

July 29, 1966

16808

tional—because it is the title that affects them most directly.

Mr. Chairman, although I feel that this section of the bill is without question unconstitutional, I do not believe it to be any more unconstitutional than the rest of this bill.

In 1963 Supreme Court Justice Harlan stated in the case of Peterson against Greenville:

Freedom of the individual to choose his associates or his neighbors, to use and dispose of his property as he sees fit, to be irrational, arbitrary, capricious even unjust in his personal relations are things all entitled to a large measure of protection from government interference.

This language states as clearly as possible that the Federal Government has no business telling a person to whom he may or may not sell his home.

TITLE V

Title V of the omnibus civil rights bill is supposedly based on the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment. But this title would apply to the action of both States and private individuals, which in my judgement violates the Constitution. I quote from the Supreme Court in the 1948 case of Shelly against Kraemer:

The principle has become firmly embedded in our Constitutional law that the action inhibited by the first section of the 14th amendment is only such action as may fairly be said to be that of the State. That amendment erects no shield against merely private conduct, however discriminatory or wrongful.

Instead of providing equal protection under the law, this section would afford special protection to certain groups.

TITLE VI

Title VI authorized the Attorney General to institute court proceedings to obtain desegregation of public education and other public facilities. This section would grant him the power to institute such proceedings as he may desire even though there may be no complaints of any discrimination in the case involved.

This section to me reveals that those proposing this legislation have no confidence in our present judicial procedure. There is no doubt in my mind that this bill would further restrict the individual liberties so granted by our Constitution.

In summary, this bill is unnecessary and unconstitutional. It does not encourage equality for all—it seeks to provide special treatment for minority groups. This bill must be defeated in order to guarantee the rights and liberties of the individual as provided in our Constitution.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers, Mr. WHITENER and Mr. CELLER.

The Committee divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 51, noes 116.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14765) "to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes," had come to no resolution thereon.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 186, on July 28, a quorum call, I am recorded as absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 189, a quorum call, I am recorded as absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

ASHLAND, OHIO, SAILOR SPEAKS OUT

(Mr. ASHBROOK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, every now and then you run across a statement that cuts through all of the double-talk, all of the veil of duplicity of purpose and protest which seems to cover our current Vietnam involvement. In reading the July 26, 1966, issue of the Ashland Times-Gazette, I saw the following statement by a young serviceman who is heading for Vietnam:

I am here because I believe in the United States of America.

What a succinct statement. Sounds almost like an echo from the past when men were measured not by their political power or pocketbook but by their patriotic fervor.

Robert C. Boyd is in the U.S. Navy. Like many young servicemen, he has seen the grumbings, the anti-American slogans and the campus weirdoes who protest our involvement in Vietnam. He is probably like most Americans when he feels a regret that it is necessary in this supposedly enlightened age to still use warfare as an instrument of national

policy. Like most Americans, however, he recognizes that communism has forced this struggle upon us and as he puts it:

I myself would rather see no flag at all over our country than the Star Spangled Banner flying in shame and disgrace.

I urge all of the Members of this body to read this very thoughtful letter:

[From the Ashland Times-Gazette, July 26, 1966]

To the Editor:

Sure, we could get out of southeast Asia and perhaps save thousands of lives. You wouldn't have to open your morning papers to read headlines about a bloody war which you think is foolish and very costly. To begin with, you wouldn't have to worry about your sons being drafted before they are hardly old enough to drive a car and life in general, might seem a lot more peaceful all around.

But while you're thinking of how good things would be, you might also stop and remember the some 4,500 boys who have already paid the supreme price, their lives. You might also think of the thousands who have been wounded, many crippled for life, because while people in this country protest, hold marches and demonstrations, burn draft cards and write their congressman about how bad and awful this war is (these men, who several months ago, in a great many cases, hadn't even seen an M-14 or a 45, who knew no more about the ways and means of war than about the man in the moon, much less places such as Chu-li, DaNang or even Viet Nam itself) were and still are fighting and dying in a war of which few even know how it started. But yet, you could ask any one of them why they were there and behind every reason would be an answer similar to this one.

Pointing towards a battered weather worn flag, its colors bleached from the hot Asian sun, showing not only the effects of weather but also bearing the evidence of war. Here a man might say, I have a son at home and because of him and his mother and all people's children, I am here.

I am here because I believe in the United States of America. I believe in her past, her present but most of all her future and to her future. I will pledge my own life. I also believe in that banner up there. Millions have given their lives in its defense. I am no different. God gave us the privilege to live in a country of which there is no equal and I intend to give this opportunity to not only my children but everyone who believes in freedom and justice for all.

Therefore, we must stay in Viet Nam until Communism is driven, not only from Viet Nam, but the entire world. It is not only a threat to our way of life, but to our very existence as a free nation on this planet. If we admit to defeat in Viet Nam, we are not only letting our boys down, we are letting every American who ever died for America's cause down. But most of all, we would be letting our country down and we might as well take down Old Glory forever. I, myself, would rather see no flag at all over our country, than the Star Spangled Banner flying in shame and disgrace.

ROBERT C. BOYD,
M-CB 58, Co. A,

U.S. Navy.

(Boyd, who is the 19-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles E. Boyd of 337 Katherine Ave., is scheduled to leave for southeast Asia in November; Ed.)

DURIEUX TO RUSK: QUESTION OF THE HOUR

(Mr. ASHBROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

hearings, where this is dealt with—that is the only reference I find to the title. We have the Attorney General before this committee testifying that there is no evidence of discrimination in the Federal system that he believes requires any further legislative action. We have the Attorney General saying that he is not taking it up with the Judicial Conference. He has not sought, in effect, the opinion of the judges.

Then, on the other hand, compare the record that we have made here on the floor of the House, which shows that out of the 90 U.S. districts in the Federal court system, not a single judge has come forward and urged or approved the enactment of title I of this bill.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASEY. In further reference to this, at the bottom of page 1185 of the hearings, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] asked if the Department of Justice in the last 25 years had recommended to the Judicial Conference or to any other body to which it could make recommendations that there be uniformity, to which the Attorney General said "No."

Mr. WHITENER. That is correct.

I hope Members will vote in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] to close debate on the amendment.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the questions I propounded to the Attorney General and his answers thereto, I came to a studied judgment that title I should have my support.

The method of selecting Federal jurors and grand jurors is not uniform in all parts of the United States, and judges who are most conscientious find that the guidelines are not all clear. By reason of the fact that the guidelines are not clear, from time to time convictions are had by juries which have not been selected in accordance with constitutional basic rights and principles.

Mr. Chairman, I know that this is going to entail the assembly of millions of names in some districts or divisions thereof and that it will require additional clerks for that work. But when the work is done I am sure there will be a uniform constitutional method of selecting jurors in this country which will meet the tests laid down by the highest court of this land. When those who are indicted are tried and convicted there will be far fewer reversals and remanding of convictions than there have been in the past.

For that reason, and notwithstanding the fact that it will cost substantial money to implement this title, I expect to vote against the amendment and in support of title I. I hope others will, too.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I spoke on the Civil Rights Act now before us, and expressed my views in favor of the strongest possible bill, if we are to fulfill our obligations to

guarantee the fundamental rights of all our citizens.

The New York Times today carried an editorial, entitled "Legislating Bias," and it is so appropriate to our discussion here and now that I am taking the liberty of inserting it in the RECORD at this point.

I would call the attention of all my colleagues to this editorial, which is, I believe, self-explanatory.

The editorial follows:

LEGISLATION BIAS

The House of Representatives is now engaged in the unseemingly spectacle of deciding who shall be allowed to discriminate against Negroes and who shall be required to treat them fairly.

Representative CHARLES MATHIAS, Maryland Republican, believes the distinction should be drawn at the city line. Those who rent apartments in buildings with five units or more will have to be good Americans and not discriminate against otherwise qualified tenants just because they are Negroes. Since these buildings are mostly in the center of cities, bigotry would be banned there. But at the city line where the suburbs begin and the neighborhoods are made up of one-family houses, discrimination against Negroes would be all right. In short, one law for slums, another law for suburbs.

The defenders of the suburban interests believed that they had achieved their goal of writing this dual standard into the civil rights bill when they amended Title IV in committee. But since the Attorney General has expressed the opinion that brokers acting on behalf of bigoted property owners would not necessarily be immune, these proponents of the double standard have another, more explicit, amendment to make their intent clear. It leaves no doubt that both brokers and owners can discriminate with no worry about punishment. It is a dismal performance.

What is most astonishing is that Representative EMANUEL CELLER and the other Administration managers of the bill seem inclined to accept this latest amendment as the necessary price of Republican support for the bill. Admittedly Mr. CELLER and his Democratic colleagues in the House have received something less than stout-hearted support from the White House and the Justice Department on this issue. But that is no reason for timorous counsels to prevail. There is no certainty that the majority of House Republicans are going to desert this bill or even this section of it if real-estate brokers are denied the immunity they seek.

The original Mathias amendment, as adopted in committee, was a mistake and an act of injustice. This further clarifying amendment only makes it worse.

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 14765, the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1966, is just another one of the many Great Society bills which this body has been ordered to pass without giving adequate consideration. This bill was brought to the floor under the 21-day rule. However, the Rules Committee was allotted only one-third of this time to give the bill ample examination. The final report on this bill was submitted on July 14, giving the Rules Committee barely over a week to examine it. If this bill is as important as the Great Society administration says it is, then certainly all committees concerned with it should have ample time to debate all the issues at hand. The rule for the consideration of H.R. 14765 passed by a vote of 200 to 180 and I am proud that

Republicans opposed it by a margin of greater than 5 to 1. In doing so, they voted for legislative responsibility on the part of this body.

H.R. 14765 is composed of eight titles. I want to say at this point that I have always been opposed to this type of omnibus legislation. The administration has made a practice of presenting this type of legislation intending to include in it, a little something for everybody in order to obtain as many votes for it as possible.

TITLE I

Title I of this bill would eliminate alleged discrimination in the selection of Federal juries. However, in an unprecedented manner, this section received very little consideration by the Judiciary Committee. This is one of the faults of omnibus legislation—invariably, some sections of the bill are either purposely or accidentally overlooked.

TITLE II

Title II would supposedly prohibit so-called discrimination in the selection of State jurors. All a defendant would have to do, if this section becomes law, would be to claim discrimination and the burden of proof would shift to the State to prove the charge untrue. Under this provision all criminal prosecutions could be delayed indefinitely. In the light of several recent Supreme Court decisions increasing the rights of criminals, and the recent riots in Chicago, South Bend, Omaha, Cleveland, and Brooklyn, this is clearly not the time to further restrict our law enforcement machinery.

TITLE III

Title III of this omnibus civil rights bill would authorize the Attorney General to institute proceedings to prevent a person from having his civil rights violated. Undoubtedly, if this title is enacted, the courts would be flooded with cases, since the term "civil rights" can be construed to cover any form of human activity. The Federal Government would also have to pay the costs of any suits under this title. The defendant would be entitled to no such services. This is merely another attempt to give preferred treatment to certain minority groups instead of equal treatment for all.

TITLE IV

Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1966, better known as the so-called fair housing section could in my estimation be termed the "great equalizer." On four previous occasions in recent years, the Congress has passed four separate civil rights bills. But, none of the four previous bills have had anything included that would have such a nationwide effect as would the fair housing section of this bill. For the first time, many of my colleagues from north of the Mason Dixon Line have expressed concern that they feel this bill goes too far. I well understand what they mean, it goes too far north. For the first time, we have a civil rights proposal that reaches home—every home in the Nation. And now, many of my colleagues are saying that title IV of this bill is unconstitu-

point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a constituent and good friend, Lee Durieux, of Mount Vernon, Ohio, was in town last week. He left his mark. He was attending a meeting of the International Platform Association and was present when Dean Rusk opened up a session to questions and answers. Lee offered the question:

Why don't we bomb the port of Haiphong—and to hell with Russian shipping?

What Mr. Durieux did not expect, however, was the evasive and questionable answer which the Secretary of State gave.

My constituent came up with about the best summation of the handling of the Vietnamese war that I have seen as yet. He noted:

It is like a mackerel hanging in the moonlight—it shines and stinks.

