drivers and their proficiency is, at best, suspect.

We have noted with great interest the program you are launching at the three public owned airports in New York City. While you have not prohibited the private aircraft from using the airport, you achieve the same result by charging a \$25.00 users fee for them only. We are convinced that this same policy would serve our interests very well in the elimination of this bothersome private vehicles traffic from our crowded roads. True, you likely would have difficulty in prohibiting the private cars, but we are sure that a \$25.00 trip permit levied against the private vehicles during these rush hours would effectively solve our traffic problem.

There may be some protest at the beginning of this policy, but we are sure that your department and a combination of public carriers could gradually justify the policy by timely and well thought out press and T.V. releases. Then after this program has been accepted by the public as being in their best interest, it would be quite easy to bar them from all of the main roads.

Please let us know if you think the program can be implemented. We are sure that we could enlist the support of the Greyhound Bus Company, Consolidated Freightways and other common carriers.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BUSCH,
President.

THE VIETNAM PLANK

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, so much is being written and said concerning the war in Vietnam, that I feel I must insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech I made on this subject at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago in August.

I submit that there is little difference between the plank of the platform of the Democratic Party and the comparable plank in the platform of the Republican Party. The general difference is that the latter calls for an immediate bombing halt, while the Democratic plank calls for a bombing halt with a condition to protect American troops in South Vietnam. The Democratic plank also calls for free elections.

Whatever the differences may be in the respective platforms, I personally believe that the next President of the United States, whoever he may be, will do that which is best for our Nation, our national security and for the protection of the free world and our civilization.

The remarks I delivered on August 28, 1968, in support of the Vietnam plank of the majority report of the Democratic platform committee follow:

IN SUPPORT OF THE VIETNAM PLANK OF THE MAJORITY REPORT OF THE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM COMMITTEE

(Speech made by Mrs. KELLY at Democratic National Convention, August 28, 1968)

Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates, fellow Americans: What is it we want out of our Vietnam plank?

We want a definition of principles and goals . . . not a tactical manifesto.

We want to instruct the next President of the United States to make a just and honorable peace . . . not to limit his options and prejudice his position at the negotiating table.

We want a declaration to the world of America's peaceful intent and the Democratic party's peaceful purpose—not recrimination about the past.

The majority plank calls "an honorable and lasting settlement" in Vietnam our most urgent task in South East Asia.

It recognizes our willingness to take some risks in the quest for peace.

It supports the talks in Paris.

It calls for a halt in bombing when the President . . . whoever he may be at the time . . . deems it wise.

It calls for shifting a larger share of the interim burden to the South Vietnamese army.

It calls for the establishment of a freely elected government which can command the support of the people of South Vietnam.

It calls upon the next President of the United States and the future Democratic Congress to be "selective" in providing future military and economic assistance to South Vietnam.

My fellow Americans, we are here to nominate the man who will be the next President of the world's most powerful nation. We are not here to instruct an ambassador . . . or a general.

We have defined our principles as a party. We expect our candidate to run on those principles, we expect him ultimately to conduct the office of President without prejudice to the safety of Americans . . . and with-

out prejudice to his long-range effectiveness in filling our peaceful purpose.

Do we want Hubert Humphrey or Eugene McCarthy . . . or George McGovern . . . or any other candidate we may choose to go to the peace table with half his cards face up?

Do we think that any man we select will do less than his utmost for peace . . . or in any way deny the peaceful mandate we have given him?

No, my friends. The majority report is sound, realistic and rational. And it is sufficient.

Therefore, let us accept this plank, my fellow delegates and send our nominee forth as President and not a puppet.

I pray you support the Majority Report!

GERMAN-AMERICANS IN LOUISIANA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Louisiana has a proud heritage—a heritage built by people from many different countries around the world. One of these groups is the German immigrants.

Inasmuch as the Volkfest was recently held in Germany, perhaps our colleagues will find of interest several articles appearing in the Dixie Roto magazine, a magazine supplement of the New Orleans Times Picayune of July 21, 1968.

I include these articles following my remarks:

LOUISIANA'S GERMANTOWN

Germantown. Not a city in Europe, but a quiet, peaceful area in the hill country of North Louisiana 10 miles from Minden.

The story of this community and of the people who settled it is as filled with pain, tragedy, romance and adventure as though it were lifted from between the covers of a best-selling 19th Century novel. Mostly it's a story of freedom-seeking people; people who were willing to sacrifice. It's a story of people who encountered hardship in a new land, but established a landmark in the country they eventually learned to love and respect.

The person most responsible for founding the Germantown colony was Maximillian Bernhard Ludwig—who later called himself "Count Leon." He was born in Germany in 1788. Because of limited freedom in Germany in the early 19th Century to worship as he wished, he began searching for a new homeland. The land he chose was the young country of America.

Ludwig organized a group of citizens who shared his zeal for religious freedom, and whose beliefs were the same as his. He selected the colonists carefully; most were wealthy. Money was important because the journey was to be long and expensive.

Ludwig's pioneers were selected for their ability to "get along," their calmness, their gentle nature. Each had to master a skill. Doctors, teachers, leather craftsmen, carpenters and others who were specially trained were sought out.

After selling his estate near Frankfurt, Ludwig and his family and about 60 other colonists set sail for the Land of Opportunity. The trip took 50 days, and on Sept. 2, 1830, they landed in New York.

Things went wrong from the beginning. America wasn't what they had expected. Many became discouraged and began to disbelieve in Ludwig and his ideals. In 1832, Ludwig took those who would follow and

went to Phillipsburg, Pa. Problems greeted them there too. Persecution, discouragement, financial loss, rebellion—these were some troubles that caused Ludwig to eventually decide the East wasn't the place to put down roots. Another journey was planned.

In September, 1834, the colonists loaded their belongings in flatboats and started down the Ohio River, destination unknown. From the Ohio, they floated down the Mississippi. When they reached the Red River, they turned north and headed upriver, again to an unknown destination. In February, 1835, the colonists landed at Grand Ecore, La., on the Red River about five miles north of Natchitoches. Although most of the colonists were bedraggled, tired and almost empty-handed, the spirit to continue remained with them. They built homes on low bluffs along the river. Churches were put up, and the colonists started farming the rich river bottomland.

This was a happy time for the colony. Ludwig and his journey-weary followers were settling down to the harmonious and peaceful life they sought. But this happy period was short-lived. Fate not only dealt them one, but two, deadly blows this time.

Yellow fever invaded the colony. Then came the great flood. Because most of the homes were built on river lowlands, the rushing waters took their toll. Not only homes, but also crops that promised bumper yields were carried away.

The loss of homes, loved ones and crops wasn't the final tabulation of misery and sorrow. Ludwig died, a victim of yellow fever. The disease had thinned the ranks of the colony. Ludwig's wife, Countess Leon, became the leader of the colony, and Dr. George Goentgen became its religious advisor, teacher and secretary.

Nothing was left at Grand Ecore; the colonists decided to seek fairer lands. They hired space on boats headed up-river. This time, they landed at Corianna Allen Settlement, eight miles west of Minden on Dorcheat Bayou. With their dwindling finances, they bought oxen and wagons and headed east.

When the colonists came to the area now known as Germantown, they suddenly knew their six-year-old journey for peace and happiness had ended. The tall trees, sloping hillsides and rich fertile valleys helped them decide to make this land their home. The first task was to purchase land. This was done, and 80 acres were deeded to them. When they learned most of the area was government land and could be had for the asking, they took advantage of the homestead law and shortly an additional 320 acres were added to their farm.

Life wasn't easy at first, but these people were accustomed to hard work, so everyone pitched in and did his share. Men skilled in carpentry and wood-working built houses. Others began to clear land for crops. Wells were dug, and additional tools were bought. Within a few years, the place that was once dense forest became a bustling community. It boasted homes, stores, grist mill, cotton gin, and places for making clothes, shoes and other necessities of life.

Almost 300 acres of creek bottomland and hillside acreage had been cleared within four years after settlement. This land produced cotton, corn, potatoes, peanuts, and several other crops. Livestock provided power, meat and milk.

The early colony maintained its own school; it had a church.

Everything in the colony was community property. A secretary and a treasurer took care of colony business and financial problems. Although each family maintained its own home, bachelors moved into their own quarters when they reached 21. Single women remained in their parents' homes until they were married. Most marriages were between

young people who were reared in the colony, although some found mates elsewhere.

All food, clothing and shelter came from the colony's farm. Wool, silk and leather were made into clothes and shoes by the industrious founders of the unusual colony.

Life went well in the colony for almost 50 years. But as the young grew older and married they began to drift away from the colony to make their homes elsewhere. By 1872, only a few families remained on the farm. At this time, Countess Leon and her advisors decided to disband the colony, divide the community property and let each colonist go his way. Most of the older settlers stayed on until death. Younger families moved to new homes nearby.

Countess Leon moved to Bastrop to make her home with her daughter, who had married and left the colony some years earlier. Her brothers-in-law, Philip Hayner and Ben Goentgen, took over the farm in 1873 and worked it until the early 1900s, when another colony resident fell heir to running the farm. He was Frank Krouse Sr., father of the man who was to take the eroded land 25 years later and build it into one of the most productive farms in North Louisiana.

When Frank Krouse began working the 75-year-old farm, the once-proud face of the land was scarred by erosion and nonscientific farming. Over-planting, heavy rains and carelessness had created an ugliness of gullies from hilltops to valleys, and muddy streams were carrying life-giving soil away to the sea. Efforts were made to restore the land by building terraces. This was futile, and pressures on the land to produce created even more problems. When Frank Krouse died in 1912, his son Chester became the second generation Krouse to operate the historic farm.

Chester Krouse was a conservation-minded farmer from the beginning. But his land produced hardly enough to support his young family. At one time, the land's abundance sustained more than a dozen families.

In 1934, Chester Krouse willingly allowed his land be used as a demonstration farm, and drew assistance from the Cooly-Brushy Conservation Demonstration Project. Help became available from the Civilian Conservation Corps. Terracing, pasture planting and tree planting—prime conservation measures—were started that year. During the late '30s, the Dorcheat Soil and Water Conservation District was organized, and Chester Krouse became one of its first participants.

Technical know-how from the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture was applied. First, a soil survey was made. This measured the soil's capabilities and disclosed its problems. Thus, conservation farming became a way of life at the old colony farm.

The rest of this story is mostly of wise land use, treating and rebuilding a wornout, sick soil, and the development of one of Louisiana's most devout and dedicated stewards of the land.

Chester Krouse and his wife Florence reared four children—three sons and a daughter—in the house Frank Krouse built some 80 years ago.

The pace on the Krouse farm has slowed down a bit since Chester's sons went away to college. About 80 acres are now in cropland—mostly potatoes and corn. Another 107 acres is in pasture and meadow. All the old eroded hillsides are now in grass. Tall, well-managed pine trees stand on 208 acres.

Several of the buildings put up in 1836 remain as a monument to a proud people. Wells dug 130 years ago are still in use. Old rail fences are there, but are falling prey to time. Old furniture, spinning wheels, century-old records and tools used during the dawn of the colony are housed in one of the old buildings. The old cemetery tells a story of dedicated men and women who built a

small domain—after experiencing a long, weary and purposeful journey.

Chester Krouse today is concerned about two things. He hopes to hand his sweat-and-tear-soaked land to his sons so its heritage can be preserved. His other hope is to restore the 130-year-old buildings before they weather away. "A museum would be the thing," he says. "All the tools, instruments and relics could be displayed. History could be captured and saved so others could see."

This hope is partly a reality. The Bossier-Webster Parishes Resource Conservation and Development Project is helping pave the way for such a project. One project calls for erection of a museum, and restoration of the old buildings.

Germantown is no longer a town, but the proud people who built it left an image that will linger for years to come.

DEUTSCHES HAUS

(By Betsy Petersen)

"When six Germans get together, they form a singing society," says John Junius. "Every town, every hamlet in Germany has one."

It happens in New Orleans, too: Back in 1928, several German singing societies, some of them dating to the 18th Century, banded together to form Deutsches Haus, a club for Germans in New Orleans. Junius, a charter member of the club, is now 80 years old—and he still joins the Deutsches Haus Saengerchor every Friday for German songs and German beer.

"Singing at the club is our social life," says George Schleh, another member of Deutsches Haus. "We try to come every Friday just to see one another."

The saengerchor is a traditional men's choir, singing "songs 50 or 60 years old," says Karr Koster Sr., another member. "We have some young singers who are very good," he adds. "You're just talking to the old fellows."

The club, housed in the old Galvez telephone exchange building at 200 S. Galvez, provides a bar and lounge for members, plus meeting rooms and a patio for fresh air social events. A dancing society, directed by Mrs. Walter Muendlein, performs traditional dances in costume at several festivals each year.

The most recent festival, the Volksfest (people's festival), dates back to 1910 in New Orleans, when two days of games, good food, singing and dancing were enjoyed by New Orleanians (German and others) in the old Southern Park. "The whole city participated," says Schleh of these early festivals, and he adds, with a reminiscent sigh, "Two whole days of drinking beer."

Recent Volksfests, including the one held last May, have been evening events in the club headquarters—but singing and dancing are still high points. Other annual festivals include the Octoberfest (celebrated, not surprisingly, in October) and the Schlactfest, originally a hog-killing festival, now a party featuring pork served in a variety of ways. All festivals feature singing and dancing, German food and German beer.

At a masquerade held the Saturday before Mardi Gras this year, the Deutsches Haus president, Louis B. Riedl, received an unusual honor: the Order of Carnival of the City of Mainz, one of the few German cities which celebrates the traditionally Latin festival.

Between parties, the club is open to members every evening except Monday, and the older members especially meet there regularly. A juke box provides German music.

Deutsches Haus had one of the first bowling alleys in New Orleans. (The alley was removed several years ago and the space remodeled for the Heidelberg Room, where meetings are held.)

A ladies' auxiliary gives Christmas and Easter parties for children and grandchild-

dren of members, and helps maintain the house. During World War II, says Mrs. Louis Riedl, the auxiliary received an award for wrapping an unusually large number of bandages for shipment overseas.

German classes were recently instituted at Deutsches Haus, and American-born members like Riedl say they pick up a lot of German just coming to the club. "But the only way you can really learn it is to sing it," says Junius.

Membership is no longer limited to people of German extraction—but good German beer and, always, German singing still provide the atmosphere.

"There is a saying in German," says Koster: "Wo man sangt da lasst dich nieder denn bese menschen haben keine leiber." It means, "Whenever you are in the company of singing people, they are happy and relaxed people—bad people have no songs."

THEY CAME TO THE BAYOUS

(By Charles L. Dufour)

In the precarious infancy of the French colony of Louisiana and 250-year-old New Orleans, the first signs of stability came with the arrival of Germans in the city Jean-Baptiste Le Moynes, Sieur de Bienville, founded in 1718.

A handful of Germans reached Louisiana in the very year Bienville established his city on a wide crescent of the Mississippi River, about 30 leagues above its mouth. In November, 1719, a much larger group of Germans reached Louisiana on "Les Deux Freres." According to Andre Penicaut, the French ship carpenter who kept a journal, these Germans arrived with "all kinds of merchandise and personal possessions," so they could not have been the indigent engages that John Law's Company of the West rounded up to settle the infant colony.

Before telling of the Germans in New Orleans and Louisiana, it is necessary first to outline briefly the history of French colonization in what is now the United States. The story begins with Rene Robert Cavellier, Sieur de La Salle. He traveled down the Mississippi from Canada all the way to the Gulf of Mexico in 1682. At the mouth of the Mississippi, on April 9, La Salle claimed all the lands drained by the great river and its tributaries for France, and named the vast territory "Louisiane," for Louis XIV, then reigning in splendor on the throne of France.

