



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 113

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 1967

No. 104

House of Representatives

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

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

Let not mercy and truth forsake thee; bind them about thy neck; write them upon the table of thine heart.—
Proverbs 3: 3.

O God, our Father, the source of all that is good in life, once again we come to Thee: weak—seeking greater strength; tired—needing more rest; worried—desiring a deeper peace. We have sought satisfaction in the minor details of daily life that do not matter much and have left undone the major duties that matter most. Forgive us, our Father, and strengthen us by Thy spirit that the business of this day may be done with Thy cause in our hearts.

Awaken within us the spirit of friendliness and kindness and good cheer. Keep us from allowing disagreements to make us disagreeable and from permitting differences in us to make differences between us. Kindle in our hearts and in the hearts of all people the spirit of good will. Let tolerance and understanding and compassion rule our spirits and possess our souls.

Send us out into this day to do our work with all our might and at eventide may this world be a better place because we have lived and worked and prayed.

In the spirit of Christ, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 1516. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Tocco;

H.R. 1708. An act for the relief of Angiolina Condello;

H.R. 1763. An act for the relief of Dr. Raul E. Bertrán;

H.R. 1764. An act for the relief of Dr. Ernesto M. Campello;

H.R. 1765. An act for the relief of Dr. Ubaldo Gregorio Catasús-Rodríguez;

H.R. 3523. An act for the relief of Chang-You Wu, doctor of medicine.

H.R. 4930. An act for the relief of Mr. Robert A. Owen; and

H. Con. Res. 393. Concurrent resolution that the two Houses shall adjourn on Thursday, June 29, 1967, until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, July 10, 1967.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 394. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7501) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes."

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

§. 1028. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend certain benefits to former employees of county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes; and

§. 1862. An act to amend the authorizing legislation of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SPEAKER OF HOUSE AND PRESIDENT OF SENATE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS FOUND TRULY ENROLLED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 394), authorization for the Speaker of the House and the President

of the Senate to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions found truly enrolled, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

On page 1, line 4, after "President" insert: ", President pro tempore, or the Acting President pro tempore".

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO SIT TODAY DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on General Education of the Committee on Education and Labor may sit while the House is in session today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

TO AMEND THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT OF 1965 SO AS TO EXTEND ITS PROVISIONS

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10730) to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, after "1968," insert "\$16,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "1969," and insert "1970."

H 8283

Page 2, line 5, strike out "three" and insert "two".

Page 2, line 13, strike out "15" and insert "10".

Page 2, line 25, after "1968," insert "\$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969."

Page 3, line 1, strike out "1969," and insert "1970."

Page 3, line 1, strike out "three" and insert "two".

Page 4, after line 15, insert:

"(g) The first sentence of section 302(b) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3022(b)) is amended by striking out "shall be available for allotment" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall be reallocated."

Page 4, after line 15, insert:

"STUDY OF NEED FOR TRAINED PERSONNEL"

"Sec. 6. Title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C., ch. 35, subch. V) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"STUDY OF NEED FOR TRAINED PERSONNEL"

"Sec. 503. (a) The Secretary is authorized to undertake, directly or by grant or contract, a study and evaluation of the immediate and foreseeable need for trained personnel to carry out programs related to the objectives of this Act, and of the availability and adequacy of the educational and training resources for persons preparing to work in such programs. On or before March 31, 1968, he shall make a report to the President and to the Congress, of his findings and recommendations resulting from such study, including whatever specific proposals, including legislative proposals, he deems will assist in insuring that the need for such trained specialists will be met.

"(b) In carrying out this section the Secretary shall consult with the Advisory Committee on Older Americans, the President's Council on Aging, appropriate Federal agencies, State and local officials, and such other public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or institutions as he deems appropriate to insure that his proposals under subsection (a) reflect national requirements."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the House has passed unanimously the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1967, as further amended by the Senate. I believe that in the main the changes adopted by the other body will strengthen the intent and the administration of this legislation, and the 1967 amendments as a whole represent a continuity of progress for our senior citizens who, in many cases, have yet to make their most valuable contributions to the community and to the Nation. The Older Americans Act, and the Administration on Aging established thereunder, can help to see that they are given that opportunity.

Bill NE
RAPID MOBILIZATION OF RESERVISTS A KEY FACTOR IN ISRAELI VICTORY

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, little has been said about the fact that the Israel Army, which enjoyed such phenomenal success against the Arabs, is very largely made up of reserves. This attests further to the significance of the Israel victory, but it points up a possible serious weakness in the organization and training of the Reserve components in the United States. Israel was able to call out 120,000 reserves and have them ready for battle in days; an equivalent picture in this country would be for the United States to more than double its effective active duty forces inside of 2 weeks.

The Israel military reserve and mobilization system is a model of efficiency. Some of the best units were combat ready only 12 hours after the callup. All units were ready within 48 hours. This reserve mobilization system gives Israel a highly responsive striking force without imposing on her the burden of a large regular army. Obviously the United States has no comparable efficiency in its Reserve components. The blame for this cannot be laid at the door of the Reserves. For most of them, the Pentagon has provided no counterpart of the vigorous training program conducted by the Israelis or the immediate availability of modern combat equipment.

In this connection, I submit, for reprinting in the Record, an interesting commentary from the pen of Charles Mohr in the New York Times of June 13:

RAPID MOBILIZATION OF RESERVISTS A KEY FACTOR IN ISRAELI VICTORY

(By Charles Mohr)

BANIYAS, SYRIA, June 12.—The Israeli Army is a highly professional striking force but it is composed overwhelmingly of amateurs.

Israel's military reserve and mobilization system, a model of efficiency, constituted one of the major factors in the quick victory achieved against the Arabs.

The army that destroyed six Egyptian divisions in the desert, conquered Jerusalem and dislodged the Syrian Army from fortified hill positions did not exist physically four weeks ago. It existed in the card indexes of the offices of reserve units in every Israeli town and city. Some of the best units were combat-ready only twelve hours after commandeered taxis began delivering call-up notices to Israeli homes, mostly on the evening of May 20. Even "sloppy" units were ready within 48 hours.

It is this reserve-mobilization system that gives Israel a highly responsive striking force without imposing on her the burden of supporting a large regular army. It is a volunteer army in a real sense. During the present crisis some reserve units had a 108 per cent response to the call-up as over-age and discharged reservists tried to get back into combat units.

There were almost no evasions of the call-up orders. "Next to Nasser," said a lieutenant colonel, "our biggest obstacle to success was people arguing with us and trying to get in the action."

LIFE ENDS AT 45

"I don't know about other countries," said another officer, "but in Israel the male climacteric comes at 45 when you must leave the active reserves. We say life ends at 45."

For the ingenious, however, there are ways to see action after 45 and they were eagerly taken advantage of. Part of the Israeli war plan is to mobilize a large number of civilian vehicles. The owners of such vehicles have the right to volunteer to drive them even if over-age, and most owners did so almost joyously.

There is universal conscription for both boys and girls, the former serving 30 months and the latter 20 months, usually at about age 18.

These conscripts spend their entire active service in training because the Israeli staff believes that only a superbly trained army can protect the country. No time is wasted on garrison duty or in occupying static defense posts. Normally a special border police force guards the nation's frontiers.

REGULAR FORCE IS SMALL

Thus the conscripts in service are not really a part of the "regular" army, although the description is usually applied to them. The true regulars consist only of a small group of officers of the rank of captain and above and senior noncommissioned officers—a nucleus around which the army is built at full mobilization.

After national service training men are assigned to reserve units and remain in them until age 45. Those reservists keep basic personnel equipment, such as fatigue uniforms, webbing boots, at home.

Like most democratic nations, Israel has a grumbler's army in peacetime, and a 90 per cent response to annual training call-ups is considered good.

"Every device of the human imagination is used to avoid the training call-ups," an officer said, "and although by law we are allowed to call men up for 30 days each year, political pressures mean that most men get less than a week's training each year, which is not enough.

"But when war comes, all this changes and the same men who have fought for exemptions fight to get back in."

The call-up notices are usually delivered at night or in the evening by taxi drivers and other messengers because, as one staff officer says, "They are at home then and that is when you catch your fish."

One Haifa civilian who fought his way to this Syrian town described it this way: "I came home from a drive with my wife and children and there it was—greetings!"

The summoned reservist makes his own way to the armory or storehouse of his unit, where he is issued weapons, ammunition and other equipment. None of this is as smooth or easy as it may sound for the small number of regulars who must maintain these stores in a state of readiness.

"Even the flashlight issued to a company commander must be filled with fresh batteries," said one regular.

Ideally, the plan is that every tank and jeep should be able to start at a touch of the ignition button. Fuel is regularly changed, batteries are checked and radiators are kept flushed.

The military system is built around a philosophy that is almost totally offensive and does not anticipate prolonged defense. Israel's military doctrine is essentially to attack, but first, to plan for the attack.

On the first day of the war, 25 Arab airfields were bombed and strafed, some repeatedly, within three hours. On the Syrian front, assault infantry units knew far in advance exactly how they would tackle Syria strongpoints.

Though discipline sometimes seems informal, that does not mean it is lax. Instant and determined response to combat orders is expected and officers who let an attack bog down may be removed almost immediately from command.

MEANING BEHIND SOVIET TALK OF WITHDRAWAL FROM TERRITORIES OCCUPIED BY FORCE

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, representatives of the Soviet Union in the General Assembly of the United Nations vehemently demanded the withdrawal of the armed forces of Israel from the Arab territory now occupied after the Middle East conflict.

As a matter of fact, Soviet Premier Kosygin himself declared at the U.N.:

In the Twentieth Century no country has the right to expand borders by military action.

If one could believe in the sincerity of the Soviet declarations, which pretend to serve international peace, the Soviets should first withdraw the Red army from the territories they have occupied forcibly since 1939.

It is well known that the Soviets keep approximately 28 fully equipped divisions occupying countries that would rather be free of the Russian influence. It is also well known that Baltic nations and other countries have been incorporated into the Soviet Union and a number of once free European nations became the victims of Soviet expansion. The Soviet Union should withdraw from Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, and parts of Rumania and Poland, which became victims of the Soviet expansion that has taken place in the 20th century.

Only if they do so, will their position on the Middle East be tenable.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 24, 1967, page H6098 be corrected as follows: Insert the word "year" in the last sentence of the second paragraph so that the sentence will read: "The next year, we fought for funds and obtained a supplemental appropriation of \$9.5 million for fiscal year 1966."

Also on June 20, 1967, page H7519, last paragraph of my remarks, second sentence, the words should read "rising sun" instead of "rising run."

Also on June 20, page H7538, be corrected as follows: In the first paragraph, second sentence add the word "of" so that the sentence reads as follows: "I deplore the suggestion on the part of anyone that the citizens of Hawaii,"—and so forth.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SHOTGUN APPROACH TO NASA APPROPRIATIONS WILL COST THE TAXPAYERS PLENTY

(Mr. KARTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time merely to inform the House of the results of the action it took yesterday so far as the motion to recommit is concerned on the bill, H.R. 10340, authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. Speaker, shotgun approaches to matters of this kind never have been good and I think probably the most glaring illustration of that is the action that was taken yesterday.

For example, in the launch vehicle procurement area which is one of the items that was included in the shotgun approach in the motion to recommit, \$78.7 million was eliminated out of \$150.7 million—all of which has been scheduled to launch the unmanned satellite system in this country in the years to come.

This could well mean that we will have hundreds of millions of dollars of unmanned satellites sitting on the ground waiting for a launch vehicle to put those satellites into orbit.

In addition, the only planetary program that this country has of any meaning and of any stature, is the Voyager program, which was again cut in the shotgun approach. This is the only area in which we are behind the Russians, in terms of effort, and in this regard we are substantially behind. The Soviets have been aggressive in this area and have launched at least four times as many satellites, for whatever value—and I think it is important to at least be aware of the fact that the Russians think that this is a very important area—for whatever value, they have launched at least four times as many satellites in this particular program area as has the United States. So I say again that those who voted for the motion to recommit ought to know full well the responsibility they must assume.

I do not know how we can correct this in conference because of the narrow margin that exists between the House bill and the Senate bill. However, I am hopeful that something can be worked out so that this can be done and so that we can, if we do nothing else, save the taxpayers of this country several hundreds of millions of dollars that they have now invested in satellites. If the House position is receded to by the other body, it will mean that those satellites will sit on the ground waiting for a launch vehicle to launch them. It will mean the Soviets will further outdistance us, and badly so. It means this Nation's planetary program dies for the next 5 to 10 years.

Further, I am hopeful that the Appropriations Committee will note that several items cut in the shotgun recommitment motion, were individually debated on the floor and amendments thereto were badly defeated.

July: NE ISRAELI ATTACK ON U.S.S. "LIBERTY"

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

Mr. HOSMER. I can only conclude that the coordinated attack by aircraft and motor torpedo boats on the U.S.S. *Liberty* 15½ miles north of Sinai on June 8 which killed 34 officers and men of the Navy and wounded another 75 was deliberate.

I do not believe the attack was ordered at the highest command level of the

Israeli military, but that it was ordered at a sufficiently high level to permit coordination of the Israel air and naval forces involved. This means that some officer or officers of relatively high rank must have acted on their own initiative. I have heard reports that similar breeches of military discipline at intermediate levels occurred during the previous Arab-Israeli war.

It is to be noted that an Israel court of inquiry has held an investigation, but its findings in this matter have not been released. The Israel Government has announced that a judicial inquiry is underway which may lead to court-martial proceedings against those responsible.

The fact that the U.S.S. *Liberty* was a Victory hull vessel, hundreds of which were produced and used by the U.S. Navy during World War II and since, rules out the possibility of mistaken identity. Every ship recognition book in the world has, for years, identified the characteristic Victory hull and superstructure of the U.S.S. *Liberty* as U.S. Navy property.

What those responsible for this outrage sought to gain can, at this point, be only a matter of speculation. It is possible that in hot headed excitement they believed the attack might involve both the United States and the U.S.S.R. in the conflict. It is possible that they believed a bald attack of this nature might keep these two superpowers out. It is possible that, heady with victory on the land, those responsible sought a means at sea to further demonstrate Israeli military might.

Whatever is the reason for the attack, it was an act of high piracy. Those responsible should be court-martialed on charges of murder, amongst other counts. The Israel Government should pay full reparations to the United States and indemnities to the families of the Americans killed.

THE NASA AUTHORIZATION BILL

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

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House in voting to reduce the line items of the NASA authorization, as contained in H.R. 10340, did not do what some people thought they did and did not do what the press in some ways reported this morning. I make this statement for the benefit of those who think they voted to reduce the authorization. I think they should review the matter, because this House did not vote to reduce the NASA authorization one penny beyond the \$65 million reduction which the committee accepted. A request was made of the Congress for an authorization of \$4,992,182,000.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH] moved, and the committee accepted his amendment, to reduce this authorization in the overall by \$65 million. This, in fact, reduced the overall authorization to \$4,927,182,000. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], in his motion to recommit, asked that individual line items be reduced to the

June 29, 1967

extent of \$136.4 million. They ignored the overall total of the authorization request as contained on page 1 of the bill.

So the net effect of the action yesterday was this: We have an authorization today, as passed by this House, for \$4,927,182,000, which is \$136.4 million in excess of the total of the line items as contained in the bill, which means this, that NASA now has an authorization which contains a contingency fund, or a slush fund, or whatever we want to call it, of \$136.4 million that they can spend as they choose, if the Appropriations Committee appropriates the money as authorized.

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

Mr. WAGGONER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, is it not true, I would ask the gentleman in the well—and I congratulate him for his statement and concur completely with him—that it creates a \$136 million slush fund, but it does cut very important line items which can put us in a straitjacket so that we cannot perform properly this space program?

Mr. WAGGONER. In my opinion, it does. That is all I can express.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAGGONER. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana has pointed up the problem I mentioned on the floor yesterday. We in the Committee of the Whole and subsequently in the House were faced with a parliamentary situation which was precipitated by the action of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. It was a bad situation, but the House as a whole was not responsible for it.

The format of the bill was submitted to the Committee of the Whole and to the House by the Committee on Science and Astronautics. All we could do, after the first amendment was approved, was to operate on line items. We were not responsible for the format of the bill which did straitjacket the whole membership.

There is no slush fund in the authorization bill. Sure, there is an extra \$134.6 million in the overall total, but I suspect that the Committee on Appropriations will take that into account and make the necessary decisions so the appropriations will conform to the line items and not to the overall amount.

Mr. WAGGONER. The gentleman may be right about that. The Appropriations Committee may do this. The point I make is this: This House did not vote to cut the overall authorization.

ACTION TAKEN BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY TO CORRECT FORMAT OF BILL

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time to comment on the problem which the distinguished minority leader

raised yesterday. We had, in this AEC authorization bill, accustomed to the procedure of previous years, this same parliamentary problem. During this interim period we consulted with the parliamentarian and lawyers, and we have an amendment which will be offered, which will correct the situation, as soon as the proper time comes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from California and the Joint Committee for appreciating the difficulties that a bill in that format presents the House as a whole. I thank the committee for taking the proper action so that we will not be straitjacketed in the House and so that our conferees will not be straitjacketed in conference.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Exactly. The gentleman has rendered a service to the House in pointing out a longstanding potential problem in the language in bills. Our committee was very happy to make this adjustment, because, as the gentleman has said, it not only protects the rights of the Members of the House, but also protects the conferees when they go into conference with the other body.

I appreciate the gentleman calling this to our attention, and on both sides we are most happy to prepare to meet this problem.

ATTACK ON THE U.S.S. "LIBERTY"

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear all of the speech of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] but of what I did hear I wish to approve and be associated with.

The *Liberty* ship incident—and indeed it was more than an incident—has been treated entirely too lightly by this Government. To say the least, too little has been said about it. This useless, unnecessary and inexcusable attack took the lives of 34 American boys, wounded 75 others, and left many others in a state of horrified shock, to say nothing of what it did to a flag-flying vessel of the U.S. Navy. How could this be treated so lightly in this the greatest Capitol in all the world?

I have heard Members of this House, and many, many others, say that if this had been done by others, the leaders of our Government would have moved in with sternness and appropriate demands or even retaliatory action.

I do not have any feeling against those, as individuals or as a people, who were responsible for this assault, destruction, and death. But according to the report which appeared in the papers this morning it was, as I had felt all along, positively unnecessary, unjustified, and inexcusable. Therefore, regardless of who is responsible—friendly or unfriendly—when American sons are unnecessarily killed by unprovoked military attack, even in a case of mistaken identity,

Uncle Sam as a rule demands to know "Why?" And ordinarily we do not stop with just a demand.

There are many Members in this House who have sons in our National Defense Establishment. There are thousands of others all over this land who have sons and daughters in such. They are spread to the four corners of this earth, and their objective is to promote and maintain peace in the world, and everybody knows it. There is no doubt about that. These men at all times are entitled to the strong backing of every citizen of this land of every race and every creed. They are entitled to and should have the strong arm, as well as the strong voice of their Government and their people behind them. But who has spoken out in their behalf from this land since some of their number were so suddenly shot down and others so severely wounded on the *Liberty* ship?

The *Liberty* ship was 15½ miles offshore, more than 12 miles beyond that which we recognize as territorial waters. It was more than 9½ miles beyond that recognized by Egypt as territorial water, and it was 9½ miles beyond the territorial waters claimed by Israel.

Before the attack, the Pentagon said unidentified planes flew in and about the ship. Undoubtedly these were the planes of the subsequent attackers. The ship was well marked, so said the Pentagon. Its name was painted on its stern. U.S. letters and numbers were on its bow. The day was clear. And it was distinctly flying the flag that you and I stood here and so praised and respected just a few days ago on Flag Day. But what respect have we shown for it since it was so recklessly shot down by the Israel attackers?

What complaint have we registered? What has Washington said? To tell you the truth, this great Capital as well as this great Government—if it can still be called great—was and is as quiet as the tomb regarding this horrible event.

The Pentagon has just concluded and made public a report on this incident. According to reports in the news media this morning, the Pentagon said the attackers "had ample opportunity" to identify the ship before that which it described as the "unprovoked" attack. The Pentagon stressed that the *Liberty* was clearly marked, that it was in international waters, that it had a right to be where it was, and that the attack was incessant, heavy and hard; that the attack came from both planes and torpedo boats, designed not simply to knock out but to destroy the ship and its men.

With due respect for the top leaders of our Government—the White House, the State Department, and the Congress—it is not enough, Mr. Speaker, to allow this matter to drop with a simple statement of regret from those responsible for the attack, no matter how sincere the state may be. It is not enough to let it drop with a simple statement that the attackers just happened to make a mistake. This is too serious a matter to accept a simple "Excuse us, please" sort of statement. There must be more than this to assure our men, our people, and our Nation that another nation must

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, representatives of the Soviet Union in the General Assembly of the United Nations vehemently demanded the withdrawal of the armed forces of Israel from the Arab territory now occupied after the Middle East conflict.

As a matter of fact, Soviet Premier Kosygin himself declared at the U.N.:

In the Twentieth Century no country has the right to expand borders by military action.

If one could believe in the sincerity of the Soviet declarations, which pretend to serve international peace, the Soviets should first withdraw the Red army from the territories they have occupied forcibly since 1939.