To clarify the matter, Mr. Durieux wrote to Drew Pearson. A copy of his letter follows. It is a good summation of what many Americans from our part of the country are thinking. Congratulations, Lee, and please come to Washington more often:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 23, 1966.

MR. DREW PEARSON: Yesterday after Dean Rusk's speech, I handed you a card with the question, "Why don't we bomb the port of Haiphong—and to hell with Russian shipping?" I note that this made headlines in the newspapers.

I was, however, disappointed with Rusk's answer even though I feel he was the top speaker so far in the IPA.

I too was a flier during WW II and can recall that we had more than a dozen places like Vietnam to conquer, but in those days we went in to win! Therefore, you can understand my bluntness and inability to comprehend this "half-vast" war in Vietnam!

I have two sons in college; one of which is going into the army in 2 weeks—the other carries a draft card. I would prefer that these sons go into the service to end this war, not a part of appeasement and delayed action. I would like for Mr. Rusk to name one instance since 1945 that the Communists haven't backed down when we showed sincerity and force! I would even go so far as to state that I would like to see us dare China to come into this war just for an opportunity to knock out their atomic installations before the day comes that we all know will come when they will be able to "deliver" these weapons.

I have always admired your comments and editorials; I also feel you have been a god-send to the IPA.

Sincerely,

LEE DURIEX.

MOUNT VERNON, OHIO.

P.S.—I am a signer and entertainer—not a writer. To sum up this war in Vietnam, it has its bright prospects and bad ones. It is like a mackerel hanging in the moonlight—it shines and stinks!

HORTON SUBMITS BILLS TO HELP AGING KEEP PACE WITH INCREASES IN COST OF LIVING

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, increases in the cost of living are a concern to all

of us who serve in the Congress, as it is to all Americans. However, it is most especially a matter of concern to the millions of our fellow citizens who live on fixed incomes. Today, I have introduced two bills which are directed particularly at the needs of this group of people—the aging.

This past year I have had the privilege of serving on the Republican National Task Force on the Problems of the Aging. If there is any one fact which stood out in the course of our investigations, it is the fact that inflation and the consequent rise in living costs have often brought harsh and dire consequences to our senior citizens.

Inflation steals from everyone, but those who live on pensions and fixed incomes are especially hurt. When inflation takes place, the purchasing power of the dollar goes down. Money that has been allocated to the later years of one's life often becomes inadequate in meeting unforeseen increases in the cost of vital goods and services.

Congress has not remained entirely oblivious to this problem in the past. The social security and the railroad retirement programs have had their benefits raised periodically. However, these increases have been sporadic and uneven. Between these increases, there has usually existed a period during which the purchasing power of the pensioners' dollar has drastically declined. For example, our task force found that between 1958 and 1964 inflation cost social security pensioners approximately \$1.4 billion in loss of purchasing power.

Statistics such as this are alarming, but not nearly as alarming as the deprivation suffered by those of the aging who cannot keep pace with the rising cost of living. Mr. Speaker, I believe that my two bills will directly aid those caught in this squeeze.

Our task force recommended that the Social Security Act and the Railroad Retirement Act be amended to provide an automatic increase in their insurance benefits which is tied to increase in the Consumer Price Index, the principal indicator of inflation. My bills are designed to accomplish this objective by raising those benefits when there is a 3-percent cost-of-living increase.

I am pleased to note that the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives have joined our efforts to achieve these goals. Enactment of my twin proposals is essential if we are to meet the needs of the aging.

Mr. Speaker, under my proposal the increased benefits will not necessitate an increase in taxes. Inflation brings with it increased wages. In turn, increased wages will naturally bring increased payments into social security and, additionally, the benefits paid represent a smaller proportion of an individual's wages as his wages approach the maximum limit—\$6,600. Therefore, because of these factors, there will be no increase in payroll deductions to finance my proposal.

I believe that my bills, if passed, will have an immediate and immensely beneficial impact on our senior citizens. Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support these bills. We need to act immediately if we are to meet the present needs

of our older Americans. There can be no matter of more extreme importance in this field.

JIM FARLEY AT 78

(Mr. JOELSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the body of the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, because of the admiration which we all feel for James A. Farley, I am sure my colleagues will enjoy reading the following article about him by Ernest Cuneo. It appeared in many papers, and was published by the Morning Call in the congressional district which I represent on May 31, 1966. It is good to know that "Jim" Farley is still going strong, and I am sure that we all wish him many more years of success and accomplishment.

The article follows:

NEW YORK.—Big Jim Farley was 78 years old yesterday. He celebrated with his usual 78-hour work week. Since his last birthday he has attended 125 dinners and 70 luncheons at many of which he was principal speaker.

He also traveled 60,000 miles by land, sea, and air, visiting 20 countries, including all European capitals, all Central American capitals, and the principal cities of Mexico. He reads the box scores of every major league ball game—without glasses—as part of his habit of reading at least four newspapers every day. He is 6 feet 3 inches tall, literally in the well-known pink, and his 205 pounds haven't varied in the last 20 years.

LOVE AFFAIR WITH A CITY

He has a most peculiar walk, one of very quick and very short steps. His towering figure seems to scoot through the New York winds, in spite of the fact that it is interrupted every 10 paces by some one who wants to shake his hand. Perhaps no man since Daniel Webster's Boston has so much received the adulation of a city. New Yorkers give him the respect accorded Al Smith and the affection bestowed on Jimmy Walker.

There is an astonishing simplicity about this most sophisticated of men. He still has the clean wholesomeness of the lanky country boy who played first base for the town team 60 years ago. He brought this same zest to politics. The Democratic Party was his team, and he gave it all he had.

From 8 every morning till 6 at night, he's in there pitching for his current team, Coca-Cola Export. He's head of it, but he puts on no airs. He calls himself a salesman, and sell he does.

Jim was the second of five boys. His father was a Hudson River schooner captain, sailing bricks down to New York City. He prospered. He bought two small brickyards. But just before Jim was 10, his father went out to harness the horse to go to a neighbor's funeral. The halter was long, the horse frisky. Suddenly wheeling, he kicked Captain Farley in the chest. He died that night.

Ellen Goldrick Farley, Jim's mother, would run neither a schooner nor brickyards. Captain Farley left no debts, small assets, sturdy bodies, an honorable name, and a great mother for his boys. Jim promised his mother he would never touch an alcoholic drink, and he never has. He doesn't smoke either. These are tremendous advantages for a man to bring to the hard-dealing games in the smoke-filled rooms of politics.

Jim wanted to be Town Clerk. An Irish-American Catholic Democrat stood as much chance in the rock-ribbed Republican town of Grassy Point then as Mao Tse-tung stands of being elected Governor of Utah now. But Jim took to the mails. Apparently Republicans like to receive letters because they

elected him. This started the most unbelievable romance in history between Jim Farley and the United States mails. He became Postmaster-General of the United States, then practically a concomitant of being chairman of the Democratic National Committee. He deserved it as its chief customer alone. Being at the head of the Post Office Department did not soothe his letter-writing propensities; it inflamed them. Following the 1932 campaign, he signed 22,000 first-name letters of thanks; in 1936, 27,000. And not when he got around to it; immediately. Within a week after election, there were 27,000 families in thousands of cities and villages proudly exhibiting the letters of thanks with the famous green-ink signature.

HOW TO SUCCEED

Farley, a boy who never graduated from high school, has 22 honorary degrees. He, with President Herbert Hoover, were the two distinguished members of both parties selected to reorganize the United States executive department. He has served on New York State's sacrosanct Banking Commission, and its Boxing Commission, and is currently on its Racing Commission. He can discuss as an expert whether foreign trade will expand (he thinks it will multiply) or whether Mickey Mantle is swinging too hard (he thinks he is).

About 10,000 letters will pour into his office this week. The whole world waved to Jim Farley on his birthday.

And Big Jim beams back. To him this is a great big wonderful world.

THE IRS AUDITORS' IMAGE

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the body of the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the auditors of the Internal Revenue Service often have been depicted as unreasonable, almost inhuman automatons, interested solely in squeezing every possible cent from taxpayers, regardless of how far they have to stretch the tax laws to do so. I believe it is fair to say that that impression has so grown that the average taxpayer who has not gone through the experience dreads the possibility that sometime he will be put through the auditing process. The Internal Revenue Service has done much to attempt to dispel the unfavorable image of its audits and auditors, by insisting that its auditors deal in all fairness with taxpayers. Nevertheless, instances continue to arise in which IRS auditors are accused of overzealousness, to the point of harassment.

The May 5, 1966, issue of the Reporter magazine contained an article entitled "The Tax Appeal Ordeal," in which the author, Mr. William R. Frye, detailed his experiences with IRS audit procedures. Perhaps the author fully summarized his feelings of what he had been through when he said it was "a miserable experience."

The article follows:

THE TAX-APPEAL ORDEAL (By William R. Frye)

Pity the poor taxpayer. He assembles his records, studies the instructions, wrestles with the forms, pays his tax—and then sits back to await doomsday. Doomsday, for him, is the day Form 3R73 arrives with this message: "Your above-described tax return or document for the year indicated has been assigned to the above-named Agent for examination. Please communicate with the Agent. . . ."

The possibility of being audited is the third dimension of the income-tax nightmare. Substantiating that office at home, finding that Washington hotel bill, proving that lunch was a business entertainment—these could be more difficult than making out the return itself. They could even be impossible.

Some sixty-six million personal income-tax returns were filed in fiscal 1965; 3,092,000—one in twenty, or just over five per cent—were "examined," as the Internal Revenue Service puts it. Deficiencies, or taxes due, were found in fifty-one per cent of the cases, producing \$1,063,000,000 in additional revenue; refunds were paid by the government fourteen per cent of the time, for a total of \$47,052,000. No change was made in thirty-five per cent of the returns. The average deficiency was just below \$700; the average refund just above \$100. Aside from gamblers and other special cases, only 1,216 of those who were examined (or 0.04 per cent) were prosecuted for fraud.

How many of the more than 1.5 million taxpayers who were made to pay additional tax really had short-changed the government, accidentally or intentionally? How many ran afoul of an IRS overzealer to maximize collections? The IRS feels sure it was practically always right (an understandable view), but many taxpayers are by no means sure.

I know how they feel. I have just been through the mill. Mine was one of the relatively rare cases—one in seven—where the taxpayer is found to have overpaid his tax. The return had been prepared for me while I was abroad and contained several major errors in the government's favor. I was due for a refund.

It was, nevertheless, a miserable experience. Day after day after exhausting day was taken up in minutely detailed, repetitive nit-picking. Accountants whom I told about the case said that they had never known an audit to be so detailed and prolonged. At the end of each session, I was assigned to prepare further data for the next visit—a task requiring long days and longer nights, sometimes running into weeks. (Everything involved had happened three years before.) My professional life was intermittently disrupted for more than seven months. The lost time was worth conservatively \$4,000 to \$5,000—and since I was self-employed, I had no way to cushion the loss. Moreover, legal and other fees ate up much of the refund.

The only comic relief was that each time I was ordered to dive deeper into the records, I came up with a new accounting error in the government's favor, and hence a larger potential refund. This was not what the agent had in mind. "How am I going to justify my time?" he asked. Finally, as a consequence of another of his probes, I discovered a \$1,500 reimbursement that had been reported, both as income and as a credit against expense. Whether by coincidence or not, the roof promptly fell in.

My agent (or his supervisor) re-opened the whole audit and disallowed deductions that previously had been fully substantiated. The law had not changed; the facts had not changed; nothing had, except that someone seemed to have decided that letting a taxpayer get back that much money would not look good at all on the report of such a prolonged audit.

I could appeal the ruling, first to a "conference"—a higher official of the IRS—and then, if necessary, to a still higher one, I could even go to tax court. But in the process, the additional time lost and the new legal fees incurred could more than wipe out any tax recovered. It seemed I would have to take the licking; either way, I would lose. After considerable additional dispute, the agent reconsidered and an appeal became unnecessary. But in my bitter moments, I felt my government had subjected me to a form of legalized extortion.