La Salle made an abortive attempt to settle Louisiana in 1684, and among the men he recruited at Saint-Domingue for the mission was the first German in the Mississippi Valley. A buccaneer and an artilleryman, this German's name, as the French recorded it, was Hiens. After La Salle was murdered by Duhaute, it was Hiens who avenged his chief's death.

"In our presence," wrote Father Anastasius Douay, "he shot the murderer of La Salle through the heart with a pistol. He died on the spot, unshriven . . ."

In the fall of 1717, the Company of the West acquired the right to administer Louisiana; its head, John Law, decided that voluntary colonization would be slow, for there was little enthusiasm in France to go out to Louisiana.

Since a few volunteered to populate Louisiana and the new city named for Philippe d'Orleans, the Regent of France, other measures were taken to secure "bodies" for the colony. These included the deportation of criminals, both male and female, of all degrees of depravity. The jails and houses of correction were emptied, the riff-raff were rounded up in the streets of France. Under heavy guard, thieves, beggars, cutthroats, prostitutes and other derelicts were shipped to Louisiana.

The population of the colony multiplied 20 times in the space of four years, but while

this tremendous growth was taking place, very few respectable colonists arrived. Writing in 1721 from New Orleans, Pere Charlevoix stated:

"The people who are sent here are miserable wretches driven from France for real or supposed crimes, or bad conduct, or persons who have enlisted in troops or enrolled themselves as immigrants in order to avoid the pursuits of their creditors."

Bienville's patience wore thin as shipload after shipload of these undesirables were deposited in Louisiana. Finally in October, 1719, he strongly protested against sending out from France any more "deserters, smugglers and scoundrels who are all ready not only to abandon you but also to turn against you."

Continuing his complaint, Bienville wrote: "What attachment also can people have for the country who are sent to it by force and who no longer have a hope of returning to their native land? . . . It appears to me that it is absolutely necessary if we wish to preserve this colony for the King to send it as far as possible only men of good will . . ."

Such then was the situation in Louisiana and in and about New Orleans when Law's Company of the West, soon to be renamed the Company of the Indies, looked elsewhere for colonists. Law's agents, armed with "propaganda pamphlets" in German, sought recruits in the Palatinate, Alsace, Lorraine, Baden, Württemberg, Mainz and Trier.

Law wanted whole families to emigrate to Louisiana. It was an alluring proposition to landless peasants, weary from the seemingly endless wars in which they were swept up. They read in Law's pamphlets of rich soil that produced four crops a year; of the abundance of game: leopards, bears, buffaloes, deer, Indian hens, snipe, turtle doves, partridges, wood-pigeons, quail and many others; and they read of riches. "The land is filled with gold, silver, copper, and lead mines," read a pamphlet, and many a recruit for Law's project dreamed of becoming wealthy.

Perhaps the most telling of all the arguments for a man and his family to sail for Louisiana was the opportunity that the Company of the West provided for a new start in life. The German colonizers of Louisiana would be given land, seeds, livestock and tools. For the impoverished Germans, this was almost too good to be true.

The late Prof. J. Hanno Deiler of Tulane University in New Orleans, a pioneer researcher on German immigration, points out that "German historians state that . . . 10,000 Germans emigrated to Louisiana." This figure is much too high, Deiler believes. He points out that many became discouraged by delays and returned to their old homes and that some settled in France.

He also noted the horrible health conditions on many of the ships and the great loss of life resulting from the voyage and disease. "I have come to the conclusion," wrote Deiler in 1909, "that (only) 6,000 Germans . . . left Europe for Louisiana (and) only about one-third—2,000—actually reached the shores of the colony. By this I do not mean to say that 2,000 Germans settled in Louisiana, but only that 2,000 reached the shores and were disembarked . . ."

A French historian, Rene Le Conte, writing in 1924, revises Deiler's estimates downward. It was Le Conte's opinion that no more than 2,600 Germans were recruited by the Company of the Indies and that only 1,600 sailed for Louisiana.

Most of those that survived the rigors of the voyage were ultimately settled up the river from New Orleans on what became known as the German Coast. Less than 40 miles from New Orleans is Bayou des Allemands and the village of des Allemands which recall that the area was settled by John Law's Germans. "Allemand" is the French word for German.

As for the people of this area, they long

ago had their German names gallicized. And thus Himmel became Hymel; Edelmaier became Delmaire; Kleinpeter became Clampetre; Schoen became Chaigne; Vogel became Fauquel; Kissinger became Quisingre; Katzenberger became Casbergue; Traeger became Tregre; Trishl became Triche; Huber became Oubre; an Doubs became Toups.

There are other instances of "French" German names in New Orleans and Louisiana. Take for example, the La Branche family. When the progenitor of that family reached New Orleans, his name was Johann Zweig. But when the French finished with his name it was Jean La Branche.

The evidence of two French witnesses bears on the importance to Louisiana's development of its German colonizers. Writing in 1776, more than 50 years after Germans settled in Louisiana, the Chevalier de Champigny contrasted the French criminals with the Germans:

"You cannot find twenty of these vagabond families in Louisiana now. Most of them died in misery or returned to France, bringing back such ideas which their ill success inspired. The most frightful accounts of the country of the Mississippi soon began to spread among the public, at a time when German colonists were planting new and most successful establishments on the banks of the Mississippi, within five leagues of New Orleans. This tract, still occupied by the descendants, is the best cultivated and most thickly settled part of the colony, and I regard the Germans and the Canadians as the founders of all our establishments in Louisiana."

More than a quarter of a century after Champigny penned these comments, Pierre Clement Laussat, the French Commissioner, who received Louisiana from Spain on Nov. 30, 1803, and who transferred it to the United States on December 20, wrote of the Germans as follows:

"What is called here the 'German Coast' is the most industrious, the most populous, the most at ease, the most upright, the most respected part of the inhabitants of this colony."

In the Revolution of 1768 which the French Creoles of Louisiana launched against Spanish Governor Antonio de Ulloa, the Germans were involved, if reluctantly, to enlist their support, the leaders of the rebellion told the Germans that the Spanish authorities would not pay them for produce which they had furnished to recently arrived Acadian refugees. When Governor Ulloa heard of these stories circulated among the Germans, he dispatched one of his officers with the money to the German Coast. This officer, however, was intercepted by the revolutionists to make sure there was no defection by the Germans.

When the 1768 revolution was crushed and its leaders executed, the Germans along with the rest of the population were granted amnesty by the Spanish General Alexander O'Reilly, on the grounds that they would not have committed their offense "if they had not been seduced by the intrigues of some ambitious, fanatic and evil-minded men."

There were four major waves of German immigrants to New Orleans and Louisiana.

1. John Law's Germans.
2. Germans who came after the Napoleonic wars.
3. Germans who arrived between 1840 and 1860.
4. Germans who reached New Orleans between 1865 and the middle of the 1890s.

Among the German immigrants of the early 19th century were some redemptioners, Germans who became indentured servants to the persons who paid for their passage to Louisiana. J. Hanno Deller in a pamphlet first published in 1889, described the operation:

"Upon their arrival at the port of destination they were detained on board of the vessels until someone was found who covered

their debt of traveling and in return received a contract of service which bound the immigrant to hard service for three to eight years according to the amount of his debt and the value of his labor. During this time the redemptioners received lodging, board and clothes, but no wages, and as the contract entered into was legally binding, he could be compelled by the courts to serve his full time . . . During his time of service the redemptioner was a slave.

"Like him, he was completely exposed to the whims of his master, and however hard his services might become he was not at liberty to leave it, for runaways were seized and from every day they had filched from their masters they would get a two-day's penalty. He could be lent or sold to others and even the possibility of bodily castigation was not excluded."

On the eve of the Civil War, nearly 25,000 German-born lived in Louisiana, most of them in or about New Orleans. Among them were trained people—doctors, lawyers, journalists, musicians, engineers, dentists, artisans, and businessmen, according to the excellent book, "The German People of New Orleans," by Dr. John F. Nau.

"The brewing trade was gradually monopolized by Germans. Draymen in the city were Germans. Metal workers were Germans. Street railways were built by German engineers, who also drew up and carried out the plans for the New Orleans waterworks. German architects built many of the houses of the non-German elite."

By 1839, the Germans of New Orleans had their own German theater and Dr. Nau believes that New Orleans was the first city in the United States to have a presentation of Goethe's "Faust" in the German language. In the 1850s there were thriving German newspapers in New Orleans, the Deutsche Zeitung and the Louisiana States-Zeitung, being the best established.

When the Civil War broke out, about 4,000 New Orleans Germans joined the Confederacy. And when, after the fall of New Orleans and the occupancy of part of Louisiana by Federal troops, a Union civil government was set up, German-born Michael Hahn was elected governor.

Today, 250 years after the founding of New Orleans, citizens of German descent take pride in the fact that it was a German who revenged La Salle's murder, that it was German colonizers who first brought stability to Louisiana, and that ever since the American flag was run up in the Place D'Armes, now Jackson Square, in 1803, Germans have made numerous important contributions to the civic, social and cultural life of New Orleans.

TRIBUTE TO NEW PRESIDENT OF GEORGIA PRESS ASSOCIATION

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Thomas H. Frier, editor and publisher of the Douglas Enterprise was elected recently as president of the Georgia Press Association.

This is a proud honor, not only for Mr. Frier, and not only for the people of Douglas but for all of the people of the Eighth Congressional District.

We are proud of Thomas Frier and we know that he will do an outstanding job for the Georgia Press Association, one of the most functional organizations in our State.

Mr. Frier is a graduate of the Henry W.

Grady School of Journalism in Athens. He is a member of Sigma Delta Chi, national journalism fraternity. He is the president of the Coffee County Chamber of Commerce. He is a member of the Douglas Rotary Club, Post 18 American Legion, and he is a deacon in the Douglas First Baptist Church.

The respected editor and publisher of the Douglas Enterprise has been active in the Georgia Press Association for many years. He served on the board of managers, as treasurer and also as the vice president. He is also a former chairman of the Georgia Press Institute, an annual event which is sponsored jointly by the University of Georgia and the Georgia Press Association.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ATTACK ON U.S. EMPLOYEES

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, one of America's greatest indoor—and occasionally outdoor—sports is to knock the diligence, qualifications, and ability of Federal employees. Any number can play this sordid game. One of the latest contestants to enter the competition is, regrettably, the magazine Nation's Business. In its October 1968 issue, this publication, sponsored by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, has an article which contains insulting and inaccurate references broad enough to damn most of the 3,000,000 Americans who have chosen to work for the Federal Government. Joseph Young, the wise and respected writer for the Washington Evening Star, has done a real service by commenting on the Nation's Business article and refuting its principal contentions. I call my colleagues' attention to Mr. Young's column which follows:

THE FEDERAL SPOTLIGHT: CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ATTACK ON U.S. EMPLOYEES VIEWED AS SO MUCH BILGE WATER

(By Joseph Young)

The other day, this column printed some excerpts from an article in the October issue of Nation's Business, in which civil service employees were called "the most mollycoddled working class in the nation"—among other things even less complimentary.

Although I mentioned that the tone of the article was like some we used to read 20 years ago, I want to be sure that readers don't identify me with this out-of-date thinking. And I am surprised that in this day the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, for which Nation's Business is the official voice, would allow itself to be identified with such a gratuitous insult to 3 million Americans.

From my extensive observation—obviously a lot more extensive than that of the article's author—I know that the picture of the federal civil servant "riding the gravy train" is so much bilge water. In the first place, he works at least as hard and as long as any private employe, and in the second place he is not loaded down with "fringe goodies." In much of industry now, the company pays the full cost of employe's life insurance, health benefits and pensions. If annual leave in federal service is more generous, it is also deducted for short absences of a kind usually excused in private business.

SAME OLD ASSUMPTION

What gets my goat really, though, is the same old assumption that government employees don't do anything. What's so bad about their having similar fringe benefits? Because, goes the out-worn stereotype, they don't do any work, that's what's bad about it. This is the uninformed attitude displayed, year in and year out, by this particular type of critic.

I happen to know something about the extent to which people in all parts of this country depend on the work of civil servants.

To begin with, federal workers keep track of time itself—at the Naval Observatory. They are responsible for the safety of air traffic. They catch kidnapers and narcotics pushers and counterfeiters. They deliver 80 billion pieces of mail a year. They inspect the meat you are going to eat, and they are very obstinate about the purity of drugs you may have to take. They are involved in the most advanced scientific research, finding out what goes on everywhere from outer space to inside a human cancer cell.

KEY ROLES PLAYED

As inventors, federal civil servants have played key roles in developing computers, space vehicles, neon lights, wash-and-wear fabrics, push-button dispensers, stretch cotton and concentrated frozen fruit juice. They provide services to veterans, businessmen, farmers, highway-users, young people, old people and the armed forces.

This is a lot of very useful, not to say necessary, work, and it is all authorized by Congress. What gets me is that the people who are always ready to say we should get rid of government employees never say which of all those services we should get rid of.

The old cliché that government employees can't be fired is not worth answering, except that the Nation's Business figure of 1,000 firings a year is about 13,000 short of the actual average of those fired for cause. The total for fiscal 1967 was 13,966.

And, rather than "clinging like barnacles" to their jobs, about one in four federal workers resigns each year—a turnover rate of some concern to the government.

FORGO SOME RIGHTS

Instead of being the "most mollycoddled" workers, they are in some ways the most deprived. For the privilege of serving their fellow citizens, they forgo rights others take for granted, such as the right to strike and to participate fully in the political process. In addition, they are fair game for anyone who wants to take an undeserved shot at them, a la Nation's Business.

The writer makes much of the government's liberal retirement system. Federal workers pay their share for their retirement benefits, while pensions of many private employees are fully funded by employers. Those in the private sector also enjoy Social Security coverage; federal civil servants do not.

Rather, than "running neck-and-neck salarywise" with most private industry workers, the pay of federal workers still falls far short of comparability in most grades—and it will continue to lag by more than a year even after next July's anticipated increase.

Nor do their fringe benefits "far outclass those in industry." Rather, surveys show the industrial average cost of fringe benefits as a percentage of payroll to be 26 percent, compared to 23.8 percent for government.

It's most unfortunate to see such an unjustified attack against public servants in the official organ of the leading association of businessmen at a time when understanding and cooperation between leaders of business and government have reached such a high point. This was highlighted most recently by President Johnson in his address to the postmasters here last weekend.

Applauding industrial leaders who are helping to solve problems of the hard-core unemployed, the President said: "The old days when the responsibilities of government

and industry were sharply separate are gone and are over. Men in government today know that America's great human needs just cannot be met by government action alone. Men in industry know that they cannot prosper in a land that is torn by strife and in a land that is divided by despair and hate."

A few days earlier, in announcing the appointment of an Advisory Panel on Personnel Interchange between government and industry, the President called for cooperation and understanding between industry and government.

The Chamber of Commerce hardly helps advance such understanding in allowing its publication to be used for such an unjustified attack on public servants.

WASHINGTON AREA AIRPORTS

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, recently the FAA received an ambitious plan for the expansion of Washington's National Airport. Improving facilities for handling air traffic is undeniably of great importance. I believe, however, that any plan for the Washington area which merits serious consideration must show a broad perspective. Certainly a regional approach would be the most constructive. Rather than considering National Airport in isolation, we should strive to improve service in the Baltimore-Washington region as a whole. For example, we should work for rapid transit not only to link Washington and Friendship Airport, but to connect Baltimore with both Friendship and other regional air transportation centers.