It is well known that the Soviets keep approximately 28 fully equipped divisions occupying countries that would rather be free of the Russian influence. It is also well known that Baltic nations and other countries have been incorporated into the Soviet Union and a number of once free European nations became the victims of Soviet expansion. The Soviet Union should withdraw from Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, and parts of Rumania and Poland, which became victims of the Soviet expansion that has taken place in the 20th century.

Only if they do so, will their position on the Middle East be tenable.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 24, 1967, page H6098 be corrected as follows: Insert the word "year" in the last sentence of the second paragraph so that the sentence will read: "The next year, we fought for funds and obtained a supplemental appropriation of \$9.5 million for fiscal year 1966."

Also on June 20, 1967, page H7519, last paragraph of my remarks, second sentence, the words should read "rising sun" instead of "rising run."

Also on June 20, page H7538, be corrected as follows: In the first paragraph, second sentence add the word "of" so that the sentence reads as follows: "I deplore the suggestion on the part of anyone that the citizens of Hawaii,"—and so forth.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SHOTGUN APPROACH TO NASA APPROPRIATIONS WILL COST THE TAXPAYERS PLENTY

(Mr. KARTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time merely to inform the House of the results of the action it took yesterday so far as the motion to recommit is concerned on the bill, H.R. 10340, authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. Speaker, shotgun approaches to matters of this kind never have been good and I think probably the most glaring illustration of that is the action that was taken yesterday.

For example, in the launch vehicle procurement area which is one of the items that was included in the shotgun approach in the motion to recommit, \$78.7 million was eliminated out of \$150.7 million—all of which has been scheduled to launch the unmanned satellite system in this country in the years to come.

This could well mean that we will have hundreds of millions of dollars of unmanned satellites sitting on the ground waiting for a launch vehicle to put those satellites into orbit.

In addition, the only planetary program that this country has of any meaning and of any stature, is the Voyager program, which was again cut in the shotgun approach. This is the only area in which we are behind the Russians, in terms of effort, and in this regard we are substantially behind. The Soviets have been aggressive in this area and have launched at least four times as many satellites, for whatever value—and I think it is important to at least be aware of the fact that the Russians think that this is a very important area—for whatever value, they have launched at least four times as many satellites in this particular program area as has the United States. So I say again that those who voted for the motion to recommit ought to know full well the responsibility they must assume.

I do not know how we can correct this in conference because of the narrow margin that exists between the House bill and the Senate bill. However, I am hopeful that something can be worked out so that this can be done and so that we can, if we do nothing else, save the taxpayers of this country several hundreds of millions of dollars that they have now invested in satellites. If the House position is receded to by the other body, it will mean that those satellites will sit on the ground waiting for a launch vehicle to launch them. It will mean the Soviets will further outdistance us, and badly so. It means this Nation's planetary program dies for the next 5 to 10 years.

Further, I am hopeful that the Appropriations Committee will note that several items cut in the shotgun recommitment motion, were individually debated on the floor and amendments thereto were badly defeated.

ISRAELI ATTACK ON U.S.S. "LIBERTY"

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

Mr. HOSMER. I can only conclude that the coordinated attack by aircraft and motor torpedo boats on the U.S.S. *Liberty* 15½ miles north of Sinai on June 8 which killed 34 officers and men of the Navy and wounded another 75 was deliberate.

I do not believe the attack was ordered at the highest command level of the

Israeli military, but that it was ordered at a sufficiently high level to permit coordination of the Israel air and naval forces involved. This means that some officer or officers of relatively high rank must have acted on their own initiative. I have heard reports that similar breeches of military discipline at intermediate levels occurred during the previous Arab-Israeli war.

It is to be noted that an Israel court of inquiry has held an investigation, but its findings in this matter have not been released. The Israel Government has announced that a judicial inquiry is underway which may lead to court-martial proceedings against those responsible.

The fact that the U.S.S. *Liberty* was a Victory hull vessel, hundreds of which were produced and used by the U.S. Navy during World War II and since, rules out the possibility of mistaken identity. Every ship recognition book in the world has, for years, identified the characteristic Victory hull and superstructure of the U.S.S. *Liberty* as U.S. Navy property.

What those responsible for this outrage sought to gain can, at this point, be only a matter of speculation. It is possible that in hot headed excitement they believed the attack might involve both the United States and the U.S.S.R. in the conflict. It is possible that they believed a bald attack of this nature might keep these two superpowers out. It is possible that, heady with victory on the land, those responsible sought a means at sea to further demonstrate Israeli military might.

Whatever is the reason for the attack, it was an act of high piracy. Those responsible should be court-martialed on charges of murder, amongst other counts. The Israel Government should pay full reparations to the United States and indemnities to the families of the Americans killed.

THE NASA AUTHORIZATION BILL

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

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House in voting to reduce the line items of the NASA authorization, as contained in H.R. 10340, did not do what some people thought they did and did not do what the press in some ways reported this morning. I make this statement for the benefit of those who think they voted to reduce the authorization. I think they should review the matter, because this House did not vote to reduce the NASA authorization one penny beyond the \$65 million reduction which the committee accepted. A request was made of the Congress for an authorization of \$4,922,182,000.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUBEUSH] moved, and the committee accepted his amendment, to reduce this authorization in the overall by \$65 million. This, in fact, reduced the overall authorization to \$4,927,182,000. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], in his motion to recommit, asked that individual line items be reduced to the

extent of \$136.4 million. They ignored the overall total of the authorization request as contained on page 1 of the bill.

So the net effect of the action yesterday was this: We have an authorization today, as passed by this House, for \$4,927,182,000, which is \$136.4 million in excess of the total of the line items as contained in the bill, which means this, that NASA now has an authorization which contains a contingency fund, or a slush fund, or whatever we want to call it, of \$136.4 million that they can spend as they choose, if the Appropriations Committee appropriates the money as authorized.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, is it not true, I would ask the gentleman in the well—and I congratulate him for his statement and concur completely with him—that it creates a \$136 million slush fund, but it does cut very important line items which can put us in a straitjacket so that we cannot perform properly this space program?

Mr. WAGGONNER. In my opinion, it does. That is all I can express.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana has pointed up the problem I mentioned on the floor yesterday. We in the Committee of the Whole and subsequently in the House were faced with a parliamentary situation which was precipitated by the action of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. It was a bad situation, but the House as a whole was not responsible for it.

The format of the bill was submitted to the Committee of the Whole and to the House by the Committee on Science and Astronautics. All we could do, after the first amendment was approved, was to operate on line items. We were not responsible for the format of the bill which did straitjacket the whole membership.

There is no slush fund in the authorization bill. Sure, there is an extra \$134.6 million in the overall total, but I suspect that the Committee on Appropriations will take that into account and make the necessary decisions so the appropriations will conform to the line items and not to the overall amount.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman may be right about that. The Appropriations Committee may do this. The point I make is this: This House did not vote to cut the overall authorization.

ACTION TAKEN BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY TO CORRECT FORMAT OF BILL

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time to comment on the problem which the distinguished minority leader

raised yesterday. We had, in this AEC authorization bill, accustomed to the procedure of previous years, this same parliamentary problem. During this interim period we consulted with the parliamentarian and lawyers, and we have an amendment which will be offered, which will correct the situation, as soon as the proper time comes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from California and the Joint Committee for appreciating the difficulties that a bill in that format presents the House as a whole. I thank the committee for taking the proper action so that we will not be straitjacketed in the House and so that our conferees will not be straitjacketed in conference.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Exactly. The gentleman has rendered a service to the House in pointing out a longstanding potential problem in the language in bills. Our committee was very happy to make this adjustment, because, as the gentleman has said, it not only protects the rights of the Members of the House, but also protects the conferees when they go into conference with the other body.

I appreciate the gentleman calling this to our attention, and on both sides we are most happy to prepare to meet this problem.

FILE NB ATTACK ON THE U.S.S. "LIBERTY"

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear all of the speech of the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer] but of what I did hear I wish to approve and be associated with.

The *Liberty* ship incident—and indeed it was more than an incident—has been treated entirely too lightly by this Government. To say the least, too little has been said about it. This useless, unnecessary and inexcusable attack took the lives of 34 American boys, wounded 75 others, and left many others in a state of horrified shock, to say nothing of what it did to a flag-flying vessel of the U.S. Navy. How could this be treated so lightly in this the greatest Capitol in all the world?

I have heard Members of this House, and many, many others, say that if this had been done by others, the leaders of our Government would have moved in with sternness and appropriate demands or even retaliatory action.

I do not have any feeling against those, as individuals or as a people, who were responsible for this assault, destruction, and death. But according to the report which appeared in the papers this morning it was, as I had felt all along, positively unnecessary, unjustified, and inexcusable. Therefore, regardless of who is responsible—friendly or unfriendly—when American sons are unnecessarily killed by unprovoked military attack, even in a case of mistaken identity,

Uncle Sam as a rule demands to know "Why?" And ordinarily we do not stop with just a demand.

There are many Members in this House who have sons in our National Defense Establishment. There are thousands of others all over this land who have sons and daughters in such. They are spread to the four corners of this earth, and their objective is to promote and maintain peace in the world, and everybody knows it. There is no doubt about that. These men at all times are entitled to the strong backing of every citizen of this land of every race and every creed. They are entitled to and should have the strong arm, as well as the strong voice of their Government and their people behind them. But who has spoken out in their behalf from this land since some of their number were so suddenly shot down and others so severely wounded on the *Liberty* ship?

The *Liberty* ship was 15½ miles offshore, more than 12 miles beyond that which we recognize as territorial waters. It was more than 9½ miles beyond that recognized by Egypt as territorial water, and it was 9½ miles beyond the territorial waters claimed by Israel.

Before the attack, the Pentagon said unidentified planes flew in and about the ship. Undoubtedly these were the planes of the subsequent attackers. The ship was well marked, so said the Pentagon. Its name was painted on its stern. U.S. letters and numbers were on its bow. The day was clear. And it was distinctly flying the flag that you and I stood here and so praised and respected just a few days ago on Flag Day. But what respect have we shown for it since it was so recklessly shot down by the Israel attackers?

What complaint have we registered? What has Washington said? To tell you the truth, this great Capital as well as this great Government—if it can still be called great—was and is as quiet as the tomb regarding this horrible event.

The Pentagon has just concluded and made public a report on this incident. According to reports in the news media this morning, the Pentagon said the attackers "had ample opportunity" to identify the ship before that which it described as the "unprovoked" attack. The Pentagon stressed that the *Liberty* was clearly marked, that it was in international waters, that it had a right to be where it was, and that the attack was incessant, heavy and hard; that the attack came from both planes and torpedo boats, designed not simply to knock out but to destroy the ship and its men.

With due respect for the top leaders of our Government—the White House, the State Department, and the Congress—it is not enough, Mr. Speaker, to allow this matter to drop with a simple statement of regret from those responsible for the attack, no matter how sincere the state may be. It is not enough to let it drop with a simple statement that the attackers just happened to make a mistake. This is too serious a matter to accept a simple "Excuse us, please" sort of statement. There must be more than this to assure our men, our people, and our Nation that another nation must

not make such unprovoked and vicious attacks upon us.

Indeed, there must be more than expressions of sorrow and regret. As the gentleman from California has suggested there must be restitution, payment of damages, appropriate apologies, and appropriate assurances that such will not happen again. There must be the kind of action that will guarantee the respect of all nations for our ships, our flag and our country. There must be respect for the brave men of our great Navy.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, it is up to the top level of this Government to speak out on this matter and to make appropriate demands. If this is not forthcoming, then, Mr. Speaker, what do you suppose will be the thoughts of the men of our Navy and of our Armed Forces as they are directed to trouble spots around this globe on missions of peace? We do not have to be little about this matter. Nor do we have to be mean. Firmness is the word. Firmness. And we had better hurry before it is too late. And we had better hurry with it before we are classified as a second-rate nation. The world has been standing by looking at us now for days since the *Liberty* was pounced upon. What do we do? What do we say?

The people of America, the fathers and loved ones of those brave Navy men of the *Liberty* are waiting and listening. What is Washington going to say or do?

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10918) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10918, with Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts in the chair. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I realize it is late in the week. I realize that many of our Members have reservations to go to their districts for the upcoming recess.

Therefore I will do my best to expedite the debate. I will not cut off anyone who

has anything pertinent to say. However, if the Members of the House feel as I do about this matter, we will expedite the consideration of this bill for the convenience of the Members of the House. I have a 14-page analysis of the bill here which, under ordinary circumstances, I might be constrained to read in toto. However, the same information is in the report which is available to all of you. Therefore I will state the main purposes of the bill and ask unanimous consent to have the analysis of my remarks printed at this point in the RECORD. Then when the reading of the bill after general debate is called for, I will ask unanimous consent at that time that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at all points.

I hope that the membership will cooperate in this way so we can expedite this matter since this is a noncontroversial bill. There may be one or two items that some Members of the House differ with us on, but the House section of the joint committee is unanimous in its reporting of the bill which you now have in front of you.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the bill H.R. 10918 is to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1968. Pursuant to section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the joint committee has considered the proposed fiscal year 1968 authorization for all appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission, including both operating and plant and capital equipment funds. Our hearings on this matter were held over a period of 7 weeks and consumed a total of 34 hours in public and executive sessions. In the course of our hearings, the committee considered the AEC's programs in considerable detail.

In general, this bill would authorize appropriations to the AEC in the total amount of \$2,633,876,000 for "Operating expenses" and "Plant and capital equipment" for fiscal year 1968, including increases in prior years' authorization. This amount is about \$4 million less than the AEC's authorization request to Congress, and about \$374 million more than the AEC's fiscal year 1967 authorization.

Close to \$200 million of this authorization increase is attributable to new weapons construction and operating requirements. The authorization for the overall reactor development program increases by \$53.4 million. There are significant increases in prior year project authorizations (\$81.5 million) primarily associated with a fast flux test facility and a meson physics facility. The balance of unobligated funds from prior years—which reduces the authorization request—is substantially less this year than last.

Section 101(a) of H.R. 10918 would authorize appropriations of \$2,164,843,000 for "operating expenses" of the AEC. On page 3 of the report before you, you will find a breakdown of the Joint Committee's recommended authorization for AEC's major programs and subprograms. A more detailed discussion of each committee action will be found in the section of the report entitled "Committee Comments," beginning at page 8. If any Members have questions about any spe-

cific committee action, I will be happy to attempt to answer them.

Section 101(b) of the bill would authorize appropriations of \$338,233,000 for "Plant and capital equipment." Again, I will be happy to respond to any specific questions on the "Plant and capital equipment" budget.

One of the more significant of the Joint Committee's actions under this section of the bill is a proposed increase of \$15,000,000 over the amount—\$700,500,000—requested by the Commission for its important nuclear weapons program. On the basis of information elicited in executive hearings, the committee believes that a more intensive development and testing program than would be possible with the amount of money requested by the AEC is required if development of new weapons systems and their entry into production are to occur at a pace consistent with the national security. It is toward this end that the committee has recommended this \$15,000,000 increase in the weapons program.

In connection with the weapons program it should also be noted that this bill would authorize \$180,250,000 in plant and capital equipment for the program in fiscal year 1968. Included in this request is \$100,500,000 for the construction of new weapons production capabilities at six locations: Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Rocky Flats, Colo.; Burlington, Iowa; Amarillo, Tex.; Tampa, Fla.; and Savannah River, S.C. The major portion of the new weapons production capabilities requested relate to warhead production for Poseidon and other new nuclear weapons systems.

In another of the Commission's important programs—the reactor development program—the committee has recommended a net reduction of \$1,750,000 from the AEC's operating fund request. The total recommended operating authorization is \$484,290,00.

Up sharply—by about 40 percent—is spending for the high gain fast breeder reactor program, where the program level will go from approximately \$51 million in fiscal 1967 to about \$71 million in fiscal 1968. Major increases have been proposed for fiscal year 1968 in a further effort to concentrate resources on the longer range objectives of the reactor development program. As most of you know, the breeder reactor is the one which holds the promise of providing this Nation and the world with a virtually limitless supply of energy. If our long-term energy needs are to be solved, it is absolutely essential that breeder reactors be developed.

A very significant point has been reached concerning test facilities for the fast breeder program. Included in this budget is the balance in funding of \$80 million for construction of the fast flux test facility at Richland, Wash. This facility, for which \$7.5 million in architect-engineering funds was previously authorized, will provide critically needed test facilities for the sodium cooled fast breeder program. In light of the complexity of this facility, test results from it are not expected until about 1975. We feel that it is important, therefore, to authorize this project this year.

Insofar as the more highly developed light water reactors are concerned, orders for their construction continue to be placed at a brisk pace by the Nation's utilities. Again in calendar year 1966, major commitments were made to nuclear-powered electrical generating capacity. During the year approximately 16.5 million kilowatts of nuclear fueled electrical generating capacity were ordered.

By comparison, about one-fourth of that amount, or 4.7 million kilowatts, of nuclear-fueled generating capacity were ordered in the preceding year—a year when more nuclear capacity was contracted for than in all the years prior thereto. This trend has not abated in the first 6 months of the present calendar year.

While this rapid growth of the nuclear power industry is indeed encouraging to those of us who have worked for the development of an additional energy source for this Nation, the committee has re-emphasized to the designers, manufacturers and utilities that they must pay unparalleled attention to the details of design, construction, and operation to assure that performance and safety requirements are met. The heavy demands that are being, and increasingly will be, put upon all of our sources of energy—be it coal, gas, oil hydroelectric or nuclear—makes it essential that powerplants using the newest of these energy sources become available without significant delays.

With respect to the Government's R. & D. endeavors in the civilian power program 1966 also saw a number of significant developments. During the year the AEC, with the Joint Committee's encouragement, further concentrated Government development efforts on fewer power reactor concepts. A number of concepts were dropped, including the experimental beryllium oxide reactor—EBOR—and the heavy water organic cooled reactor HWOCR—concepts. The latter concept was dropped after the Joint Committee recommended and the AEC performed, an intensive review of the program to determine whether the technical and economic factors involved, when viewed in relation to the potential of competing systems, justified the expenditure of the resources needed to carry out this program. The effect of the decision was to save \$15 million in fiscal year 1968 alone. In addition, the sodium reactor experiment—SRE—was terminated because of its limited potential value in the advanced sodium cooled reactor field. Further concentration of effort on the more promising reactor concepts is planned.

I think the Commission is to be commended for the forthright way in which it has weeded out a number of these development programs when it became apparent to the Commission that the line of effort involved was not feasible or sufficiently promising, or did not offer significant advantages over alternate systems competing for limited funds. The easier course in such cases might be to spare the ax and simply continue the program at a relatively modest funding level. The Commission is to be congratulated for making these oftentimes very hard decisions.

Two Government-industry cooperative power projects in the reactor development program—namely, the Fort St. Vrain reactor in Colorado and the metropolitan water district nuclear power-desalting project in southern California—are at important stages. Regarding the Colorado project, the committee is pleased to note that the 9-month period of power operation of its forerunner, the Peach Bottom reactor, began on June 3, 1967, following satisfactory completion of a reasonable demonstration period.

The next—or construction—phase of the demonstration high-temperature gas-cooled reactor is dependent upon continued successful operation of the smaller Peach Bottom reactor. Thus the upcoming period is of critical importance in determining the future of this joint AEC, Public Service Co. of Colorado, and General Dynamics Corp. project.

The parties involved in the metropolitan water district nuclear power-desalting project are continuing to take the necessary steps to carry this project forward. The committee reviewed developments in this connection with the AEC during the recent authorization hearings. The committee understands that a construction permit application may be filed by the participating electrical utilities with the Commission's regulatory staff by the fall of the year.

The committee intends to continue to monitor developments in both of these important projects closely.

There are other important reactor applications which are fully covered in the committee's report before you, and which anticipate other speakers will address themselves to during the course of debate on this bill. These include applications in space, and in the first line warships of our Navy.

In the physical research program, the committee has recommended authorization of several important projects. First and foremost, perhaps, is the recommended initial authorization of \$7,333,000 for the 200 Bev accelerator, to be located at Weston, Ill. As you will recall, the proposed site of the 200 Bev was among the six which the National Academy of Sciences recommended to the Atomic Energy Commission, and was the unanimous selection of the five AEC Commissioners.

On the basis of intensive hearings by both the full Joint Committee as well as the Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation, the committee voted to recommend an authorization of \$2½ million less than the \$10 million requested by the Commission.

These moneys will be used principally for architect-engineer work for the project. It will be recognized, of course, that this is only a fraction of the total cost of the facility.

The budget also includes funding of an additional \$50.3 million for the Meson physics facility at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory in Los Alamos, N. Mex. It is estimated that the total cost of this project will be approximately \$55 million. Earlier \$4.7 million was authorized for this project, primarily for architect-engineering work. Also proposed to be located at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory is a project which would house

and power the proposed scyllac controlled fusion experimental device. This bill includes an \$8.5 million construction authorization for this purpose. The project is the first new construction project requested by the Commission for controlled fusion research in the past 5 years.

Action on another important physical research project, the omnitron accelerator proposed for the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in Berkeley, Calif., has been deferred by the Committee in fiscal year 1968.

In view of the cost of the proposed machine, as well as the competition it faces for the limited resources available for new accelerator projects, the Committee voted to put this project aside for this year without prejudice.

I will now summarize very briefly the remaining sections of H.R. 10918.