THE HIGH COST OF APPEALS

A spot check of accounting firms in the New York area suggests that thousands of taxpayers every year may have similar unpleasant experiences. Similar, that is, not in the denial of refunds that are due but in the levying of additional taxes which they consider unjustified but which they cannot recover economically through the normal appeal process. By comparison with the total number of returns filed, the number of these taxpayers may be small, but to the people concerned it is a serious matter.

Mr. S., a partner in a New York accounting firm that specializes in tax work (because of his continuing dealings with the IRS, he insisted on remaining anonymous), said he used to fight, on behalf of his clients, as many as fifty appeals at a time. But in virtually every case, once the appeal was over the client was so angry at the size of the accounting bill that, whatever the results of the appeal, Mr. S. would lose the account. So he made it a firm rule never to handle appeals. He now negotiates with the IRS agent as stoutly as possible the first time around, and then proposes to the client that he accept the outcome, favorable or otherwise. If the taxpayer wants to appeal, some other firm must take the case. His relationship to the client is then finished either way.

The effect of this policy is that in cases where Mr. S.'s advice is accepted, the government has been allowed virtually to dictate its terms to the taxpayer on the issues in dispute. If Mr. S. is right, many if not most appeals are too expensive to be practical. Other accountants are not quite so sweeping; but they say that unless at least \$1,500 to \$2,000 in tax is involved, the taxpayer can scarcely expect to break even from an appeal to "conference," even if he wins. Unless he feels qualified to handle it on his own, he must pay an accountant \$50 to \$200 a day, not merely during the conference itself but throughout a period of preparation. And the taxpayer's own time is also a factor. Still higher appeals, beyond the conference stage, are not considered economical unless something in the neighborhood of \$10,000 in taxes is involved. The IRS does not release figures on how many cases went to conference; but in 1965, 21,737 disputes (less than one per cent of the total) were handled at the appellate level, the next stage, and only 5,448 (roughly one quarter of one per cent) were disposed of by the tax courts. The money in question however, was in the hundreds of millions.

The man who decides to do without costly help is, in effect, throwing himself on the mercy of the IRS. Mr. C., a partner in a Connecticut consulting firm, was on the road five days a week, year round, returning home only for weekends. He naturally had a large travel and entertainment deduction. When the return was selected for audit, he could not take time off to attend personally; his "billing rate" (the rate at which clients were charged for his services) was \$250 a day, and he was fully booked. So he sent his wife to the tax auditor, armed with canceled checks and credit-card bills. The auditor contended there was not proof the travel was not personal, and disallowed the whole amount. The wife did not know how to protest persuasively. So the whole year's travel was lost.

This couple could have hired professional help, but did not. Many others cannot afford to. Few men making less than \$15,000 a year care to pay \$15 to \$50 an hour for an accountant, let alone \$25 to \$100 an hour for a lawyer. A return showing a \$4,000 income is not as likely to be examined as one showing \$400,000, but it can happen. The test, the IRS says, is not the size of the income but whether there is anything unusual about the return, anything that causes raised eyebrows. If the ax falls, the little men have no choice but to fend for themselves.

Why have American balance of payments and monetary policy had these bad results—so opposite to those for which any reasonable man would hope? The answer, I believe, is that there has been the same kind of open-ended commitment, the same kind of increasingly frozen position, and consequently, the same kind of escalation of effort, without characterized our policy in Vietnam. Reconsideration of purpose, that have Our commitment to total elimination of our payments deficit, our frozen position on the emergency balance-of-payments program, and our escalation of interest rates—all three require immediate reconsideration. In Vietnam our purpose must be peace—I hope it is, and I pray that this administration seeks peace—and our policies must be brought into line with that purpose. Just so, in the economic world, our purpose must be prosperity—and our policies must be rethought, refashioned, and reformulated to bring them into line, too. As our unprecedented military power must be used for world peace, so our unprecedented economic power today must be used for world prosperity.

STAKES IN VIETNAM

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Arizona Republic takes us to the heart of the Vietnamese situation in an editorial commenting on waves of public optimism and pessimism over the fighting in southeast Asia.

President Johnson and Secretaries Rusk and McNamara have put matters into perspective, the newspaper says, after an unduly optimistic impression sprang from the President's guarded news conference remarks early in July.

Whatever else, the Republic comments, Americans should realize that the fighting is going better for us than for the enemy, that a new element of stability has asserted itself in Saigon and that a campaign of economic and social reconstruction is progressing in South Vietnam.

The stakes are high, says the newspaper—high enough for patience and fortitude at home as well as courage and strength on the other side of the Pacific.

I wish to insert this editorial in the RECORD.

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

[From the Arizona Republic, July 14, 1966]
VIETNAM PENDULUM

President Johnson made an optimistic assessment of the Vietnam war in his July 4 interview on the ranch. He said "diplomatic reports" indicate the Communists "no longer expect a military victory." He felt the air raids on the oil depots near Hanoi and Haiphong had destroyed well over half of the enemy's reserves and equipment. "Success will be ours in Vietnam," he said.

If these guarded statements were parlayed into the general impression that Ho Chi Minh was hanging on the ropes and that his backers were likely to throw in the towel at any minute, that is unfortunate. For such is not the case.

This week, Secretary of Defense McNamara put matters into better perspective when he told a news conference he was "cau-

tiously optimistic," but said he saw no indications that the Communists were ready to go to the negotiating table. He indicated additional appropriations, above the present figure of \$1 billion a month, might be necessary, and other administration spokesmen have indicated the U.S. might have to beef up its troop commitment in Vietnam.

Secretary of State Rusk was equally realistic when he said, "One can be encouraged without believing the war is over." And then he added, "We are not over the hump yet. We haven't begun to see the end of this thing. There has not been the necessary decision on the other side."

The President, speaking to the American Alumni Council meeting at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., Tuesday said that peace "may be long in coming, but it is clearly on the way. And come it must."

If the average American gets impatient with alternate messages of optimism and pessimism, he must realize that no one can predict day-to-day developments on a battlefield. What Americans should realize is that the Vietnam war is going better for us than for the enemy, in a military sense, and that a new element of political stability seems to have asserted itself in Saigon. Only a few months ago, the Buddhists were burning themselves all over the place and the peace-niks were saying the U.S. could not possibly win. The pendulum may have swung too far the other way last week, but it has been righted this week.

In the meantime, if anyone has any doubt, the Vietnam war gives every appearance of being one of the decisive battlefields on which communism must be stopped. Just as communism was stopped in Greece and in Korea, it must be stopped in Vietnam or the future, not only of Southeast Asia, but of the whole free world, will be endangered.

Nor should Americans forget the other war, the campaign of reconstruction, that is being waged in Vietnam. Just as South Korea and Formosa have built up their economies to the "take-off point," at which economic aid is no longer needed, so can South Vietnam establish a viable economy. And when that is done, the siren call of communism will fall on deaf ears in South Vietnam and the international conspiracy will have suffered another great setback in its effort to subvert and conquer free countries everywhere.

The stakes are high—high enough to call for patience and fortitude on the part of those at home as well as courage and strength for those on the other side of the Pacific. This won't be the last battle between freedom and tyranny, but its importance can't be minimized.

BOMBINGS CLEAR AIR

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Copley newspapers detect a new feeling of pride and sense of purpose among the American people.

They suggest it dates from the day our planes bombed the oil storage facilities near Hanoi and Haiphong.

The newspaper organization agrees with President Johnson that we would rather reason than fight, but we never run from duty nor desert an ally. The air strikes served notice to the enemy that the price they may have to pay for aggression might not be to their liking. And they represent tactical action aimed at a quicker honorable peace in Vietnam.

I offer for the RECORD the Copley editorial as it appeared in the Elgin, Ill., Daily Courier-News.

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

BOMBINGS CLEAR AIR—NO OTHER CHOICE

There is a new feeling of pride and a sense of purpose among the people of the United States of America that can almost be felt tangibly.

It dates from the day when the United States Air Force and Navy carried the most telling blow of the war to the enemy in Viet Nam by bombing military targets at Hanoi and Haiphong.

The President is entirely correct in his assessment that American people "would rather reason than fight. We are using our power in Viet Nam because the Communists have given us no other choice."

He also is entirely correct in the statement that American people "when they understand what is at stake have never run from their duty . . . The American people have never left an ally in a fight."

Unfortunately, at times in the past the American public has been justifiably confused over the war in Viet Nam, not about goals but in tactics.

For too long the initiative has been given the enemy. Our responses were only to meet some new condition of battle he imposed. Important strategic targets such as the oil storage facilities that now have been severely damaged were untouched by our superior air might.

Equally confusing is the fact that some of our other allies who protest loudly at each countermove the United States made to an enemy tactic are themselves contributing substantially to prolongation of the war. Without the supplies they ship to North Viet Nam through the port of Haiphong, the war may have taken a far different turn some time ago. In other words, some of our allies have made our drastic action necessary.

From recent history Americans are aware that the only way to meet what the President calls "raw Communist pressure" is by looking it in the eye and making it unmistakably clear that we will not retreat.

It was this type of confrontation that made the Communist guerrillas retreat in Greece, it broke the blockade of Berlin, prevented Russian nuclear tipped long range missiles from being installed in Cuba and it worked in the Dominican Republic where a free election has been conducted.

It was understandable that the U.S. public might be confused why we were not applying the same pressures in air and naval superiority, as military leaders suggest.

Since the enemy has not shown any desire to reason or come to a peace table under any conditions, the price of the war to him must be made untenable.

The air strikes against oil storage and other strategic targets were a plain notice to the enemy that the price they might have to pay for the war might not be to their liking.

On a purely military level, the latest air strikes undoubtedly hampered the flow of supplies to the south and as a result saved many American lives by reducing the Viet Cong ability to wage war.

For these reasons, the long delayed air strikes are really tactical action for a quicker honorable peace in the embattled nation.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, August 1, 1966.

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

REDWOOD PARK A NATIONAL MUST

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have introduced S. 2962, to establish a Red-

rowers. Even subsidiaries of American corporations have been driven to finance their operations and investments in the narrow, divided financial markets of continental Europe. Every dollar that is not invested abroad today means a dollar that will not return as income on that investment tomorrow. Further, beginning in June 1965, there has been a breakout in international borrowing in Europe, with the lions' share being taken by the subsidiaries of American companies. Such international financings have more than doubled in the last 12 months. This rise—desirable in itself as it contributes to a growing ability of industrial Europe to finance its own expansion—has taken place haphazardly and recklessly. From February to May of this year, in fact, the European capital market broke down; no issues could be floated whatsoever. This forced-draft expansion, too, has involved a driving up of interest rates to levels rarely seen before. Moreover, much of the cash which has gone into the new European capital market has simply been taken out of New York for that purpose—thus, once again, offsetting the supposedly positive impact of the emergency program. The fact is that U.S. balance-of-payments policy, by placing a near-embargo on New York, has placed a in-supportable burden upon the free world's financial system. Here, the balance-of-payments policy of the United States is clearly self-defeating.

Finally, American balance-of-payments policy has struck at the underlying stability of the entire international monetary system. The compromise system formulated at Bretton Woods more than 20 years ago was based upon international cooperation. At its center was a twofold determination: the United States determined to supply the rest of the world with dollars for trade, investment, and reserve purposes; and the rest of the world determined to hold and use those dollars for these productive ends. Unilateral action by France and a range of other nations to cash in their dollars for gold has for some time threatened the second determination. And the U.S. reaction to the excessive dollar outflow of the 1958-63 period—a reaction embodied in the emergency program—now threatens the first determination. The indispensable basis for the mere operation of the present monetary system is disappearing more quickly than negotiations can proceed to reform that system. The fact is that a growing number of nations no longer desire to hold dollars—despite the clear need of their bankers and businessmen for dollars with which to do business—and the United States is just as desirous to prevent their getting more dollars.

The emergency program, and its subsequent extension to cover direct foreign investments by American corporations, was explicitly intended as a temporary expedient to eliminate the dollar drain and, thus, to gain bargaining power for the effort to reform the monetary system. What has been its real effect?

First. A temporary expedient has become ever more institutionalized.

Second. The immediate achievement of surplus in the summer of 1965 has been

superseded by a—once more—growing deficit; dollars spent to buy imports and to pay the dollar price of escalation in Vietnam have risen faster than the emergency program can cut down on productive dollar investments. A \$1.3 billion deficit in 1965 has become a 1966 payments deficit which is headed toward \$2.5 billion; no firm figure is possible as only the Defense Department planners can even estimate the further dollar cost of Vietnam escalation.