In an editorial on October 7, the Washington Post raised serious objections to the National Airport expansion plan. I believe that these points should be seriously reviewed by all concerned. Only by proceeding with the widest possible vision can we give the air travelers of Baltimore and Washington the finest service in the world, and avoid simply compounding difficulties for the future. The editorial follows:

EXPANDING NATIONAL AIRPORT

The grandiose plans for rebuilding National Airport submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration recently are just another example of technology attempting to overrun a city. Starting with the assumption that National should continue to be Washington's major airport at least into the 1980s, the planners demonstrated four ways of rebuilding it so that it can accommodate 1980 air traffic. It is hard to argue with their conclusions if you are willing to accept their assumption. But that is to assume the outcome of the crucial argument about National's future and to assume that this argument is settled in a manner that would be against this city's long-range interests.

The attitude of the planners toward the city's needs is found in their letter to FAA: "Due to its close-in location, Washington National is better able to support its metropolitan area than any other major airport. The nuisance imposed on the metropolitan area by the airport is overshadowed by that superior service offered to the area and to the eastern United States." With that, the planners close out their study of the impact of an expanded National on the city except

to provide a map of the expected noise levels. That map makes it clear that the adoption of any of their four plans would mean a noise level over South Capitol Street approximately equal to that now existing over Memorial Bridge. The construction of a new runway pointing toward the Anacostia River would, of course, reduce the frequency of air traffic over Georgetown, but it would increase the frequency over the south and east sides of Capitol Hill.

Under the basic assumption of the planners, National in 1980 would be expected to handle 12 million or so local passengers—equal exactly to the Washington traffic handled at both Dulles and Friendship, and twice that handled in 1966. The airport would, it is true, handle this many people with no significant increase in the number of flights, but all that means is that bigger and bigger airplanes would swoop over the city each day even if four-engine jets continue to be barred.

The future of National Airport, if it is to have one at all as an airport, ought to be in extremely short-haul and shuttle flights. And by short-haul we do not mean Washington to Miami or St. Louis. To expand National now would be only to postpone the day when longer flights are moved to Dulles and Friendship where they belong.

If the planners think the city's air traffic needs to have \$169 million to \$203 million spent on it at this time, and those are the top and bottom estimates in this report, it could best be spent on providing a monorail or other high speed transit system to link Dulles with a transportation center in, say, Rosslyn. Dulles is the finest airport in the Nation today, and it deserves to be treated as such, not as a standby field to be used only when air traffic makes its use absolutely necessary. With a monorail link, the city could continue to have that "superior" service the planners speak of but without the noise, the auto congestion, and the constant safety question that surround National.

CONGRESSMAN ROONEY ADDRESSES POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on September 28 my good friend and distinguished colleague from New York, Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY, addressed the national convention banquet of the Polish-American Congress in Cleveland, Ohio.

Congressman ROONEY has given almost 26 years of dedicated service to his constituents of the 14th District of New York, to his State, and to his Nation. Again and again his constituents have returned him to Congress because of his honesty, his ability, and his hard work.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies, JOHN ROONEY has helped to shape intricate legislation beneficial to our country and to all Americans, and he has efficiently guided this legislation to final passage.

Congressman ROONEY's remarks at the national convention of the Polish-American Congress are not only timely—they represent a keen analysis of some of the key issues confronting our Nation. I would like, therefore, to call them to the attention of my colleagues in the Con-

gress by including them at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. ROONEY's speech follows:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN J. ROONEY

Mr. Chairman, Reverend Fathers, Honored Guests, my friends and Drodzy Rodacy:

Once again I feel highly honored to participate in a convention of the Polish-American Congress, an institution which has had a glowing history of service.

I always look forward to these meetings to renew old friendships and make new ones.

I should like to express my deep appreciation for the fine support American Polonia has given me in Congress, for the quarter of a century I have been there, in efforts to secure legislation beneficial to all Americans and for such fine groups as this.

Whatever success I have had or will have in getting needed changes in our outmoded immigration laws, or in obtaining essential enlargement and expansion of Social Security and Medicare benefits for our senior citizens and other citizens in need of various types of public assistance, has been the result of your help and encouragement.

In these trying times I feel I should pay tribute to the Polish-American Congress, and, indeed, all the Polish-American patriotic organizations for their dedication to the best interests of our country.

At a time when the light of freedom has been dimmed in Czechoslovakia—let us hope it is only temporarily dimmed—it is especially important to pay tribute to the untiring efforts of the Polish-American Congress to bring to our attention the plight of those who are enslaved behind the Iron Curtain, and your actions to combat Communist activities aimed at dividing Polonia and the American people.

At the same time you have done a remarkable job of maintaining the close ties between the peoples of Poland and America, ties which go back to the time of the American Revolution. What is especially remarkable is that you are continuing this in spite of the difficult times caused by the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia.

In this connection, let me make one thing clear—I do not believe the people of Poland should be penalized for the action of a Communist government in Warsaw, dominated by Moscow, in allowing Polish troops to participate in the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. On the contrary, we should not close the doors; we should increase our efforts in trade and exchange programs to give proof to the Polish people themselves that we realize their forced situation.

Vice President Humphrey put it this way in Toledo early this week: "I do not believe that despite the tragedy of Czechoslovakia that we should forego the hope, and indeed, the practice, of trying to build better relationships economically, politically and culturally with Eastern Europe. I think the old era is coming to an end. I do not want to see a restoration of the cold war once more."

Along these lines it is my belief that we should strive to guarantee Poland's present western border—a guarantee that would improve prospects for peace and for more freedom for the Polish people from Moscow domination.

I repeat, in these matters I have just mentioned you can be proud of the achievements of your organizations. But it would not be enough for me to mention the achievements of your organizations without drawing attention to two individuals of whom the whole country can be proud.

I refer first to my colleague in the Congress, Senator Edmund S. Muskie of Maine, who is now a candidate for the second highest office in the land. His Senate record is remarkable; his ability as a Senator unquestioned.

The second individual to whom I refer is Jan Cardinal Krol of Philadelphia. A year

ago last June, I had the moving and unforgettable experience of traveling to the Vatican to witness Cardinal Krol's consecration by the Pope.

My knowledge of the accomplishments of your organizations and of their members is no accident.

The fact that I have been permitted to represent Brooklyn for as long as 13 terms is due in great measure to that segment of your vast membership who live and vote in the 14th Congressional District. If I am to continue my 25 years of service, it will be the result of the efforts being made by my loyal friends and neighbors of Polish extraction.

With these expressions of gratitude to you, I should sit down. But instead I feel it necessary to urge you to help our country even more.

We need your active participation everywhere throughout this great nation to help curb the lawless element that runs rampant and too often unpunished in our cities and on our streets. We need your help to identify and to eliminate the causes of crime and civil unrest.

We need your help to regain a measure of unity of purpose and practices in our communities like the unity which is so evident in your organizations—which has been tested again and again by the enemies of Polonia.

Parenthetically, I would add that I wish the Congress of the United States operated with even a portion of the unity and dedication with which the Polish American Congress conducts its significant activities. I can assure you the wheels of the legislative mill would grind out far more worthwhile laws with greater speed and less contention if this were so.

The country needs your unrelenting help to secure immediate consideration by the nations of the world of the needed redress of the wrongs now long suffered by the several nations at the hands of the Soviets and their atheist Communist vassals.

Precious as is our own national security, and welcome as is the development of less hostile and less suspicious relationships with the Kremlin, we cannot forget our friends from whom self-determination and sovereignty were so ruthlessly stolen. You who are so close to this problem and who have such personal interest in its solution must help us if justice is to prevail.

You are well aware of the dilemma in which this country finds itself relative to the balance of payments. The solution of our fiscal problems is not the responsibility of your government alone.

We need the help of every American and of every civic minded organization to plug up the outflow of dollars and to stimulate the in-flow of zlotys, rubles, francs, pounds and every other currency now in circulation. Too often those of us in Congress who try to curb government spending are faced with the all too prevalent attitude of "Stop Government spending, except for the things in which I am interested."

We need your help in these days ahead to achieve greater private investment and less government participation, less government money spent, and less government controls.

This is a great country and you and your Polish forbears have helped to make it so. You have the golden opportunity of helping now so that your grandchildren and their children will honor you as you so proudly honor your own grandsires.

I am confident we can count on your support and assistance in meeting our urgent legislative needs. For that help which I know you will give I commend you and thank you. For the help you have always given, I say in behalf of all our fellow Americans Thank you, and God bless your fine organizations with their loyal and patriotic members. "Sto Lat Niech Zyja Nam!" Dziekuje.

REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, as is my custom, I intend to report to my constituents the results of the activities of the 90th Congress.

I would like to include my report in the RECORD at this point in order to share its contents with my colleagues:

NEWSLETTER

DEAR FRIEND: The Ninetieth Congress has effectively drawn to a close. It is appropriate, therefore, that I report to you, my constituents, on the activities of this Congress and my participation in it. Making this report, as you know, is a practice I have followed since I entered the Congress ten years ago and became the first Representative from our community to initiate a system of newsletter reports to the people of our District. Your comments, as always, are welcome.

Ten years can be a long time, but ten years is a very short period in national government where complex problems place a premium on years of experience. This is particularly true in the House of Representatives where positions of responsibility and authority go only to those who have been returned to Washington by their constituency with sufficient regularity to enable them to serve their apprenticeship and "live" for a period of time with the mass of legislation, laws and procedures through which our Republic is governed. A great leader of the U.S. Congress once remarked that, "A man has to learn to be a Representative just as he must learn to be a carpenter, an engineer, a farmer, a lawyer or a doctor". I have been among those privileged to learn about the workings of the House of Representatives. In the past decade, I have observed the changes in leadership; I have seen major programs of historic significance enacted into law; I have witnessed and been a part of many great debates. For these reasons, I believe I am in a position to view the 90th Congress in perspective.

The period 1960 through 1964 was one of creative planning. The challenge of the 1960's was upon us; the country and Congress have been forced to develop better methods for coping with new problems both at home and abroad.

Large steps were taken in the never-ending search for justice; new measures were written, some of which I authored, to enhance the opportunities of all Americans by providing better schools, libraries, housing and jobs. Then, in the 89th Congress (1964-1966) all our labors bore fruit during a Congress which most historians have called the most productive in history.

When the 89th Congress completed its work, the Nation had many of the tools with which to meet the challenges of today. But we had to learn how to use them. It is one thing to declare war on poverty; it is another to wage such a war effectively. We passed legislation to improve our schools, but we must still learn how to use this assistance wisely and well. Reports on the various programs launched by the 89th Congress flowed back to Washington, and the 90th Congress has been busy amending, revising, improving and reforming. Although this has not been an innovative Congress, it has been a Congress concerned with perfecting the work of its predecessors.

Because I have participated in planning and implementing the major legislative programs of the past ten years, I believe that I am in an excellent position to criticize se-

verely those programs which have not measured up to our earlier expectations.

THE ECONOMY, THE CONGRESS, AND YOU

Any program that "overheats" the economy so that progress can only be measured in the false coin of inflation is self-defeating.

I served in the Congress in 1964 when the American people were handed the largest tax reduction in history. Individual income taxes fell an average of 20% while corporate taxes were cut 10%. Many excise taxes were lowered or abolished. This move was designed to stimulate more investment and production and create more jobs. It worked!

But, as so often happens, the economic pendulum swung a bit too far. During this past year, although employment was reduced drastically and jobs and profits were in abundance, the warning flags were flying for inflation. I am happy to report that this Congress responded. The 1964 tax reduction was *partially* reversed (the 10% temporary surcharge this year still insures the average taxpayer a net gain of more than 10% in federal income tax savings since 1964); spending was slashed by \$6 billion, and the increased hiring of new employees by the Federal government was halted. I supported these moves because you and I will be the beneficiaries of more moderate prices in the stores and lower mortgage rates on the new homes we may buy if they succeed in stemming inflation. For example, if these steps cut $\frac{3}{4}$ % off of mortgage interest rates, the typical home buyer will save close to \$100 per year throughout the period of his mortgage.

Included among these tax measures were provisions that make it a virtual certainty that a comprehensive program of tax reform will be brought before the next Congress. I believe that an overhaul of our Federal tax program is long overdue. Tax reform is a most complicated matter to cope with; it requires experienced judgment and an awareness of the various interests represented in the Congress. I am hopeful that a thorough review of our tax policies will close some tax loopholes and, at the same time, raise the personal exemption, or as I would prefer increase the amount of the standard deduction. Action in these two areas would be a great benefit to the taxpayer in the lower and middle income brackets.

MORE EFFORTS AGAINST GOVERNMENT INEFFICIENCY

In my role as a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I review the budget requests of each Federal agency and department. Much can be done in the fight against inflation by eliminating unnecessary government spending and requiring the agencies of government to utilize their funds with greater efficiency. In past newsletters, I have informed you of my fight against the ineffective utilization of monies allocated to some segments of the poverty program. Therefore, I shall not go into further detail at this time. But there are other areas where waste occurs. For example, I have been particularly concerned with the activities of the Defense Department in this regard.

Because the defense of our Nation is vital to us all, the budget requests of the Defense Department have been treated very liberally by the public and the Congress. I believe this is most unfortunate. The budget of the Defense Department must be scrutinized as carefully as those of other Federal agencies. One item which concerned me in particular during the past year was the appropriation request for the Sentinel Anti-Ballistic Missile System.

Administration and Defense experts have stated for some time that there was no need for such a system and regardless of the question of need there was little guarantee that it would work. (Our defense against nuclear attack is our offensive capability; i.e., the enemy knows that if he attacks first we will be able to survive his first strike and retaliate with enough strength to completely

destroy him.) This year, the Administration suddenly proposed the deployment of the defensive Sentinel ABM which would cost \$5 billion.

Three former science advisors to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson and numerous other weapons experts believe that the system will not work. In other words, it can be penetrated through the use of sophisticated offensive weapons; it can be overwhelmed by using more ballistic missiles than the system can defend against, or it can be defeated by simple sea-launched missiles.

In summary, because the effectiveness of the system was so much in doubt and the expense so great (it could reach \$50 billion), I felt that Congress should have devoted considerably more time to its study. Unfortunately, my initial attempt to require such a study was defeated. I do not intend to give up on this or on my efforts to have the Congress look more closely at what is being spent in the name of defense.

I have long believed that many inefficient government programs would be ferreted out and corrected or ended more quickly if the methods for monitoring these programs were more efficient. As our society grows and becomes more complex, government increases in complexity. To do the job expected, the Congress must have access to far greater information than was ever at the disposal of earlier Congresses. To help the Congress and the general public keep track of government activity, I joined my Republican colleague, Congressman Roth (of Delaware) in sponsoring a bill known as "The Program Information Act". If enacted, this measure would require the President to compile a complete and detailed catalogue of all Federal programs and to keep it updated. The public and the Congress would then be able to scrutinize the activities of the Federal government by reference to a single source.

PROTECTING YOU, THE CONSUMER

The Government's battle against inflation helps to protect the integrity of our dollars. The Federal Government can also do much to help us get what we pay for when we spend those dollars. The 90th Congress enacted a dramatic series of programs to protect the consumer:

A Truth-in-Lending Act to require complete and accurate disclosure of the cost of credit.

Amendments to the Flammable Fabrics Act to provide increased protection from flammable clothing and household fabrics.

A Product Safety Commission Act, which establishes a National Commission on Product Safety to make certain that household products are not household hazards.