Section 102 of the bill would impose certain cost limitations on the initiation of construction projects, similar in most respects to limitations contained in other AEC authorization acts.

Section 103 of the bill would authorize the AEC to perform design work, subject to the availability of appropriations, on construction projects which have been submitted to Congress for authorization. This special authority would allow the AEC to undertake preliminary design work on projects which are of such urgency that actual physical construction must be initiated promptly after appropriations for the projects have been approved.

Section 104 of the bill would allow the AEC to transfer funds between the "operating expenses" and the "plant and capital equipment" accounts to the extent permitted by an appropriations act. In the past, the AEC appropriations acts have allowed the AEC to make transfers between these two accounts of up to 5 percent of the appropriations for either account, provided that neither appropriations could be increased by more than 5 percent by such a transfer.

Section 105 of the bill would amend the AEC authorization act for fiscal year 1958 (P.L. 85-162) by extending for an additional year, until June 30, 1968, the date for approving proposals under the third round of the AEC's cooperative power reactor demonstration program.

Section 106 of the bill would amend previous AEC authorization acts to increase two project authorizations, as discussed above, and change the location of another project previously authorized.

Section 107 of the bill would rescind authorization for two projects which are no longer considered necessary, except for funds heretofore obligated.

These are the highlights of H.R. 10918. It is the belief of the Joint Committee that this bill provides for a prudent authorization which is sufficient to assure the continuation of essential activities in both the military and peaceful applications of atomic energy.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to state that H.R. 10918 was reported out by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy without any dissent among the House Members of the Committee, and I urge its enactment in its present form.

June 29, 1967

CONGRESSMEN

Post Office Committee

Thaddeus J. Dulski, New York; David N. Henderson, North Carolina; Arnold Olsen, Montana; Morris K. Udall, Arizona; Dominick V. Daniels, New Jersey; Robert N. C. Nix, Pennsylvania; Joe Pool, Texas; William J. Green, Pennsylvania; James M. Hanley, New York; Charles H. Wilson, California; Jerome E. Waldie, California; Richard C. White, Texas; William D. Ford, Michigan; Lee H. Hamilton, Indiana; Frank J. Brasco, New York; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; H. R. Gross, Iowa; Glenn Cunningham, Nebraska; Edward J. Derwinski, Illinois; Albert W. Johnson, Pennsylvania; James A. Broyhill, North Carolina; Daniel E. Button, New York; William L. Scott, Virginia; Philip E. Ruppe, Michigan; James A. McClure, Idaho; Fletcher Thompson, Georgia.

Area Congressmen

Indiana, Lee Herbert Hamilton, 9th Dist. Indiana.

Kentucky, Marlon Gene Snyder, 4th Dist. Kentucky.

Ohio, Robert Taft, Jr. and Donald D. Clancy, Cincinnati.

Address

Address all Congressmen to: House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

File NE

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS DEMONSTRATES NECESSITY FOR A STRONG AND HEALTHY DOMESTIC OIL INDUSTRY

(Mr. SHRIVER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, this is an appropriate time to bring to the attention of the Congress once again the importance of a meaningful mandatory oil import program to our domestic oil industry.

For too long the administration has dealt out promises but failed to deliver in terms of preserving a strong domestic industry. Now we have before us the experience of the Middle East crises. The outbreak of the war in the Middle East between Israel and the Arab States drove home the absolute necessity of our maintaining a strong domestic petroleum industry.

Shortly after hostilities broke out in the Middle East, the Department of Interior issued a petroleum emergency declaration. Approximately 7 million barrels of daily oil production had been lost to the Western world as a result of a cutoff of oil supplies by certain Arab nations.

The Middle East crisis demonstrates the importance of maintaining the effectiveness of the oil import program in the interest of national security.

For nearly 7 years now I have repeatedly called attention to the underlying purpose of the mandatory oil import program. Simply stated, the primary reason for the oil import program is the security of the United States of America. We must have a strong and stable domestic petroleum industry to guarantee adequate oil supplies for the Nation's domestic needs and or its defense requirements.

The Middle East developments have given us firsthand experience that we cannot depend upon foreign sources for

our petroleum requirements. We must be able to draw upon a healthy and vigorous domestic supply and reserve which can serve our own needs as well as that of the free world.

It is becoming apparent the only way to stabilize the program and provide the domestic industry with the necessary assurances is to write basic guidelines into the law. I have introduced H.R. 10698 to spell out those guidelines.

Mr. Speaker, time and again I have called attention to the deteriorating condition of the independent oil industry. It is a sick industry.

In my own State of Kansas most petroleum activities reached a peak in 1956, and since that time they have been going downhill steadily. There are several key indicators of the depression which has hit the independent producer in Kansas.

The number of rotary rigs in Kansas is down from 169 in 1956 to approximately 40 this year. This means that drilling exploration has continued to decline.

What should be of great concern to all Americans, particularly at this time, is a steady decline in crude oil reserves. These reserves, according to the Kansas State Geological Survey, have dropped from 862.4 million barrels in 1962 to 751.6 million barrels in 1965, and they are declining still.

In recent years we also have witnessed a loss of highly skilled jobs because of the downturn in this very important industry in Kansas.

One of the primary reasons for these declines is that excessive imports from Canada, Latin America, and the Middle East have largely removed the incentive for looking for new oil reserves. A meaningful oil import program is essential if we are to stimulate investment in the domestic oil industry.

The bill I have introduced is not an emergency measure because of the Middle East crisis. Of course, the crisis has helped drive home the validity of what Members of Congress from oil-producing States and representatives of the independent oil industry have been saying for many years. We must have a vigorous, healthy domestic petroleum industry in the United States to insure the security and defense of our country as well as continuing oil resources for the free world.

We have repeatedly pointed to the need for strengthening the mandatory oil import program.

The administration has held hearings on the program but no meaningful relief for the independent oil producer has been forthcoming. There are those who have been close observers of the hearings held in the past by the Department of Interior who have expressed the belief that the import hearings are actually "post decision hearings," and that the independent producer will be the victim of increased oil imports.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that Congress give speedy consideration to this legislation. It also would be in the best interests of our Nation and this important industry to have a thorough investigation of the

oil import program by the appropriate committees of the Congress.

America cannot afford to let one of its most vital industries wither by default for want of vigorous action. Oil imports must be controlled so as to permit the domestic industry to have its fair share of the domestic market, replace its depleted reserves, maintain an efficient distributive system and a strong financial structure. Only then can America retain its position of world leadership and prosperity in peace as well as a posture of strength to meet any military situation.

On Sunday, June 11, 1967, the oil editor of the Wichita, Kans., Eagle, Mr. Ted Brooks, wrote an editorial which emphasized the uncertainty of foreign oil supplies and the importance of a direct stimulation of domestic oil producers. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Brooks' oil-page editorial:

MIDDLE EAST WAR REVEALS NO SAFETY IN FOREIGN OIL

It has become clear to Americans everywhere that the fuel and energy security of the United States and the world is suspended on a vulnerable thread of transportation from insecure sources of supply in the Middle East and Africa. They control 13 million barrels of oil daily, or 37 per cent of the world's 35 million. Asian and Russian sources, which dangle on equally tenuous lines, account for about seven million. It adds up to 20 million barrels daily.

The international oil industry, curiously intent on saving face until the truth becomes irrefutable, has been assuring the world at large that it faces but a mere inconvenience—you move a tanker here and a tanker there and presto you have business as usual, unless someone goes into the tanker-sinking business.

In the U.S., which nurtures the bulk of the international companies, the American Petroleum Institute, their mouthpiece, has issued vague reassurance that we can continue to roar over the hills behind 400 horses for the indefinite future. A state-aligned industry that has poured its resources into the development of fantastic profits in foreign areas has no choice but to hide or justify the fact that these profits have been earned at the expense of domestic production and a domestic producing industry that is now on the way to becoming extinct.

Oil production and consumption are complex worldwide operations. You do not substitute for the loss of five, 10 or 20 million barrels daily by moving ships here and there. Extra capacity available in Texas, Louisiana, Canada and Venezuela is useless if less than half of the claimed surplus can be delivered where it is needed. Yet, even an independent petroleum association has dutifully joined its sponsors in proclaiming the availability of an extra 2.5 million barrels daily in the U.S.

There is no assurance that the international companies will put all of the domestic oil into U.S. channels regardless of need. If the Suez crisis of 10 years ago is any guide, they will boost the price of crude and send part of it to Europe. Then, after the emergency, when they have re-established foreign oil profits, they will blandly cut the domestic crude price and thus continue to barter off U.S. self-sufficiency and security.

There is but one answer—a two-part one: In some manner, either through price or price equivalents, domestic production and security must be assured by direct stimulation of producers.

The international oil industry must be kicked out of the easy alliance with our

H 8326

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 29, 1967

government that has exposed the U.S. to side-taking and entanglement in dollar diplomacy that now masquerades under other names.

NASA AUTHORIZATION

(Mr. SCHADEBERG (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. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that I did not enter into the discussion and debate prior to the passage of the national aeronautics and space administration authorization act on Thursday, I did have strong feelings about the propriety of such passage.

I voted against H.R. 10340 because of its almost overwhelming magnitude. No one could oppose NASA and its basic objectives, but I feel very strongly that we must hold down excessive spending during a war. And the war in which we are presently engaged is costing ever-mounting staggering sums. If we are to give our troops all the support and equipment they need, we must start to make sacrifices fiscally here at home.

I cannot believe that massive Federal programs will falter or die if they are pared to more realistic amounts. It is quite apparent that the administration will expect the taxpayer to live on a reduced amount when they come to Congress later this year with another request for a tax increase. It is the same old story—the Government will overspend and then ask the poor bewildered taxpayer to tighten his belt.

My voting record may well continue to reflect my opposition to unreasonable requests by the administration at the expense of the already hopelessly harassed taxpayer.

THE ALEWIFE PROBLEM

(Mr. SCHADEBERG (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. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill similar to that of my colleague and friend, CLEM ZABLOCKI, designed to control or eliminate the alewife and other pests in the waters of the Great Lakes.

The problem is again acute and does not need to be spelled out, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] told the story very graphically on Wednesday last. I will cooperate fully with my colleague in an effort to see this much-needed bill become law.

THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION LAW

(Mr. RUMSFELD (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. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in just 5 more days, on July 4, 1967, the Declaration of Independence will be strengthened by a new Federal law.

It is the freedom of information law—Public Law 89-487—which reasserts the fundamental right of the American people to know what their Federal Government is planning and doing. The law, unanimously approved by both the Senate and the House of Representatives a year ago, becomes effective on a most appropriate day. By guaranteeing the public's right of access to Government information, the new law reinforces our independence and freedom. It reiterates that our Nation was founded on the principle that the Government derives its power from the consent of an informed electorate.

The freedom of information law is important because we in this country have placed all of our faith, all of our hope, in the intelligence of the people and in their interest in their government. We have said that ours is a government to be guided by the citizens. From this it follows that Government will serve us well only if the people are well informed.

It is appropriate today to recognize some of the individuals who have played significant roles in the formulation and passage of this new law.

In the forefront of the battle to oppose secrecy in Government during the 1950's has been the chairman of the Government Operations Committee's Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, the Honorable JOHN E. MOSS, of California. For more than 12 years now, Congressman MOSS has been a leader in the fight to insure the public's right to know. His leadership has been vital to the development of this legislation.

So, too, have other former and current members of the subcommittee made significant contributions to the progress of this legislation. They include: former Representatives CLARE HOFFMAN, GEORGE MADER, and Senator ROBERT GRIFFIN, all of Michigan, who ably served on the subcommittee at various times in the 1950's and early 1960's; Congressman DANTE FASCELL, of Florida, one of the first members of the subcommittee; and particularly current members of the subcommittee PORTER HARDY, Jr., of Virginia, ranking minority member OGDEN R. REID, of New York, and ROBERT DOLE, of Kansas.

Literally hundreds of reporters, editors, broadcasters, and news media executives have assisted in the development of this legislation. Those who have made most significant contributions include: the late Dr. Harold L. Cross and the late Dr. Jacob Scher, both of whom assisted the subcommittee with their valuable counsel; James Pope, formerly of the Louisville Courier-Journal; Basil Walters, formerly of the Chicago Daily News; J. Russell Wiggins, of the Washington Post; Creed Black, of the Chicago Daily News; Herbert Brucker, of the Hartford Courant; John Colburn, of the Wichita Eagle and Beacon; and Eugene Pulliam, of the Indianapolis News.

Also, Clark Mollenhoff, of Cowles Publications, Inc.; Julius Frandsen, of United Press International; Jack Norman, of Fairchild Publications; William McGaffin, of the Chicago Daily News; Nick Kotz, of Cowles Publications, Inc.;

Joseph Costa, of the National Press Photographers Association; Howard Bell, of the National Association of Broadcasters; Eugene Patterson, of the Atlanta Constitution; V. M. Newton, Jr., of the Tampa Tribune; Theodore A. Serrell, of the National Newspaper Association; and Stanford Smith, of the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

Mention should also be made of some of the staff members of the subcommittee who have contributed to this legislation. They include the late Dr. Wallace Parks, Samuel J. Archibald, Benny Kass, Jack Matteson, J. Lacey Reynolds, Jack Howard, and Paul Southwick.

In addition, dozens of other newsmen, public information officers of the Federal Government, and Government security officers have contributed to the adoption of this legislation.

When the Department of Justice distributed guidelines for implementation of the law to all Government agencies recently, it stated:

If government is to be truly of, by, and for the people, the people must know in detail the activities of government. Nothing so diminishes democracy as secrecy. Self-government, the maximum participation of the citizenry in affairs of state, is meaningful only with an informed public. How can we govern ourselves if we know not how we govern? Never was it more important than in our times of mass society, when government affects each individual in so many ways, that the right of the people to know the actions of their government be secure.

These words accurately reflect the importance of the new law. It is my hope, as we observe the Fourth of July 1967, that the essence of these words may begin to be reflected in meaningful actions by the Federal Government in behalf of an increased availability of Government information and, thus, in a better informed public.

(Mr. MESKILL (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. MESKILL'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE PROPOSED STUDY OF FCC

(Mr. CONTE (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. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor today to express my great concern over the 4-to-3 decision last Thursday by the Federal Communications Commission giving its approval to the proposed merger of International Telephone & Telegraph Co. and American Broadcasting Co.

In all candor, I must state that I find the history of these proceedings before the FCC, culminating with last week's decision, extremely disillusioning. It is certain to cause legitimate public doubt and lack of confidence in the Commission and ultimately in our entire governmental processes, if the merger is allowed to be consummated.

June 29, 1967

Justice, and Communist countries have refused to accept the Court's jurisdiction when the United States has instituted proceedings against them in the past. North Viet-Nam cannot be compelled to come before the Court, and there is no reason to expect that it would submit the question of the legality of its use of force against South Viet-Nam to the judgment of any impartial tribunal. In these circumstances, resort to the Court by the U.S. could be widely interpreted as an empty propaganda gesture.

Under the UN Charter, the maintenance of international peace and security is primarily the responsibility of the Security Council. We have twice initiated discussions of the Viet-Nam conflict in the Security Council, but North Viet-Nam and Communist China have denied the competence of the United Nations to consider this dispute and have maintained that any decisions by the United Nations would be considered "null and void." Furthermore, in the absence of agreement in the Security Council, we believe it unlikely that the majority of members of the General Assembly would wish to take any substantial decision on the Viet-Nam issue.

Without wishing in any way to minimize the importance to a stable world order of impartial international settlement of legal disputes, I must note, nevertheless, that the Vietnamese conflict involves many political issues which a court could not be expected to resolve. What is needed most is a willingness on the part of North Viet-Nam to negotiate a settlement that protects the legitimate interests of both North and South. I do not believe that efforts to submit the legal issues involved to the International Court of Justice would be likely to enhance the prospects for such a compromise settlement.

Thank you for sending your suggestions on these matters. We are most anxious to examine every possible avenue to peaceful settlement of the conflict in Viet-Nam. We believe that it is impossible to devise a fair accommodation of the legitimate interests of both sides, and we shall continue to make every effort to bring about a settlement with that end in view.

Sincerely yours,

W. W. ROSTOW.

In several important respects I dissent from the conclusions Mr. Rostow reaches regarding my proposal. Mr. Rostow's contention: "We are convinced that our actions in Vietnam are in accord with international law and with the United Nations Charter," does not mean, in fact, that our actions are necessarily consistent with the generally accepted principles of international law, the United States Constitution, or the United Nations Charter.

In fact, there is a considerable body of opinion which holds to the contrary. Some of the evidence gathered by these critics is impressive and we should be willing that it be taken into account. The announcement of virtuous ends does not relieve us of the responsibility to see that our policy is consistent with the ends which we have established. That the White House feels our actions are in accord with international law is of course not surprising, but the general body of world opinion remains to be convinced.

The fact that North Vietnam has not accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court is not material to my proposal for general reasons.

First, by its application for membership in the United Nations, North Vietnam has expressed its willingness to accept peaceful settlement of international disputes. Presumably North Vietnam

would expose itself to public censure if it refused to honor principles to which it has assented in writing.

Second, it is not necessary for a nation to have previously accepted the jurisdiction of the ICJ before a suit is filed. North Vietnam could accept the jurisdiction of the ICJ at the time the issue was joined.

Third, even assuming North Vietnam—or South Vietnam—refused to accept the jurisdiction of the ICJ, the United States could nevertheless ask the United Nations Security Council or General Assembly for an advisory opinion from the ICJ on the issues involved.

Mr. Rostow is correct in stating that "under the U.N. Charter, the maintenance of international peace and security is primarily the responsibility of the Security Council." However, the maintenance of peace is not the exclusive responsibility of the Security Council as the United States itself contended at the time of the adoption of the "Uniting for Peace Resolution" in 1951. Indeed this position has been affirmed by the ICJ itself in its advisory opinion on United Nations Peacekeeping Expenses in Suez and in the Congo.

The fact that North Vietnam and Communist China have denied the competence of the United Nations to consider this dispute is again immaterial. We should continue to stress some type of negotiation through the United Nations institutions in order to accomplish a political settlement, or failing in that, continue to expose North Vietnam for its unwillingness to accept United Nations adjudication of the dispute.

It is entirely possible, as Mr. Rostow stated, that if there was an absence of agreement in the Security Council on this matter the General Assembly would not want to take the issue to the ICJ. However, history records an exception to this theory. The General Assembly was willing to refer the question of U.N. peacekeeping expenses to the ICJ notwithstanding the opposition of two of the permanent members of the Security Council, France and the Soviet Union.

I would be willing to concede that many of the issues in Vietnam are political. But the basic questions involved are legal, not political. I set out in my letter to the President interpretations of the Geneva Accords of 1954, the United Nations Charter, the SEATO Treaty, and general principles of international law involving these legal questions.

In the search for peace in Vietnam I hope that the White House and State Department will continue to give every proposal serious consideration and not be blinded by self-fulfilling prophecies and overly optimistic statements on the progress of the war. I am grateful to Mr. Rostow for his courteous and serious attention to my proposal. Perhaps at some later date he may determine that it or some part of it merits additional attention.

APPROPRIATION BILLS STILL PENDING

(Mr. LANGEN (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. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, Congress has again reached the end of a fiscal year without passing the necessary appropriations bills on time. Until today, only one Department—Interior—knew how much money it would get for the new fiscal year starting this Saturday. The others will operate under a continuing resolution without actually knowing what Congress will eventually appropriate.

In fairness to the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. Speaker, nine regular appropriations bills and two supplementals have been cleared. The Committee on Appropriations cannot proceed with the five remaining bills until authorizing legislation clears Congress.

One example is the foreign assistance program, commonly known as foreign aid. There is no guarantee that Congress will even authorize a program in foreign aid for the next fiscal year, much less appropriate the money for it. But under the continuing resolution, foreign aid funds will continue to be dispensed without proper direction being provided by the legislative branch of the Government. This is unpardonable, considering the serious doubts in our aid programs following the Arab-Israeli war.

I hope that Congress will eventually trim at least \$5 billion from the budget requests by the time all of the appropriations bills have been passed. In the nine regular appropriations bills passed by the House so far, over \$2.8 billion has been cut from the budget requests. We can trim at least another \$2.2 billion from the remaining requests, and it is hoped that the Senate sustains these cuts. We must accomplish some fiscal restraint, because we are in real fiscal difficulties in this country today.

File: WE

CONGRESSMAN WHALEN ANNOUNCES ADDITIONAL SUPPORT FOR THE MIDDLE EAST RESOLUTION

(Mr. WHALEN (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. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, since 54 of my colleagues joined me in introducing a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the establishment of permanent peace in the Middle East over a week ago, I have recirculated the resolution.

I was prompted to seek the support of other Members by the remarks of Soviet Premier Alexei N. Kosygin on Sunday, June 25, 1967.

Mr. Kosygin, according to a transcript of his remarks printed in the New York Times on Monday, June 26, 1967, stated that Israel must withdraw from the territory it occupied following the cease-fire before negotiations can begin.

Mr. Kosygin said:

In order to start the consideration of the possible peaceful solutions of the problems of the Middle East it is necessary as a first step to achieve the withdrawal of forces behind the armistice line.

That is the most important. It is indeed the total question today.