Third. The international negotiations on monetary reform have demonstrated clearly that there is no consensus either for the need or for the method of reform; they have demonstrated equally clearly that we cannot depend upon these negotiations to bail our bankrupt policy out before it bankrupts the world.

For, let us make no mistake about it, it is bankruptcy that threatens the free world. The unmistakable signs have been seen in Britain. After months of creeping, Government-sponsored deflation, after two full-scale, international rescue operations inspired, organized, and led by the United States—the only alternative to devaluation of the pound has been seen to be savage economic restrictions and the deliberate promotion of unemployment in Britain. In simple terms, the British Government has determined that its only hope for avoiding devaluation is to create unemployment. I point out parenthetically that this is the same policy that was followed in 1931.

This continuing, cruel British experience points up the bitter irony of American policy. On the one hand, the United States has—as I have said—inspired, organized, and led emergency rescue operations to save the pound by pumping dollars into British reserves. But, on the other hand, U.S. restraint on dollar outflows has created a condition of international tight money which has forced ever greater restrictiveness on Britain. It is clear, after all, that the fundamental problems in the British economy—an outmoded industrial plant, archaic union, and management practices—require massive new investment to solve.

Deflation, effective as it may or may not be in the short run to "save the pound," only at best puts off the day of reckoning with the critical need for modernization of plant, equipment, and attitudes. It has been American balance-of-payments policy which bears a share of the responsibility for this forced restraint. It is American economic policy in another field which has put a halt, for the time being at least, to Britain's modernization hopes. U.S. monetary policy, which has produced unprecedentedly high interest rates at home, here in the United States, has contributed to the international interest rate war and has helped provoke the current crisis in Britain.

Interest rates have been rising higher and higher in every financial center in the world. In good part, this reflects the deliberate tightening of credit by foreign central banks. But the movement toward tighter money in the majority of industrial countries, which began as separate, individual efforts to restrain do-

mestic expansion, has now become a crazy international competition at ever higher levels. Just as currency devaluation by one nation breeds competitive devaluations by others, so interest rate escalation in one financial center leads to competitive escalation in others. During the last 3 months alone, as U.S. rates have moved to historically high levels, four major foreign central banks—Germany, Belgium, Holland, and Britain—have increased their discount rates to meet this new competition.

The United States is not alone responsible for this destructive competition. But the international aspect and impact of higher U.S. interest rates is incomparably greater than that of any other nation's monetary policy. There is yet another irony here in American economic policy. Without question the United States is the most important single factor in determining the course of the free world's economy and finances. But international considerations are—in normal times, at least—far from the most important factors in determining U.S. economic policy. There is an old saw that when America sneezes, the rest of the world catches pneumonia. It is neither excuse nor consolation to say that we did not even know we were sneezing.

It is also no excuse or consolation to note that European central bankers seem happy with the financial situation. Their irresponsibility is no excuse for ours. When Germany, for example, deflates at a time of sound U.S. expansion and contribution to prosperity, Germany's restrictiveness is isolated before it hurts the prosperity of others. But today, German restrictiveness—which has, incidentally, sent short-term German interest rates up to 10 percent—is being aided, abetted, and internationalized by American policy.

There is no excuse again for American policy, in the fact that the run on the London money market has "at least" brought new funds to New York to offset the dollar outflow. For these funds are the notorious "hot money" which jumps from financial center to financial center at the drop—or rise—of an interest rate. In fact, it is this "hot money" which has again and again provoked the sterling crisis of the past 35 years. There is no consolation for American policy in making the United States, as well, today, a prisoner of hot money.

There is neither excuse nor consolation for American monetary policy in any aspect of the growing international financial and monetary anarchy. Internationally, as well as domestically, American monetary policy has proved disruptive where it has not actually been destructive, as the homebuilders demonstrated in their march on Washington yesterday. Domestically, American monetary policy has been destructive to the housing industry and disruptive to the savings industry. International American monetary policy has been destructive to Great Britain and disruptive to the whole complex system of international financial relations. This is consistency of a kind—and it is a kind that spells disaster.

5. Depletion allowance of 25 per cent on income received by nonoperators from gross royalties or rentals based on production.

6. Shareholders can deduct 20 per cent of their dividend income from companies that get at least 75 per cent of their earnings from mineral production.

7. Full deduction from producers' federal income tax of any provincial taxes against production.

8. Special 40 per cent, or \$4 per ounce—whichever is greater—depletion allowance for gold mines.

9. Ten-cents-per-ton subsidy for coal production.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, and now let me add that the passage by the Senate today of H.R. 4665 introduced by our able House colleague, Representative AL ULLMAN, of Oregon, a companion bill to S. 338 which I introduced is an important and gratifying first step in the direction of encouraging mining as Canada has done.

My bill was favored by a number of distinguished cosponsors who were my colleagues Senators BOB BARTLETT of Alaska, ALLOTT of Colorado, BENNETT of Utah, BIBLE of Nevada, CANNON of Nevada, CHURCH of Idaho, DOMINICK of Colorado, HART of Michigan, JACKSON of Washington, JORDAN of Idaho, LONG of Missouri, MCGOVERN of South Dakota, METCALF of Montana, MONTOYA of New Mexico, MOSS of Utah, MUNDT of South Dakota, RANDOLPH of West Virginia and SIMPSON of Wyoming. The strong support of these able colleagues has been invaluable in achieving the result today of enactment of this important legislation to aid the American mining industry.

The amendment of Senator SMATHERS which increased the flexibility of the measure is a very useful contribution and a provision I am happy to have seen adopted.

In the work which has been done to obtain passage of H.R. 4665 our able and distinguished colleague from Montana, Senator METCALF, has been invaluable. His energetic and constructive assistance represents a major contribution to the welfare of the mining industry and one for which I am very grateful.

SUMMIT MEETING WITH DE GAULLE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, this week's issue of Newsweek suggests that some diplomats, in both Washington and Paris, see a good chance for a meeting in September between President de Gaulle and President Johnson. President De Gaulle has planned a trip around the world, stopping in southeast Asia to visit Cambodia, and according to Newsweek, has scheduled a 48-hour stop on the French Caribbean island of Guadeloupe on his way back from the Pacific.

As Senators know, I visited Europe in early May. In a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations, entitled "Europe Today," I made a number of recommendations. One of them was that effective communications must be restored between the French and American Governments. I suggested, in this connection, a

summit meeting between the two Presidents, if feasible.

President de Gaulle's stop in Guadeloupe seems to me to offer an ideal opportunity for these two statesmen to meet, if not at Guadeloupe then perhaps in Puerto Rico. Surely, our differences should not stand in the way of such a meeting. On the contrary, a discussion of these differences should contribute to improving understanding between the two countries.

I hope that the President will give serious consideration to meeting with De Gaulle.

THE DANGER OF EMPIRE IN ASIA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the course of the war in Vietnam has begun to generate an uneasiness that we may be slipping unawares into the role of a colonial power in Asia. A recent editorial in the July 12 edition of the Lewiston, Idaho, Morning Tribune raises a clear alarm over this possibility. Quoting two widely respected foreign correspondents, the editorial concludes with the following warning:

Two American presidents have said this must never be permitted to become an American war. It not only has become an American war, but South Vietnam has become an American enclave and Southeast Asia has become a bog from which we will have a most difficult time escaping. The possibility of empire by accident is by no means remote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial from which I have quoted, entitled "The Danger of Empire in Asia," published in the Lewiston, Idaho, Morning Tribune of July 12, 1966.

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

THE DANGER OF EMPIRE IN ASIA

Is the United States in danger of stumbling into empire in Asia? C. L. Sulzberger, the foreign affairs columnist of *The New York Times*, thinks so, and a reporter's conversation with some military officers bears him out.

Sulzberger pointed out in a recent column that the United States has plowed millions of dollars into Southeast Asia in the form of harbor developments, roads and military bases. He believes the temptation may be great, once the shooting war ends, to seek to protect these enormous investments by maintaining a strong American presence there. This would create the danger "that the United States might unconsciously create an empire in Southeast Asia. At whatever cost we must avoid any absent-minded imperialism that would not only contradict America's national philosophy but could lead to nothing but trouble."

One can scarcely argue with Sulzberger's point of view. Yet there are ominous signs that some military men on the scene are not daunted by the prospects of empire. Richard A. Dudman, a roving correspondent of *The St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, is writing a series of reports from Saigon. American officers in South Viet Nam, he writes, are now speaking in terms of 400,000 U.S. troops in Southeast Asia by the end of this year and possibly 600,000 by the end of 1967. "Some speak seriously of needing a total American buildup of 1-million men." Dudman adds:

"Carried to its logical conclusion, the Americanization of the war could conceivably lead to a complete American takeover of

South Viet Nam. A widely respected American commander advocates this course privately in so many words.

"We should occupy and rule this country," he says, "instead of pretending to respect the sovereignty of a government that really is only temporary and illegal and could change tomorrow. It would be more efficient, and probably the end result would be better if we abandoned the idea of assistance and pacification and settled for subjugation, regarding South Viet Nam as an enemy country..."

Two American presidents have said this must never be permitted to become an American war. It not only has become an American war, but South Viet Nam has become an American enclave and Southeast Asia has become a bog from which we will have a most difficult time escaping. The possibility of empire by accident is by no means remote.—L. H.

EDITORIALS COMMEND SENATORS BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA, ERVIN, AND DIRKSEN

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials entitled "Byrd Sparks U.S. Promise of Aid To End Race Riots" and "Would Lift Confession Bar," published in the *Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser* of July 26, 1966, and an editorial entitled "Congratulations to Senator DIRKSEN," published in the *Chicago Tribune* of July 18, 1966.

In connection with the latter editorial, the concluding sentence, I believe, is very pertinent:

For his successful leadership Senator DIRKSEN deserves the thanks and congratulations of the American people.

I certainly subscribe to that sentiment.

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

[From the *Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser*, July 26, 1966]

BYRD SPARKS U.S. PROMISE OF AID TO END RACE RIOTS

Law-abiding Negroes and responsible civil rights workers as well as other conscientious citizens will welcome the federal government's promise of assistance to cities harassed by race riots.

The announcement of federal aid was made by Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach in response to a letter by Sen. ROBERT C. BYRD (D-W. Va.) to President Johnson urging him to use the power and prestige of his office to stop the outbreaks of "lawless and provocative demonstrations."

Sen. BYRD's letter declared "There is no rational justification for tolerating these incredible attacks on firemen, policemen and innocent victims."

In calling the President's attention to the responsibility of the federal government to discourage outbreaks of lawlessness, Sen. BYRD was serving the cause of law-abiding Negroes as well as the public generally.

His statement that continued violence would set back the cause of civil rights was substantiated in part by the announcement from New York that extremism was sharply cutting contributions to the more militant organizations.

There are also indications in Congress that riots are causing reluctance to enact the administration's civil rights measure now pending.

Much of the money for civil rights efforts has come from northern liberals. In spite of this some of the militant individuals and

Minerals: Canada's diversified mineral industry is pacing the world in growth rate. Output has tripled in value since 1950 and is expected to approach the 4-billion-dollar mark this year as Canada—

Leads the world in nickel, zinc and asbestos production.

Ranks second after the U.S. in total output of uranium and of molybdenum, a vital additive in steel manufacturing.

Keeps its place as the world's third biggest producer of aluminum.

Stands fourth in output of lead, fifth in copper and iron ore, and sixth in production of potash. Canada ranks ninth in output of oil and gas.

The future, to Canadian geologists and mining men, is even more exciting than the feverish present. The potential of Canada's mineral wealth is awesome. The rush to measure it and bring it out of the ground is turning the country into the world's biggest mining camp.

Ores: Two big iron-ore bodies, far to the north, are getting attention.

One is on Baffin Island, almost 300 miles beyond the Arctic Circle. There, Baffinland Iron Mines has mapped more than 127 million tons of high-grade ore that can be shipped directly to mills without upgrading.