A Wholesome Meat Act and a Wholesome Poultry Products Act to insure that meat and poultry processed and sold within states, as well as that sold in interstate commerce is safe and wholesome.

An Automobile Insurance Study Act to investigate unfair and arbitrary practices existing within the automobile insurance industry.

A Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act to protect persons from the hazards of leaking or exploding natural gas pipelines.

A Fire Research and Safety Act to reduce deaths, injuries, and property losses from fires.

In this Congress, I authored a bill that would encourage the development of a system for licensing automotive repair mechanics. Every day millions of Americans entrust their lives to mechanics who are charged with the responsibility of keeping our automobiles safe for the highways. It seems essential to me that we develop some method for determining whether these mechanics are competent to assume such a tremendous responsibility. Although this Congress has not acted on my proposal, my suggestions have picked up meaningful support, and I am confident that progress will be made in

this area in the near future—perhaps in the next Congress.

JUSTICE, LAW, AND ORDER

There can be no argument about the need for better law enforcement in our society. This subject entails some of the most important pieces of legislation on which I wish to report, and therefore, I have reserved it as the last topic of discussion.

The 90th Congress has enacted more measures to stem criminal activity than any Congress in history. The new laws include measures which:

Authorize grants for upgrading state and local police departments.

Make it harder for criminals and other irresponsible persons to acquire handguns by restricting interstate shipments.

Authorize grants to states for prevention of juvenile delinquency and rehabilitation of delinquents.

Make it a Federal crime to travel in interstate commerce to incite a riot, to manufacture firearms, or to teach rioters to use weapons in civil disorders.

Require establishment of minimum standards for burglar alarms and other devices, and for procedures to protect banks and savings and loan associations from robberies and embezzlements.

Provide a Federal Judicial Center to improve judicial administration in the Federal Courts.

Provide benefits to state and local law enforcement officers disabled or killed while assisting in Federal law enforcement.

Authorize the Federal Bureau of Prisons to assist state and local governments in improving their correctional systems.

In my opinion, these are among the most important measures passed by this Congress. I firmly believe that all of our efforts to enact sound legislation and to move forward in the quest for full justice for every man would come to naught unless the laws we do enact are enforced fully. Laws are the instruments by which we govern ourselves and define those freedoms which are every American's due. If they can be ignored, then the freedoms they insure can be ignored.

Primarily, crime control and law enforcement are the responsibilities of state and local authority, and I believe they should be. We cannot—we must not—establish a super Federal police force in our Nation. But the Federal government does have an important responsibility to assist and to support local and state law enforcement officials. That is what the measures enacted by the 90th Congress are designed to do, and that is why I supported them.

CONCLUSION

In the limited space afforded by this newsletter, it is impossible for me to discuss every matter which has come before the 90th Congress. However, I have tried to touch upon some of the highlights and some of the activities which may not have come to your attention. I hope that you will find this report of interest, and again I express appreciation for the confidence which the people of the Third District have placed in me for the privilege of representing them in Washington. I have exerted myself to the full extent of my power and strength to represent you wisely and well. I urge you to write to me at any time you believe I may be of service as your Representative in the Congress.

HEMISFAIR "INOLVIDABLE"

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. PEPPER, Mr. Speaker, it is regretful that so many good things in this life

must draw to a close. In this context, I sense a loss today as we mark the end of HemisFair, 1968, in the city of San Antonio, Tex.

Mrs. Pepper and I had the good fortune to attend the international exposition in June and were afforded the gracious hospitality that the people of Texas are so well known for.

HemisFair, 1968, was a resounding success, and for this we can thank the eminent businessmen of San Antonio who teamed up with local, State, and National officials in a spirit of willing cooperation. I would personally like to take this opportunity to commend our distinguished and beloved colleague, HENRY B. GONZALEZ, who contributed so richly to the promotion and success of HemisFair.

Though we must now bid a fond farewell, the memories we share with millions of Americans who visited the exposition were surely unforgettable.

RABBI ARTHUR J. LELYVELD

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House of Representatives the celebration of the 10th anniversary of Rabbi Arthur J. Lelyveld as spiritual leader of Fairmount Temple. Rabbi Lelyveld has exemplified the highest traditions of the teachings of his religion. He has been involved deeply in the great moral questions of his community, of the general community of Greater Cleveland, and the great questions facing our country.

He has been a distinguished leader among clergy within the Jewish faith as well as ecumenically. He has interpreted his faith to others through his work as president of the American Jewish Congress. He is an author of note, having recently published a book entitled "Atheism is Dead." His credentials as a great Hebrew scholar and modern, learned sage are of renown throughout the country.

The Greater Cleveland community is proud to pay tribute to Rabbi Lelyveld, a great leader among men.

I would include in the RECORD at this point an article in the October 4, 1968, Cleveland Jewish News on the special services marking Rabbi Lelyveld's 10th anniversary at Fairmount Temple, October 11:

Rabbi Arthur J. Lelyveld's tenth anniversary as spiritual leader of Fairmount Temple will be marked with a festive service on Friday evening, October 11, 8:15 P.M., in the Temple sanctuary. Guest speaker will be Rabbi Jacob Weinstein, spiritual leader of KAN Temple, Chicago, who has been a close friend of Rabbi Lelyveld for many years.

Rabbi Weinstein is a noted leader in the reform movement, and is past president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis. He will pay tribute to Rabbi Lelyveld's work, both nationally and on the local scene.

In honor of the occasion, an original "Hebrew Suite in Four Movements" will be performed by the Temple choir, under the direction of Reuben P. Caplin. The work was

especially commissioned by the congregation, and was written by Max Janowski, renowned contemporary composer of Jewish music.

Tenor Robert Nagy, a member of the Metropolitan Opera Company, will be the featured soloist. Mr. Nagy, a former resident of Cleveland, at one time was a member of the Fairmount Temple choir, and studied voice with Mr. Caplin.

The service for the evening will be read by Rabbi Mordecai Schreiber and Rabbi Frank Stern. The evening will conclude with a festive reception in honor of Rabbi Lelyveld.

WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as election time draws near, each of us bears the responsibility for shaping the frontier of the present and the future. That there is discontent in the land cannot be denied but we must ask ourselves forthrightly and honestly—"Why the discontent?" What troubles you? The voices of protest? Race hostility? The war in Vietnam? Conditions in the cities? Crime? Let us take each in turn.

First, let me say, we know what each one of us seeks—a job equal to his talents, a living wage, good housing, a good education, security in old age, a society which works within the rules of decent and responsible behavior, the curbing of crime, and foremost, peace.

There is a measure of prosperity for most of us. Twelve million persons within the last 5 years have moved above the poverty line. Long-term joblessness fell by almost 1.4 million persons. The standard of living has increased by 25 percent. The earnings of the average worker with, let us say, three dependents, rose 11.4 percent after income taxes, and one final figure, wages and salaries grew by 68 percent. Educational opportunities have increased, social security payments have been increased, the problems of water pollution and air pollution have been attacked, laws have been passed on motor vehicle safety, highway safety, fire safety, on consumer credit protection, and on fair packaging and labeling. All of this has been to the good and we see a Nation moving steadily forward to meet the needs of the citizens. But how do we meet the anxieties that beset us?

VOICES OF PROTEST

Student unrest grips the Nation, as it does in most of Europe. Youth cries out for change, for greater participation in our decisionmaking bodies, and for social justice. We will do well to listen, but we will also do well to take care that the raucous, irresponsible, destructive voice and methods of a minority within the student body does not close our ears to the just demands of the responsible majority. This disruptive minority, caught in its own immaturity, must be dealt with, with appropriate severity. There is a line between dissent and disorder which we cannot afford to let be erased. I advocate immediate expulsion of the ringleaders. Let them learn to take the responsibility for the consequences of their acts. Let the college administra-

tors meet and decide on a uniform course of action. A determined stand by administrators and parents would go a long way toward halting these undemocratic tactics.

The same can be said of the militant, irrational voice of a minority of black people who incite to riot and destruction and loss of human lives. We have seen such irresponsibility in the behavior of the militant blacks in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville school district. School decentralization could involve the community in the process of education and thus foster a love of learning and self-responsibility. We must not be forced to discard this vital experiment in education by such irresponsibility. What is true of the student militant minority is true of the black militant minority. They do not represent the majority of black people who work for equality of opportunity in jobs, housing, and education within the legal framework. The full weight of the law must be brought to bear upon those who seek to break down the law.

PEACE

On the question of peace, I maintain that each person running for office, in order to merit the public trust, must give his stand on it. For my part, I advocate that we stop bombing to test the willingness of Hanoi to make peace. Should this result in increased infiltration of the North Vietnamese into South Vietnam, then the bombing would have to be resumed. While it is true that we have ceased bombing six times with no result, it is worth a calculated risk to try it a seventh.

I believe that more and more of the fighting should be turned over to the South Vietnamese. I believe that the Allies should be induced to send more of their own men so that there can be an honorable and orderly withdrawal of American troops. To keep Southeast Asia free to develop as it chooses is only one step in obtaining and maintaining peace.

With the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union, we know that we cannot relax our efforts to make NATO work for collective security. We must ratify the treaty for nonproliferation of nuclear arms. We must be alert to the danger of the Soviet Union controlling the Middle East, which is the gateway to three continents. If it is at all possible, there should be a permanent police force in the United Nations which, as an international body, will be charged with making its presence felt in all of the dangerous corner spots of the world.

In keeping with this plan, I would propose a change in our draft laws so that the inequities are removed by eliminating many of the exemptions which now exist, and which many have used to escape their responsibility, placing a greater burden on those who could not fall within the specified exemptions.

CRIME

All of us should be thoroughly familiar with some of the basic facts concerning crime in our country. It is not generally known that one-half of all serious crimes is committed by youths under 17 years of age, living in the cities.

The crime cannot be handled by the Federal Government unless we choose to

change the structure of government. We have 371,000 full-time law-enforcement officers in the country, of which 308,000 are local, 40,000 are State, and 23,000 are Federal. Thus, we must know that crime must be handled primarily by the cities, with Federal assistance. The omnibus crime bill passed by Congress is already part of our law, under which a program of aid to the States and cities has been put into operation. The Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968 is also in operation. At this time of writing, we are shaping into law the Firearms Control Act which will restrict interstate shipments of firearms, giving the States every opportunity to curb gun use in criminal activity.

As I have said to you before, crime can and will be curbed. In a previous communication to you, I proposed that cities, for example, flood communities with light, put into use noncrippling chemical deterrents, special photographic equipment for identification of criminals, increased patrol activity and better detection devices. Law-enforcement agencies could develop techniques in riot prevention such as slick streets and nonlethal weapons. There should be police call-boxes, which should be left open and brightly marked, installed on as many streets as possible.

Already special training has begun in modernization of equipment including two-way radios for patrol officers, new alarm systems, and advanced techniques in identification. Because crime is so large in the 15 to 24 group, we need programs not only of prevention and detection but programs of rehabilitation, and most certainly, in community relations. Yet we must not be so paralyzed by fear of crime that we lose sight of our fundamental liberties. We must remember at all times that a man is presumed innocent until proven guilty. If we break away from that concept, then we and our children may taste the bitter poison of Fascist or Communist police tactics where an accused has no benefit of counsel, no right to a jury trial, and no witness to his execution.

OUR GOALS

We must know that as a people we are capable of achieving the kind of society that history has never known before, and that primarily means that government be not alien to compassion. No person should be in fear of an insecure old age, or live below the poverty line, and where a person is willing and able to work, there should be jobs to fill that need. We must insure that our housing laws be stringent so that shabbiness and ugliness disappear from the cities, that our police force be adequate to protect the person and the property of the citizen, that there be an opportunity for living, not necessarily an easier life but a more fulfilling life. These are not impossible goals.

Our problems are man made and must be man-solved. To your needs, to your wishes, to your goals, I dedicate my life as your Representative and my record in Congress proves, I hope, that I have tried to fulfill my responsibilities toward those I am honored to serve.

Though I cannot outline for you all of the bills which I sponsored and which

were enacted into law, there having been over 200 of them, I do mark for your special attention those which I consider of the largest national importance, in this way letting you know how I have discharged and intend to discharge those responsibilities:

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965;

The Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, 1964, 1965, and 1968;

The Celler-Kefauver Act, which sharpened our antimonopoly laws;

The Narcotics Addicts Rehabilitation Act. Three constitutional amendments: First, abolition of the poll tax; second, transfer of power in the event of Presidential disability; and, third, permitting the District of Columbia residents to vote for President and Vice President.

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968;

The Firearms Control Act of 1968, together with a large number of laws concerning crime prevention, judicial reform, administration of justice, and consumer interests.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the controversial ACLU is discussed in an interesting series of articles commencing with Barron's for August 26, 1968.

Under unanimous consent, I submit Mrs. Shirley Scheibla's article, "Pros and Cons," for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

PROS AND CONS: THE CURIOUS STORY OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION

(By Shirley Scheibla)

WASHINGTON.—Violence and civil liberties these days seem to be inextricably entwined. Chances are that whenever violence erupts, someone representing the American Civil Liberties Union is already on the spot or quickly appears to jealously guard the rights of the violent ones. A famous recent instance: shortly after TV viewers witnessed the brutal murder of Robert F. Kennedy, an official of the ACLU hurried to protect the civil liberties of the Senator's alleged assassin.

Established 47 years ago with the stated aim of providing legal help in preserving constitutional rights, the ACLU handles litigation chiefly through cooperating attorneys who serve without pay. Through its 46 affiliates in 44 states, the ACLU has defended communists and their sympathizers, fascists, pornographers, draft dodgers, admitted burners of flags, crosses and draft cards and alleged burners of cities. The diversity of its defendants has confounded its critics. Seemingly, the organization's only purpose is the announced one of preserving rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. And ACLU's insistence that it defends the liberties of all by defending those of the most despised has won it many friends.

HITS U.S. DEFENSES

Careful study of ACLU cases, however, reveals that nearly all the causes it has taken up tend to weaken law and order and the ability of society to defend itself. Some landmark cases give communists more freedom to destroy the nation from within. Those

involving the draft erode the state's ability to defend itself against armed attack. Other significant ACLU cases diminish the authority of schools and police and the influence of religion.

The cases ACLU refuses to take are just as significant as those it does handle. It has refused to defend right-to-work laws. It also has turned down a request to protect the civil liberties of one group of Washington, D.C., merchants whose businesses were destroyed by riots last spring.

According to the ACLU, holding federally funded Head Start classes in churches and having Catholic nuns as teachers of such classes do not violate the constitutional separation of church and state. Yet it has argued in court that church-and-state separation is violated by inserting the phrase "under God" in the oath of allegiance.

What, then, is this organization which voices such good intentions, yet exhibits such unfortunate tendencies in its litigation? The genesis goes back to the beginning of World War I. The American Union Against Militarism was established to prevent U.S. involvement in the war, and Roger Baldwin, a young Harvard graduate who called himself a "philosophical anarchist," became head of the organization's Civil Liberties Bureau.

Public sentiment forced dissolution of the union soon after the U.S. entered the war. Its Bureau lived on, however, defending conscientious objectors and occasionally members of the International Workers of the World, an organization devoted to waging a class war "until the workers of the world organize as a class, take possession of the earth and the machinery of production and abolish the wage system."

Of necessity, however, the Bureau functioned without Mr. Baldwin. Shortly after the U.S. entered the war, he was jailed as a conscientious objector and not released until July 21, 1919. Following his release, he attended a meeting at the home of Socialist Norman Thomas to decide on the future of the Bureau. Among those attending were Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, who later became chairman of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and Agnes Smedley, who served as a Soviet agent in China until she died and was buried in a Red Chinese cemetery. From that meeting the Bureau emerged in 1920 as the American Civil Liberties Union.