I agree with Premier Kosygin that the question of withdrawal is of prime importance. But, as I stated in my resolution, acceptance of this precondition of Israeli withdrawal would repeat the mistake of 1956 which led to the resumption of hostilities 11 years later.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that the number of Members of this House who recognize the validity of this point and who have introduced identical or similar resolutions has increased to 92.

The additional 38 Members who have introduced resolutions as of today and since June 20, 1967 are: JOHN B. ANDERSON of Illinois, JAMES C. CLEVELAND, JOSEPH E. KARTH, TIM LEE CARTER, HENRY HELSTOSKI, ALEXANDER PIRNIE, WILLIAM D. FORD of Michigan, EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, ROBERT PRICE of Texas, GEORGE M. RHODES of Pennsylvania.

EDWARD R. ROYBAL, ROBERT N. C. NIX, ROBERT J. CORBETT, BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN, JAMES HARVEY, WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey, THADDEUS J. DULSKI, WILLIAM R. ANDERSON of Tennessee, FRANK M. CLARK.

FRANK J. BRASCO, FLETCHER THOMPSON of Georgia, BROCK ADAMS, JAMES R. GROVER, JR., HORACE R. KORNEGAY, CARL D. PERKINS, THOMAS L. ASHLEY, JOHN R. DELLENBACK, EMANUEL CELLER.

ABRAHAM J. MULTER, HERBERT TENZER, JOSEPH J. ADDABBO, JACOB H. GILBERT, EDNA F. KELLY, CLAUDE PEPPER, JOSEPH Y. RESNICK, LESTER L. WOLFF, LEONARD FARBSTEIN.

GLASSBORO SUMMIT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUNT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. HUNT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, on June 23, 1967, without any advance notice, a summit meeting was conducted at Glassboro, N.J., between President Lyndon B. Johnson and Premier Alexei Kosygin, of the Soviet Union. The exact site for the meeting was in the home of the president of Glassboro State College; namely, Dr. Thomas E. Robinson. The house itself has for many years been known as Hollybush and has traditionally been the residence of presidents of the college.

Glassboro College was formerly the Glassboro State Teachers Normal School, but the college has grown so large during the past 15 years that it is now a 4-year accredited State college specializing in teachers' education and a liberal arts course.

I know the house very well, having visited there on many occasions. It is located about one and a half miles from my home. I live in Pitman, N.J., which adjoins Glassboro directly. Both towns have a population of about 10,000 people each.

The honor of having a summit meeting at Hollybush is something that the people of Glassboro and Gloucester County will never forget. Although I was not invited by Gov. Richard Hughes of the State of New Jersey to attend the welcoming functions, nevertheless, I did visit the campus during the initial summit meeting on June 23, 1967.

I am proud to say the meeting was conducted in the First Congressional District and I am likewise extremely proud of the reception that was accorded President Johnson and Mr. Kosygin. The deportment of our people was exemplary with none of the usual fanfare of kooks, disgruntled people, draft card burners, and so forth, in evidence. Our people greeted the leaders enthusiastically knowing full well that this meeting could be the means of averting world war III.

We are hopeful that many good things came from the discussions that were conducted by the two leaders, not only on June 23, 1967, but at the subsequent meeting on Sunday, June 25, 1967. All of the world looks anxiously to the future, hoping that the summit meeting will bear fruit and be instrumental in worldwide peace. Although indications at the present do not point toward an early solution of the Middle East crisis and the Vietnam situation, the people are still hopeful that statesmanship will prevail as a result of this meeting.

I am inserting in the Record today several articles that appeared in different papers which will indicate to the entire world the attitudes of the people of Glassboro, N.J., and Gloucester County.

The first article was published by the Courier-Post newspaper, of Camden, N.J., under a dateline of June 23, 1967, and carries a thumbnail description of Dr. Thomas E. Robinson, our esteemed president of the Glassboro State College. I have known Dr. Robinson since childhood, due to the fact that we were both raised during our teenage years in the same locality in Trenton, N.J. He is an outstanding educator and a gentleman of the highest caliber. His wife, Mrs. Robinson, has long been known in our community as a gentle lady.

The second insertion that I am making today was likewise printed in the Courier-Post of Camden under the dateline of June 23, 1967, and was captioned "Leaders Hailed by Throng." The article was written by Bob Houriet and Lee Daniels, two outstanding writers of the Courier-Post staff. Their article carries a thumbnail description of the actions exhibited by Glassboro residents, which, in my estimation, depicted the friendly nature of our people.

The third article was printed in the New York Daily News under the dateline of June 24, 1967, and was written by Joe Cassidy, staff correspondent of the News. He likewise indicates the attitudes of some of our people in the greetings to President Johnson and Mr. Kosygin.

My sincere wish is that the summit meeting which has just been concluded at Hollybush will be the answer to many of the personal prayers offered up by the Glassboro citizens and the people of the First Congressional District of New Jersey, which I represent.

The articles follow:

[From the Camden, N.Y. Courier-Post, June 23, 1967]

GLASSBORO PRESIDENT ROBINSON NAMED MAN OF THE YEAR

(By Charles Fetzold)

GLASSBORO.—Two months ago Dr. Thomas E. Robinson, president of Glassboro State College, was named "Man of the Year" for "putting Glassboro on the map."

Under the 62-year-old Trenton native's guidance, the 44-year-old institution's enrollment has grown from 418 undergraduate students to more than 3,000 students plus 3,500 part-time and graduate students.

Dr. Robinson, tall, gray-haired and distinguished looking, has been president of the college since 1952.

The former superintendent of Mercer County schools, a position he held from 1944 through 1952, is the institution's third president. He received a B.A. degree at Lehigh University, an M.A. at University of Pennsylvania and D.Ed. at Rutgers University.

From the time he was graduated from college in 1926 until 1944, Dr. Robinson was employed in the Trenton school system, where he served progressively as a teacher and a principal before becoming the Mercer County superintendent.

The educator lives with his wife, Margaret, in a colonial style home on the Whitney Mansion grounds. The home, built in 1849, now is known as "Hollybush."

According to Samuel E. Witchell, associate professor of social studies, the home once was owned by a man named Whitney who was prominent in the glassmaking industry.

"Whitney entertained many prominent guests in this home," said Witchell. "But none as important as this."

Dr. Robinson, married for 38 years, has written a handbook on public relations and magazine articles and has coauthored textbooks on reading, English and character development.

He is a member of the New Jersey State Board of Examiners, chairman of the New Jersey School Building Code Revision Commission, the National Education Association's Citizenship Committee and the board of directors of the Southern New Jersey Development Council.

He has served as NJEA vice president, editor of the NJEA Review. He also edited "It Starts in the Classroom" and other publications.

[From the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post, June 23, 1967]

GAY GLASSBORO: LEADERS HAILED BY THROG (By Bob Houriet and Lee Daniels)

GLASSBORO.—With Fourth-of-July bunting, bouquets of roses and appeals for peace, this borough of 11,000 hosted an historic meetings of East and West.

They took off from work and jammed streets, half a dozen deep to catch a glimpse of the motorcades bearing President Johnson to his confrontation with Premier Alexei Kosygin.

Many of the old houses of this sedate town decked their doorways with flags.

One house flew two sheets from its windows on which were scribbled: "Welcome to Glassboro, World Leaders," and "End World Conflict."

DELUGE OF FLOWERS

For the most part, the reaction of residents was reserved. Only once was there an emotional outburst—when a crowd broke through a yellow rope separating them from the President and pelted him with red flowers.

Most residents, despite their curbside wait, missed the arrival and meeting of the two world leaders.

But 150 persons sneaked under police lines and stood in the pine trees beyond the outfield of the baseball field where President Johnson landed at 10:33 in an olive and white helicopter bearing the Presidential emblem.

The wind from the descending copter whipped the trees in the outfield.

After the Presidential party was welcomed, the motorcade swept away to "Hollybush," the ivy-covered home of the college president.

bla in the Congress, and companion measures, before the full committee of the Committee on the Judiciary. These hearings will begin on Wednesday, July 19, 1967, at 10 a.m., in room 2141, Rayburn House Office Building.

Those wishing to testify or to submit statements for the record should send their requests to the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representative, room 2137, Rayburn House Office Building.

Full NK
PERMANENT PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST—HOUSE RESOLUTION 689

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a resolution upon which a permanent peace can be based in the Middle East. Today I would like to bring this resolution to the attention of my colleagues in the House.

In order to insure permanent peace in the Middle East, I believe it is essential that peace negotiations take place directly between the belligerent nations. I am certain any agreement between the parties will prove acceptable to the world.

I know my colleagues will find this resolution of timely interest and ask that they give it their careful consideration:

H. Res. 689

A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to permanent peace in the Middle East

Whereas Israel has, for the third time, driven off the aggressors who have vowed her destruction; and

Whereas Israel asks only peace in the Middle East; and

Whereas Israel has thwarted designs of communism in the Middle East and is America's only reliable friend in the region; and

Whereas all nations have the right to live secure from threats and harassment: Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved, That the Gulf of Aqaba and the Strait of Tiran be recognized by the United Nations as international waters;

That the Constantinople Treaty of 1888 be enforced by the signatory powers so that no parties shall be denied passage through the Suez Canal;

That Israel not be required to withdraw its troops to any arbitrary line until the negotiation of a permanent peace treaty;

That peace negotiations take place primarily and directly between the belligerent parties in the Middle East;

That Israel be assured a rectification of frontiers to make its territory less vulnerable to surprise attack, including possession of the old city of Jerusalem;

That the problem of the Arab refugees from this most recent and previous wars be resolved once and forever more, with assistance from the United Nations and the United States;

That this Government and the governments of other developed nations contribute reasonable amounts of money to encourage economic development among all the belligerent states;

That the United States agree to guarantee enforcement of any peace treaty that emerges from the recent conflict.

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

[Mr. FARBSTEIN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

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

[Mr. FARBSTEIN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CONSERVATION OF OUR NATURAL RESOURCES

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I think we are all interested in conservation of our natural resources, and are prepared to do all we can do to preserve these resources for future generations of Americans. However, many of us probably do not realize that conservation also involves the efficient use and proper replenishment of resources located in or on the outskirts of our urbanized areas. My district is honored to have included in its borders 1 of 26 areas in the country selected for study in how to best develop and use the natural resources for economic growth while still providing for the recreational needs of people in and outside the area. This project is only 1 of the 26 resource conservation and development projects being considered.

If implemented, this project is expected to lead to an area income gain of over \$83 million over the next 15 years. Retention of natural resources will be balanced with industrial growth to provide the best possible living and working conditions for this growing area. One of the most laudable aspects of the project's plan is the cooperation and enthusiasm of both the area residents and potential and established industries in the region. The entire plan is studied in the June 16 Minden, La., Press-Herald, and I urge everyone to read it to gain a better understanding of how efficient use of our natural resources can benefit everyone:

LARGE ECONOMIC IMPACT IS SEEN IF R.C. & D. PLAN IS IMPLEMENTED—15-YEAR GROWTH OF \$83.3 MILLION PREDICTED

Large impact on the economy of Webster and Bossier Parishes is expected if the Resource Conservation Development Project's plan is implemented, according to officials of the pilot project.

Estimations in the Project's draft call for expenditures of more than \$44 million during a 15-year period while the plan is being installed.

In addition, the draft notes, "If all measures are installed, the gross income of the area will be increased by an estimated \$83.3 million dollars over the next 15 years."

Concerning labor, it was pointed out em-

ployment within the project area, not counting additional job opportunities, could require 4,200 man-years to implement all phases of the project.

Although the brief predicts specific monetary increases in forestry and agriculture, it simply notes implementation of other phases "will ultimately show up as increased growth in industry, recreation and tourism and associated businesses as a result of these project measures creating a more favorable atmosphere for growth.

"Increased productivity in agriculture, including forestry, resulting from accelerated land treatment and water management programs is expected to increase the gross income of the area by an estimated \$23.1 million dollars annually once all programs are completed," the report says.

BRIEF IN FT. WORTH

According to F. W. Hofmeister, project coordinator, the plan is now in Ft. Worth, Tex., being printed prior to its submission to state officials for approval the last week in June. Tentative plans call for the project plan to be in Washington, D.C. for approval by June 30, Hofmeister noted.

One of only 26 such projects underway in the country, the RC&D program for the Bossier and Webster required the services of more than 100 persons plus some 30 organizations and state and federal departments in drawing up information for the brief now being printed.

While work on the plan was underway, it was noted, 30 meetings were held with more than 800 persons in attendance.

OBJECTIVE

Officials have noted the primary objective of the RC&D plan is "to develop and use wisely natural resources for economic growth and to provide for the needs of people in and outside the project area."

It was explained the presence of a "wealth of undeveloped soil, water, forest and wildlife resources" is evidence of potential benefits in the area.

Pointing out the population rise in the project area, the report notes the trench is for persons in the Shreveport-Bossier area "to flock to the countryside for recreation and places to hunt and fish." The trend is becoming greater, thus creating pressures on land water, officials added.

STRONG WILLINGNESS

Discussing implementation of the plan, the brief points out persons in the area have indicated a strong willingness to carry out many needed project measures to the limit of their financial and technical ability.

"However," it goes on to say, "Technical and financial assistance will be needed to help do the job."

"They also know that if this assistance comes their way and the conservation and development of resources in the project area will create benefits that are difficult to measure in dollars and cents."

OBJECTIVES OUTLINED

A complete listing of objectives for the RC&D program here are outlined below:

1) Fully develop, improve, conserve and utilize the project area's woodland, cropland, grassland, wildlife and water resources to meet the following goals:

a) Triple the value of the standing timber resource woodland owner income from timber sales.

b) Double the number of forest industry associated jobs and the income in salary and wages from forest industries.

c) Increase cropland income by 25 per cent and secure new uses for cropland now producing crops in surplus.

d) Increase income from livestock enterprises by 35 per cent.

June 29, 1967

H 8351

solutions. Perhaps, most important is the growth in bank employment. Few industries have so large a ratio of clerical employees to payroll costs. If banking employment continued its 15 year post World War II growth, everybody in the labor force would be working in banks by the year 2100.

The issue was clear. Banks accepted the challenge before them with a speed uncommon for a relatively conservative profession.

By the late 1950's, a solution for automated processing of the mounting volume of checks was hit upon.

Magnetic Ink Character Recognition—known as MICR—was developed and introduced, and broke the check barrier.

Computers have opened up a new era of banking altogether. For business firms, banks can provide such automated customer services as: account-reconciliation programs; bill-collection programs; sales analyses; accounts receivable and payable; expense analyses; and inventory controls. For individual depositors, services may involve: income and disbursement analyses; consolidated statements of all information on a savings, checking or installment credit account; automatic debits; and even a paying-agent service.

The age of the checkless society or the cashless society still has many obstacles to overcome. There are trends, however, that indicate we will use less and less cash and fewer and fewer checks.

What becomes of people who have been displaced by automation?

Many old-fashioned jobs are being eliminated. Generally, personnel are transferred to similar or better positions. Statewide banking employment in Illinois has risen about 2½%. This is partly the result of the offering of new services as well as industry growth.

The Insurance Industry—which like banking consists essentially of white collar occupations—has felt the sharp impact of automation, according to testimony of witnesses from Illinois insurance companies:

Insurance is a growth industry. Since World War II, many companies have grown at a phenomenal pace.

The Franklin Life Insurance Company of Springfield, Illinois, for example, grew from one billion to 6,330,000,000 dollars of insurance in force from 1952 to 1966. And they better than doubled their life policies during that time from approximately 400,000 to 950,000.

The Continental Assurance Company of Chicago grew from five billion to eleven billion dollars of insurance in force from 1957 to 1966.

The insurance industry ranks among the largest employers in the United States, employing more than 850,000 people. More than half of these—470,000—are employed by life companies. Total employment rose 32% between 1954 and 1964.

A large part of the activity of an insurance carrier consists of the recording, storage, retrieval, and processing of information. Unless a rapidly expanding company takes advantage of every means to process this information, the burden and expense of paperwork becomes insupportable. The old manual and punch card system had served insurance company purposes well up to a point, but now is unable to keep up with the continued demand for services. There was no alternative for rapidly growing insurance carriers. They were compelled to turn to electronic computer systems. By 1963, companies accounting for 80% of all employment in the insurance field had installed computers.

Computer systems have almost eliminated decisionmaking in routine jobs. Supervisory jobs have a greater number and variety of responsibilities. Middle management personnel responsibilities have increased greatly.

Top management jobs will require more skill. Those who aspire for such positions in the future will have to be computer oriented.

What is the employment outlook in the industry?

Jobs for key punch operators and tabulating machine operators will decline within the next five years. Job opportunities for file and junior clerks will be fewer.

In short, the insurance industry will be able to absorb proportionately fewer people from the labor market in the years ahead than formerly.

At present, there is an acute shortage of trained computer personnel. Many insurance companies have had to turn to its own organization for talent, and to undertake costly training programs.

It was soon evident that companies in many industries other than insurance and banking were "beating the bushes" for trained computer programmers, systems analysts, as well as other trained personnel. This led the Commission into a two-day hearing on vocational education, manpower training programs and apprenticeship. The Commission wanted to know what was being done by our educational institutions to educate and train the workforce of Illinois for jobs attuned to the atomic, space and computer age.

One witness from industry said that forty (40) personnel directors of companies in Illinois, acknowledged dissatisfaction with the average product of our public education system. The general complaint was that literacy and mathematical skills were much too low for most jobs.

Products of public high schools and vocational high schools may be as good as they were ten (10) or fifteen (15) years ago, but that is not good enough. Today, modern industry places a much more serious demand on learning ability and achievement, particularly in the areas of reading, writing and arithmetic. A much greater demand is being made for special skills than is being turned out by vocational high schools.

Many companies object to training in machine operations that will not be useful anywhere in industry. With increasing frequency, employers comment, "We have to untrain graduates of vocational high schools before we can begin to train them on our machines."

Other witnesses representing private, state, city and federal education agencies and manpower training programs starkly outlined the training and education problems Illinois faces:

Illinois is moving ahead with an exciting program—the development of a junior college system. In the past, the State has not had institutions to do the job a junior college can do. It has had universities and it has had the secondary schools, but some fields such as medical technology are neither university nor secondary school subjects. If the junior college succeeds in becoming a community institution that serves community and state needs, such technical training can be started.

There is a broad gap at present between the training the State provides and projected developments in industry. We have not really come to grips with the many changes in workforce skills which are being brought about by technological progress.

Illinois has been among the leading states in the Union in the number of out-of-school and displaced persons enrolled in training under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. Only California and New York surpass Illinois.

Manpower training programs recently have been oriented to the disadvantaged group who are unemployed or underemployed. As a result, these programs are now geared towards filling about one-third of existing job needs while two-thirds are unmet because of a lack of funds. Consequently, emerging occupations in the skilled, technical and professional fields can be helped only on a very limited scale because of fund limitations. Even training of computer programmers has been curtailed.

Approximately ten different Federal acts provide funds for training. Each year the State is required to develop a plan for training under each of these acts. There is, however, no overall coordinating machinery for this. Coordination is considered imperative if Illinois is to derive full benefit from federal funding programs.

The effect of technological advancement in the building trades has been to reduce employment and apprenticeship opportunities. Six years ago the Cook County Building and Construction Trades Council had a membership of 130,000 building trades mechanics during peak periods. Today, it is down to less than 100,000 workers. At the same time, this smaller number of mechanics is doing a greater square footage and dollar volume of construction than ever before.

Not only building projects are affected. Road construction uses a machine that applies and pre-finishes 60-foot-wide segments of concrete. Only two or three men are needed to do final touch-up.

According to testimony presented by the Chicago Urban League, the impact of technological progress in the Chicago labor market has been to decrease the number of unskilled jobs while increasing the number of semi-skilled and skilled positions. These new job openings are out of reach for many Negro workers, primarily because the schools have failed to equip Negroes for the realities of modern day job requirements.

The representative stated that high schools are failing to educate people. Not enough money is being spent per pupil. There are not enough experienced teachers. Classrooms are overcrowded.

One of the Commission's last findings concerns the 200 billion electron volt (Proton) Accelerator Project at Weston, Illinois.

The project not only will accelerate atoms to unparalleled speeds on earth, but will also jet stream the State of Illinois into an advanced competitive position in science research. At one fell swoop, Illinois is assured of joining the elite fraternity of such science-oriented states as California, New York and Massachusetts.

There is no telling at this stage what spin offs in scientific knowledge, new technological advances and new industries may evolve out of this remarkable scientific enterprise which seeks to penetrate the innermost secrets of matter and energy. We can reasonably predict that the (Proton) Accelerator will deeply affect industry, university, public policy and labor in Illinois. It will create in economic potential of unlimited dimensions. Suffice it to say, that no single event in recent State history has an equal claim to significance in shaping the future prospects of the people in Illinois. The Commission's work has only begun.

Our study of technological progress in Illinois thus far has raised more questions than we have been able to answer. Many subjects have been scrutinized, but are far from having been probed or understood.

We have gone as far as our resources allowed since the 1965 session of the Illinois General Assembly.

It is not difficult to see that we have a long way to go to catch this tiger by the tail.

HEARINGS ON REPRESENTATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled hearings on House Joint Resolution 396, to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Colum-

H 8354

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 29, 1967

tive and coordinating agency for the programs that constitute the War on Poverty.