In the Yukon, Crest Exploration, Ltd., a subsidiary of Standard Oil of California, has located an estimated 11 billion tons of medium-grade ore. The deposits are near the Snake River, close to the boundary between the Yukon and the Northwest Territories. A rail line nearly 600 miles long would be needed to haul the ore to tide-water at Skagway, Alaska, but an existing narrow gauge road, the White Pass & Yukon, might serve as the final leg, from Whitehorse, Yukon Territory, to Skagway.

The search for nickel, too, is moving northward. A belt of mineralized rock cutting across the Ungava Peninsula in northern Quebec is believed to hold rich nickel deposits. Canada now produces 80 per cent of the world's nickel, mostly from mines in Ontario and Manitoba.

Metals locked together: Canada's booming base-metals industry feeds chiefly from ore bodies that produce more than one metal.

The big nickel deposits in Ontario and Manitoba also are major producers of copper concentrates. Zinc, lead and copper—often with silver included—are found linked in various combinations in the mineralized rock that is found throughout Canada.

Spurred by a worldwide shortage and high prices, the search for copper deposits now is centering in the mountains of British Columbia and the Yukon.

Several copper mines in Western Canada already in production are being expanded, and a number of new bodies of ore are being developed to meet Japanese requirements. Production from a deposit found on an island in remote Babine Lake in northern British Columbia is to start this year at a 5,000-ton-a-day rate.

Potash success story: Within the last four years, Canada has emerged as a major producer of potash—an ingredient in much of the world's fertilizer.

Thick beds of potash were found far underground in Saskatchewan by oil drillers. During 1965, three companies were in production, two others were sinking shafts or wells, and three more had announced major potash projects.

Production in 1965 totaled 1.3 million tons of refined potash, either by mining or by a process using wells to pump dissolved potash to the surface.

By 1970, it is estimated, 750 million dollars will have been invested in developing Saskatchewan's potash beds, and Canada will be producing 7 million tons of potash, enough to make it the world's largest supplier. Recoverable potash in vast Saskatchewan beds

has been estimated at 60 billion short tons, about half the world's known supply.

Asbestos is another giant Canadian industry. Asbestos Corporation, Ltd., a major producer with large mines in Quebec, is spending 50 million to develop a large deposit at Asbestos Hill, 1,100 miles north of Montreal.

The mine is expected to be turning out 100,000 tons of asbestos fiber a year in 1970. It will be shipped to plants in Canada, Britain and the U.S. from Deception Bay, on Hudson Strait, during the short ice-free season there.

Uranium marks time: Canada has the biggest known reserves of uranium—an estimated 200,000 tons producible at \$5 to \$10 a pound. Even under current conditions of relative depression in the uranium market, Canadian production is second only to that in the U.S.

Most mines in the major producing areas—Beaverlodge, Sask.; Elliot Lake and Bancroft, Ont.—are shut down or operating only part time.

Rising world demand, however, is expected to revive the uranium-mining industry in the 1970s. Stockpiling by the Canadian Government is helping to keep the mines functioning.

Forests: Canada leads the world in newsprint production, ranks second in the production of wood pulp for other paper products and fourth in output of lumber and plywood.

Exports of Canadian forest products total nearly 2 billion dollars. New mills are being built all across Canada to meet the growing demand for newsprint and other paper goods.

Currently, Canadian timber workers cut an estimated 3 billion feet of wood annually. Experts say the forests of the country could sustain an annual yield of 12 billion cubic feet under intensive management.

Oil and gas: Vast quantities of oil and natural gas in Canada's sedimentary rock provide one of the best guarantees of future prosperity.

"As far down the road as we can see," says a geologist-executive of the oil industry, "Canada will have oil for world markets."

Present known reserves are set at 7.7 billion barrels of oil, enough for 23 years of production at the present rate, and 44.4 trillion cubic feet of gas, a 35-year supply. These are the proven reserves of fields that have been in production for some time.

There are new discoveries in northern Alberta and northeastern British Columbia that soon will send the official estimates of reserves soaring.

It is believed that more than a million cubic miles of sedimentary rock, of the type that bears oil and gas, lies under Canada's northern regions.

On the basis of the North American average of production per cubic mile, the oil potential of the Yukon Territory is set at 3 billion barrels of the Northwest Territories at 13 billion barrels and of the Canadian Arctic islands at 33 billion barrels.

Oil from sand: Oil-impregnated sands lie close to the surface under several hundred square miles of wilderness along the Athabaska River in northern Alberta. This "tar sand" can be mined by strip-mining processes.

Production is to begin next year on a limited basis. Great Canadian Oil Sands Ltd., a subsidiary of Sun Oil Company, is rushing a 230-million-dollar plant and pipeline system into completion.

Early next year, the firm will start pumping 45,000 barrels of oil a day through its 266-mile pipeline.

Water: Canada now produces 22 million kilowatts of hydroelectric power. All of it, plus 7 million kilowatts produced by thermal-electric plants, is used by Canada's own booming industrial machine.

Giant new projects are under way in Que-

bec, British Columbia and Manitoba. All told, U.S. power authorities believe, 7 million kilowatts of new hydroelectric power will be available for export to the U.S. within the next decade.

Electric power in Canada is now a billion-dollar business. But much of the value of the country's hydroelectric resources shows up in the form of exports. Canada's position as the third-biggest producer of aluminum, for instance, is due to its plentiful supply of hydroelectric power.

Canadians are beginning to view their almost limitless flows of fresh water as a valuable source of export dollars.

Arthur Laing, Minister of Northern Affairs, sees water "as one of the prime resources of the Yukon—one which I predict in the future will be of equal, if not greater, importance than the mining industry."

Two plans are being pushed in the U.S. to make use of the waters of the Yukon River—the Rampart Dam proposal in north-central Alaska and the North American Water Alliance proposal.

The latter is a plan advanced by private engineering interest with support from some western members of Congress. It would divert Alaskan and Yukon water southward through a network of waterways reaching into Mexico and across the plains to the Great Lakes.

The U.S. stake: In the race now going on to develop the resources of Canada, the biggest spenders are American firms or their Canadian subsidiaries.

Foreign corporations, mostly from the U.S., already own or control more than half of Canada's industry. American-owned firms dominate the oil and gas fields and their pipelines. Nearly 60 per cent of Canada's mineral production belongs to outsiders.

One Canadian leader who welcomes even more American investment is Premier W. Ross Thatcher of Saskatchewan, who has this to say:

"In the last several years, American capital has been responsible for a dramatic transformation of Saskatchewan from an impoverished 'have not' province to its present position as one of the most prosperous. . . ."

U.S. companies are spending heavily in the search for oil and gas, in developing Saskatchewan's rich potash beds, and in creating a pulp and paper industry in the Province.

"Had our doors been even partially closed to America's capital," Mr. Thatcher says, "we would still be one of Canada's backward Provinces. The Government of Saskatchewan, in the months ahead, intends to take every practical or feasible step to attract additional American investment."

National policy toward foreign investment in Canadian resources, and ownership of those resources, may change in the future.

But meanwhile in Canada, with the help of U.S. dollars, the biggest development boom of modern times is under way.

[From U.S. News & World Report, July 25, 1966]

A HELPING HAND—TAX INCENTIVES

Here are the ways Canada encourages mineral development:

1. A full write-off of exploration, drilling and excavation costs in connection with the search for minerals.

2. Any company with income from mineral production can write off its off-property exploration costs against its mineral income. New syndicates for mineral exploration can write off cost against future mineral income, with unlimited carry-forward privileges.

3. Income from production of new mines is exempt from income tax for three years.

4. Depletion allowance of 33½ per cent for most types of oil, gas, prime-metal and industrial-minerals operations on net income.

ation and are motivated by the highest principles in our religious heritage, what can we expect of our future leaders?

Freedom of religious expression is a basic human right. Many of the original Colonies were founded upon religious liberty. Jefferson's "wall" between church and state should remain intact, but the religious principles upon which this country was founded must not be discarded nor replaced by godless doctrines in our public schools.

J. E. Kennedy Retires From Customs Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE D. LONG
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, after more than 42 years of outstanding customs work in Baltimore, Mr. J. Eugene Kennedy retired from his post as District Director of Customs. Baltimore is one of the busiest and most important port cities in the United States, and efficient and reliable customs workers like Mr. Kennedy have contributed to Baltimore's current status as a port city. The Havre de Grace Record of July 14, 1966, summarized Mr. Kennedy's accomplishments in his long career, and I should like to bring this article to the attention of my colleagues:

J. E. KENNEDY RETIRES FROM CUSTOMS POST

Mr. J. Eugene Kennedy, district director of customs, retired on his birthday last Thursday after more than 42 years of customs work in Baltimore. A native of Havre de Grace, he has been dubbed "Mr. Customs" and "the fount of all knowledge" regarding collection problems along the entire East Coast.

In an interview with the Record on Monday, Mr. Kennedy was enthusiastic about the full life he anticipates in the future as he maintains an interest in a warehouse business he helped to found, plays the piano for his "own amazement" and files the mementos of the past fruitful years.

Mr. Kennedy was honored at a gathering of some 300 persons last Thursday night including many co-workers, the city's Congressional delegation—Representatives FALLON, GARMATZ, and FRIEDEL, and Thomas J. D'Alessandro, 3rd, president of the Baltimore City Council and acting mayor.

In paying tribute to Mr. Kennedy, the speakers praised him for helping to build Baltimore to its present status as a port city. One recalled when he entered the customs service in 1924 as a clerk-stenographer—"a freckle faced boy with bushy red hair". Present indications are that the hair has given way to forehead.

The Bureau of Customs' highest award was presented Mr. Kennedy, the Honor Award, making him the tenth man ever to receive it. He has also received the Treasury Department's Gallatin Award for distinguished service. Mr. D'Alessandro presented him the city's "Outstanding Citizenship" award.

The Kennedy family, not to be confused with the Cape Cod Kennedys, the retiree hastened to point out, consists of his wife, the former Agnes Eustace of Aberdeen and four children: John E. Jr., 25, a graduate of Cornell now with the IBM Company; Ann Carey, 24 a graduate of Notre Dame Preparatory School and Villa Julie Junior College, now employed as an investigative aide for the House Public Works Committee of which

Rep. FALLON is chairman; James E., 20, a student at Cornell in the field of Metallurgical engineering and Joseph Robert, 18, a recent graduate of Boys Latin School.

Mr. Kennedy is an accomplished pianist and studied for a number of years at Peabody Conservatory of Music. Long time residents remember with pleasure several concerts he gave in Havre de Grace many years ago.

Treatment of Americans Captured by the North Vietnamese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Wednesday, July 27, 1966, the Augusta Chronicle, Augusta, Ga., published an editorial entitled "The Mark of the Beast." The editorial concerns itself with the treatment of American fliers captured by the North Vietnamese and reports of executions by beheading. It also takes note of the barbaric actions of the Communists who have been shooting our wounded on the field of battle. This entire area is a most serious problem and demands immediate and affirmative attention. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

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

THE MARK OF THE BEAST

A group of American fliers captured by the North Vietnamese after being shot down will not be tried as "war criminals"—yet, at least. That's the word relayed to our government through diplomatic channels.

President Ho Chi Minh is quoted by a Czech news agency as stating, in Hanoi, that North Viet Nam in this decision has behaved in a humane manner. No doubt, around the world, advocates of a free hand for the Communists in South Viet Nam will parrot this claim, and use it as ammunition for new attacks against resistance to aggression.

If a humane element is involved, it is sheer coincidence. Humaneness is not communism's way. Ask refugees from the Baltic states, from Hungary, from Tibet. The deciding factor in the decision with regard to the fliers is propaganda value. By this means, the friends of communism around the world are permitted to compare the "humane" Ho with the "ruthless" Johnson, who is ordering barbarous attacks on a Viet Cong which wants only a peaceful, democratic dialogue with the obstinate South Vietnamese who erroneously think freedom is good for them.

Even as the message on rejection of a "trial" was being evaluated in Washington, North Vietnamese regular army units illegally in South Viet Nam were overrunning an American unit. The Americans had been forced by heavy attack to withdraw without even an opportunity to evacuate their wounded. A survivor said the advancing North Vietnamese fired bullets into the heads of any wounded Americans who moved, killing at least six and then looting the bodies of any valuables.