Many years later, Mr. Baldwin wrote an article, published in the September 1934 issue of Soviet Russia Today, in which he said: "When the power of the working class is once achieved, as it has been only in the Soviet Union, I am for maintaining it by any means whatsoever. . . . The class struggle is the central conflict of the world; all others are coincidental." According to a pamphlet by Organizational Research Associates quoted by Rep. John A. Rousselot (R., Calif.) in the Congressional Record for September 20, 1961, Mr. Baldwin "has a record of over 100 Communist-front affiliations and citations." He was the first national director of the ACLU and served in that post until 1950. Currently he is its International Work Adviser.

"ADVOCATE OF TREASON"

Dr. Harry Ward was the ACLU's first chairman. According to the same issue of the Congressional Record, he has over 200 Communist-front affiliations and citations listed by the House Un-American Activities Committee and was chairman of the American League for Peace and Democracy at the same time he was ACLU chairman. The League has been cited as Communist and subversive by the Attorney General, as subversive and un-American by a House Appropriations subcommittee, as a Communist front by the Senate Internal Security subcommittee and as "nothing more nor less than a bold advocate of treason" by the House Special Committee on Un-American Activities.

Serving on Dr. Ward's ACLU board of di-

rectors was Scott Nearing, who was also a member of the Garland Fund. The House Un-American Activities Committee said in 1944 that after the establishment of the Fund in 1922, "it was a major source for the financing of Communist Party enterprises. . . ." The Committee has described Mr. Nearing as a "leading writer for the party." The late William Z. Foster served as a member of the ACLU National Committee when he headed the Communist Party, U.S.A.

In its first official statement, in January 1920, the ACLU declared: "Today, the organized movements of labor and of the farmers are fighting the big fight for civil liberty throughout the United States as part of their campaign for increased control over industry. Publicity, demonstrations, political activities and legal aid are being organized nationally and locally. . . . The union of organized labor, the farmers, radical and liberal movements is the most effective means to this."

Before the end of the ACLU's first year, a New York legislative committee characterized it as "a supporter of all subversive movements" and said it "attempts not only to protect crime but to encourage attacks upon our institutions in every form."

CELEBRATED CASES

The Sacco-Vanzetti case, one of the ACLU's first, involved the defense of two anarchists accused of murder. One of the ACLU lawyers in the case was Felix Frankfurter, then a Harvard professor and later a Supreme Court Justice.

Another celebrated early ACLU case concerned Fred Beal, charged with shooting a policeman during a textile workers' strike in Gastonia, N.C. According to the California Senate Fact-Finding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities, Mr. Beal was then a member of the Communist Party, and his bail "was provided by the instrumentality of the ACLU."

In 1925, the ACLU achieved great fame as a result of the so-called Scopes Monkey Trial case. Tennessee state law prohibited public schools from teaching Darwin's theory of evolution. The ACLU advertised in Tennessee papers, offering free legal defense for any teacher who would violate the law. John T. Scopes volunteered. Two brilliant and famous lawyers handled the case, Clarence Darrow for the defense and William Jennings Bryan for the prosecution. Although the ACLU lost, the case launched it on the road to wide popularity. Among government officials who subsequently joined the ACLU were Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior; Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor; Lloyd K. Garrison, chairman of the National Labor Relations Board; and Francis Biddle, U.S. Attorney General. (Last year, the ACLU again challenged the Tennessee law and won.)

In the "Thirties, a bitter fight erupted within the Union between moderates and leftists; the upshot was that in 1940 it adopted a resolution barring Communists from leadership. Miss Flynn refused to resign and was dismissed. Dr. Ward then resigned in protest. (William Foster already had resigned, saying that since he had moved to Chicago he found it too difficult to attend ACLU meetings.)

Since the resolution applied only to those holding office in the ACLU, it did not keep Communists out altogether. Herbert A. Phillips, who was a Communist for the FBI in the 'Forties, wrote in his book, *I Led Three Lives*: "Communists had orders to infiltrate the ACLU. They always had kept a token representation in it and were told to strengthen their ties with it." He told Barron's recently that the secretary of a state chapter of the ACLU at that time "was a secret member of the Communist party and a member of my own cell."

The Southern California Staff Counsel for

the ACLU's Roger Baldwin Foundation is Abraham L. Wirin, the ACLU lawyer who rushed to the aid of Mr. Sirhan. According to the Congressional Record for September 20, 1961, Mr. Wirin practiced law in partnership with Leo Gallagher, who once ran for office in the Communist party in California. The same issue of the Congressional Record says that in 1954 Mr. Wirin was a candidate for the executive board of the National Lawyers Guild, an organization cited as a Communist front by both the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Un-American Activities Committee.

STRONG OPINIONS

The Rev. A. A. Heist resigned as executive director of the Southern California chapter of the ACLU in 1952 to become director of a new organization which he founded called the Citizens' Committee to Preserve American Freedoms. According to the Congressional Record of September 20, 1961, "This organization is run by its executive secretary, Mr. Frank Wilkinson, an identified Communist." The Record says: "The Rev. Heist stated in a speech to an audience of high school and junior college students in Pasadena that 'the Constitution of the United States is outmoded, outdated and impotent.'"

William A. Kilpatrick, long a prominent member of the ACLU on the East Coast, declared in his 1939 book *The Teacher and Society*: "The revolution by force and violence was probably necessary in Russia, but it would not be necessary in America. Here, the same goals could be achieved by effectuating change within the framework of the Constitution."

The anti-Communist resolution, of course, has not kept the ACLU from helping the Communists in the courts, and on this score it has an astonishing record of success. In the Steve Nelson case it persuaded the Supreme Court to make state prosecution of Communists virtually impossible. Overturning the conviction of an admitted Communist party leader for allegedly violating the Pennsylvania state sedition law, the high tribunal said the Smith Act of 1940 gives the federal government exclusive jurisdiction in the field of sedition. Then, in the Yates case, the high court accepted the ACLU contention that advocating overthrow of the government does not violate the Smith Act if the advocacy is "divorced from any effort to instigate action to that end."

A FEDERAL OFFENSE?

In a recent Kentucky case the ACLU argued successfully that sedition is strictly a matter for federal prosecution. The defendants were Alan and Margaret McSurely, Carl and Anne Braden and Joseph Mulloy. According to the Washington Post of September 17, 1967, the local sheriff had hauled a truckload of allegedly seditious material from the Mulloy and McSurely homes. At the time, the Post said, the McSurelys were organizers for the Southern Conference Education Fund. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1954 found the fund to be under the same Communist leadership and to have the same purpose as its predecessor organization, the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. (The House Un-American Activities Committee has cited the latter as a Communist front.) The Bradens have been identified as members of the Communist Party by the Louisiana Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities. Mr. Mulloy was a poverty worker. The aforementioned William Kunstler was an ACLU attorney in the case.

Thanks to the Union, the Supreme Court has made it virtually impossible to deny membership in bar associations to Communists. The ACLU won the Rudolph Schware case in which the high tribunal ruled that he could not be denied membership in the New Mexico Bar Association because of past membership in the Communist party. Bow-

ing to the ACLU's argument on behalf of Raphael Konigsberg, the court declared he could not be prevented from joining the California Bar Association although he would not say whether he ever had been a Communist.

At the behest of the ACLU, the courts also are making it difficult for state governments to deny employment to persons because they are Communists. In a recent case brought by ACLU affiliates, a Kansas federal court struck down a state loyalty oath required of all public officials, employees and teachers. The Minnesota CLU has asked the state supreme court to declare unconstitutional the Minnesota civil service rules denying employment to anyone who advocates Nazism, Communism, Anarchism, Fascism or is "in any manner disloyal to the U.S." And the Northern California CLU won a ruling in a federal district court that a man's refusal to say whether he is a Communist could not bar his employment as a postal worker.

The ACLU also has been effective in blocking at least one subversive investigation. In Tennessee it obtained a federal district court order prohibiting a legislative investigation of alleged subversive activities at the Highlander Education and Research Center.

In like vein, the ACLU has asked the U.S. Supreme Court to declare unconstitutional the provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act which requires Communist-front organizations to register with the Attorney General. It also filed a complaint against a Justice Department order that the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs register as a Communist-front organization.

LEFT AND RIGHT

When criticized for defending the Left, the ACLU regularly replies that it also has defended the Right. Close examination of its activities of the latter type leads to some disturbing conclusions. The Union defended the Ku Klux Klan—contending that the House Un-American Activities Committee had no right to investigate it. This, of course, fits right in with the ACLU's call for abolition of the Committee.

The ACLU also has defended the right of policemen to belong to the John Birch Society. This dovetails with an ACLU aim to abolish all control over which organizations government employees may join. It also has defended Jehovah's Witnesses, contending that they cannot be required to give the pledge of allegiance to the American flag as a condition for attendance at public schools.

The Union protested revocation of the visa of Michael Struelens, director of the Katanga Government Information Office in New York City. The organization objects to Uncle Sam deciding who shall or who shall not enter the country.

When Governor Ross Barnett was charged with contempt of court for barring James Meredith from the University of Mississippi, the ACLU stepped in with an amicus curiae brief which contended that he had a right to a trial by jury. The Union's critics say that if it obtained all the jury trials it wants in civil rights cases, the courts would break down from sheer overload.

While the ACLU urges college presidents to allow Dow Chemical Co. to recruit students on campus, the Southern California CLU is defending four students who were arrested for allegedly participating in a demonstration to protest the same company's recruitment at State College in Los Angeles.

The Union enthusiastically supports the right of both Left and Right to demonstrate. In a case now pending in the Supreme Court, the ACLU has argued that the threat of a race riot in Princess Anne, Md., was insufficient reason for a court order banning a series of segregationist rallies in that town about two years ago by the National States' Rights Party.

Too, the ACLU contested a regulation of Washington police putting a 100-man limit on demonstrations at the White House. It also applied for an injunction to keep District of Columbia police from using the chemical Mace during riots, and it is seeking an injunction to prevent them from enforcing the statute prohibiting demonstrations at the Capitol. It sued the Los Angeles police chief for breaking up a demonstration against President Johnson. In Washington it argued that an alleged threat against the Chief Executive was, in fact, only rhetorical criticism of foreign policy. After a demonstration against the President in Killeen, Texas, the ACLU went to court on behalf of the demonstrators and won a ruling that the Texas disturbing-the-peace law was unconstitutional.

"BRUTALITY" CASES

In conjunction with lawyers employed by the Legal Service Program of the federal Office of Economic Opportunity, it launched, but lost, suits asking U.S. district courts in Newark and Philadelphia to appoint federal receivers to run the local police departments as a means of eliminating "police brutality," particularly during riots. (The Union also has five "police brutality" cases pending in Mississippi and three in Louisiana.)

The Philadelphia suit also asked for nullification of state laws against carrying concealed deadly weapons, sedition, riot, conspiracy, loitering and obstructing justice. The Newark case asked for a halt to the compilation of police dossiers on civil rights groups.

Asked why the ACLU rushed to the aid of Sirhan Bishara Sirhan, the accused killer of Senator Kennedy, Lawrence Speiser, director of the Washington office of the ACLU, told Barron's: "When President Kennedy was shot, Oswald was questioned by police without counsel; we didn't want this to happen with Sirhan."

ADDRESS OF GOV. RAYMOND P. SHAFER

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a week ago, the Polish American Congress, an organization representing the fraternal, civic, patriotic, veteran, and church groups among our Nation's Polish-American communities, held its quadrennial convention in Cleveland, Ohio.

One of the highlights of the convention was an address by Gov. Raymond P. Shafer, of Pennsylvania, at the convention banquet, Saturday evening, September 28.

Governor Shafer delivered an extremely eloquent and dramatic address and the very vital and current nature of his subject is of special significance. Therefore, I am very proud to place into the Record at this point the address of a distinguished American Governor speaking to the delegates of this important national organization:

ADDRESS OF GOV. RAYMOND P. SHAFER

My Fellow Americans:

You gather here in Convention at a critical time in our Nation's history.

Never have we Americans, as a people, been so divided, concerned and often confused by the violence and complexity that dominates our time.

It is a time when we must reach back into our past, into the courage of the people who helped make this Nation the most powerful and freest on earth, to seek a new hope and strength for our future—to find a new confidence in ourselves.

And where better can we look than to the courage, strength, sacrifice and loyalty of Americans of Polish descent and the great legacy they have given our land.

My own Pennsylvania is rich in the heritage of early Polish settlers whose marks of excellence have been left clearly along the path of progress we have made.

Even before the Puritans, Polish citizens were putting their roots deep into American soil from which they can never be torn.

Nor will America forget names like Pulaski that will forever be inscribed in our history.

The legacy these men of Polish blood bequeathed to us is something more than public service. It is a living force of loyalty and love of country.

In my own State there is the grave of Stephen Decatur, a naval hero, who once gave this toast:

"My country—may she always be right—but my country, right or wrong."

Philosophers have, in the calm of booklined studies, speculated on the content of these words.

They have debated them, discussed them, argued about them. But Decatur forged them in the fires of burning ships, and in the face of Barbary pirates who had forced the mightiest nations on earth to pay tribute which a young America refused to pay.

We are now involved, in what may well be, the most unpopular war in our history. It has weighed heavily upon the hearts of our people.

The wisdom or folly of the Johnson Administration's policies with respect to that war are part of dilemma today. They formed issues on which our political parties will be judged in November.

But no Administration is America. It is only her spokesman. We must never lose sight of that fact—or the fact that the young Americans—many of them of Polish ancestry—who are fighting, bleeding and dying in Viet Nam stand apart from the policies that put them there.

They are American boys. They deserve the respect of Americans.

Whether they are instruments of freedom or victims of tragic bunders, they are our sons. They are performing the duties assigned them just as surely as the continental soldier or the soldier of any other war in which we have been engaged.

And the price demanded of many is the same which their fathers and uncles may have had to pay in a cause where the enemy and his mission stood in much clearer perspective.

They may, indeed, ask themselves whether the spokesmen for this Nation are right or wrong. But any doubts are subordinated to the higher concept of duty. And duty is the handmaiden of love.

The force that binds us to our flag is a mystic, beautiful force. It cannot be fully explained. It can only be felt.

It is what Richard Nixon felt a few years ago when he visited Warsaw.

Permit me to describe that feeling in his own words:

"I looked back on my trip to the Soviet Union with little satisfaction and my impending visit to Poland with even less hope," he said.

"I had been briefed before Moscow not to expect any crowds in Poland—first it was Sunday, the only day off the workers were allowed, and secondly, the Polish government had not announced the time of my arrival or the route of the motorcade.

"As we left the airport exit and turned on to the highway, I noticed small clusters

of people shouting at us from the side of the road.

"Then, something hit me in the face. But it was not a rock. It was a bouquet of roses. I turned to Dr. Osker Lange, the Vice Premier and asked him what the people were shouting. He replied: 'Long live America.'

"The hope that was on their faces and in their tears was not because I could promise them freedom, but because they shared my abiding belief that the American spirit might be carried to all lands and all peoples. It was the most living experience of all my trips abroad."

What Dick Nixon found in those roses and faces was the hope and spirit of freedom that only a people who have known oppression can have.

In America, the joy of freedom and liberty has long been with us and many of us have forgotten how difficult it was to earn that joy.

We are becoming a shrieking society of demanding groups who are beginning to tear the fabric of democracy apart, instead of making the giant efforts necessary to keep it together.