The bill before you strengthens, continues and in some cases expands a complex of programs that has been of incalculable benefit to the people of my city of Pittsburgh. Just as importantly, it retains the administrative and coordinating framework without which the Pittsburgh program could not have succeeded to the extent it has.

Pittsburgh's program is a success because the city was ready with appropriate plans and proper leadership a year before the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The City was able to mobilize quickly for its War on Poverty because the pattern of cooperation between the City government and the community's social, religious and civic organizations was well-established.

Pittsburgh's anti-poverty administrative agency is the Mayor's Committee on Human Resources, Inc. Both ends of its name are significant. The Mayor of Pittsburgh, the Honorable Joseph M. Barr, set up the Committee, is its chairman, and appoints a majority of the members. Yet the Committee is an incorporated private organization, not a city agency or a public body, with a membership representing many important elements in the community—business, labor, government, housing and social service agencies, the clergy, educators, civil rights groups and the poor themselves.

The Committee combines the variety of skills, powers and interests essential for a concentrated attack on poverty. Pittsburgh's War on Poverty has been a team effort from the first. Existing community services and agencies have been coordinated with each other and the city government in a way never before attempted; lines of communication are now open between the poor and the city; the poor have been given a voice in planning ways out of their poverty; and all efforts have been focused on specific target areas.

I might add here that Sargent Shriver, the very able Director of OEO, has frequently singled out the Pittsburgh anti-poverty program as a "model for the Nation."

As of yesterday, it is estimated that since early 1965 the lives of more than 120,000 disadvantaged Pittsburghers have been affected for the better by one or more of the 29 programs in the City's War on Poverty. Here are some specific examples:

In education, 54,000 children from preschool to high school age, have participated in special compensatory programs ranging from Head Start to reading clinics, to tutoring, cultural, recreational, counseling and mental health programs.

Employment centers in Pittsburgh's eight target neighborhoods have found jobs for 3,000 sixteen to twenty-one year olds in Pittsburgh's Youth Corps, nearly 300 sixteen to twenty-one year olds in Job Corps camps all over the U.S., 450 adults in sub-professional posts in anti-poverty programs in their own neighborhoods, and 590 adults in new positions in the private employment market.

Some 28,000 persons have received a range of comprehensive health services ranging from pre- and post-natal care, child medical and dental care, home visits from health teams, immunization clinics, and most recently, a neighborhood health center to be set up under a \$1.7 million OEO grant.

Social services have been brought to more than 27,000 persons. These services include family counseling, homemaker training, and welfare consultation.

Free legal services from lawyers in the eight target neighborhoods have been rendered to 3,800 clients. These lawyers also conduct consumer education classes.

Other programs include housing repair and maintenance classes for 6,000 students and special activities for 2,800 of the city's aged.

But while the City, its public and private agencies and its citizens deserve substantial

credit for combining their skills, powers and interests in a concentrated effort that necessarily involves all of them, so, too, does the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In my estimation, OEO, the machinery that Congress created to administer the War on Poverty, was well conceived, and should not be dismantled, as some have suggested, merely because it has shown some imperfections. Our nearly three years' experience with OEO are reflected in the streamlining and strengthening provisions of the bill before you.

It is my firm belief that a majority of the flaws that have shown up in the administration of certain aspects of the War on Poverty—most notably the Community Action Programs—are not inherent in the structure of OEO but rather are a reflection of the fact that some American cities were not as well prepared for the demands of the War on Poverty as was Pittsburgh.

Our Pittsburgh program shows that by combining the resources and talents available in any American community the War on Poverty can be won. But it is essential to have at the Federal level one independent agency, OEO, capable of concentrating skills and resources in the manner the local programs do.

Mr. Chairman, I have noticed that many of those who are quick to denounce the War on Poverty are equally quick to defend its specific component programs, such as Project Head Start and the Neighborhood Youth Corps. These people seem to feel that by removing the specific programs from the jurisdiction of OEO, criticism of the anti-poverty program will end. To me, this is specious logic.

First, we have seen over the years how difficult it is to assure interdepartmental cooperation on any project, and there is little reason to believe that this situation would improve if the various anti-poverty programs were parcelled out among the various departments.

Furthermore, the basic concept of the War on Poverty—a total, concentrated attack on the complex of social, physical and economic ills that afflict our poor—would be subverted by fragmenting programs that OEO has thus far carefully coordinated among departments already overburdened by the demands of their own programs.

Third, the abandonment of OEO as proposed in the Opportunity Crusade would forfeit nearly three years of experience and know-how accumulated by that agency in the administration of the War on Poverty. In many respects, the war would have to begin again from where it started in 1964.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge the Committee to retain the Office of Economic Opportunity and to strengthen and streamline its operations by adopting the amendments in the bill now before you.

Thank you for allowing me to appear here today.

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

[Mr. MULTER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

file: 102
ISRAEL FREEDOM WEEK

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, one of the major themes of our present world is the

struggle for freedom, on both a national and international level.

The Israel nation has undergone a constant struggle for freedom from oppression, attempted domination, and extinction since its inception.

The whole free world was alarmed at recent Communist backed Arab attempts to drive the Israelis into the sea, and as the struggle progressed the free world was enmeshed in the Israelis' valiant efforts to maintain an outpost of freedom in a desert of domination.

It is with great pleasure and pride that I am able to announce that the House of Representatives and the Senate of Florida, with the concurrence of the Governor, the Honorable Claude R. Kirk, have designated June 12 to June 19, 1967, as Israel Freedom Week, in commemoration of their victory for all free men in the world.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I submit this resolution proclaiming Israel Freedom Week:

RESOLUTION DRAWN UP BY THE FLORIDA HOUSE AND SENATE, SIGNED BY GOVERNOR KIRK

Whereas, there exists in the world today a constant struggle for freedom from Communist tyranny and

Whereas, the entire free world is duty bound to support in word and deed those who find themselves enmeshed in this valiant struggle and

Whereas, world events have embroiled the sole remaining bulwark of freedom in the Mid-East, the State of Israel, involuntarily into this valiant conflict and

Whereas, the support of the State of Israel is the manifest responsibility of all the followers of freedom and

Whereas, the basic tenets of our nation demand that we lend all support to the valiant citizens of Israel in their life and death struggle to preserve for us and for themselves the freedoms we so cherish,

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Florida, the Senate concurring, that the Honorable Claude R. Kirk, Governor of the State of Florida, is respectfully requested to demonstrate the support, good wishes and prayers for victory of all Florida citizens for the State of Israel in their struggle for freedom by declaring the week of June 12 to June 19, 1967 as "Israel Freedom Week."

CLAUDE R. KIRK, Governor.

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

[Mr. PEPPER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH ON VIETNAM

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, delegations from 30 States are in Washington this week to launch a national effort to build visible public support for new U.S. initiatives to bring about negotiations and a political settlement based on democratic elections in South Vietnam. This effort, which was

June 29, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 8353

- e) Increase the vast recreational and tourism opportunities.
- f) Provide aesthetic beauty for all.
- g) Provide high quality water to meet all needs.
- h) Utilize all idle, unproductive land for the purpose it is best adapted to in relation to need.
- 2) Encourage new industries to use the increased resource production and provide more skilled jobs for people.
- 3) Complete needed soil surveys.
- 4) Encourage and assist communities to improve facilities such as water and sewage systems, streets, parks, libraries, health and sanitation, education and other facilities which would make them more desirable places to live and work.
- 5) Expand educational and training programs to create a well-trained labor force to meet the needs of the area.
- 6) Increase resource educational work with youth groups through schools and youth organizations.
- 7) Develop watershed projects to conserve soil and water and for irrigation, municipal, industrial and recreational uses.
- 8) Protect, conserve and develop natural, scenic, archeological and historic areas resources and restore historical structures.
- 9) Make full use of local leadership and secure the participation and support of all the people in the project area.

HIGH HONOR ACCORDED TO MRS. OVETA CULP HOBBY

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

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, a great lady of Texas—one whom many of my colleagues know personally and respect for her charm, ability and dedication—was recently accorded a high honor in Houston.

Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, chairman of the board and editor of the Houston Post, became the first woman in history to be named to the board of trustees of Rice University.

Because so many of my colleagues remember this great lady from her years of service to our country as the first Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and from her distinguished service as first Commander of the Women's Army Corps during World War II, I take great pride in bringing to their attention the following news story concerning her appointment.

I know my colleagues join with the people of Houston in congratulating Mrs. Hobby on this great honor.

FIRST WOMAN NAMED TO SERVE—MRS. HOBBY NAMED TO RICE UNIVERSITY BOARD

Oveta Culp Hobby, chairman of the board and editor of The Houston Post, has been named to the Rice University Board of Trustees.

She is the first woman to serve on the board in its 76-year history. Chairman H. Malcolm Lovett said in announcing the appointment.

Noting that Mrs. Hobby and her late husband, former Gov. William P. Hobby, had long been associated with Rice, Lovett said: "Mr. and Mrs. Hobby encouraged their son, William P. Hobby Jr., to select Rice for his university education and he was graduated in 1953.

"They have befriended and supported our university in many other significant ways over the years.

"Mrs. Hobby's brilliant career in national, state and local educational, civic and business affairs will enable her to bring a vast experience in such matters to the work of our board, and, if she chooses, she may also bring the woman's viewpoint for the first time directly to our table.

"We are delighted that she has accepted our invitation to join the Rice governing body, and will be the one to begin a new tradition at Rice."

Mrs. Hobby will fill the board vacancy created by the death of Harmon G. Whittington on Oct. 22, 1966.

She was appointed by President Eisenhower as the first secretary of health, education and welfare, a post she held from 1953 to 1955.

The Cabinet post was one of many contributions she made to government.

In 1942 she was named director of the Women's Auxiliary Army Corps, and from 1943 to 1945 she served as the first commander of the Women's Army Corps.

For her wartime service she was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal and the Philippine Military Merit Medal.

In 1953 she was named federal security administrator.

Mrs. Hobby currently is a member of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television; National Advisory Commission on Selective Service; and the Health, Education and Welfare Department's Vietnam Health Education Task Force.

Also, the Board of Advisors to the Committee for Economic Development; Continental Oil Company Scholarship Award Committee; Committee of 75 for the University of Texas; and the President's Commission on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

Also, the visiting Committee, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University; Advisory Board of the George C. Marshall Research Foundation; and the Board of Trustees, Society for Rehabilitation of the Facially Disabled.

This year, she received the Carnegie Corporation Award for Advancement and Diffusion of Knowledge and Understanding.

Mr. Hobby is a member of the Houston Country Club, Bayou and Ramada Clubs, and the Junior League of Houston.

She has received well over a dozen honorary degrees, among them doctorates from Baylor University, Columbia University and the University of Pennsylvania.

SERVING OF LIQUOR ABOARD AIRLINES

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Aeronautics Board has given the airline industry until July 24 to show cause why their notice of ruling to discontinue the serving of free drinks aboard airlines should not be put into effect.

The ruling proposed by the CAB makes good commonsense and is a point to which I have addressed myself on the floor of the House of Representatives and to the Civil Aeronautics Board. I am hopeful that this ruling will go into effect.

I wish to submit the article of notification regarding this ruling which appeared in the June 24 issue of the Washington Post, with the thought that it will be of interest to the Members of this body:

CAB TO BAN FREE DRINKS IN AIRLINERS

The Civil Aeronautics Board has proposed an end to free drinks aboard airliners.

The Board has given the industry until July 24 to respond to a proposed rule that would require each airline to file provisions for the type and amount of charges for in-flight liquor service, in the same manner that they file passenger fares and cargo rates.

The tentative rule says that "It is the policy of the Board to require that each passenger who receives such in-flight service shall be assessed a charge therefore which shall be reasonably related to the cost and value of the service, in all classes of service." On most trunk airlines, first class passengers receive free drinks, and coach passengers pay \$1 a drink.

The Board explained its policy regarding liquor service is the same as that toward movies and other in-flight benefits.

The CAB said these services are separate from the transportation functions of the airlines, and therefore the cost should be borne as much as possible by the passengers receiving the service.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN MOORHEAD

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, we always address everyone in this House as our "distinguished and able colleague," and I, for one, have no difficulty in extending this title to most of my fellow Members. But there are some of my colleagues for whom I have a particular bond of affection and respect. One of those is my good friend and neighbor, the gentleman from the Pennsylvania district adjoining mine [Mr. MOORHEAD].

It has long been my pleasure to work with BILL MOORHEAD in the interests of the city of Pittsburgh and of Allegheny County which we both have the honor to represent, and we are accustomed to finding ourselves on the same side of most legislative issues, as well. But it was particularly satisfying to me to have my colleague appear before the Education and Labor Committee, of which I am a member, to testify on behalf of H.R. 8311, the pending administration amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. Mr. MOORHEAD provided the committee with a very penetrating analysis of the wonderful work that is being done in Pittsburgh by the mayor's committee on human resources with the support of OEO, and with a most persuasive argument against those who would "de-escalate" the war on poverty by tearing its command post apart and scattering the remnants to other agencies, which have other purposes to fulfill and other clientele to serve.

I insert the statement of my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] at this point in the RECORD:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD BEFORE THE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE ON H.R. 8311, THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967, JUNE 28, 1967

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: It is a great pleasure to be here this morning as your first Congressional witness. My purpose in appearing here is two-fold: first, to speak on behalf of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 and second, to urge that the Office of Economic Opportunity be retained as the central administra-

June 29, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 8367

I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is here objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

See also
ISRAEL CONTROL OF JERUSALEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the reservations with which much of the world, including our own Government, has received the news that Israel has decided to administer all of Jerusalem as a unity, under the direction of Israel authorities. It is felt that this was a unilateral action, in contradiction to a kind of global consensus.

I think, however, that we must look into the reasons for the Israel decision. I believe we will acquire therein some understanding of the move.

Since the partition of Jerusalem in 1948, when Jordan seized control and took charge of the holy places, Jews have been forbidden to pray at the Wailing Wall, the most holy place in the Jewish religion. There have also been recurring reports that obstacles have been placed before Christian worshippers.

The world recognizes politics as one thing, Mr. Speaker, but religious faith as another. If an Arab State excludes Israel from, say, Suez, it is regarded as a political act, within a nation's legitimate sphere of action. But to exclude pilgrims from their religious shrines is cruel beyond human standards. We must note that Israel has, by law, pledged to keep all holy places in Jerusalem accessible—to Christians and Jews and, most significant, to Moslems. I am certain we can rely on this pledge.

It is also important to note that Israel has been scrupulous in dealing with the Arab minorities within its borders. Every sign so far indicates that Jerusalem's Arabs will have more rights of participation in the local government than they did under Jordan and that they will be given fair and even generous treatment in an undivided city.

The question to be asked is, Should Israel return to Arab control the Jerusalem hills from which Jordan's soldiers rained shells on the Jewish population of the city? While Jordan poured death on the Israel sector, Israel's gallant army was sacrificing its blood to capture the Old City without inflicting damage on the holy shrines. What greater assurance could the world ask of Israel's sense of responsibility? Having survived the Arab State's third challenge to its existence, Israel cannot be denied a border rectification which includes Jerusalem as a measure of self-defense.

Under no circumstances should the Old City of Jerusalem be restored to Arab hands because they do not cherish and safeguard its holy places. I am completely confident that the Israel Government would be able to work out a satisfactory arrangement with the reli-

gious leaders of the three great faiths so that never again will any person be denied the right to worship as he pleases in sacred Jerusalem.

(Mr. BROTZMAN (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. BROTZMAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. SMITH of New York (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for period July 10 through 15, 1967, on account of official business as U.S. Representative of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives at the conference at Geneva, Switzerland, on World Peace Through Law.

Mr. HUNGATE (at the request of Mr. ROGERS of Colorado), for July 10 to 24, 1967, on account of official business.

Mr. MOSS, for June 29, 1967 to July 11, 1967, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of REINECKE) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts, for 60 minutes, on July 10.

Mr. MICHEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FARBSTEIN (at the request of Mr. CABELL), for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HALL in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. DUNCAN immediately after the remarks of Mr. HOSMER in the committee today on the bill H.R. 10918.

Mr. REID of New York to extend his remarks following concurrence in Senate amendments to Older Americans Act Amendments of 1965.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. REINECKE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RUMSFELD in two instances.

Mr. CEDERBERG.

Mr. SHRIVER in two instances.

Mr. KING of New York in three instances.

Mr. HALPERN in two instances.

Mr. URT.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. LLOYD.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland in five instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CABELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GILBERT in two instances.

Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.

Mr. PICKLE in three instances.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. BOLLING in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. MULTER in three instances.

Mr. SIKES in five instances.

Mr. BARRETT.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in two instances.

Mr. EDMONDSON in two instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1028. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend certain benefits to former employees of county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1862. An act to amend the authorizing legislation of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5702. An act to remove the 5-acre limitation on the amount of tobacco allotment acreage which may be leased;

H.R. 8265. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the transfer of tobacco acreage allotments and acreage-poundage quotas; and

H.R. 10730. An act to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4880. An act to extend the time within which certain requests may be filed under the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965;

H.R. 5615. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1969, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap;

H.R. 10943. An act to amend and extend title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965; and

H.J. Res. 652. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

**ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
JULY 10, 1967**

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 393, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, July 10, 1967.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 393, the House adjourned until Monday, July 10, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.**

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

866. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of guidelines needed for custodial and engineering staffing in the public schools of the District of Columbia, Board of Education, District of Columbia; to the Committee on Government Operations.

867. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for improvement in the Coast Guard Reserve training program, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

868. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings attainable through improved control over computations of disability compensation, Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Government Operations.

869. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report on anticompetitive practices in the marketing of gasoline; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DANIELS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 11089. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide additional group life insurance and accidental death and dismemberment insurance for Federal employees, and to strengthen the financial condition of the Employees' Life Insurance Fund (Rept. No. 462). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 421. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 472). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2516. A bill to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 473). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 11000. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to help cities and communities of the Nation develop and carry out intensive local programs of rat control and extermination (Rept. No. 474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2485. A bill for the relief of Elisabeta Horwath; with amendment (Rept. No. 463). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3497. A bill for the relief of Namiro Velasquez Huerta; with amendment (Rept. No. 464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4159. A bill for the relief of Teresina Marg; with amendment (Rept. No. 465). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4538. A bill for the relief of Dr. John E. Tannakakis (Rept. No. 466). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5216. A bill for the relief of Roberto Martin Del Campo (Rept. No. 467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5996. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bernardo D. Marcelo (Rept. No. 468). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8254. A bill for the relief of Jan Drobot (Rept. No. 469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9080. A bill for the relief of Federico de la Cruz-Munoz (Rept. No. 470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1820. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Demetria Messana Barone; with amendment (Rept. No. 471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSH:
H.R. 11259. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CARTER:
H.R. 11260. A bill to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 11261. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11262. A bill to relieve the Postmaster General of responsibility for determining inavailability under the congressional frank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:
H.R. 11263. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple on their com-

bined earnings record, to eliminate certain special requirements for entitlement to husband's or widower's benefits, to provide for the payment of benefits to widowed fathers with minor children, to equalize the criteria for determining dependency of a child on his father or mother, and to make the retirement test inapplicable to individuals with minor children who are entitled to mother's or father's benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EILBERG:
H.R. 11264. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple on their combined earnings record, to eliminate certain special requirements for entitlement to husband's or widower's benefits, to provide for the payment of benefits to widowed fathers with minor children, to equalize the criteria for determining dependency of a child on his father or mother, and to make the retirement test inapplicable to individuals with minor children who are entitled to mother's or father's benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. DENT, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. DANIELS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mrs. MINK, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. QUIE, Mr. BELL, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. BRADEMAS, and Mr. ESCH):

H.R. 11265. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Adult Education Act of 1966 for 2 additional years; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POFF (for himself, Mr. McCULLOCH, Mr. RHODES of Arizona, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. MOORE, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SMITH of California, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. RAILSBACK, and Mr. GOODELL):

H.R. 11266. A bill to amend the Sherman Act to prohibit the investment of certain income in any business enterprise affecting interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF (for himself, Mr. RHODES of Arizona, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. MOORE, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SMITH of California, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. MESKILL, and Mr. ROTH):

H.R. 11267. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for improved criminal procedure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF (for himself, Mr. McCULLOCH, Mr. RHODES of Arizona, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. MOORE, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SMITH of California, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. RAILSBACK, and Mr. GOODELL):

H.R. 11268. A bill to prohibit the investment of income derived from certain criminal activities in any business enterprise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLEN:
H.R. 11269. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to provide that

June 29, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

[Conference table]

Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office appropriation bill (H.R. 7501), fiscal year 1968