At the same time, an American Navy airman who had escaped from a North Vietnamese prisoner of war camp was telling of the fate of a fellow-escapee who was captured by pursuing North Vietnamese. As the survivors hid and looked on, the "hu-

mane" Communists summarily beheaded the American they had caught.

These men, wounded on the battlefield or fleeing a prison camp, were beyond combat status. They were defenseless, and by all the rules of civilized conduct were prisoners. By the vicious and barbarous way in which they were done to death, they join many thousands of others in South Viet Nam who have suffered hideous deaths at the hands of Communists. They share the fate of village chiefs and their families tortured to death to intimidate the villages. They share the fate of civilians in Saigon who have been callously bombed into oblivion by the Viet Cong who—we are told in some quarters—simply are seeking their rights.

Regardless of who is spared from a trumped-up "war crimes" trial in the prison camps of North Viet Nam, these men were given not even the benefit of mock trials. They were simply slaughtered by Communists acting like Communists.

Such incidents mark the character of the forces under Ho who will be enabled to perpetrate more of the same kind of atrocities if we can just be persuaded to cease oil depot bombing, and let more of the killers move south. They mark the foreseeable action of future waves of invaders if we will just "de-escalate," or withdraw our forces and let Ho's horror sweep over the South Vietnamese countryside.

Such incidents place the mark of the beast also on the Soviet Union, which is supposedly a peace-loving member of the United Nations, and on Red China, for which many persons in a soft-on-communism bloc are trying to win UN membership. Russia's active participation in aggression by sending weapons and munitions to Hanoi, and Peking's vociferous moral support and threats of intervention brand them as being unworthy of associating in the society of civilized nations.

Colorado River Project—Address by Hon. Barry Goldwater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 27, former Senator Barry Goldwater addressed the National Press Club on one of his favorite subjects—the Colorado River project. Senator Goldwater particularly addressed himself to the false impressions given by preservationist groups as to the effect Marble and Hualapai Dams would have on the Grand Canyon. Since the Senators knows the canyon like he knows his own Arizona patio, his remarks are particularly well-informed and persuasive, and I include them herewith:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY HON. BARRY GOLDWATER TO THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., WEDNESDAY, JULY 27, 1966

Mr. President, friends of the Press, I trust you'll forgive me today if I appear before you in a slightly different role from the one in which I have appeared here on so many occasions in the past. For once, I am not going to exhort you about politics or my views on the state of international affairs or the problems we are encountering on the domestic front. I have no doubt that some of you will get at these matters when the question period is held. But, in the meantime, you

Appendix

Grand Canyon Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, a timely defense of the Grand Canyon was presented by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable HENRY S. REUSS, in his letter to the Washington Post of July 25, 1966.

As Congressman REUSS points out:

If Congress acts wisely, Arizona can have water and America can continue to have the Grand Canyon as nature made it.

This analysis speaks directly and perceptively to the problem and I include it for my colleagues' consideration:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 25, 1966]

GRAND CANYON THREAT

Your editorial on the "Colorado River Issue" seems to pose a false alternative: shall "vital" additional water be supplied to Arizona or shall we avoid any "further obstruction of the picturesque Colorado," which is a highly euphemistic way of describing the huge dams proposed at Bridge and Marble Canyons in the Grand Canyon.

In fact, the two dams are not necessary for the physical diversion of water from the Colorado into Arizona. The water impoundments created by the dams would make available less water (because of evaporation), not more, for Arizona's farms, industries, and people.

The purpose of the dams is to finance the project through the sale of electricity. Yet other means of provided needed electric power and of financing the water supply project are possible and economically advantageous. Thus if Congress acts wisely, Arizona can have water and America can continue to have the Grand Canyon as nature made it.

"Any grave encroachment upon the Grand Canyon National Park itself would be unthinkable," the editorial says. But unless America is willing to give up its far-sighted commitment to the preservation of wilderness areas and of its irreplaceable natural wonders, the entire Grand Canyon—all 280 miles of it—should be saved and protected as a great national asset.

It is no less unthinkable to destroy the parts of the Grand Canyon outside the 105-mile-long Park than it would be to "encroach" upon the Park. It is not the legal entity that is the Park but the unique ecological entity that is the Canyon which needs protection.

And it would be, to use the editorial's words, "plain nonsense" to speak of these dams as making minor changes in the Grand Canyon. They would turn 132 miles of the river into unneeded storage reservoirs. They would put such scenes of beauty as Redwall Cavern under 280 feet of water. Their reservoirs would cover beaches and sandbars, wipe out the habitat of wildlife and plants and inundate the geological records of millions of years.

The goal is to supply water so that Arizona can continue to enjoy one of the highest

population growth rates in the Nation. As a Congressman who is concerned with the development of all America, I am ready to vote taxpayers' money to help Arizona get more water—but not to alter 132 of the 280 miles of one of the world's great natural wonders.

HENRY S. REUSS,
Representative from Wisconsin.
WASHINGTON.

Our Religious Heritage Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the National Congress of the Sons of the American Revolution recently conducted an oratorical contest for high school boys.

Many excellent speeches were delivered by the 15 competing boys and one, by Anthony Gilbert Mitchell, 130 Goodrich Avenue, Lexington, Ky., entitled "Our Religious Heritage Threatened," in my opinion, merits the attention of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

OUR RELIGIOUS HERITAGE THREATENED

(By Anthony Gilbert Mitchell)

In June of 1963, by an 8 to 1 decision, the United States Supreme Court declared that it was unconstitutional to recite the Lord's Prayer and to conduct devotional Bible readings in public schools. The High Court based its decision on the first part of the First Amendment of the Constitution.

The pre-Revolutionary principle of separation of Church and State has today evolved into a separation of religion and state, especially in our public systems. Thomas Jefferson originated the idea of the "wall" between church and state to keep the two institutions from overlapping or unifying. Through his efforts, the writers of the Constitution stated that: "Congress shall make no law representing an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. . ."

It was Jefferson's desire to prevent any denomination or religious sect in the United States from becoming a ruling sect. Fresh in the minds of the Framers of the Constitution was the religious persecution conducted by the Church of England. It had become not only a spiritual ruler of its people, but also a governmental ruler in civil affairs.

In Jefferson's attempt to separate Church and State, did he mean to build his "wall" between Religion and State? The founders of this nation were just as concerned with the practice of religion within the state as they were with the separation of Church and State. They placed "In God We Trust" on our coins as a symbol of that conviction. Very early in our history we were called a

"Christian Nation", and we honored that commitment to religious beliefs by observing the Sabbath as a Holy day and as a day of rest. Our national pledge professes that we are a "Nation under God" but in our public schools, Jefferson's separation has led to an attempt to delete religious principles and acknowledgement of God.

The Ten Commandments have been declared undesirable instructional material by the Board of Education in New Hyde Park, Long Island. The Ten Commandments have been banned likewise in public schools in New Jersey. This ban is rather ironical in view of the fact that all of the moral laws that exist in civilized nations today are derived directly or indirectly from the Ten Commandments.

Public school teachers in the various fifty states of the Union may and should teach about the gods of Greece, the gods of Rome, and the gods of Egypt, but they may not teach about the one true God. Why? Because this is religion. Last year in my class in United States History, we spent six weeks studying Communist doctrine, but no time was allotted to the teachings of the Master Teacher.

Our American forefathers never dreamed of education without religion. Horace Mann, the father of tax-supported "public schools", strongly believed that the Bible should be a basic part of a child's education. McGuffey's Reader was also oriented in this direction.

Education without God is like an engine without a governor. "Without religious motive" says Wyatt Brown, "Education is adding power to irresponsibility." Theodore Roosevelt said, "Mere education, without divine guidance, is like giving a gun to an irresponsible man."

One of the most heart rending occurrences of this century took place in Russia in the mid-winter of 1962-63. A group of Russian Baptists walked over 2000 miles in freezing cold to the American Embassy in Moscow and begged permission to come to America. Their plea was not only refused, but they were turned over to the Russian police. The conscience of the entire Free World was outraged by the brutal treatment these people received after their fantastic journey and presentation of their humble request.

The main reason they gave for wanting to come to America was that their children would not have to attend Russian schools any longer and be taught by atheists. If these pathetic people had been allowed to come to "Christian America" they would have found some shocking things here that are almost identical to those in Russia.

In 1964, Mrs. Madalyn Murray, an atheist, carried her case to the Supreme Court to contest prayers in the public schools. The Court declared prayers unconstitutional, and then Mrs. Murray faded out of the national picture. Many people have asked, "What has happened to this woman who has tried so hard to take God out of America?" She lost favor in her own hometown and she was publicly banned from several other cities including Boston. Shortly after her escapade in the Supreme Court, her husband divorced her and her oldest son was sentenced to serve time in the penitentiary. But, "old soldiers never die," and Mrs. Murray is presently trying to erase the "Nation under God" from our Pledge of Allegiance. Is this not an example of the insidious ways of those who dare to abolish God?

As the schools go, so goes the nation. Unless our young people receive a strong edu-

A3999

July 29, 1966

unless Japan willing to extend substantial long-term credit. Another factor—to what extent China operates on a pragmatic basis without trade as a wedge—would influence volume of trade.

Question (JOHN A. ROWE, Jr.). Chinese experts going to Taiwan—are they government employees?

Answer. Movement of specialists and researchers was in late 1940's. Went to Taiwan especially because of U.S./Chinese agricultural cooperation programs.

Question (ROY P. NEWELL). Will Communist China ever kow-tow to non-Communists?

Answer. Most unlikely.

Question (PAUL HEYNEMAN). Comment on position of overseas Chinese as to loyalty toward mainland?

Answer. Since World War II, quite a change in attitudes toward host countries. Greater movement toward local integration. Will tend to go to winning side.

Question (D. S. RIGGS). Is Red China, in reality, capable of processing her natural resources enough to make her massive manpower effective militarily?

Answer. Depends on nature of warfare. If guerrilla warfare, there would be little problem in supporting "wars of national liberation." If conventional warfare on a large scale—could be sustained only for short periods. In order to do so they'd have to modernize, which they could not do without Russian aid. If nuclear—there is a capability. While such development would affect economic growth, it wouldn't be immediately apparent. There'd be no serious constraint if skilled manpower available.

Question. How full and accurate information out of Red China?

Answer. Can get considerable information on an open basis. There are gaps but we do have great deal. All there for interested parties. Doubt we could get much more by sending correspondents to China.

Legislation To Assist Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF
HON. KEN W. DYAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, those Members of the Congress who have been concerned over the problems of our American Indians will be interested in the editorial which recently appeared in the San Bernardino Daily Sun:

LEGISLATION TO ASSIST INDIANS

The American Indian, who seemingly has been bypassed in this age of technology, stands to benefit in new Department of Interior legislation being prepared on Indians. In fact, the new legislation is deemed the most important in 30 years.

The legislation's key provision, if approved, will alter the tribal trusteeship laws. The Department of Interior desires the tribes to be able to enter into partnership with private firms in utilizing natural resources on tribal land. Instead of leasing the land, as has been past practice, the tribes would mortgage it for industrial development. The Indians, in the process, would be trained to participate in management and be employed on jobs created by the industry.

There is, however, considerable convincing to be done before such legislation runs the congressional gauntlet. Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall must convince Congress to allow the mortgages and private industry to take part in the development.

Robert LaF. Bennett, new Indian Bureau commissioner, must persuade the Indian tribes that their risk will be no greater than an average citizen would take in mortgaging his home. Of the two, Bennett's assignment will be the most difficult.

Regardless of the new legislation's outcome, it is good news to learn that the American Indians' miserable plight at last is coming to the fore. This nation has poured billions of dollars into the foreign-aid trough supposedly to assist struggling countries to resist international communism.

Little has been done to improve the economic and social lot of the American Indian who indeed was the real victim in the birth and development of the United States. In our opinion, the remaining Indian tribes deserve a fair share of the political and economic rights which belong to all citizens in this constitutional government.