Someone must provide the leadership to bring us all back together with ourselves, as a whole Nation, determined to bridge the differences that separate us so that every man and woman and child gets an equal chance at a decent life.

To do that, every individual is going to have to rededicate to the reasons for which America was founded. In just 38 days we Americans will have an opportunity to do just that.

We will be called upon to choose a new leadership or continue with the policies of an old leadership. Never has the choice been so important because this Nation of ours now stands on the threshold of a new unity or total division and destructiveness.

It is up to you and me not to let the American dream become lost or cheapened.

Thank you.

ORANGEBURG HELICOPTER PILOT
A VETERAN AT 21

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, each generation of young Americans called upon to defend freedom has developed its own distinctive brand of battle expressions. No doubt the doughboy of World War I would have some difficulty in understanding the language of a communications team in Vietnam today just as the expression "over the top" would probably be foreign to the contemporary American fighting man.

Mr. Speaker, I must confess that some of the terms used by our military personnel in Vietnam are too sophisticated for many of us who are veterans of earlier conflicts. However, one thing is certain—our men in Vietnam are writing new chapters in heroism and bravery.

I have been particularly proud of the young men from South Carolina and the record of valor which they have achieved. Although it is not possible to mention each by name, I did want to share with my colleagues a story of one outstanding young man only 21 years of age who hails from my congressional district. As a helicopter pilot he logged

about 1,400 combat hours—quite a record for a man who just became old enough to vote. You may not understand the jargon of this brave man, but one can only marvel at his fascinating story of sheer determination and "guts." For this reason I would like to include a recent article from the Orangeburg, S.C., Times & Democrat about CWO Kirk N. Nivens, Jr., as a part of my remarks, as follows:

ORANGEBURG HELICOPTER PILOT A VETERAN
AT 21
(By John Faust)

"I spent over 1,400 hours in a Huey hauling Grunts to LZ's and then returning to pick them up at the PC . . .

"The slug popped through the chin bubble, slammed into my shoulder strap, went through the flak jacket and skinned out through my shoulder skin . . .

"We went in on the first lift of 10 ships and we got caught in a crossfire, taking 39 hits. The crossfire from two fifties knocked down three choppers and 19 Grunts got zapped . . .

"I could see the muzzle flashes of the machine gun looking down between my feet through the bubble and saw the rounds whip by under the ship. We couldn't shoot back because the guns wouldn't depress that far . . ."

Kirk N. Nivens Jr., a native of Orangeburg and son of Mr. and Mrs. Kirk N. Nivens Sr. of the Old St. Matthews Road, has only lately turned 21 years of age.

But during the first partial quarter century of his life he has been commissioned a warrant officer in the U.S. Army and flown 1,400 combat hours, flying a Huey helicopter in South Vietnam from August, 1967 until August of this year.

The time CWO Nivens spent in Vietnam was endured at the provincial capitol of Tay Ninh. Tay Ninh, according to U.S. Army maps, is located five miles from the Cambodian border in a patch of South Vietnamese ground that, on the map, appears to protrude like a face silhouette into Cambodia . . . a silhouette resembling Charles De Gaulle.

The Vaico Oriental River forms a small part of the border between the two countries but for the most part, the border runs through relatively flat land that is dotted here and there by squares of trees . . . easy infiltration for Viet Cong and North Vietnamese regulars.

The Tay Ninh base is primarily a support base with some 5,000 troops in the area.

When Nivens, a 1965 Orangeburg High School graduate arrived there in August of last year, he was placed under the wing of an experienced aircraft commander to fly as his copilot and gain experience.

"My first mission," said Niven, "was to lift troops on a combat assault to an LZ (landing zone) southwest of Saigon.

"We flew seven troops in the chopper and fortunately didn't draw fire on my first mission. I was apprehensive, to say the least."

Such idyllic flights didn't last long.

One week later while Nivens and his aircraft commander were settling down for a troop landing near a village, an AK 47, automatic rifle of Soviet or Chinese manufacture, opened up and stitched seven plunging hits into the body of the chopper, wounding a crewman in the hand.

"We were about 25 feet off the ground on the final approach," said Nivens, "and I heard the AK when it went off. We landed our Grunts (the term used by the flyers to describe infantrymen) and dusted off."

The "hairiest" mission Nivens participated in took place January 5 of this year.

"We took 39 hits on that one. We went in on a lift of 10 ships into the jungle area to the north of Tay Ninh in a morning drop.

"We got caught in a crossfire from heavy

machine guns, three ships got shot down, a crew chief got killed and 19 Grunts were wiped out.

"We put them in," he said, "and when they ran into all that resistance, and we couldn't supply them into that jungle, we called in the Air Force for strikers and decided to lift them out again."

An estimated 700 VC were in the immediate area, of which 200 were killed by the 300 U.S. troops that had landed.

"We were afraid they'd get surrounded," said Nivens, "so we had to go in and get them out."

All but the last five ships had made their pickup when the Communists decided to saturate the PZ (pickup zone) with everything they had.

As the five Huey helicopters were in their short final, heavy machine guns, light automatic weapons, rifles and mortars zeroed in to the small area.

"They were hitting us all over," said Nivens, "and we had to go back around for another try. But, they didn't quiet down when we tried it again and you could see the VC rushing across the open field."

Even with seven gunships putting the full effect of their rockets and machine guns into the ranks of the VC, they still persisted in their efforts to wipe out the Americans on the ground.

"The gunships would shuttle back and forth between the area and base where they'd get rearmed . . . but, we just couldn't get into the place.

"Out of 25 Grunts, the VC got nine . . . and I got nicked by a hit that came through the chin bubble, a shoulder harness and my flak jacket, taking the flesh off my left shoulder."

The impact slammed Nivens back from his forward leaning position as he watched for colored smoke that was to be laid down by the ground troops to mark the PZ.

The hail of fire was so intense the choppers were ordered back to base. A check on the five ships showed multiple hits on all, with Nivens' having sustained so much damage it was relegated to the scrap pile.

A hit on the rotor assembly had been so severe that during the flight back to base, the only thing keeping the chopper in the air was a small cotter pin that resisted the efforts of a key bolt to fall out and put the chopper in a wild drop to the jungle below.

Nivens had two other ships shot from beneath him, once, a lucky hit by a VC gunner punched holes in the oil reservoir, causing the engine to seize up. Nivens autorotated the chopper into an open field that luckily wasn't under observation by the VC.

The second time, believe it or not, a mine put his ship out of action.

An artillery observer was forced down in a rice paddy and we lifted security troops in to set up a perimeter while they pipe-smoked the crippled chopper out."

"Pipesmoked" means sending a huge Chinook helicopter in to lift out the smaller chopper bodily.

After the hit ship was taken out, Nivens was dropping in his flareout to pick up the security troops when he heard an explosion.

"I was landing right in the middle of the troops and thought that maybe they had set off a Claymore mine for some reason or had thrown a grenade into the paddy . . . didn't pay it much mind.

"But my engine just quit right on touch-down and when we looked at it found that shrapnel had ricocheted through the exhaust stack and into the turbine blades of the jet engine putting it out of commission."

The other security troops were dropped back into the area and the pipesmoke lift requested again. Nivens rode out in another ship.

He had other actions that he regards as "routine." Such as flying treetop height trying to draw unfriendly fire; helping wipe out

infiltrating patrols of VC; hauling troops into areas that were not secure and such.

He wears the Distinguished Flying Cross; Air Medal with 40 Oak Leaf Clusters and two "V" devices for valor; Bronze Star; Purple Heart; Good Conduct Medal; National Defense Ribbon; Campaign Medal with two battle stars; Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry for the Tet Offensive; and the Vietnamese Service Ribbon.

Nivens has seen a lot in his 21 years, the majority of it occurring before he was old enough to vote.

He will be stationed now at Hunter Army Air Field at Savannah, Ga., as an advance instrument instructor.

REEVALUATE PRIORITIES

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, a Vietcong ambush immobilized the convoy in which a young man, Specialist Andy L. Musgrove, son of Mr. and Mrs. L. D. Musgrove of Homerville, Ga., was serving as a jeep driver.

Specialist Musgrove realized that the driver and assistant driver of the lead vehicle of the convoy were in a semi-conscious state of mind due to initial shock of the attack.

Disregarding the value of his own life, he risked an intense barrage of enemy bullets in order to race to the vehicle, take the controls and lead the following convoy to safety.

For this courageous act, Specialist Musgrove was awarded the Army Commendation Medal with "V" device. He was decorated by the commanding general of the 9th Infantry Division "for conspicuous gallantry for his fellow soldiers and the people of the United States."

Specialist Musgrove is typical of the young people of the Eighth District of Georgia. In a split second, he was faced with a life or death situation. He did not falter for a moment. He made his decision and he acted on it.

What this young man did is what we expect a soldier to do. We take it for granted. That is what he is there for. Andy Musgrove and thousands of other young men just like him risk their lives every day for their country, while we sit comfortably in our homes.

Another young man, Wayne Anderson, is also serving his country. Some people may have forgotten Wayne Anderson. He is a member of the Pueblo crew.

And he is a prisoner in North Korea, waiting for the U.S. Government, his Government, to secure his return.

There are many Andy Musgroves and Wayne Andersons serving the United States around the world. Many of these young men may never have the opportunity to become heroes. Many will lose limbs while acquiring their hero status and, these limbs and other losses will be replaced with bronze and silver medals.

The stories of these valiant heroes do not make headlines. They are merely listed as statistics.

But, in the meantime, here at home, we read in the headlines about the dissenters and the peaceniks and efforts are made to arouse sympathy for these individuals. And, we read in the papers about professional agitators who claim to be dissenters and we sometimes see where these agitators have suffered bruises from a blow levied by a police officer after the agitator has spat upon this policeman or thrown a rock or taken some other form of overt physical action.

And, often the sympathy sought has been generated and these agitators—all the while spouting anti-American slogans—are made out to be martyrs and some segments of our society, even some people who are ordinarily considered to be reasonable citizens, begin to yell "police brutality."

Is it not time that we stop paying lip-service to these agitators and anti-Americans and begin giving notice to the true heroes of our country. A man loses an arm or a leg fighting for his country and he should be praised and noticed. An agitator takes a bump on the head from a police officer who is said to be overreacting while performing his duty and that agitator deserves the sympathy of no good American.

Let us reappraise our priorities.

THE RISING MENACE OF ADDICTION

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the number of drug users is increasing among people in all social and economic levels. What is particularly tragic about the present trends in drug abuse is the sharp increase in drug abuse among the young people.

Before my election to this House, I served as the chairman of the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Penal Institutions. As chairman of that committee, I had a unique opportunity to observe at firsthand the extent of the increased use of drugs and the tragic consequences of drug abuse.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics as of December 31, 1966, there were 59,720 active narcotic addicts reported in the United States. According to the Bureau of the total number of reported active addicts, 31,191 addicts or 52.2 percent of the total were in New York State. Based on investigations made by the Joint Legislative Committee on Penal Institutions, I am convinced that statistics dealing with known, tagged, and certified active narcotic addicts fall far short of the reality and extent of addiction in our Nation.

For example, Dr. Efren Ramirez, Administrator of the Narcotics Control Agency in the city of New York, reported that the New York City Health Department Control Narcotics Registry reports 35,000 to 40,000 active records for the entire city. Based on the narcotics registry and feedback from community in-

formation programs, Dr. Ramirez estimates 100,000 opiate addicts in the city of New York. To this there must be added an additional 100,000 addicted drug uses of other than opiates.

Statistics gathered by the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics indicate that the total number of known addicts is about equally divided between white and Negro people. On the other hand, the Bureau reports that known addicts under 21 years of age numbered 2,118, of these 534 addicts or 25.2 percent were Negro while 1,579 addicts or 74.6 percent were white. This is reflected in the fact that drug abuse is as serious a problem in the suburbs as in the slums, at Ivy League campuses as in ghetto schools, and in the high schools in every variety of neighborhood.

The extent of drug abuse on college campuses is indeed striking and frightening. Commissioner Lawrence W. Pierce, chairman of the Narcotic Addiction Control Commission of New York State, estimates that between 23,000 and 30,000 college students are placing their lives and their futures in jeopardy through experimentation with drugs. Indeed, surveys clearly disclose that entering freshmen to our colleges and universities had already sampled a variety of drugs before their high school graduation. Compounding the campus problem of drug abuse is that fact that some faculty members also indulge in experimentation with drugs.

A major difficulty in coping with the addiction problem is that so many of the abuses are highly skilled, intelligent, and articulate people who have intellectualized drug use and have developed cliches and refutations which have great appeal. This is particularly true with respect to psychedelics and hallucinogens which have been endowed with some particular mystical significance as holding the key to otherwise impenetrable insights.

This has ever been the way of man. Just slightly over a hundred years ago, many people thought they were achieving new insights about themselves and the universe through intake of nitrous oxide, laughing gas. Robert Southey, a sensitive English poet, wrote:

I experienced the most voluptuous sensations. The outer world grew dim and I had the most entrancing visions. I lived in a world of new sensations.

These feelings produced by nitrous oxide are in essence the sensations described by LSD users.

In addition to the hazards to which they expose themselves through the use of drugs, to hepatitis and other diseases resulting from the use of instruments not sterile, drug abuse leads to criminal activity. According to the report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, police estimate that between \$3 and \$5 worth of property must be stolen to realize \$1 in cash on the illegal market. In New York City, the narcotics habit averages to a daily cost of approximately \$23. It is reliably estimated that New York City addicts annually steal goods valued from half a billion to a billion dollars amounting to about 50 percent of all thefts in our city.

Crime reports of the city of New York

disclose that 20 percent of arrests for felonies against property and 80 percent of arrests for prostitution involved addicts. In fact, in any 1 year in New York City some 19,000 persons arrested for criminal activity admit to narcotics addiction.

Clearly what is urgently needed is a broad education program at all school levels exposing the risks and hazards of drug abuse. Greater deployment of law-enforcement officers to the distribution and sale of narcotics is imperative. In many areas throughout our city, narcotics are openly sold in the streets including streets near high school sites. Greater penalties must be imposed on the pusher to take the profit out of the narcotics business. Improved rehabilitation services must be made available for those ensnared in the addiction trap. Above all, as a creative society we must establish new goals to rid our life of the malaise which afflicts so many of our young people.

THE 1968 AMENDMENTS TO THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1968

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, a little over 3 years ago the Older Americans Act of 1965 became law. In the 34 months since its enactment, we have had ample opportunity to evaluate how effectively it has begun to meet the challenge posed by our millions of older citizens.

Statistics alone are meaningless, but when reviewed can become valuable aids in understanding the nature of a problem. In terms of sheer numbers alone, it is clear that the problems of 19 million older Americans cannot be ignored. The fact that by 1980 there will be nearly 25 million older people only serves to sharpen the focus of our concern. Of the problems facing our society today, few indeed are more critical than those facing older Americans. These problems are not limited to a single area, nor are they restricted to those over 65. On the contrary, the questions of income, of health, of housing, and of productive use of time are matters which affect us all.

Though primary responsibility for solving the problems of the aging must remain with State and local governments, with private organizations, and with individual citizens, it is nevertheless clear that insofar as these problems are nationwide, there is a Federal responsibility as well. The Older Americans Act of 1965 was an unequivocal declaration of national concern for the aging. Title II created the Administration on Aging, thereby establishing a strong central point within the Federal Government for focusing concern upon the problems of older citizens. The provisions of this act have meant that the resources made available to provide new opportunities and services for the elderly have been multiplied many times over.