TITLE I—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

	Appropriations, fiscal year 1967 ¹	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1968	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						Conference Appropriations, fiscal year 1967	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1968	House	Senate
Office of the Secretary.....	\$7,027,000	\$7,317,000	\$7,015,000	\$7,156,000	\$7,015,000	-\$12,000	-\$302,000		-\$150,000
Bureau of Accounts:									
Salaries and expenses.....	32,988,000	34,500,000	34,500,000	34,500,000	34,500,000	+1,512,000			
Fund for payment of Government losses in shipment.....	265,000					-265,000			
Total, Bureau of Accounts.....	33,253,000	34,500,000	34,500,000	34,500,000	34,500,000	+1,247,000			
Bureau of Customs.....	88,278,000	* 89,061,000	90,700,000	89,361,000	89,361,000	+1,083,000	+300,000	-\$1,339,000	
Bureau of the Mint.....	21,193,000	14,600,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	-7,193,000	-600,000		
Bureau of Narcotics.....	6,275,000	6,565,000	6,565,000	6,565,000	6,565,000	+290,000			
Bureau of the Public Debt.....	53,794,000	* 54,784,000	52,048,000	54,748,000	54,748,000	+954,000	-36,000	+2,700,000	
Internal Revenue Service:									
Salaries and expenses.....	18,896,000	20,060,000	19,960,000	19,960,000	19,960,000	+1,064,000	-100,000		
Revenue accounting and processing.....	173,029,000	177,024,000	177,000,000	175,000,000	177,000,000	+3,971,000	-24,000		+2,000,000
Compliance.....	473,207,000	501,016,000	490,000,000	496,800,000	494,800,000	+21,593,000	-6,216,000	+4,800,000	-2,000,000
Federal tax lien revolving fund.....		800,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	+500,000	-300,000		
Total, Internal Revenue Service.....	665,132,000	698,900,000	687,460,000	692,260,000	692,260,000	+27,128,000	-6,640,000	+4,800,000	
Office of the Treasurer.....	6,348,000	6,588,000	6,588,000	6,588,000	6,588,000	+240,000			
U.S. Secret Service.....	15,631,000	16,919,000	16,850,000	16,850,000	16,850,000	+1,219,000	-69,000		
Total, title I, Treasury Department.....	896,931,000	929,234,000	915,726,000	922,037,000	921,887,000	+24,956,000	-7,347,000	+6,161,000	-150,000

TITLE II—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Administration and regional operation.....	\$95,546,000	\$107,973,000	\$100,450,000	\$105,973,000	\$103,450,000	+\$7,904,000	-\$4,523,000	+\$3,000,000	-\$2,523,000
Research, development, and engineering.....	16,152,000	23,148,000	23,148,000	23,148,000	23,148,000	+6,996,000			
Operations.....	5,043,600,000	5,344,059,000	5,269,500,000	5,307,500,000	5,306,500,000	+262,900,000	-37,559,000	+37,000,000	-1,000,000
Transportation.....	640,700,000	656,500,000	650,000,000	650,000,000	650,000,000	+9,300,000	-6,500,000		
Building occupancy and postal supplies.....	243,322,000	276,130,000	275,000,000			-243,322,000	-276,130,000	-275,000,000	
Building occupancy.....				185,724,000	185,724,000	+185,724,000	+185,724,000	+185,724,000	
Supplies and services.....				89,276,000	89,276,000	+89,276,000	+89,276,000	+89,276,000	
Plant and equipment.....	138,000,000	201,345,000	200,000,000	195,000,000	195,000,000	+57,000,000	-6,345,000	-5,000,000	
Postal public buildings.....	55,853,000	55,853,000	45,000,000	55,853,000	50,000,000	+50,000,000	-5,853,000	+5,000,000	-5,853,000
Total, title II, Post Office Department.....	6,177,320,000	6,665,008,000	6,563,098,000	6,612,474,000	6,603,098,000	+425,778,000	-61,910,000	+40,000,000	-9,376,000

TITLE III—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Compensation of the President.....	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000				
The White House Office.....	2,955,000	3,009,000	3,009,000	3,009,000	3,009,000	+\$54,000			
Special projects.....	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000				
Operating expenses, Executive Mansion.....	692,000	708,000	708,000	708,000	708,000				
Bureau of the Budget.....	8,913,135	9,500,000	9,250,000	9,500,000	9,500,000	+16,000			
Council of Economic Advisers.....	790,000	858,000	858,000	858,000	858,000	+586,865			+\$250,000
National Security Council.....	664,000	664,000	664,000	664,000	664,000	+68,000			
Emergency fund for the President.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000				
Expenses of management improvement.....	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000				
Total, title III, Executive Office of the President.....	17,014,135	17,739,000	17,489,000	17,739,000	17,739,000	+724,865		+250,000	

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Tax Court of the United States.....	\$2,355,000	\$2,407,000	\$2,407,000	\$2,407,000	\$2,407,000	+\$52,000	-\$250,000		
Administrative Conference of the United States.....		250,000							
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.....	436,000	510,000	510,000	510,000	510,000	+74,000			
Total, title IV, independent agencies.....	2,791,000	3,167,000	2,917,000	2,917,000	2,917,000	+126,000	-250,000		
Grand total, titles I, II, III, and IV.....	7,094,056,135	7,615,148,000	7,499,230,000	7,555,167,000	7,545,641,000	+451,584,865	-69,507,000	+\$46,411,000	-\$9,526,000

¹ Includes amounts carried in 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1967 (Public Law 90-21).
² Includes reduction of \$1,339,000 contained in S. Doc. 23.

³ Includes increase of \$2,700,000 contained in S. Doc. 23.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 29, 1967,

The Secretary of the Senate, on June 29, 1967, received the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 4880. An act to extend the time within which certain requests may be filed under the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965;

H.R. 5615. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1969, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap;

H.R. 10943. An act to amend and extend title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965; and

H.J. Res. 652. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the General Assembly of Ohio, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 66

Resolution memorializing the 90th Congress of the United States to take whatever action may be necessary and appropriate to bring a lasting peace to the Middle East

Whereas, The recent tragic war between Israel and the Arab states has emphasized, once again, the fact that the nations of the world are highly interdependent and that, consequently, a rash and unconsidered action

June 29, 1967

by any one of them may jeopardize the peaceful pursuits and well-being of all; and

Whereas, This situation has also demonstrated that such interdependence has raised the destructive potential of every nation, regardless of its rank as a primary or secondary power; to an historically unprecedented level; and

Whereas, The territorial integrity of the Middle East, together with the right of all countries to the free and unharassed use of the Suez Canal, the Strait of Tiran, and the Gulf of Aqaba, has thus become a matter of supreme human, as well as international, importance, and one which we can disregard only at our peril; and

Whereas, The events of the past several years have thoroughly illustrated the dangers inherent in a failure to thoroughly resolve such problems—which have displayed a tendency to proliferate that is in almost direct proportion to the degree of complacency with which we have regarded them; therefore be it

Resolved, That the 107th General Assembly of Ohio hereby memorializes the 90th Congress to take all necessary and appropriate action to end forever the possibility of conflict in the Middle East; to encourage fruitful negotiations between Israel and the Arab nations; and to reaffirm the position of the United States in regard to the right of innocent passage through the affected waterways; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be spread upon the pages of the Journal, and that the Clerk of the Senate transmit duly authenticated copies of this Resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Honorable Frank J. Lausche, the Honorable Stephen M. Young, to each member of the House of Representatives in Congress from Ohio, and to the Honorable James A. Rhodes.

Attest:

THOS. E. BATEMAN,
Clerk of the Senate.

PETITION FOR CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, as my distinguished colleagues know, a number of States have approved petitions calling for a constitutional convention to propose an amendment to reapportion the State legislatures. Colorado has joined those States; and, according to the rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Memorial No. 5, adopted by the 46th General Assembly of the State of Colorado be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

The joint memorial was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 5

Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to secure to the people the right of some choice in the method of apportionment of one house of a state legislature on a basis other than population alone

Whereas, The United States Supreme Court has ruled that membership in both houses of a bicameral state legislature must be apportioned only according to population; and

Whereas, For one hundred and seventy-five years the people of the various states have had the freedom to apportion their state legislatures in the manner they felt

best reflected the interest of the people, recognizing that a system of apportionment that might be appropriate for one state would not necessarily meet the needs of another state, but that each state should be free to make its own selection; now, therefore,

Be It Resolved by the Senate of the Forty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the House of Representatives concurring herein:

That this General Assembly hereby respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a constitutional convention for the purpose of submitting a constitutional amendment to the states, which will secure to the people the right of some choice in the method of apportionment of one house of a state legislature on a basis other than population alone; and

Be It Further Resolved, That this Memorial is rescinded if the Congress itself, no later than June 30, 1967, proposes such a plan to the states for ratification; and

Be It Further Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this Memorial be transmitted to the members of the Congress of the United States from the State of Colorado.

MARK A. HOGAN,
President of the Senate.
COMFORT W. SHAW,
Secretary of the Senate.

JOHN D. VANDERHOOF,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
HENRY C. KIMBROUGH,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. PROXMIRE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment:

S. 5. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit (Rept. No. 392).

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] filed a report on S. 5, the truth-in-lending legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the individual views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. PERCY, and Mr. HANSEN):

S. 2048. A bill to amend the Sherman Act to prohibit the investment of certain income in any business enterprise affecting interstate or foreign commerce; and

S. 2049. A bill to prohibit the investment of income derived from certain criminal activities in any business enterprise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HRUSKA when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate heading.)

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. HANSEN):

S. 2050. A bill to prohibit electronic surveillance by persons other than duly authorized law enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified cate-

gories of offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HRUSKA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. PERCY, and Mr. HANSEN):

S. 2051. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for improved criminal procedure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HRUSKA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BAKER:

S. 2052. A bill for the relief of Hong Sing Cheung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER (for himself and Mr. PERCY):

S. 2053. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for periodic cost-of-living increases in monthly benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2054. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MILLER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina):

S. 2055. A bill for the relief of Yadkin County, N.C.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SPONG:

S. 2056. A bill to require Members of Congress to file annual financial statements for themselves, their spouses, and their minor children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 2057. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended, to provide for more effective regulation under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. RIBICOFF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 2058. A bill to provide a practicable weather modification program for the Upper Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOMINICK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BREWSTER (for himself and Mr. TYDINGS):

S. 2059. A bill to authorize construction of the Six Bridge Dam and Reservoir on the Monocacy River in Frederick and Carroll Counties, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. BREWSTER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PELL:

S. 2060. A bill to amend section 503 (f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend for a period of 10 years the authorization to make appropriations for allocations and grants for the collection and publication of documentary sources significant to the history of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. PELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PELL (for himself, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 2061. A bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

June 29, 1967

S 9179

The bill calls for the committees to hear the Director of the Budget each year explain the federal spending proposals of the coming fiscal year.

For decades this had been the custom: The Director of the Budget would come to Capitol Hill with his thick book and his reams of supporting papers. The meetings were singularly dull, and before long Sen. Hayden found himself sitting dutifully and alone. He continued each year to conduct the meeting, usually the only member of the committee to sit it out. Then, at last, he quietly suspended the obviously unwanted ceremony.

The new reorganization act would require Hayden to reinstitute these annual conversations with the director. When the provision was called to Sen. Hayden's attention with the suggestion he might want it amended out of the reorganization measure, he only shrugged.

"It won't make any difference. Let it be," was his decision. There were other more restrictive items he preferred to eliminate.

President John F. Kennedy, as a young senator from Massachusetts, undertook to reform the federal budget-making procedure in what many colleagues believed was a sound economy move.

He proposed the frequently recommended adoption of an accrued accounting system instead of the annual administrative budgeting system used by the executive agency.

Sen. Hayden notes that the system looks good on the surface because it appears to tighten down the lid on spending. In actuality, in his opinion, it would shift the control of the appropriation process away from Congress and put it in the hands of the federal bureaus.

The subtlety of this is best explained in an over-simplification: instead of telling the Fish and Wildlife Service, for example, how much it may spend in a fiscal year under the present system, Congress would be told by the agency what it planned to spend in the next 12 months.

Sen. Hayden interposed an objection when the Kennedy accrued account bill reached the calendar. It was, therefore, not called up. Finally, it was agreed as a compromise to send the bill, which came out of the government operations committee, to the appropriations committee then under the chairmanship of the late Sen. Styles Bridges, R-N.H.

The appropriations committee considered it and reported it again. The Senate passed it. It went through the House and President Eisenhower signed it into law.

But it was unworkable, as Sen. Hayden foresaw. So it was never implemented, and it died a natural death on the day set for its expiration.

"The appropriations procedures of the Senate are the result of 100 years of experience—sometimes very hard experience," Sen. Hayden warns. He is disinclined to rush into any improvisations for that reason.

The late Sen. Harry F. Byrd, D-Va., the leader of the economy bloc in the Senate for a quarter of a century, urged all appropriations be considered in a single bill.

Byrd succeeded in selling his idea to Congress, and it was tried once in 1950. The late Rep. Clarence Cannon, D-Mo., who prided himself on slashing presidential budgets without mercy, angrily denounced the procedure.

The bill itself looked like a fat, coverless phone book. It was physically unwieldy and nearly incomprehensible even to committee members. It was never tried again.

In an analysis of the failures of the one-package system, Sen. Hayden set down, also, five arguments for and against the "item veto," frequently advanced as a tool a President might use to eliminate from spending

bill any items of which he might disapprove.

As Sen. Hayden noted, the proponents of the item veto declare:

"It would permit the elimination of legislative riders.

"It would reduce extravagance in public expenditures.

"It has worked successfully in 30 states, where the governors have been given that power.

"The constitution of the Confederate States of America, adopted in 1861, permitted the President to 'veto any appropriation or appropriations, and approve any other appropriation or appropriations.'

"Presidents Grant, Hayes, Arthur and Franklin D. Roosevelt have recommended the item veto."

On the other side Sen. Hayden set down these arguments:

"It would lessen the responsibility of the Congress.

"It would increase the influence of the executive whose powers have already been expanded.

"It would be an uncertain grant of power.

"It would impair the system of checks and balances established by the Constitution.

"It would defeat the legislative intent of the Congress."

Thus, far, Congress has withheld the item veto. Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson have subsequently improvised a modest kind of substitute: They have, on occasion, simply not spent funds Congress voted for which they had not asked.

From the outset, Congress has guarded jealously its right to control the federal purse. President Washington, in 1791, sent the Senate a message indicating he intended to ransom some Americans held captive by Algiers and urging an appropriations "on your earliest attention" for the recognition of a new treaty with the emperor of Morocco.

The Senate quickly advised President Washington by resolution to suspend his operations for the ransom of the captives until funds were provided. It then voted to appropriate \$20,000 for recognizing the emperor of Morocco, the funds to be derived from duties on distilled spirits.

The Senate Appropriations Committee which Sen. Hayden has directed since 1955 is only 11 years older than its chairman.

The Senate created the appropriations panel in 1867, following the Civil War. President Lincoln's wartime regime is considered by congressional historians to be the "high water mark of the exercise of Executive power in the United States."

Francis S. Hewitt, writing the history of the committee, notes of that period, "Millions in federal funds were spent without appropriations having been made for such. The exigencies of the moment had in many instances pre-empted other considerations so that congressional attempts to control the purse were frustrated by an executive who wrote: 'I feel that measures, otherwise unconstitutional, might become lawful by becoming indispensable to the preservation of the nation.'

"Once the national danger subsided, the Congress reasserted its constitutional rights. Appropriations control was one area to which attention was directed."

The Senate, March 7, 1867, adopted a resolution by Sen. Henry B. Anthony, R-R.I., creating a seven-member committee on appropriations.

Today's Senate Appropriations Committee, far from being Sen. Hayden's one-man show, is an organization of 26 senators and a professional staff of 35 men and women, including three Arizonans, Thomas J. Scott, of Douglas, chief clerk; Paul Eaton of Yuma, for many years Hayden's administrative assistant, and Joe E. Gonzales of Superior.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SKILLFUL HANDLING OF THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the performance of the Johnson administration during the Middle East crisis is receiving widespread—and deserved—praise.

Writes publisher John S. Knight:

President Johnson has shown excellent judgment and commendable restraint in dealing with the Middle East crisis.

This sentiment has been echoed by a large number of newspaper editorials from coast to coast.

I share this view. I believe that President Johnson demonstrated superb statesmanship and patience in dealing with a highly complex and dangerous situation. There is no question but that the President took the most reasonable course for the Nation—one that avoided the possibility of a confrontation with the Soviet Union, but which also acted as a restraint to those seeking to escalate or widen hostilities to the point where the whole world could have been involved.

The President's performance deserves the warm praise and commendation of the Congress and of all the American people.

I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD a sampling of newspaper reaction to Mr. Johnson's diplomatic skill.

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

[From the Chicago Daily News, June 10, 1967]

L. B. J. RESTRAINT WINS IN CRISIS (By John S. Knight)

President Johnson has shown excellent judgment and commendable restraint in dealing with the Middle East crisis.

He was not thrown off balance by emotional appeals for U.S. unilateral intervention in behalf of Israel.

Nor did he later yield to pressures from the Soviet Union demanding an Israeli pull-back as a condition of a cease-fire agreement.

Had the President employed the same calm and discerning approach to the problems of Southeast Asia, we would not today be engaged in a frustrating and inconclusive large-scale war in Vietnam.

Israel's spectacular military successes against the Arabs have greatly allayed the fear of a third world war. For that, we can eternally be grateful.

But the triumph of arms, though temporarily reassuring, is but the prelude to our hopes for peace.

Three times in the last two decades have we seen Israel and the Arab nations at war. The hatreds born of these conflicts—together with centuries of religious, ideological and economic strife—have made the Israelis and the Arabs irreconcilable enemies.

Yet there must be a better approach to coexistence in the Middle East than border raids, retaliatory measures and eventual resort to war.

If we accept this premise rather than living forever under the Arab threat to drive the Israelis into the sea, the appointment by President Johnson of a special committee to work for acceptable and permanent solutions of the border struggle must be viewed as a most constructive step.

For this is the hour and the opportunity to remove the impasse which has seen Israel

June 29, 1967

S9180

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

and the Arabs at each others' throats for the last 19 years.

The films undertakings made after the Anglo-French-Israeli attack of 1956 and the subsequent withdrawal of these forces were found to have no validity in practice.

Thus Israel was denied access to the Suez Canal, open to all other nations, and Nasser's restriction of navigation through the Gulf of Aqaba invoked the present hostilities.

Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban concedes that Arab denial of the existence of Israel is the heart of the problem. And Mrs. Avraham Harman, wife of the Israeli ambassador to the United States, believes that ignorance and poverty fostered by rulers of the Arab world are Israel's real enemies rather than the peoples of the Arab countries.

So the questions facing President Johnson's task force on the Middle East are not easily answered. Yet we do have the assurance that they will not be neglected or ignored as they were in 1956.

The dramatic story of Israel, a product of the United Nations in 1947, is too well known to be repeated here except to say that the United States has a compelling interest in her survival.

With government aid and privately sold Israel bonds, this tiny country has expanded its industry, established irrigation projects, built new towns in the Negev desert, constructed new harbors, highways and housing and pushed exploitation of natural resources such as phosphates, copper, oil and the potash and bromine of the Dead Sea.

Moreover, Israel has given technical assistance to the majority of the 50 new countries which have come into being since Israel itself was born.

Thus, our involvement with Israel—whether emotional or in admiration for her accomplishments—is very deep indeed. The leaders of Israel unlike that mischievous tyrant, Gamal Abdel Nasser, seek no dominion over other lands.

As Israel's 20th Century prophet, David Ben-Gurion, wrote in "Jews in Their Land": "We must dispel the hostility of the encircling Arab peoples and make a covenant of peace between them and Israel that will culminate in economic, cultural and political co-operation, and advance the well-being of the whole Middle East.

President Johnson's committee will discover, however, that an Israel disillusioned by the broken pledges of the '50s has passed the point of accepting promises in good faith.

She will demand and should obtain as a matter of justice access to both the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba.

To help accomplish these ends, we must be firm in our dealings with Nasser, who first broke off diplomatic relations with the United States.

The usual U.S. tendency to reward our enemies with massive grants of aid once the fighting has stopped should be avoided this time around.

Our best diplomacy must be summoned in our relations with Russia, always remaining firm, patient and unrelenting on matters of high principle.

Thus far in the Middle East turmoil, the Johnson administration has an admirable record.

We pray then that its wisdom is more than a passing mood that firmness, dignity and restraint will mark its coming to maturity in the field of foreign affairs.

From the Christian Science Monitor,
June 12, 1967]

WHITE HOUSE: TIGHTLY ORGANIZED POLICY SECTION BRIEFS JOHNSON ON MIDEAST CRISIS

(NOTE.—A dispatch Saturday viewed United States handling of the current Mideast crisis from the standpoint of the State Department. The following report approaches the matter from the perspective of the White House.)

(By Saville R. Davis)

WASHINGTON.—The outbreak of the Middle East crisis was unexpected by the United States Government in the sense that most such explosions come without sure warning. And in the Middle East the barometer always points to sun in the sky and storm in politics.

But criticisms of the lack of advance planning for this crisis are both understandable and not the whole story.

When the crisis did break, President Johnson was ready with a firm and strong statement of the United States' basic position within 2½ hours of the moment he was awakened in bed with the news. This basic policy was not changed by a millimeter as the crisis rolled on, and what looked like an Arab success was turned into an Arab defeat.

To those closely covering the White House this firm hand at the top, while confusion reigned elsewhere, was not an accident.

Most of the charges of confusion come from persons and countries who disagree with the policy, not from the absence of firm policy.

CRITIC MAKES CHARGE

The reason why the President knew what he was doing, irrespective of whether one agrees or disagrees with it, is to be found in his own tightly organized foreign-policy section, which functions around the clock. It is in action when the more relaxed planning machinery of the State Department is understaffed or preoccupied with routine or other matters.