Honolulu Star-Bulletin Editorial: Communists Are on Trial, Too, in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, if we are to make a realistic approach to the situation in Vietnam, we must realize that communism too is on trial in Vietnam, not democracy alone. This thought-provoking suggestion is made in an editorial of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of July 20, 1966. In the hope that this editorial will stimulate thinking toward seeking new approaches to a peaceful settlement of the war in Vietnam, I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THEY ARE ON TRIAL, TOO

In almost every public discussion of our Viet Nam policy, the point is made that we are, in effect, on trial before the world. That is, we have made commitments; if we walk out on them, what ally of the future will depend on us, who will trust us?

It is a good point, and one not to be disregarded. It should not be overriding, preserved at the cost of all else. But whether on the score of national honor or sheer practicality it must always be considered.

The trouble is that hardly any of those who make the point ever bother to turn the coin. If they would they would see that our adversaries are bound to the struggle in Viet Nam in the same manner that we are, and probably to an even greater degree.

Communism is a relatively new concept in the world. Next year will be only the 50th anniversary of the Russian revolution. In another 11 years—in 1976—American democracy will be 200 years old.

The idea of a free society, and the free enterprise system that has developed from it, is in a much stronger position for maneuver than is fledgling communism. We could cash in our chips and walk out of Viet Nam tomorrow and it would not destroy us. We do not choose to do so, but we do have a choice of alternatives.

The Communists haven't such a choice, seen from their point of view. Their experiment is too young, and it has lost too much ground recently, to admit another defeat in Viet Nam. Even the Russians, who would like to suspend temporal adventures and bank on a future in Space, will not stand by and see North Viet Nam defeated. There is too much at stake.

Earlier this week the Russians stepped down hard on an attempt by Prime Minister Harold Wilson of Great Britain to open an avenue to a negotiated peace. The Russians told Wilson in advance his visit would be useless, and confirmed this when he arrived in Moscow.

They supported completely Hanoi's conditions for negotiation, the first of which is removal of all American forces from South Viet Nam. This condition is, of course, unacceptable to us; but the Russians knew it was unacceptable when they endorsed it.

We ought not to deceive ourselves either as to (1) the willingness of the Communists to fight in Viet Nam or (2) the pressures which compel them to fight. We tell ourselves that we are on trial in Viet Nam. They tell themselves the same thing, and, indeed, they are.

The Redwoods: A Call for Preservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, every day that goes by sees the number of redwoods that could be preserved in a national park still further reduced.

As the Izaak Walton League of America pointed out in a resolution adopted at their 49th annual convention earlier this month:

It is in the public interest that a fully representative stand of these unique forests be protected and perpetuated.

But the Izaak Walton League goes on to make the very important point that—

Such an objective will not much longer be possible at the rate of cutting of the virgin stands.

Mr. Speaker, time is not on our side in this fight to establish a Redwood National Park that will be worthy of its name. We must move quickly and decisively if this unique national resource is to be enjoyed, not only by future but by this present generation of Americans.

I include the timely resolution adopted by the Izaak Walton League for my colleagues' consideration:

REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

Whereas the virgin stands of Sequoia sempervirens (coast redwoods) represent a natural heritage of national and world significance worthy of attention and concern by all Americans; and,

Whereas consumptive uses have reduced virgin stands of redwoods from an original range in California of some 2,000,000 acres to a present day area of only 200,000 acres; and,

Whereas it is in the public interest that a fully representative stand of these unique forests be protected and perpetuated in such a way that ecological, esthetic and watershed qualities of a complete range example are included; and,

Whereas such an objective will not much longer be possible at the rate of cutting of the virgin stands; and,

Whereas an area of approximately 90,000 acres of the remaining virgin redwoods stands is proposed for establishment as a unit of the National Park System, including a continuous habitat representation from sea level to altitudes of some 2,000 feet; and,

Whereas measures to secure this valuable national objective are now before the United States Congress: Now therefore be it

July 29, 1966

Resolved by the Isaak Walton League of America in convention assembled this 2nd day of July, 1966 at Boston, Massachusetts, That it endorses the principles and purposes of HR 11723, by the Hon. Jeffery Cohelan, and urges establishment of a Redwoods National Park without further delay in accord with this and similar measures.

First Manassas Fought To Keep Power Out of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 29, 1966

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday, July 23, the 105th anniversary of the First Battle of Manassas, the major opening engagement of the Civil War, was observed at the Manassas National Battlefield Park at Manassas, Va. The principal speaker for the occasion was the Honorable W. Carrington Thompson, member of the Virginia House of Delegates from Pittsylvania County and the city of Danville in my congressional district.

Mr. Thompson is a distinguished lawyer and a former assistant attorney general of Virginia, having served in the latter capacity during my term as Governor. He is widely known throughout the State as a capable legislator and as a citizen and public servant who keeps abreast of the times.

His speech at the Manassas Battlefield Park was extremely relevant to the issues confronting us today, and I should like to commend it to my colleagues. It is as follows:

The history of the battles of Manassas, on a creek called Bull Run, is too-well known to you ladies to be repeated here in great detail.

You will recall the circus-like atmosphere with which the morning of July 21, 1861, began. Congressmen and their ladies came from Washington in anticipation of a great Union victory. Negro servants sought vantage points from which their masters and mistresses could watch the carnage that was about to begin. Fine linen cloths were spread and picnic lunches unpacked. Several Congressmen even treated the by-standers to a few flowers of oratory. Oh, it was to be a grand day!

You will recall how the Federal tide washed round the Southern position on three sides; how Union general Irvin McDowell sent off a telegraph of victory to Washington.

You will recall that it was here, on these fields on that dusty, humid July day so many years ago that Confederate general B. E. Bee, mortally wounded, rode down the line of Southern troops, swung his hat to rally the men, and exclaimed, "Look, there stands Jackson like a stone wall," and fell dead.

Finally, you recall how General McDowell lost his head and sent in regiments all along the line in piecemeal, disjointed attacks, riding with them like a sergeant.

Let me read to you a few lines written by the late Fletcher Pratt, one of America's leading authorities on Civil War history, describing how July 21, 1861, was to end:

"[The Union troops] shattered against the stone wall; the confusion spread, and in the middle of it, down the road on to the new

Union rear came the rest of Joe Johnston's troops at the run, headed by the Louisiana Tigers. Helplessly caught, the whole Federal army collapsed, men and officers threw down their arms and ran for their lives.

"McDowell tried to save the day with some of the sound regiments from his left wing, but they only caught the contagion. The trains, the artillery, the wounded and even two Congressmen were abandoned, and the mass of terror-haunted fugitives never stopped till they reached the Potomac River bridges."

The city of Washington dripped moisture and despair the next day. For the first time, the truth was brought home to the North that it faced a long ordeal.

Nor need I say much about the second battle of Manassas. Second Bull Run ended like the first—defeat for the Union forces.

So much for the history of the battles of first and second Manassas. The question I want to address myself to in the time I have remaining is *why were these battles fought in the first place—why the Civil War?*

Historybooks are replete with a variety of answers. Slavery, the great American Shame—industrial North versus agrarian South—a progressive, democratic North versus a conservative, aristocratic South—answers *ad infinitum*.

I do not question that all of these factors played some role—greater or lesser—in the ultimate decision that turned father against son, and brother against brother. It is a rare history book, however, that discusses in any detail what I believe to be one of the major causes of secession, and the bloody war to follow—the spectre of a unitary government with its seat of power in Washington.

We are all familiar with the balanced mechanism of the Constitution of 1787; the division of governmental authority between the States and the central government and the distribution of power within the federal establishment itself.

Those men who fought and died here at Bull Run were equally familiar with the document. Indeed, their fathers and grandfathers had gathered in Philadelphia and drafted the Constitution.

Under the compact, you remember, the States were assigned a vital role. They were to have equal representatives in the Senate; State electors were to choose a President—or, if that failed, the States themselves, voting as equals, were to choose a President.

Continuing, the final power of constitutional amendment was to rest in the States as States—not in a mere majority of the States but in not fewer than three-fourths of them.

Finally, the States wanted it known that all powers not delegated to the central government by the Constitution, nor prohibited by the Constitution to the States, were reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Those men who fought on these fields knew why the Constitution assigned such a vital role to the States. They recalled that their forebears had feared the excessive centralization of power, and had wanted to secure the advantages of political experiment that arise from a diversified control of political authority.

No doubt some of the men who died here remembered hearing their grandfathers discuss the Virginia Convention of 1788—the ratifying convention—and of the dangers that arise when a government of laws is corrupted by a government of men.

"I may be thought suspicious," Patrick Henry had cried, "but Sir, suspicion is a virtue, as long as its object is the preservation of the public good, and as long as it stays within proper bounds . . . guard with jealous attention the public liberty!"

Thomas Jefferson was another who sounded this alarm in the Virginia Convention. Suspicious that too much author-

ity would ultimately be concentrated in Federal hands, he had said "I owe I am not a friend to a very energetic government. It is always *oppressive*."

The men who fought and died on these fields were fighting for the same beliefs that their fathers and grandfathers had fought for almost one hundred years earlier. "The first thing I have at heart is American liberty," Henry had cried, "the second is American union."

The first thing those men at Manassas had at heart was *liberty*—the second was *union*!

Did they die in vain?

Early last year, Mr. David Brinkley—of "good night Chet" fame—addressed a group of students at Ohio University. The following statement is of special interest: "The decline and fall of the 50 State governments will be completed within our lifetime. The movement of political power from State capitals to Washington, D.C. is inevitable and unstoppable *whether we like it or not*."

I, for one, do not like Mr. Brinkley's prediction. Nor am I so pessimistic as to believe that this ever increasing trend towards centralism can not be stopped.

The question is how? How do we restore to the States that which is constitutionally theirs—while limiting the greed of the power-mad federal government.

I need not spell out in detail how the Federal government has usurped the powers of the States. I need not remind you that since the decision in *Brown vs. Board of Education*, handed down twelve short years ago, the Federal government has taken over the administration of public schools in the United States, an area formerly within the exclusive control of the States.

I shall not talk about how Christ has been excluded from the classroom by Supreme Court decree.

Nor about how Congress has abolished the power of a State to require that its residents meet certain minimal literacy requirements in order to vote.

Nor how State control of the administration of criminal law is currently being threatened by an ever-expanding system of federal control.

Nor how rights of property are in the process of being abolished.

You know these facts of life as well as I.

And yet, I for one have heard few protests—much less angry and outraged protests—from the citizens of our country over the increasing erosion of the powers of the States.

To be sure, several courageous Congressmen have introduced legislation to curb the Federal government, particularly in the reapportionment and school prayer areas. Unfortunately, it seems that the majority of the American people are unwilling to support these measures.

I believe that this lack of support is *not* because most Americans agree that a unitary government is the answer—instead, I think most of our fellow citizens are too lazy to bother. As Senator Goldwater said in 1960:

"We can be conquered by bombs or by subversion but we can also be conquered by neglect—by ignoring the Constitution and disregarding the principles of limited government. Our defenses against the accumulation of unlimited power in Washington are in poorer shape, I fear, than our defenses against the aggressive designs of Moscow."

One hundred years ago, these fields were red with the blood of men who feared the accumulation of unlimited power in Washington.

Is it too much to ask of our fellow citizens, today, that they must realize that the conduct of our public affairs *must* be entrusted to men who understand that their first duty as elected officials is to *divest* themselves of the power they have been given?

16814

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 29, 1966

RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of Great Britain now finds his socialistic and labor-oriented government in such an economic dilemma that he is again calling upon Uncle Sugar to bail out the British pound.

I respectfully suggest that before the President of the United States gives any further assistance whatsoever to Great Britain that he extract from the Prime Minister an unconditional and unqualified guarantee that Great Britain will immediately cease shipping supplies to Communist North Vietnam for use against our soldiers there.

The American taxpayers are fed up with bailing out the English pound and then having their government sit helplessly by while Great Britain continues to ship supplies to the enemy for use against our American soldiers, who are risking life and limb for the cause of freedom in Vietnam.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION CONCERNING U.S. MILITARY PRISONERS

(Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. REINECKE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, as of this date 64 of our colleagues in the House have introduced a concurrent resolution concerning the treatment of U.S. military personnel held prisoner in Vietnam.