Under title III grants are made to the

States to coordinate and expand existing programs for older people, to carry out demonstrations of programs or activities of particular value, to establish new programs, and to train needed personnel. In 34 months of operation, the plans of 46 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands have been approved. Some 650 State-approved community programs are now in operation, serving an estimated 600,000 older people in a variety of ways.

Through its grant program in title IV, the Administration on Aging has made 100 grants for research and development of new approaches and programs to meet the needs of older people. Fifty grants have been made under the provisions of the training grant program, to help combat the critical shortage of trained personnel that exists in the field of aging. To date, some 3,000 people have either already received training or are now enrolled in a training program funded under title V.

In addition, the Administration on Aging has carried the major responsibility for administering the Foster Grandparent program, under contract with the Office of Economic Opportunity. The success of this program has been widely recognized and praised—and with good reason—for it offers older people the opportunity of playing a valuable role in providing personal care to infants and children living in institutions. Initially started in 22 States, the program has now grown to include some 4,000 foster grandparents in 157 facilities, in 38 States and Puerto Rico.

Federal concern for the aging has steadily increased over the last 3 years. New housing legislation, medicare, the Older Americans Act, and many other actions taken by Congress have helped generate new interest in, and provided new opportunities for, millions of those who have reached the age of 65. Yet in view of the problems still awaiting solution, the work has barely begun.

The Older Americans Act sets forth 10 major objectives in title I, clearly stating the rights and privileges which should be provided for all our older citizens. Federal responsibility toward attaining these objectives must not falter. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I so strongly urge passage of the 1968 amendments to the Older Americans Act. The soundness of this legislation has already been demonstrated many times over, so there can be no quarrel about its value. But the time has come when we must act to strengthen and reinforce the Older Americans Act, in order to increase its effectiveness. The older population in this country is not static. On the contrary, it increases by over 800 every day. Clearly then, programs for older citizens must expand to meet this challenge. The 1968 amendments to the Older Americans Act will determine in large measure the degree to which we can succeed in meeting this challenge. If Congress fails to enact these amendments now, we run the very real risk of not only jeopardizing future programs for the aging, but also of seriously weakening those already established. Federal concern for the older members of our society is an acknowl-

edged fact; Federal responsibility must prove equal to this concern.

The amendments we are considering today are both significant and imaginative, and would help open doors of opportunity and participation for increasing numbers of older Americans. The provision to strengthen State agencies on aging, for example, would permit a much-needed increase in statewide planning, evaluation, and coordination of programs for older people. A new section would be added to title IV, authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to set aside up to 10 percent of the title III appropriation for any fiscal year, to be used on a project-by-project basis for statewide, regional, metropolitan area, or other areawide model projects. Projects will be conducted in priority areas as identified by the Secretary, with the Federal Government providing up to 75 percent of the cost for development and operation of such projects for 4 years.

The significance of this amendment is the flexibility it will give to State agencies and the Secretary in responding to the urgent needs of older people by concentrating on areawide approaches to their problems. Action programs which provide effective organization and allocation of resources for meeting urgent social needs can be implemented throughout an entire city, a county, or region of a State, or on a statewide basis. This broad type of coverage should insure that services to all older people in a given area would be more readily available.

Another important provision of the amendments provides that title III grants can be made for a period of 4 years. Extending the grant period from 3 to 4 years is necessary for two reasons: it would enable States to assure the continuation of proven community projects and services through crucial periods, and would also allow additional time for developing local financial support for community projects.

One of the most significant provisions of the amendments would add an important new title to the Older Americans Act, authorizing a program of "service roles in retirement." The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to make grants to, or contracts with, public or nonprofit private agencies so that people aged 60 and over would be employed to render supportive services to children and to older persons with exceptional needs. Preference would be given to low-income older people. Three types of programs would be authorized under this new title:

First. Services by older persons to children receiving institutional care in hospitals, homes for dependent and neglected children, or other establishments providing care for children on a temporary or permanent residential basis. At least 90 percent of the older persons serving in these projects would be low income.

Second. Services by older persons to children in such capacities as aids or tutors in setting such as day care centers or nursery schools for children who are from low-income families—or from urban or rural areas with high concen-

trations or proportions of low-income persons.

Third. Services by older persons to older persons in need of special, personalized assistance because of physical infirmities or other special circumstances.

This title would thus combine two essential concepts: it would provide new opportunities for older Americans to use their skills and talents in their communities, and at the same time, enrich the lives of neglected children and of less fortunate older people.

A final important provision of the 1968 amendments would transfer funding for the foster grandparent program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This transfer seems to me to be imminently sensible and logical. Both Secretary Cohen and the OEO Director, Mr. Harding, have issued a joint statement in support of the transfer.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation we are considering here entails a profound responsibility, and as one of its cosponsors, I do not urge its enactment lightly. The 1968 amendments to the Older Americans Act are absolutely vital to the continuation of our efforts to solve the problems of aging in the modern world. The Older Americans Act of 1965 established a framework for solving these problems—problems which are both formidable and growing. It is incumbent upon us, as Members of Congress not to cripple this framework, but to do all in our power to strengthen and reinforce it.

I firmly believe that all of us have a stake in the quality of American life for all our citizens, and I am convinced that enactment of the 1968 amendments to the Older Americans Act will help improve that quality for the older members of our society. It is for this reason that I again urge prompt and favorable action on this important legislation.

I am also convinced that the time is drawing near for a thoroughgoing review of all our present policies and programs affecting older people. Such a review is not only appropriate, but in this time of rapid change, it is essential. It is for this reason that I along with many others in Congress introduced a resolution calling for a White House conference on the aging in 1970. The resolution has been passed by both the House and the Senate and is now in the hands of the President. It is my firm belief that older Americans not only require, but richly deserve, all the attention, effort and resources available to us.

HUMPHREYISM NO. 9

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

From a collection of Representative HENRY C. SCHADEBERG (R. Wisc.):

"This Administration has no plans of accelerating the war and extending it to the north." (Denver, Colo., Sept. 12, 1964.)

"THE VULNERABLE RUSSIANS"**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the recent action of the Russians against Czechoslovakia reminds one of an old Kazakh proverb quoted in the current volume "The Vulnerable Russians." The proverb warns:

When you travel with a Russian, make sure you carry an axe.

Not that Czechoslovakia was by any means free to even carry an ax. No state in the Red empire can afford to permit the range of freedom sought by the captive nations of Czechoslovakia. To maintain basic Soviet Russian domination in Eastern Europe, Moscow showed its hand regardless of effects on world opinion and the mythical image of it developed by "detentists" in our country.

This sharp turn of events should necessitate a fundamental reevaluation of our policy toward the U.S.S.R. The so-called pragmatic, survival pact between Moscow and us has cost us heavily in honor, friends, integrity, and security. The book on "The Vulnerable Russians" reveals all this so well. Authored by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, this plainly written work furnishes one a unique background leading to the sordid actions of Moscow in the present. After reading this book, one can rest assured that Red-dominated Czechoslovakia is not the last syndicate member to be straightened out.

The work is now available at the Georgetown University bookstore, White Gravenor, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. Numerous reviews of the work show an unusual interest in the several themes advanced by the author. For example, the following review, which appeared in the June issue of the New Guard, a publication of Young Americans for Freedom, will give the reader the type of absorption made possible by the work:

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky's latest book fills a gap found all too often in one's approach to the Soviet Union. The noted author, economist, political adviser, and currently professor of economics at Georgetown University, bares the USSR for what it is: the unwilling union of many once-sovereign states, some of whom having their own distinctive language, customs and heritage.

Dr. Dobriansky points out that the Soviet Union is not Russia. When the captive nations are mentioned, too many people think only of those countries absorbed by Russian expansionism after World War II. However those non-Russian nations within the borders of the Soviet Union are captive nations in the truest sense of the term. The Ukraine, White Ruthenia, the Baltic states, and Turkistan are just a few. The author notes that of the total population of 230 million in the USSR, only 110 million are Russians. Furthermore Moscow thrives on these non-Russian colonies within the USSR. They form her greatest strength, as well as her greatest weakness. The industry, the resources and the people form the strength; the flames of nationalism, which still burn in the hearts of these once-free, still proud people, form the Soviet Union's major weakness.

The surest way to emasculate the Soviet union, asserts the author, is to detach these

captive nations from the grip of Moscow. To do this the flames of healthy nationalism in these states must be fanned. Dr. Dobriansky maintains that emphasis should be given to psycho-political warfare, an area in which the United States lags far behind the Russians. The U.S., which for too long has held a continuously defensive posture in the Cold War, must take the initiative.

We must make no mistake, emphasizes Dr. Dobriansky, that we are at war, a cold war, yet one directed toward the goal of our final subjugation. We must approach this war with a view towards victory. Explaining the nature of this war, and the nature of the enemy—an indispensable element toward any victory—becomes the prime tasks taken on by the author. He traces the threads of Russian imperialist expansionism back to the early days of Muscovy. Even then Moscow was master of psycho-political warfare, propaganda, and power diplomacy. Dr. Dobriansky concludes it is not the ideology of communism that we are fighting, today in Vietnam, yesterday in Korea, Greece, Turkey, China, the Philippines, etc. It is the new wave of the old Russian imperialism that lies masked under the banner of ideological "communism," a "communism" that Marx would be hard pressed to recognize. We should, in short, condemn Communist aggression for what it is—imperialism.—MARK A. COYLE and ROYAL M. WHARTON.

PATRIOTISM IS NOT DEAD**HON. JERRY L. PETTIS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I attended an outstanding event 2 weeks ago sponsored by the Twentynine Palms Marine Corps Base. It was such an amazing and outstanding success in patriotism that I would like to share this experience with my colleagues.

I watched and listened; they watched and listened; we felt—yes, we experienced together the thrill of our heritage parading before us on the high desert stage of Luckie Park in Twentynine Palms, on Friday night, that memorable 27th of September, 1968. A crowd of 10,000 spectators from southern California and elsewhere in the United States and Canada attended and, despite the comfortable, warm, dry air, there were few dry eyes among them. This was the scene of the Marines' desert spectacular—a military tattoo and evening parade—sponsored, directed, and produced by Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, Calif., Brig. Gen. Regan Fuller, commanding. Patriotism dead: do not believe it. Promptly at 8 o'clock the huge special lights, contributed for the occasion by Warner Bros.-Seven Arts Studios, were extinguished, and a strong spotlight illuminated two Marine noncommissioned officers in dress blues holding a ship's bell, which then was rung with authority by the sergeant major. From the moment of that ringing, an existential link was forged between spectator and performer: a silent clamoring for more could be sensed as the crowd leaned forward to follow the spotlight across the field. The light fell on a solitary marine leading the bulldog mascot toward the crowd. The marine stopped in midfield, saluted, and proceeded forward smartly

to the applause of the spectators. Then silent anticipation, as the spotlight shifted to play on the massed trumpeters of the Marines and Canadians and their fanfare: a harmony of service, color, and regal music—the show was on. A 24-gun barrage then saluted the distinguished guests, Lt. Gen. Victor H. Krulak, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, and Mr. J. Gear McEntyre, Canadian Counsel General at Los Angeles. It is difficult to describe the feeling of personal warmth and pride I had in being a part of all this, but the surface of the program hardly had been scratched.

Simulated daylight flooded the green carpet that is the turf at Luckie Recreation Park. Centered was the nucleus of the most impressive flag pageant one could imagine. One by one all the flags that have flown over this Nation from just prior to its inception until the present were introduced by marines in period uniforms from the Marine Corps Recruit Depot in San Diego, who, supported by a stirring narration, told the story of a people who have worked, loved, fought, and died to build a tradition of "liberty and justice for all," where "the pursuit of happiness" is not a dream choked with frustration but a reality. As marine after marine depicted each period in our history, the plaudits of the crowd rose in a crescendo that voiced effusively: "We are grateful, we understand, we are part of it."

This evening was not only a spectacle of patriotic splendor and colorful precision but also of timing: there were no lags. The flag pageant barely had departed to the periphery of a darkened stage, when suddenly a blaze of brilliant brass and dress uniforms sparked in new light, and equally dazzling martial music marked the entrance in rapid tempo of the Marine Corps base, Twentynine Palms' band in their dress blue uniforms whose outstanding 5-minute performance was followed by the Princess Patricia Canadian Light Infantry Band, Edmonton, Canada. A symphony of white helmet, scarlet tunic, and musical precision greeted the onlookers who were spellbound also by the delayed cadence marching routine and the flawless showmanship of the drum major. From a distant corner of the field came the gloriously unusual sound of the pipes and drums of the U.S. Air Force Pipe Band, Washington, D.C., whose technical excellence thrilled openmouthed spectators, as kilted pipers, drummers, and a dancer each soloed.

The last of the bands boasted a solid blend of instrumentalists who wore the blue jackets of the Canadian Forces Naden Band, Victoria, B.C. The cliché held true: Indeed, these were not the least apt performers. There was no dearth of talent anywhere in this 2-hour highly professional testimony to American patriotism.

The individual performances certainly would have satisfied all of us gathered there, but then as everyone rose to attention, the massed bands mesmerized the gathering with renditions of "O Canada" and the "Star-Spangled Banner," as colors of each nation respectively were raised and spotlighted.

Onto the field marched the marines of

the Provisional Infantry Battalion in full battle dress. All bands "sounded off," the horse-mounted color guard from Camp Pendleton trooped the colors, and the distinguished guests accompanied the commanding general to the reviewing stand. "Ruffles and Flourishes" and the "Flag Officer's March" were played as Lieutenant General Krulak's three-star flag was "broken."

At this point Brigadier General Fuller was introduced. Carefully chosen words explained the purpose of this pageantry as he paid tribute to the masses before him and to the military personnel who were to be honored next on the program. "Patriotism," he said convincingly—in other more effective words—"is very real and very much in evidence in the living testimony that is yours tonight." Personnel to be retired and also those to be decorated moved forward as the commanding general and distinguished guests individually presented their decorations and awards. The marines of the Provisional Infantry Battalion fixed bayonets and passed in review; the honorees joined Brigadier General Fuller to review the troops.

The eyes of 10,000 spectators and a thousand military participants collectively sparkled from the dew that had begun to gather there while the massed bands played "America the Beautiful." Spellbound, each one in his own way experienced in his mind's eye the glorious personal panorama that is his country—truly, a beautiful America. The crowd was silent. A lone piper strode forward to play the "Scottish Lament." Canadian and Marine buglers sounded "Tattoo," and the "Last Post" while the flags of both nations were lowered.

The bands played as they left the field. Reluctant to admit that the 2-hour performance had concluded, the crowd slowly departed—there was no rush to the gates as there is following an athletic contest. Many pushed forward to congratulate and thank Brigadier General Fuller for a thoroughly rewarding experience that they will never forget. An orderly, satisfied people, aided by members of the California Highway Patrol and the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department, made their way to their homes. An inner glow warmed them as the night cooled.

In retrospect, we saw a town of about 6,000 people, complemented by 4,000 visitors, turned out for the desert spectacular featuring the combined efforts of 1,000 troops of Canada and the U.S. Marine Corps. Some 79 percent of those marines were combat veterans of the war in Vietnam. Cooperative efforts of townsfolk and military personnel from San Diego, Camp Pendleton, and Twentynine Palms, the Twentynine Palms' Park and Recreation District, the Morongo Unified School District, the U.S. Air Force, the Canadian Government, and myriad others, some heretofore mentioned, created this splendid work of art that was the Twentynine Palms' desert spectacular.