Where the White House staff might be faulted is in failure to take steps in advance to head the crisis off. But the critic who makes this charge has two additional questions to answer, in his turn: What steps? And how can the divided political situation in the United States, with respect to the Middle East, be brought to the point of supporting action when it is preoccupied with Vietnam?

The steps which might have deflected President Nasser from his adventurous gamble were roughly two: First, to hurt him or maneuver American force in his path so that he was unable to move (he knew the fundamental American commitment to defend Israel was a firm one, and his ploy was to block the Strait of Tiran, not to "bribe Nasser.")

Second, to use credit with Colonel Nasser to induce him to cope with his problems at home and not risk everything by plunging abroad. But American opinion, and congressional opinion, were strongly set against either step. The prevailing mood was not to "go it alone" in the Middle East, and not to "bribe" Nasser.

So the White House, in a political situation where action in the Middle East was not possible, held itself ready for action when events should compel it and make it politically possible. Democracies can take steps in time of crisis which are unthinkable when the heat is not on.

The chief White House adviser on foreign policy, Walt Whitman Rostow, is known to have made a consistent and deliberate effort to keep the President's attention focused on areas other than Vietnam. His unit in the White House basement prides itself on having made considerable progress in areas like Europe and Latin America while the attention of the country is riveted almost exclusively on Vietnam. Mr. Rostow has kept active policy discussions on these other areas—including the Middle East—going both in the White House itself and at lower levels of government.

CRISIS GROUP DESIGNATED

When a crisis actually comes, however, any advance planning has to be applied to the specific situation, and this takes fast and supple footwork. The Rostow group, together with Secretary of State Dean Rusk and his staff, who are always kept closely geared into the White House calculations lest an administrative disorder take over, carried on this function of helping to guide this improvisation during the first phase of the crisis. Now the President has designated a special crisis-management group, under the experienced McGeorge Bundy, to head it up.

Looking back on the period before the explosion, therefore, it appears that in the lower echelons of government there were gaps of personnel and what sometimes looked like confusion. But on the whole, a case can be made by those who watched it closely that the people at the top knew what they were doing and were better prepared for it than most persons yet recognize.

In sum: from the perspective of the White House press room, it would appear that most of the "confusion" was at base caused by differences of judgment by various groups and critics as to what should be done, rather than by a breakdown in preparing for what was actually done.

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
June 12, 1967]

AMERICA'S MIDEAST DIPLOMACY

Washington has shown considerable skill in its handling of the Middle Eastern crisis so far. Despite the (almost inevitable) crumbling of the American position throughout the Arab lands, the United States has followed a generally well-thought-out line of action. We cannot agree with those critics who say that the administration has been weak and wavering.

It is true that Washington appears to have been caught flat-footed by the speed with which the crisis developed last May. There are suggestions that Washington should have sought to temper the swiftness with which United Nations Secretary-General U Thant fell in with Cairo's demand for the removal of United Nations Emergency Force units from parts of the Sinai. But it must be remembered that all nations (and this includes Israel and the Soviet Union) appear to have been caught equally by surprise at the speed with which the crisis developed.

Before the fighting began, the United States supported efforts to have the Security Council take preventive action. After the fighting broke out, Washington was quick to demand that the Council act to halt the warfare.

Although Washington has warm ties with Israel, its spokesmen immediately announced a hands-off-the-fighting policy. There are, of course, those who question whether Washington would have followed such a policy were Israel, rather than the Arabs, being de-

June 29, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 9181

feated. Washington is also criticized by some for not having agreed that the Council's first cease-fire demand also calls for a surrender of all territory taken by either side. Yet, given all the circumstances, particularly Washington's conviction that President Nasser was deeply anti-America, the American stand since the beginning of the crisis in mid-May has been at most points commendably even-handed when compared with that of, say, the Soviet Union.

Perhaps most important of all has been the manner in which Washington has handled Moscow throughout the crisis. Indeed, it has been apparent from the beginning that Washington clearly understood that the main goal throughout the crisis must be to keep American-Russian relations on as steady and unheated a basis as possible. Although the crisis is still far from over, it would seem that Washington (with equal reciprocation from Moscow) has succeeded in this important work.

There is evidence that Western Europe as a whole has approved of American policy towards the crisis. This will be welcome indeed to the White House. Whether in the non-Western parts of the world, that is in Asia and Africa, there will be similar approval is less certain. But it seems likely that, in the West at least, American diplomatic stock is higher than at any time since America's massive intervention in the Vietnamese war in the winter of 1965. This provides an encouraging background for the almost inconceivably difficult diplomacy which must now begin in and around the Middle East.

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM DESERVES SUPPORT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, nearly 2 years ago, Congress enacted legislation to provide an imaginative, unique, and sound program to provide good housing to very-low-income people; this is the rent supplement program.

It is imaginative for several reasons, but chief among them is the fact that it enables private enterprises to serve the low-income housing market directly for the first time.

The new feature embodied in the program is the payment of a rent supplement to the private housing owner to make up the difference between the rent a poor family can afford, and the market rent for the housing unit the family needs.

The program is a sound one. It is built on the concept that major involvement of the private sector in every endeavor brings efficiencies, economies, and progressive improvement.

It does not force the low-income family that improves its lot in life out of decent housing and back to the slums because family income passed a certain limit.

Instead, it encourages families to advance, and, having done so, pay their full rent.

This program is a hand up—not a handout.

Rent supplement housing is financed in the traditional manner.

The mortgage loans are made by private lenders. They bear interest at the market rate, and are insured by the Federal Housing Administration.

The money for rent supplements and the authority to contract to pay the supplements are provided in appropriations by Congress.

As I said earlier, we provided the basic program about 2 years ago.

Unfortunately, we did not act as quickly as we might have to get it under way.

It was not until May, 1966—about 9 months later—that contract authority for rent supplements was provided in supplemental appropriations.

In the intervening months there was a lively public debate about the merits of this housing aid for low-income families.

This discussion has continued for about 2 years. Some comments have been helpful and informative. Others, unfortunately, resulted from misinformation or lack of understanding. Some were plain distortions. These latter have muddled the issue.

The latest variation on the distortion theme goes like this: "There's no demand for the program."

This, of course, is pure nonsense.

In calendar 1966, Congress provided rent supplement contract authority totaling \$32 million.

That allocation was exhausted in less than a year.

Project proposals continue to pour into the FHA offices at the rate of about 5,000 units a month.

Right now, FHA has enough proposed rent supplement units in its pipeline to earmark \$20 million in additional contract authority.

In other words, half of the President's budget request for rent supplement funds—\$40 million—could be reserved immediately for new projects, and without affirmative action by this body and this Congress there is no contract authority.

In spite of the public record, we continue to hear the charge that there is no demand for the rent supplement program.

Now for the second criticism—"The program is not producing."

The record shows the strongest of FHA multifamily housing mortgage insurance programs to be section 221(d)(3) housing, which provides rental units for low-income families through below-market interest rate financing.

This program grew from about 8,800 units in fiscal 1962 to some 24,700 units in fiscal 1966. Applications under the (d)(3) program account for about 39 percent of all FHA multifamily housing applications.

The (d)(3) program—FHA's fastest growing rental program—was created in mid-1961. But, the first (d)(3) project was not ready for occupancy until nearly a year later.

By comparison, the rent supplement program had a project in occupancy within 7 months after it was funded.

A number of projects are now in operation and about 800 families are receiving the benefits of rent supplements. Some of these projects were created by rehabilitation of sound but rundown existing housing. Others are housing-for-the-elderly projects that were under construction or recently completed.

I understand that scores of all-new construction projects will be underway this year. Some already are being built. So much for the program's productivity.

There is another criticism—more often implied than stated. That is, "The

rent supplement program somehow really doesn't serve the poor."

Let us review briefly some of this program's requirements.

First, eligible tenants must have incomes at or below those for admission to public housing in the locality.

Total family assets cannot exceed \$2,000 unless the applicant is 62 or older; then the limit is \$5,000.

In addition, eligible tenants must qualify as displaced by governmental action, be elderly or handicapped, living in substandard housing, or be without housing because of a natural disaster.

Eligible tenants pay 25 percent of family income toward the rent. Any difference between that and the economic rent is met by the supplement paid directly to the private project owner.

If family income changes, so does the supplement. Thus, it is possible for the family to better itself economically, pay the full rental, and not have to move.

The housing is privately planned, owned, and operated. The private owner selects his tenants, and there are the usual landlord-tenant relationships.

Rent supplement housing developments are subject to local taxing authority.

They are modest in design, but there is no institutional or project look to them. This is a private housing program. In my judgment, it is a most productive program.

More than 33,600 families will have a decent home because of it. This is the progress to date.

We have in our hands the potential for its greater service in the months ahead.

The requested \$40 million in contract authority would provide about 44,000 poor families with housing that meets the American standard.

I urge every Senator to join with me in full support and funding of the rent supplement program.

THE NATIONAL HOME OWNERSHIP FOUNDATION ACT—VIEWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, on January 11 of this year the distinguished Representative from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], who is ranking Republican member of the Banking and Currency Committee and its Housing subcommittee in the other body, placed in the RECORD a memorandum describing what at the time was the plan which has since been embodied in the National Home Ownership Foundation Act, S. 1592. Shortly thereafter the Department of Housing and Urban Development circulated an unsigned memorandum critical of the proposal as it then stood.

After 3 arduous months of research and development, the legislation to create a National Home Ownership Foundation was introduced, with numerous and important improvements over the January version, on April 20. The following day Secretary Weaver of HUD issued a nine-page statement sharply critical of the proposal, drawing upon the earlier HUD memorandum.

Subsequently, on June 10, Secretary Weaver was interviewed by United Press

S9182

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 29, 1967

International and again commented on the National Home Ownership Foundation Act.

In order to clarify certain misconceptions about the act, and to offer a dollars-and-cents analysis of its potential benefits to lower income families, I have had prepared a statement which addresses itself to these criticisms and misunderstandings, dated June 20.

In view of the wide interest this statement has generated, I feel that it is appropriate to make its contents available to the public. I thus ask unanimous consent that the HUD memorandum of January 31, Secretary Weaver's statement of April 21, excerpts from Secretary Weaver's UPI interview of June 10, and the text of my analysis of June 20 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[Unsigned memorandum dated Jan. 31, 1967, referring to National Home Ownership Foundation plan as described in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Jan. 11, 1967]

A NEW DAWN FOR OUR CITIES—A HOME-OWNERSHIP ACHIEVEMENT PLAN

(As described by Senator CHARLES H. PERCY)

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

A new private nonprofit corporation would be chartered by Congress—the National Home Ownership Foundation, Inc. (NHO). Two-thirds of the board of directors of NHO would be drawn from the private sector of the economy and the remainder would be appointed by the President with Senate approval.

NHO's function would be to encourage the formation of local nonprofit housing associations (LNHA) and to provide them with technical assistance, trained personnel and some of the funds needed to carry on their activities.

The function of the LNHA's would be to (1) prepare low-income families for homeownership by providing them with a basic education, on-the-job training and other forms of counseling; (2) acquire substandard dwelling units; (3) hire contractors who, using low-cost techniques and the trainees recruited in the area being rehabilitated, will rehabilitate the dwelling units; (4) sell to the low-income families these remodeled units; (5) finance their purchase by a mortgage loan the interest on which would vary depending primarily on the need and the income of the buyer and the cost of the unit.

The financing of the program would be as follows:

(1) NHO will have the blanket obligatory authority to channel funds to the LNHA's from existing Government programs to cover its training and counseling services.

(2) NHO will issue Federally tax exempt debentures in the private money market. These bonds will, in effect, be Federally guaranteed—that is, they will, in case of default be exchangeable for equivalent government securities. They will have an interest rate pegged to the rate of prime commercial bonds. An initial subscription of up to \$100 million will be made by the Government, which money will be repayable without interest. A further source of funds would be the sale by NHO of some of the mortgage loans it has received from LNHA to FNMA, which would purchase these uninsured below-market-interest-rate mortgages at par, using Special Assistance Funds furnished by the Treasury.

(3) FHA will insure the new owner against losing his home due to curtailment of income through ill health or economic recessions. The cost of this insurance will be borne by borrowers under FHA insured mortgages.

ANALYSIS

Delegation of sovereign power to private corporation

The program is administratively weak in that there is unbridled delegation of power to a nongovernmental corporation. The proposal grants to a private corporation the power not only to siphon funds from Congressionally authorized programs but to pledge the credit of the United States. Control by legislative and executive branches is so weak as to run the substantial risk of the program being declared unconstitutional by the judicial branch.

The basic financing aids specified cannot provide housing for the poor

The crucial element of the plan—developing a method to make it possible to rehabilitate housing at a price which puts it within reach of the poor—is also its weakest spot. There is no indication of the mechanism by which hired contractors will achieve the "low-cost technique" which has as yet eluded such giants of United States industry as United States Steel and U.S. Gypsum. Without such a technological breakthrough, the major financial mechanism specified by the proposal—low interest rate money achieved through using Federal credit and Federal guarantees, and through exemptions from income taxes, is barely sufficient to produce lower middle income housing, let alone low-income housing.

Yet the cost to the Treasury of the proposed use of Federal credit and guarantees, and tax exemption could be very great. The proposal clearly contemplates amending "the FNMA laws to provide the FNMA purchase of a specified amount of NHO-held mortgages in order to revolve the financing funds." But the proposal carefully avoids the question of how much in Federal funds FNMA would need. Every below-market-interest-rate mortgage acquired by the NHO would have to be purchased by FNMA with Treasury funds if the NHO is to be able to "turn over" its limited capital and carry on any sizeable operations. Assuming that the average below-market-interest-rate mortgage is \$10,000, the purchase of only 10,000 such mortgages a year would require \$100 million in Treasury funds. In addition, the loss in Federal tax revenue involved in exempting from taxes the interest payments on NHO debentures would be equal to 50 percent of the dollar amount of the interest payments.

The "Hooker"

Apparently in belated recognition of the fact that the basic financing aids specified in the proposal cannot bring housing within the reach of the poor, the author suggests that Federal urban renewal funds be used to help local public agencies acquire buildings in "urban renewal or concentrated code enforcement areas for low-cost resale to LNHA's". This would permit LNHA's to get buildings acquired by condemnation at a fraction of the price paid for them (and perhaps as a gift from the local public agencies) with Federal and local funds paying the difference between the cost of acquiring the buildings and the amount paid for them by the LNHA's. While there is a specific and sizeable Federal and local subsidy involved in this kind of "write down", it can be a valid and desirable use of the urban renewal program. Use of this kind of a "write down" can help to accomplish the redevelopment of slum and blighted areas in accordance with a public plan which emphasizes reuse of the area for residential purposes by low-income families.

However, the author, perhaps fearful that his "new-dawn" proposal may work only with this kind of subsidy, and anxious not to be limited to buildings in urban renewal and concentrated code enforcement areas, also recommends amending the urban renewal laws "to permit the use of urban renewal funds for acquisition of building shells

for LNHA rehabilitation in areas not presently designated as urban renewal or concentrated code enforcement areas." [Emphasis added] The LNHA's would thus be given a roving commission to obtain homes (apparently through condemnation by local public agencies on their behalf) at a fraction of their real cost. The write-down would be borne by Federal and local funds.

There are very serious questions as to the legality of this kind of indiscriminate taking of property, improving it and conferring the benefits provided by Federal and local funds upon an individual selected by a private nongovernmental body. Aside from the very questionable legality of this aspect of the proposal if Federal funds are going to fully underwrite the difference between the cost of producing housing and the price the poor can afford to pay, we ought, at least, to be told how much this will cost per house, who will select the beneficiaries of the program, and how we will avoid windfalls to a beneficiary whose income rises and who sells a house he has acquired with substantial subsidy.

Not in the mainstream of housing finance

The program will have a disruptive effect on the existing structure of housing finance.

(1) FNMA will be required for the first time to purchase mortgages on dwelling units which are neither insured nor based on an economic analysis of the value of the underlying security. The amount of the mortgage may often exceed the market value of the property (rehabilitation often adds less to the market value of a house than the cost of doing the work) and the cost to the Treasury of possible foreclosures could be catastrophic.

(2) The sale of tax exempt, Federally guaranteed debentures, which promise a yield equal to that of prime commercial bonds with no risk, will tend to siphon funds from the usual mortgage markets, thereby increasing the pressure on interest rates and the cost of homeownership to nonsubsidized families.

(3) The proposal contemplates "insurance to protect homeowners against foreclosures due to curtailment of income through ill health or economic recession". If the homeowners, selected from among the poor, are required to pay an actuarial premium for this insurance, its size would be far more than they could bear. On the other hand, if the proposal assumes (as it appears to) FHA assumption of the insurance payment, with the risk spread over all FHA borrowers, nonsubsidized families participating in the FHA program will be saddled with the cost of benefits provided to the beneficiaries of this program. If subsidized insurance is to be provided the beneficiaries of this program, its cost should be borne by the entire society, not just the person who happens to have an FHA mortgage.

SUMMARY

While well-intentioned, the "New Dawn" proposal indicates little understanding of the problems of developing housing within the economic means of poor people. The proposal is totally unsupported by any factual analysis of the problems involved or the impact of its purported solutions.

It is predicated on a reasonable notion—that the provision of housing within the means of the poor requires some subsidy. But there is not an iota of cost analysis of what kind of subsidy would be required to make housing available at low enough costs for low-income families to afford. Beyond statements of good intentions and financial juggling, there is only one phrase devoted to the difficult problem of reducing the cost of rehabilitation—"The plan by opening up a mass market for housing rehabilitation products and techniques, would stimulate technological advances in those fields."

There may be great potential for the application of technological advances to the development of new rehabilitation products

A 3368

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 29, 1967

Last Monday the Wall Street Journal's column "Review and Outlook" took a critical look at these developments and observed that they raise doubts about the quality of life in the future.

The article follows:

THE TRIUMPH OF VULGARITY

Much of what is annoying or depressing about contemporary life can be described in one word—vulgarity.

It is an ironic circumstance in a time when educators, bureaucrats and commentators prate hopefully of progress in the "pursuit of excellence," of improving the "quality of life," of the wonders to be wrought by universal higher education. It sometimes seems the actual trend is mostly away from excellence.

We hasten to say we recognize that nothing in the U.S. can match the vulgarization of life achieved in Communist and other police states. Further, that existence was infinitely harder, materialistically speaking, for most people in the past than in the present; in the absence of many amenities it was a grubby, subsistence affair for the generality of men.

Yet in certain prior historical periods standards, at least, were high, and in any event we are here concerned with what's wrong now, not a century ago. The grains of coarseness show up in a variety of areas, as seemingly remote from each other as fashion and politics.

Witness, for a start, the state of painting and other arts. If art reflects the dominant mood of a society, it makes a sad commentary; pop, op, psychedelic or whatever, its distinctive feature is mindlessness. We by no means reject all non-representational art, but merely observe the obvious, that the quality of a great deal of the stuff being turned out today is singularly cheap. The same stricture applies to many—certainly not all—current musical, theatrical and literary works.

Next on our list of unlovable, obsession with the solvenly is grotesquely evident in the phenomenon of the drug-drunk hippies. They would not merit mention except that their careless attitudes are also found to some degree in a much larger segment of the population, namely teenagers. Whatever else anyone may think about the hippies, going around in rags and crowding together in filthy rooms—by choice, that is—constitute a triumph of vulgarity.

So, too, does the excessive and often gratuitous pornography now permeating practically every avenue of communication. Men may, and do, argue whether the concentration on sex and violence leads to anti-social behavior, and few Americans favor the heavy hand of censorship. But that pornography can be esthetically distasteful is beyond argument.

Curiously enough in such an atmosphere, high fashion, which like art is often regarded as an index of society's frame of mind at a given moment, has grown sexless. While gowns have seen many a quirk over the generations and are capable of being abruptly changed tomorrow, the remarkably ugly, mechanistic things being designed for women today must rate some kind of award for crudity. True, no one is compelled to buy high fashion; its excesses just seem perhaps symbolic of the time.

Speaking of buying, there is that favorite old whipping-boy, advertising. We come not to denounce it, since it is absolutely essential to the economy's functioning.

The fact remains that advertising has never been known for subtlety or great artistic achievement, particularly in the case of radio and TV commercials, and these appear to be getting worse. You might almost suspect that the copywriters and announcers have convinced themselves they have to appeal to a lower breed of audience than heretofore.

Pervasive vulgarity is also one of the blights afflicting our cities. Graceful structures of the past are relentlessly wrecked to accommodate undistinguished and indistinguishable glass boxes. Noise, dirt and congestion assail the nerves, and the slums grow despite all the efforts to remove or rebuild them.

Even in the sacrosanct civil-rights movement more than a trace of grossness appears, especially in the expressed attitudes of the leaders. However well-intentioned they may be, they sometimes talk as though they were not so much interested in inspiring excellence in their people as in simply grabbing some of the gains achieved by the majority. And of course the constant resort to violence in the streets is degrading and disquieting for the whole nation.

If we may offer a final instance, politics is always easily vulgarized, and so it is today. The U.S. still has the most nearly perfect form of government ever devised, but in important respects the noble objectives of the makers of the Revolution have been prostituted in a welfare state of handouts for all. For a government to try to transform people into parasites, and for many of them to be willing, is nothing if not an oafish condition.