The purpose of this resolution is to express the will of the American people through the Congress that all U.S. military personnel held prisoner in Vietnam are "prisoners of war" entitled to the benefits of the Geneva Conventions; that if North Vietnam were to try, execute, or punish U.S. military personnel held prisoner it would be a violation of the Geneva Conventions and established standards of international behavior; that such action would be a reprehensible offense against the peoples of the world and would not be in the interest of North Vietnam; and that such action could only diminish the chance for peace in southeast Asia.

It is important for the Congress to speak, to speak with one voice, and to speak now. The resolution would be a clear expression to the North Vietnamese leaders that they can gain nothing from such a move—and have much to lose.

Mr. Speaker, a considerable measure of credit for this initiative rests with our colleague from Kansas, BOB ELLSWORTH. Although the gentleman from New York [Mr. REIN] and I were the original sponsors of the resolution, the initial suggestion for congressional action was BOB ELLSWORTH'S.

As in so many areas the Congress is again indebted to Mr. ELLSWORTH for his thoughtful, creative, and effective service. On selective service, on wheat acreage allotments, on Federal revenue sharing, on the international monetary system—in all these areas and now in Vietnam BOB ELLSWORTH has led the way for progress.

Ho Chi Minh has recently suggested that the contemplated trials may not be held. I would like to think that the introduction of our resolution helped to convince him. If so, much credit must go to BOB ELLSWORTH.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO AUTOMATICALLY INCREASE SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS AS COST OF LIVING INCREASES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Iowa). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce legislation which would automatically increase social security benefits in proportion to increases in the cost of living. This concept, which I have long supported and advocated, finally seems to be gaining the support of more and more of my colleagues who have recently seriously considered the need for such a change in social security policy.

The small percentage increases each month in the Consumer Price Index have steadily mounted, seriously weakening the purchasing power of those retired, elderly, and other dependents of social security. In essence, this process actually decreases the real benefits which those on social security have honestly paid for and who now deserve to have them returned to them. This process has been allowed to continue, with congressional action coming only when benefits lag far behind actual costs which payments were intended to cover. The bill I propose today would be designed to eliminate mounting inequities; it would substitute the ounce of regular economic prevention for what has usually been emergency cure.

The ones hardest hit by inflation are those with fixed incomes and pensions. And those who suffer most are the elderly on social security. It is high time some consideration was given the problem of meeting increasing costs of services on a dependent's fixed income.

Financing of this program would also be automatic. As cost of living increases, there is a concomitant increase in revenue obtained by the Social Security Administration.

Would such an automatic increase create a further inflationary push? Not any more so than current wage increases. If industry can afford to continuously give its healthy workers pay increases to meet the cost of living, then we should return to the elderly, retired, and other dependents the real value of what they have already paid through direct or indirect contributions to the social security system. The bill would thus relieve inequities caused by inflation. Inflation can be stopped at its roots, when such industrial wage increases exceed recommended guidelines. Inflation must not be abated at the expense of those who can afford it least.

I urge my colleagues to carefully consider this automatic increase concept, which I hope will allow the social security benefits to pay in real buying power what dependents have already paid for.

TRI-CONTINENTAL CONFERENCE: FOURTH CONGRESS OF LATIN AMERICAN STUDENTS

(Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in statements to the House on April 20, May 25, and July 12, 1966, I commented at some length on the much publicized Tri-Continental Conference held in Havana in January of this year and attended by representatives of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and the plans of that conference for increased activities through infiltration, subversion, and guerrilla warfare by students trained in Castro's Cuba.

In Panama, we have already seen the results in the form of bloody student riots that were featured by loss of life and large destruction of property in that country and which required the use of the Panamanian National Guard to restore law and order. We have also seen that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has been made an objective for fomenting a so-called war of national liberation.

The latest information from Cuba is that from July 29 to August 9 there will be a Fourth American Congress of Students at Havana, with 27 Latin American delegations present and Puerto Rican Communists playing a major role.

Because such activities will inevitably have a bearing on the Panama Canal, which is the main target in the long-range program for Hemispheric assault by Red power, I quote the pertinent section of a recent Latin American Report published by the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba of Miami, Fla., as part of my remarks. If the situation thus presented were in the reverse and if in the Soviet or any of its satellite countries, there was permitted an assemblage with representatives from the free world committed to the task of freeing satellites from the Red yoke, such agents would be stood up against a wall and shot. If delegates from the United States and Puerto Rico attending the indicated Cuban convention do not suffer any sort of punishment at home for their recreancy, then we can expect an ever-increasing resurgence of communistic revolutionary activities both in the United States and Puerto Rico.

Under these circumstances, it is not a matter of wonder that communistic power flourishes in the free nations while in Red lands all efforts in behalf of freedom are ruthlessly suppressed.

The indicated report follows:
[From the Latin America Report, Washington, D.C., July 11, 1966]

HAVANA SCHEDULES CONFERENCE ON STUDENT SUBVERSION

Havana will host a "student" conference on subversion. From July 29 to August 9, youths from all over Latin America will attend the "Fourth Latin American Congress of Students." It is expected that the United States will be represented by delegates from the "New Left" or perhaps by openly-declared Communists.

The event is an extension of the tri-continental conference of Havana (See "The Havana Conference," Vol. 4, No. 7, April 4,

July 29,

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

16815

The Fourth Latin American Congress of Students is supported by the Communist International Union of Students, which has recently established branches throughout Latin America. Reports from the state that 27 Latin American delegates will be present.

The theme of the Congress is taken from the final resolution of the tri-continental conference, stating "the role of the students in the fight for independence, and self-determination of the peoples, against imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism, is in solidarity with the people who are in the fight." In other words, students are now to be brought into the central organization of subversion in Havana and charged with specific duties in support of that subversion.

Puerto Rico is to assume a major role at the Congress. Silvio Silva, a Puerto Rican, has been given the post of Vice President of the International Union of Students. He also is on the preparatory committee of the upcoming Havana Congress.

The meeting to be held in Havana represents a major effort of the Communists for an even more concerted campaign than it has been carrying out in the past to penetrate intellectual circles in the hemisphere.

A CHANCE TO AID OUR IMPRISONED FIGHTING MEN

(Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a story on the front page of the New York Times revealed thru Abba Schwartz, formerly with the State Department's Bureau of Consular and Security Affairs, that private, clandestine talks with various international Red Cross units could possibly be a prelude to direct talks on the subject of guarantees of humane treatment of American boys now captives of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese.

Those Americans who have given so much and now lie in some dank prison camp deserve every effort we can employ to safeguard their lives and their well-being.

The Times story included an obscure paragraph toward the end that is a clue to an obstacle that prevents these talks from becoming a reality and the safety of our men a fact:

The main problem to be resolved . . . is which nation or groups should be invited. One possibility would be to invite all signatories of the 1949 Geneva Conference on prisoners, but this would exclude the National Liberation Front. An alternative would be to invite all parties to the conflict, but this would raise the problem of American objections to Vietcong representation.

Here then is a chance to part the Bamboo Curtain. Perhaps ultimately it could be the beginning of enlarged negotiations that could lead to peace.

We have often said that we will sit down any time, any place, to talk peace.

Well, our men in the dark huts deserve the enlightened thinking of our leaders.

Vietcong participation in talks has always been one of the major stumbling blocks to ending the conflict in Vietnam. I long have urged that all parties to the war including the Vietcong be peace table participants.

In reality, how can we expect to achieve a bargaining agreement without the presence of one of the major participants? What if decisions are made and those absent refuse to go along and continue fighting? We will have achieved little, but more talk.

Although they were our enemies, we sat down with the Japanese, the Germans, and the North Koreans.

We are playing games with the lives and security of American service men if we refuse to sit down to discuss the welfare of American boys in the hands of the enemy.

We must move to implement these discussions now—and not let another day of growing despair pass for American youth in foreign prison camps.

Let us not miss this opportunity.

A CRUSADE OF GOOD WILL BY 34 TEXANS

(Mr. PATMAN was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, part fun, part work, part study—this describes a constructive enterprise by 34 Texans who traveled thousands of miles to make a gift of their vacation time to help a small church located in the north country of New York State. It is well worth the time of this House to read the following account, published in the Plattsburgh Press-Republican of July 23, 1966, an item that would probably otherwise be generally passed over in a world accustomed to daily newspaper stories of youth riots, street battles, and dissension. However, this, too, merits attention, and although the group in this instance is from my own church, the First Baptist Church of Texarkana, I take pride in noting that the Teen-Stitute movement is not restricted to any denomination—it is in fact open to all who have the courage to cast good deeds at their fellow men.

THIRTY-FOUR FROM TEXAS COME 4,000 MILES TO AID GRY CHURCH

The day begins with breakfast for 34. That's dozen upon dozen of eggs, gallons of coffee and loaves of toast.

Then down to business. Girls busily clean up after the big breakfast and set about a multitude of other tasks as the boys go outside and get right to work.

This is how the day begins for the 34 Texans who arrived here for a week of building and teaching at Champlain Valley Baptist Church.

From the First Baptist Church of Texarkana ("Texas-side of the border," they brag) the group includes 21 young people of senior high school and college backgrounds.

The Texarkana Church is responsible for organizing the CV Baptist Church which started in 1960. They also had as a "Pioneer Mission" the First Baptist Church of South Burlington, Vt., the only Southern Baptist church in the State of Vermont.

They arrived Tuesday by bus to give a helping hand to the Plattsburgh church.

This morning they can be found tearing down an old frame building or pouring cement sidewalks or leveling ground for a new parking lot.

Sweaty, grimy, hot and tired after a hard day's work, these same young people will get

into their best clothes for study classes this evening.

They are here to teach youngsters of all ages but their "pride and joy" is a "Teen-Stitute" for young people, ages 13 to 24.

This is a panel discussion type program augmented by slides and text planned to aid young people in "coming to grips" with the problems imposed upon them by modern society.

And it is not restrictive to Baptists—or Protestants. The Rev. Marvin Simpson has invited interested young people from all denominations, from all over the entire area, to participate in Teen-Stitute.

From 7 to 9 p.m., the young people give of themselves to their programs—for people of a town, a community, a part of the country many will never again see.

It's a 4,000-mile round trip these people have made to bring their aid to the small church on Route 22 in South Plattsburgh.

It is several thousands of dollars donated by people who have never seen Plattsburgh—who have no family or acquaintances here.

But they have friends. For, by sending such a goodwill emissary as this group of teenagers they have drawn a small New York city and a small Texas town closer together.

WORK, PLAY AND TEEN-STITUTE FOR TEXAN YOUTHS

(By Larry Payton)

Members of the Champlain Valley Baptist Church this week greeted 34 visiting Texans of the First Baptist Church of Texarkana.

Primarily made up of young people, ages 17 to 22, the group made the trip to Plattsburgh to aid in church construction projects and to conduct mission study groups for youngsters and church leaders.

The local church was first established in 1960 as a "Pioneer Mission" of the 2,500-member Texas congregation.

The Plattsburgh church is one of three missions the Texarkana congregation has initiated. Another is the First Baptist Church of South Burlington, Vt. The third is in Nebraska.

The Rev. Marvin Simpson, pastor of CV Baptist Church, said an Air Base sergeant, Ervin Carson, organized the Plattsburgh church. He had been a member of the Texarkana church prior to transferring here.

The 21 young people and their adult supervisors will aid in tearing down an old building, clearing the site and constructing a parking lot, installing almost 200 feet of concrete sidewalk and doing exterior painting of the new church building.

The money for these projects comes from the Texarkana group also and takes nothing from the local church's funds.

"Thousands of dollars," said Dr. William Shields, coordinator of the excursion, "have been donated by individual contributors of our home church which supplies the bus and our food." For sightseeing and their motel rooms, he pointed out, each of the youngsters chipped in \$15.

He said the young people did this so they could take a sightseeing trip to New York City afterwards without using the donors' money.

Emphasis of the program is on youth. The young people will conduct a census for the church of the neighboring towns and will lead study groups for all denominations of area children and young people.

Many of the adults on the trip will teach area church workers how to instruct their classes. Joe Parks instructs adult workers in a course titled "Preparing to teach the Bible." Mrs. Earl Oxford teaches the young people and intermediate workers. In addition, instruction is provided for junior and primary and nursery workers.

But the highlight of the study groups is "Teen-Stitute."

5