Our Nation and its citizens? No one who was there would question where they stand. What about demonstrations—were there no demonstrators? Yes, there were those too—the proper patriotic kind. Tears were noticeable in thousands of eyes, deafening applause was in evidence,

standing ovations were the vogue, and throngs were heard singing the "Star-Spangled Banner"—an affirmation of the words of the host of the night, Brigadier General Fuller, who saw patriotism in action. The "Star-Spangled Banner" still waves proudly over the heads of moist-eyed citizens in this our "land of the free and the home of the brave."

ESTABLISHMENT OF A FOREIGN TRADE ZONE AT PORTLAND, MAINE

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, a disparaging attack was made in this Chamber last Thursday on the Johnson administration, our esteemed Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, and all of the States of New England in connection with the application of the State of Maine for establishment of a foreign trade zone at Portland and a subzone at Machiasport in that State.

A charge was hurled that "the fix is on" in the Johnson administration to approve oil import quotas for the proposed trade zone refinery at complex at Machiasport. It was stated that the agreement by the U.S. company proposing to operate the refinery to contribute millions annually to a nonprofit natural and marine resources foundation for New England projects and to introduce heating oil at competition into New England is an effort to "buy" regional support for the plan.

Such charges, whatever their motivation—and I do not question the motives of the gentlemen making them—could be made only in the absence of knowledge of the facts about the Maine project.

The project was developed and sponsored by Gov. Kenneth M. Curtis, of Maine—its purpose is to bolster the economy of Maine and that of New England generally. It has the support of the Governors of all six New England States and of virtually the entire bipartisan New England congressional delegation. It has the backing of the New England Regional Commission, established under title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, and the New England Council.

Such support is not surprising to those who understand that the project will meet important State, regional, and national economic, social, and security goals.

This project will lower the cost in New England of heating oil to consumers by approximately \$50 to \$60 million annually. By reducing the cost of oil to the Department of Defense, it will save \$6 million annually of tax funds. The size of the proposed refinery, domestically located, will give U.S. Armed Forces an added measure of supply security in the event of emergency.

The plant's location in Maine will help achieve another strategic goal, dispersal of the Nation's refinery capacity. Oil refineries are heavily concentrated along the U.S. side of the Gulf of Mexico.

Washington County, Maine, site of the

projected subzone, has been designated a depressed area. The building of the refinery at Machiasport not only will create jobs in itself but also will attract other important industries to provide desperately needed employment opportunities.

In view of such facts as these, it is not surprising that Maine's application for establishment of a foreign trade zone and subzone is receiving such strong bipartisan support. It is a constructive plan, deserving of support.

Why, then, the suddenly vocal and deeply bitter opposition to the project now being expressed in some quarters? The answer is not far to seek.

The major oil companies and the big, rich independent oil producers, concentrated in a few States, are against the Maine project. As beneficiaries for 10 years of the U.S. oil import program, their vested interests do not wish to share the benefits. They traditionally operate on the basis that "Them that has—gits." They do not want to cut anyone else in on the game.

Their opposition to the Maine project is based solely on their desire to maintain their large profits and to block any competition which would reduce the price of petroleum products in New England.

Opponents referred to the project as an economic giveaway. In fact, the oil import program has operated as a giveaway for 10 years—a giveaway of approximately \$500 million annually to the big, rich oil companies. It is enough to finance a small war and that is just what it does—a war against the people of New England.

They want to keep monopoly control over the oil import quotas. They insist on preventing competition within the New England States. Their financial power makes it easy for them to find spokesmen to serve their selfish purposes.

The bipartisan Maine project, assailed in the Chamber as a "Handout" and "political payolla," is, in fact, designed to reduce the price poor families in New England pay for heating oil and gasoline, to provide jobs in a deeply depressed area, to serve the interests of national security, to save money for taxpayers, and to aid in the U.S. balance of payments.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that these are worthy goals. They have extensive bipartisan support. They should not be distorted for selfish political purposes.

I believe the American people are fed up with the influence of big oil in our national affairs. They are rightly skeptical when spokesmen for big oil hurl reckless charges at individuals in an effort to focus attention away from the machinations of greedy men seeking to destroy the just and fair aspirations of a region seeking its own place in the economic sun.

The State of Maine has followed proper legal procedure in its application for creation of a foreign trade zone and subzone. There is a strong presumption in the Foreign Trade Zone Act in favor of granting such application. The act provides:

If the Foreign Trade Zones Board finds that the proposed plans and locations are suitable for the accomplishment of the purposes of a foreign trade zone under this act, and that the facilities and appurtenances

which it proposed to provide are sufficient, it shall make the grant.

Mr. Speaker, a public hearing will be held on Maine's application at Portland on Thursday and Friday of this week. Witnesses will produce evidence that plans for the Maine project fully meet these specifications.

The influence of big oil extends far and wide, and I have no doubt that attacks on the Maine project will continue. But the merits of the plan will serve as a shield against such attacks. The right of the people, not the might of the big oil, should and must prevail in this instance.

THE LOW ROAD INTO THE HISTORY BOOKS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is a strange phenomenon of political life that some politicians, having gained office, tend to feel cleansed of all past sins, tend to forget that their lives and statements did not begin anew when they took office. This phenomenon appears frequently when you look at political promises and it recently became quite apparent in the area of political tactics.

In the space of time between 1964 and today, Lyndon Johnson has changed from an apostle of fear and emotionalism to a decrier of these very tactics. He has, apparently by the sheer passage of time, been converted from a master of the political low road to a proclaimer of the political high road.

It was thus that President Johnson called on September 28 for "an end to hate and fear as vote-gathering tactics."

The New York Times quoted the President as coming down hard on the politician "who exploits fear and hate and prejudice." These tactics are, the President said, "choosing the low road."

This position is commendable. All candidates and all Americans should continue to strive toward clean, accurate campaigns. Fairness and a lack of hysteria should be watchwords of any election. But it is astounding that the President could find the impudence to expound on these political virtues.

It takes very little effort to remember the television ads sponsored by the Democratic National Committee—Lyndon's committee—in 1964. Few Americans will forget the little girl in the sunny field picking daisies, the voice growing in the background announcing the countdown, and at "zero" the television screen filling with the nuclear blast scene. Viewers were then treated to the voice of Lyndon Johnson saying:

These are the stakes, to make a world in which all of God's children can live, or to go into the dark. We must either love each other, or we must die.

This is the politics of fear. This is emotionalism. This is pandering blatantly to fear. Yet last week Lyndon Johnson was saying:

For some, the temptation is to trade openly on anger and discontent (as if there was

no crime in the nation, and, and no lack of enforcement by his attorney general); to arouse emotions in order to exploit them (as if insinuating a little girl is not emotional, and fearful); to blatantly ponder to fear and prejudice; to use the code word of hate (or the bomb?); to offer rhetoric and slogans and angry accusations in the place of solutions (as if there were an answer in that advertisement.)

Last Saturday Lyndon Johnson said:

There is another road which can be taken, it is the uphill road of responsibility: the way that is often steep, sometimes lonely, always the most difficult. In my opinion this is the only acceptable way today. This is the honest way to go to the people.

"Today" it may seem to the President to be the only acceptable way. But it 1964 nearly anything was acceptable. As another example:

In 1964 another little girl licked an ice cream cone and told TV viewers that people used to explode atomic bombs and that the fallout made children die. This emotional pitch was delivered across the Nation. A Geiger-counter ticked ominously in the background, Barry Goldwater was equated with the killing of children by the line—

So if he's elected, they might start testing all over again.

Then the voice in the background added:

Vote for President Johnson on November third. The stakes are too high for you to stay home.

Is this responsible campaigning? Is this not pandering to fear, emotionalism? Is this not a vile, invidious tactic typifying the lowest of all possible roads?

The Democrats took the ad off the air at the request of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee. The committee commented that it had received volumes of mail and phone calls from Democrats and Republicans who were shocked, offended and angered.

The advertisement of Lyndon Johnson's party which saw the social security card torn up also comes to mind, along with other statements of both Johnson and HUBERT HUMPHREY.

Few would stand up for Lyndon Johnson's political virtue based on this campaign statement:

We are now told that we, the people, acting through government, should withdraw from education, from public power, from agriculture, from urban renewal and from a host of other vital programs. We are now told that we should end Social Security as we know it, sell TVA, strip labor unions of many of their gains, and terminate all farm subsidies.

The President should ask himself—Is this really telling it like it was.

The Democrats under Johnson depicted Goldwater as the beast, the wrecker of society, the amoral candidate. Yet, it was Goldwater who came to Johnson during the campaign and pledged not to make an issue of riots. And, naturally, as Theodore H. White noted, this pledge "was Goldwater's loss."

White also notes Goldwater's decision on the Jenkins affair. It is fitting contrast to Democratic campaign tactics.

White states:

When the Jenkins affair came out the Republican candidate was in Denver . . . Here if ever was demonstration of his

charge of moral decay, of sickness of soul, of bestiality in Babylon. Yet the Goldwater painted as a killer by the Democrats could not bring himself to hurt an individual; urged by his young men to hammer the issue, to make the most of it as if a gift had been given him—he simply refused.

One must assume that Johnson also had control over his running mate, especially since he has exerted so much control in the past 4 years. Yet HUMPHREY was right in there with his form of irresponsibility and his panderings to fear and emotionalism. In Madison, Wis., October 27, 1964, HUMPHREY harangued that the election of Goldwater would create "a garrison state in a nightmare world, isolated from everything except a nuclear reign of terror." He states that Goldwater's positions were "dead wrong—tragically, dangerously wrong. The solutions he offers are no solutions at all. They are instead a sure path to widening conflict and ultimately to a terrible holocaust."

Author Lionel Lokos noted that a week before this statement HUMPHREY "had summed up what he thought the next three weeks would be like in these words: 'the hardest, roughest, and I'm afraid, the meanest of the campaign.'"

In light of the advertising, one might attribute to this statement both planning and prophecy.

The prophets of fear in 1964 are now becoming the decriers of that same form of political fear.

It is a strange phenomenon. Not unlike hypocrisy.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point the article from the New York Times of September 29, 1968:

JOHNSON DECRIES POLITICS OF FEAR—URGES END OF HATE TACTICS IN GATHERING VOTES AND MAKES UNITY PLEA

(By Bernard Gwertzman)

FORT MITCHELL, Ky., September 28.—President Johnson called today for an end to hate and fear as vote-gathering tactics in a plea for unity in this "season of bitter debate."

Without mentioning by name any of the Presidential candidates, Mr. Johnson said, "When feelings are so deep and emotions are so high, it is tempting for some to play upon the fears and uncertainties of their countrymen."

"For some, the temptation is to trade openly on anger and discontent; to arouse emotions in order to exploit them; to pander blatantly to fear and prejudice; to use the code word of hate; to offer rhetoric and slogans and angry accusations in the place of solutions," Mr. Johnson said.

SPEAKS AT COLLEGE

The President's remarks on campaign ethics were included in a speech he had prepared for delivery at dedication ceremonies for Thomas More College here.

Mr. Johnson flew here after addressing the National Postmasters Convention in Washington this morning.

He said here that anyone "who exploits fear and hate and prejudice" was choosing "the low road" to the presidency.

"There is another road which can be taken," he went on. "It is the uphill road of responsibility: the way that is often steep, sometimes lonely, always the most difficult."

"In my opinion," Mr. Johnson said, "this is the only acceptable way today. This is the honest way to go to the people."

Mr. Johnson has endorsed the candidacy of Vice President Humphrey and seemed to be hitting out at both Richard M. Nixon, the Republican candidate, and George C. Wallace, the third-party candidate.

RECALLS SITUATION IN 1787

The President said, "some people discovered a long time ago that it is easier to scare people than to reason with them; it is easier to shout 'fire' than to fight fire; it is easier to condemn 'crime' than to conquer crime."

Both Mr. Nixon and Mr. Wallace have made a major campaign issue of the rising crime rate in the cities, and particularly in Washington.

Mr. Johnson likened the current situation in the United States to that at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in September, 1787.

"Out of a wearying, turbulent assembly," he said, "came the answer to a fundamental American question: Could our people, in spite of all their differences, be one nation, one people? Could the adventure in liberty

which began in 1776 live on—or must it die in disunity and defeat?

"That is a question which faces you and me—and all Americans today."

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1968

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the male population's hat is off to our business and professional

women as observance of National Business Women's Week, October 20-26, gives credit where credit is most certainly due. More than 3,800 clubs in every congressional district will spotlight woman's role in today's world by means of congresses of career women leaders.

The career woman of today adapts easily to her multiduties life, is gracious and understanding, efficient, and dedicated. In a world of challenges her role is oftentimes difficult but always exciting. The rewards of work well done lie not alone in one's personal satisfaction but also in recognition from the coworker, the neighbor, the friend, or, yes, employer.

I join in saluting all our career women.

SENATE—Tuesday, October 8, 1968

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we turn from the wild confusion of the world without, praying that Thou wilt cleanse our hearts from secret faults.

We lift grateful hearts for the heritage that is ours, bought by toils and tears other than our own.

In the eternal struggle of truth and error, tyranny and liberty, give us the assurance that we do not fight alone, but that Thy increasing purpose is bound up with all this human struggle toward the goal of man's redemption from ignorance, hunger, and chains.

Riding forth with knightly valor, may we bear in our hands the commission of ancient days, "He hath sent us to bind up the broken hearts, to proclaim liberty to the captives and the opening of prisons to them that are bound, to proclaim the day of justice of our God."

We ask it in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate having adjourned yesterday in the absence of a quorum, the clerk will call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The bill clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 321 Leg.]		
Aiken	Hartke	Murphy
Allott	Hatfield	Pastore
Anderson	Hayden	Pearson
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Pell
Brooke	Hill	Percy
Burdick	Holland	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Randolph
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Case	Kuchel	Sparkman
Curtis	Lausche	Spong
Dirksen	Long, La.	Stennis
Dodd	Magnuson	Symington
Eastland	Mansfield	Thurmond
Ervin	McClellan	Tydings
Fannin	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Fong	McIntyre	Williams, Del.
Goodell	Metcalf	Yarborough
Griffin	Mondale	Young, N. Dak.
Hansen	Morton	Young, Ohio
Harris	Moss	
Hart	Mundt	

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 7, 1968, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEWIS G. ODOM—A VALUABLE STAFF MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, Lewis G. Odom, Jr., who during this Congress served as staff director of the Committee on Banking and Currency, has left the committee to go back to Alabama to engage in his first love, the practice of law.

Mr. Odom was one of the most effective and efficient of staff directors and assistants I have ever known. A good many people, including many Senators and others in government have recognized his qualities and have written letters to Mr. Odom expressing their appreciation of his service and regret at his leaving, in which I join.

I ask unanimous consent to have these letters printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,

July 29, 1968.

Mr. LEWIS G. ODOM,
Banking and Currency Committee,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LEW: I write this letter with a considerable conflict of feelings. I am extremely sorry that you are leaving the Banking and Currency Committee, where you will be sorely missed, but on the other hand, I know you will do an even better job in the private practice of law than you have done so long and so faithfully in the United States Senate.

Few people, outside of my own staff, have been as helpful, cooperative, and generous with their time, ideas, and assistance as you have been to me in performing my duties as a member of the Senate. Without your help in just this Congress, there is a good likelihood that we would have had no Flood Insurance Act, no Interstate Land Sales Act, no major amendments to the Urban Mass Transportation Act, and no mutual Fund bill. These measures are but a few among many which will stand as monuments to your ability, ingenuity, and interest in making our country a better nation.

Even as I regret seeing you leave, I hope that this will not be the end of our long association, because we cannot afford to lose the contributions which you still have to offer.

With best personal regards.
Sincerely,

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.