In international politics as well, one can only turn in disgust from the hypocrisy and meanness so frequently on display in the halls and corridors of the United Nations.

It would be foolishly lopsided to contend that no offsets, or only a few, to these vulgarisms can be cited.

The undeniable fact is that our forefathers created, and their successors have expanded, a state of material well-being unsurpassed in history or in the world. If current artistic production is largely unimpressive there is nonetheless widespread interest in culture, past and present. Reports from the campus picture many if not most college students as quiet and industrious. Not least, people are attempting, even if often ineffectively, to deal with some of the ills that beset us.

Still, the manifestations of vulgarity are so ubiquitous that it is necessary to ask what has caused such a falling-off.

Without getting into more or less profound theories of identity and alienation, we would guess a fairly large part of the explanation is the growth of the cult of mass-man, which is a kind of perversion of democracy. Far from the so-called pursuit of excellence, much of human activity today seems geared to appeasing the lowest common denominator.

Democracy at its best is not synonymous with egalitarianism. The equality it promises is equality before the law and equality of opportunity, not equality of material attainment or career.

Nowadays, however, just that seems to be the idea: If A, by dint of hard work and talent, achieves a mode of what used to be called gracious living, then B must have it too, even though he may be an idler and a boor. If B doesn't get it, then it is somehow supposed to be the fault of A.

This degeneration of the democratic ideal is no casual development, nor, is it necessarily the result of the population explosion, although expanding numbers have unquestionably caused some of the vulgarity. Rather, the notion of literal equality has been persistently preached by politicians and would-be opinion-molders throughout this generation. The productive citizens are regularly berated, seemingly precisely for their attainments, while the unproductive are made into paragons of virtue.

Since the preachment reverses the incentives and aspirations that made this country pre-eminent in the world, it inevitably raises doubts about the quality of life in the future, but whatever happens then, it is in no way surprising that democracy deformed has bred a disturbing debasement of standards.

Kosygin Unmasked on Arab Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, lest anyone hastily arrive at the conclusion that Premier Kosygin and President Johnson made no little progress in solving the world's problems at their recent Glassboro meeting, I recommend that they first ponder this editorial which appeared in the June 27 issue of the Peoria Journal Star. In an extremely lucid and logical manner, the author wisely affirms the old adage, "You can trust the Communists—to be Communists."

The editorial follows:

KOSYGIN UNMASKED ON ARAB QUESTION

One question stripped the facade from the visit of Premier Kosygin to the United Nations.

When he was asked if he thought that the Soviet Union's sending planes and tanks to Egypt and Syria to make up for their losses in battle was a step toward peace, he gave the game away.

"That's a matter between the Soviet Union and the Arab nations," he said bluntly.

He might as well have said: "We are in cahoots with the Arabs. I am not here as a world statesman seeking peace and justice. I am here seeking to establish an advantage for the Arabs where they themselves failed."

And that is, in any case, the truth.

He spoke of peace and cooperation between the U.S. and U.S.S.R. which, he made clear, consists at the moment of the U.S. totally abandoning Vietnam, and Israel retreating behind her old open and suicidal borders.

Then, he said, it would be possible to talk of other cooperation.

The new "cooperation" would consist of what other Soviet demands? For "demands" are all that the present offer of cooperation involves. Cooperation to Kosygin means, "Do what I say!"

He demands more than world-wide retreat on the part of the U.S. and other free nations. He demands a public confession that we are blackguards, and scoundrels, who have been committing aggression against those "peace-loving" Viet Cong terrorists and the "peace-loving" Arabs.

It's hard to imagine what he and Johnson talked about for 10 hours if his language as to "aggressors" and complete, hundred per cent "We're right and you're stinkers" approach was the language of Glassboro as well as in public.

That's what all the hopeful speculation is about—the idea that it couldn't have been . . . and we seem to be a people that will go to any lengths to kid ourselves about something we want to be true.

It was very nice of those thousands of people to turn out in the rain at Niagara Falls and at Glassboro to wave and smile and cheer the Soviet premier—sandwiched in between his bitter charges against us.

The question is: Did Kosygin thus get the impression that Americans are pretty sophisticated about political speech-making, and do not take him seriously? Or has he gotten the impression that we enjoy being called aggressors and castigated before the world, and are on his side and against the U.S. policies? Does he think we're falling for his Soviet propaganda?

June 29, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 3367

The 1.3 Million Causes of Tension**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial published by Life magazine on June 23, 1967, which presents some very thought-provoking ideas concerning the plight of Arab refugees in the Middle East and possible long-range solutions of this social and humanitarian problem.

The editorial follows:

THE 1.3 MILLION CAUSES OF TENSION

The 20th Century's excellence—and its horrid defects—find some of their most vivid monuments in the hate-filled camps of Arab refugees. The refugees have been supported by the voluntary U.N. contribution of some 75 governments, not to mention the Inner Wheel Club of Hobart, Australia, the Boy Scout Union of Finland, the Women's Club of Nes, Iceland, the Girls High School of Burton-on-Trent, England, and (for some reason) a number of automobile companies including Chrysler, Ford, G.M., and Volkswagen.

The philanthropy, governmental and private, that has aided these displaced Arabs is genuine—and admirable. The stupidity and political selfishness that has perpetuated the problem is appalling.

Down the ages, there have been thousands of episodes in which whole peoples fled their homes. Most were assimilated in the lands to which they fled. Brutally or beneficently, previous refugee groups were liquidated. Not until our time has there been the money, the philanthropy, the administrative skill, the hygienic know-how, and the peculiar kind of nationalism which, in combination, could take a wave of refugees and freeze it into a permanent and festering institution.

In the wake of Israeli victories, the refugee camps received thousands of new recruits, and there may be more if, as seems likely, Israel successfully insists on some enlargement of its boundaries. Thus the refugee problem, one of the main causes of Middle East instability, is about to be magnified.

The early Zionists, looking toward a binational state, never thought they would, could or should replace the Arabs in Palestine. When terrorism and fighting mounted in 1947-48, Arab leaders urged the Palestinian Arabs to flee, promising that the country would soon be liberated. Israelis tried to induce the Arabs to stay. For this reason, the Israelis do not now accept responsibility for the Arab exodus. Often quoted is the statement of a Palestinian Arab writer that the Arab leaders "told us: 'Get out so that we can get in.' We got out but they did not get in."

After the Israeli victory, Arab leaders outside of Palestine reversed their policy and demanded that all the refugees be readmitted to Israel. Israel reversed its policy, refused to repatriate large numbers of Arabs on the ground they would endanger the state. Arab leaders do not disagree on that point. Nasser, for instance, has said, "If Arabs return to Israel, Israel will cease to exist."

Now 1.3 million Arabs, not counting the recent influx, are listed as refugees. The United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) has an international staff of about a hundred and spends nearly \$40 million a year, 60% of it from the U.S. government. UNRWA services are performed by 11,500 Arab employes, most of them refugees. Ob-

viously, this group has an interest in not solving the refugee problem.

So have the host governments. Consistently they have refused to go along with any plan or policy for the resettlement or assimilation of the refugees, preferring to use them politically. In 1955 the Arab League scuttled a Jordan valley development project precisely because it would have reduced, perhaps by 250,000, the number of Arab refugees.

It's about time this dangerous deadlock ended. The inevitable reshuffle of the Middle East ought to include a plan to phase out the refugee problem in five or 10 years. Israel, to show goodwill, should repatriate a few thousand refugees a year. All of the 1.3 million could be absorbed in under-populated Iran and Syria, provided their governments would cooperate in internationally supported development projects. Persuading Arab governments to adopt a policy of resettlement should be central to U.S. policy, and it would be worth putting up quite a lot of A.I.D. money to get the job done.

**Richard P. Winder, Winner of the National
Jaycees Speak Up Contest****EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. SHERMAN LLOYD**

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I take pride in paying respects to an outstanding young man from the Second Congressional District of Utah, Mr. Richard P. Winder, who today was named the national winner of the Jaycees Speak Up contest, sponsored by this great American organization representing 300,000 young men across the country.

Through personal experience, I am aware of Mr. Winder's devotion to America and to a free and strong society. He is a man of deep religious faith, and his desire to serve his country and his fellow men is genuine and sincere.

He will give his speech in Baltimore today before 13,000 Jaycees who are attending their annual convention. Mr. Winder's speech follows:

**SERVICE TO HUMANITY IS THE BEST WORK OF
LIFE**

(The sixth line of the Jaycee Creed)

Every citizen of this great land of ours has the opportunity to render a great service to humanity by helping folks help themselves. Abraham Lincoln once said, "You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they can and should do for themselves." But yet, there are those among us who would say the best way to help people is to literally live their lives for them, to assume their responsibilities, to take away from them their accountability, dignity and their pride. This system has never worked. In history and will never work in the future. A good example of what happens when the state takes away the initiative, the pride of achievement and the responsibility of the individual, is best demonstrated by what has taken place in Sweden. For the last 22 years, Sweden has been the most highly socialistic country in the western world. Its people are literally taken care of from the time they are born until the time they die. In fact, they even pay their high school and college students \$35 a month just to attend school. They have little unemployment and little so-called poverty but yet let's take a look at how well the individual is doing in this so-called Utopian society.

According to a report that was made in a U.S. News & World Report article, Sweden has had the highest increase of crime of any nation in the western world. They have had the highest percentage of increase of alcoholism and dope addiction of any nation in the western world. They have had the highest increase of complete and total immorality and perhaps the worst of all, more people have literally stopped going to church in Sweden because they don't need God any longer, they have the State.

Well, where do we stand here in America regarding the individual, his freedom and opportunity. In 1932, Norman Thomas ran for President of the United States of America on the Socialistic party ticket. He did this in every Presidential election year for several decades. However, he was defeated each time. A check of the record of the platform that he had in 1932 shows that all the planks that he proposed now have become law of the land and the last one was Medicare.

Arnold Toynbee, the great English historian, tells us that in his study of 21 civilizations 19 of them literally vanished from the face of the earth not from some great external force or nation conquering them, but because the people themselves lost their faith in God, in their country and in themselves. They lost their determination to succeed through their own efforts. They became totally and completely dependent upon the state for everything. How then can we prevent this from happening to this great land of ours. First, stand up and speak up for America. Be proud of our country, of its heritage and the part you play in it. Second, teach every man, woman and child that you come in contact with the basic fundamentals of good citizenship, loyalty, self-discipline, honor and the desire for permanent success. In other words, each one teach one, each one teach ten, and in so doing you will truly render a great service to humanity by encouraging folks to help themselves to achieve their dreams and their goals in life.

In closing, let me leave with you the words of Dean Alfange when he summed up how he felt about America and the opportunity that is here for all when he wrote "My Creed":

"I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon if I can. I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the state look after me. I want to take the calculated risk, to dream and to build, to fall and to succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenge of life to the guaranteed calm of Utopia. I will not trade freedom for beneficence, nor my dignity for a hand out. It is my heritage to think and act for myself, enjoy the benefit of my creations, and to face the world and say, 'This I have done.'"

"All this is what it means to be an American."

May God bless you all.

The Triumph of Vulgarly**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, whither are we heading in this generation marked by growing disrespect for law and order, riots, profiteering purveyors of pornographic material, our hippies, the growing crime rate, and a host of other developments never dreamed of by even the most straight laced of our grandparents.

June 29, 1967

That could be very dangerous.

Indeed, while President Johnson says that the meeting made the "world a little safer," one cannot but fear that if the President puts trust in the Koygin who smiled at Glassboro, damned us in New York, and then flew off to confer with his buddy Castro in Havana, the world is a little more dangerous than before.

The last time the Russians smiled and gave our president a snow job it was to cover up while they tried to sneak ballistic missiles into Cuba. And then, there was the time before that . . . and the time before that . . . and the time before that.

Commendation of Representative Gonzalez

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge a statement made by John A. Bitter, chairman of the board of commissioners of the Urban Renewal Agency, delivered at the dedication ceremonies of the San Antonio River extension project, expressing appreciation for our esteemed colleague from Texas, Representative GONZALEZ. I heartily concur with Mr. Bitter's recognition of Mr. GONZALEZ' continued efforts on behalf of his constituents and in the interests of the Nation as a whole. I should like to enter into the RECORD this statement made on Saturday, June 24:

REMARKS BY JOHN A. BITTER, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY DEDICATION CEREMONIES, SAN ANTONIO RIVER EXTENSION, JUNE 24, 1967

It is eminently appropriate that Congressman Henry B. Gonzalez be the Honorary of today's ceremonies, for without his interest, influence, and effort, the contributions of the three programs involved would have been impossible.

From the start of his public career as a City Councilman in 1953, Congressman Gonzalez has contributed considerably and substantially to the development of our City, our State, and our Nation. During his 8 years as a State Senator, Congressman Gonzalez sponsored and co-sponsored 42 bills. One of these bills, introduced in 1958, allows the City of San Antonio as well as other Texas cities to participate in the Urban Renewal Program. Another of these bills established the San Antonio River Authority. Both of these bills enable us to be here this afternoon with a tremendous example of urban redevelopment and civic progress before us.

Since 1961 Congressman Gonzalez has been a member of the United States Congress from the 20th District of Texas, the 9th largest Congressional District in the U.S. In 1964, after having served for only three years in Congress, Congressman Gonzalez was selected by the New York Times as one of the 16 top Senators and Congressman in the National Legislature. Congressman Gonzalez was the only Congressman selected from the South to receive this honor.

The Congressman has secured numerous programs, grants, and facilities for the City of San Antonio. Through his efforts a 17.5 million dollar Federal Building and a VA Hospital will be constructed in our City. Through his efforts all of San Antonio's military facilities have been expanded. Kelley alone has

hired 6,000 additional employees since his election to Congress.

Recently Congressman Gonzalez secured a 4.4 million dollar concentrated employment program for San Antonio's chronically unemployed and underemployed. Federal participation in HemisFair would have been impossible without his legislative talent and hard work.

Congressman Gonzalez is a member of the powerful House Banking and Currency Committee as well as a member of the Subcommittees on Housing, Consumer Affairs, and International Finance. His work in the field of housing and urban development has been monumental. In 1966, Congressman Gonzalez introduced 11 amendments to the Housing and Urban Development Act, 9 of which were accepted. One of these amendments provided non-cash grant-in-aid credit for San Antonio's Convention Center facilities.

He was personally responsible for obtaining federal authorization for the last 400 units of public housing constructed in San Antonio, after the Federal Government had already committed elsewhere the total number of units authorized by Congress.

In addition to authoring the State enabling legislation for urban renewal in Texas, Congressman Gonzalez has long been a friend and contributor to the Urban Renewal Program. It was largely a result of his efforts that the Civic Center Project has progressed so rapidly and so well. Congressman Gonzalez played a major role in securing approval for the second phase of development on the San Antonio River Extension, which we are here to dedicate today.

Congressman Gonzalez's legislative contributions have been extensive and impressive. I have mentioned only a small part of the role he has played as a Representative in the United States Congress. It is, therefore, with a great deal of sincere appreciation and respect that I present to you the Congressman from the 20th District of Texas—our Congressman, Henry B. Gonzalez.

In Vietnam, Impatience Is Among the Besetting Sins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, during the recent Easter recess, I was privileged to go to South Vietnam as a member of a special Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee.

This visit gave me an opportunity to see at first hand the tremendous morale of our troops. It also gave me a chance to meet one of the top Australian officers serving in Vietnam—Brig. Stuart C. Graham, OBE, MC.

I was highly impressed with Brigadier Graham and have had an exchange of correspondence with him since my return from Vietnam.

I would like at this time to place in the RECORD his latest brief, but very pertinent letter. The brigadier wrote:

How very thoughtful of you to send me the photograph of yourself and myself taken on your recent visit. Thank you also for your encouragement and good wishes. We will keep plugging on here and I agree with you entirely that the main requirement is the patience to see it through. In this situa-

tion, I count impatience among the besetting sins! Might I also add that the more we see of your soldiers (and we work very closely together), the more I can say that their country can and should be proud of them.

Torah View of War and Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, from time immemorial the Jewish people have had to continually defend themselves against the threat of extinction. Now that the State of Israel has emerged as one of the most effective military powers among the "nonnuclear" nations, Jews are confronted with a seeming dilemma. The Jewish religion does not favor militarism.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues an article written by Rabbi Tobias Golombek, which explains the apparent conflict between Judaism and militarism.

It also demonstrates that the Israelis complied with their highest religious and moral duties in every aspect of this latest conflict.

The article appeared in the June 23, 1967 edition of the Jewish Press, and follows:

TORAH VIEW OF WAR AND SERVICE

(By Rabbi Tobias Golombek)

Many people ask "What is the attitude of the Jewish religion towards militarism and war," and we also hear many people utter words of criticism. They ask how can the Jews claim to be the bearers of the Messianic ideals of the fraternity among peoples when the Torah justifies war.

Answer: The Jewish religion does not favor militarism. Judaism is opposed in a positive way to fist culture; it abhors the glorification of physical might; it forbids bloodshed; it condemns the subjugation of others.

On the other hand, passive sufferance under attack is not exalted. G-d has commanded us to defend ourselves with all our might against the attacks of our enemies. It is not "religion" to stand like sheep for slaughtering. Jewish laws teach that when your enemy approaches to kill you—beat him to the punch! Therefore King David introduced military training for the young men in Eretz Israel.

No other people has upheld the ideal of peace so much as the Jews. Our prayers always include the hope for peace. God is called "The Prince of Peace." Isaiah, the prince of prophets expressed the Jewish longing for the peace of all mankind in these inspired and inspiring words: "And they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." But this does not mean that until the glorious era of peace is established, we must bare our breast to every foe's weapon.

The Jewish religion condemns war and cruelty. At the same time our religious law recognizes such a thing as a milchemet mitzvah, a war of merit. If any enemy attacks or invades our country, it is not merely permissive but a duty and a positive religious merit to fight in defense of our country. It is likewise meritorious to fight to exterminate

June 29, 1967

nate evil within the community that threatens to undermine the morality. Those who have studied the history of the Jewish wars and the Jewish laws relating to war know that the Jews never made war for the same ignoble causes as other ancient and modern nations. In the very midst of war, by their humane treatment of the enemy, by their unparalleled laws and conduct in the course of armed conflict, the Jews proved that they were animated by a high humanitarian spirit in their relationship with all mankind.

It should be understood that the Jews are not and never were powder-puff pacifists—a people who would face a murderous enemy by baring the breast to the sword. The Jewish peace ideal calls for the establishment of a state of affairs in which all people will keep the peace—not just one group who, thereby, become the easy victims of their war-like fellowmen. But the Jews, though ready to defend themselves against aggressors, never sought war. When they fought, as their history reveals, it was in defense of their people, possessions, laws, rights and country. A notable exception is the war of conquest of the land in which they were to establish themselves, from which they had to dispossess the Seven Nations; and the war against the Amalekites. The specific reasons for these aggressive wars are well known. The Jews could neither become established nor survive without fighting and winning them. They need no justification, and must be classed as wars for the extermination of evil and corruption.

In all other instances the Jews were threatened and attacked before they went to war. And now let us consider the manner of the Jewish conduct of war.

In ancient times war was the occasion for the most savage behavior of men to each other. The physically stronger simply devoured the weaker. The development of cultures and well organized governments brought about some improvement in human relations—but not in the behavior of men towards the enemy. In war there was no morality and no restraint. The loosed sword cut down men and women and children without mercy. The great and small kingdoms waged war unceasingly, believing that wealth and greatness must be achieved by subduing and enslaving other peoples. The victors laid the enemy country waste; robbed it of every valuable they could seize; slaughtered the population that could not be taken for slaves; raped the women; tortured and made sport of the captives. This is a very brief sketch of the horrors of war and its consequences in ancient times. Yet the Jews were not guilty of these horrors.

The Jewish soldiers were not transformed into wild, blood-thirsty beasts. When forced to defend themselves, and to rid the earth of brutish creatures, who made decent, civilized life impossible, they acted in accordance with a set of regulations laid down in the Torah which prevented them from degenerating to the status of their enemies. Even in war they strived to maintain the basic rules of not committing murder, not inflicting unnecessary pain on living creatures, not fighting for the sake of fighting. War, to the Jews, was never an end in itself. The real spirit of Judaism in relation to war-making is expressed in its laws, of which a few are cited here.

In the first place, the Torah emphasized the rule of avoiding war if at all possible. An offer of peace to the enemy must precede the beginning of hostilities. The sudden and unannounced attack is prohibited.

When hostilities begin, unnecessary cruelty must be avoided. Women and children may not be slain.

Even in the heat of combat the enemy must be treated justly and mercifully.

The fruit-trees around a besieged city must not be cut down.

The enemy's water-springs may not be destroyed.

The enemy must not be completely surrounded and annihilated. Some way must be left open to enable those who wish to escape to do so. While in the case of the Seven Nations the rule of permitting escape was not applied, the motivation of this exception was, "that they shall not teach you to do according to all their abominations." But in ordinary wars the destruction of the enemy could not be made an objective. Since the purpose of warring was to render the foe harmless, never plunder, or power, or to give way to the brutal injustice in man, the enemy must be afforded a fair opportunity to surrender or to run away. The unnecessary taking of life had to be avoided. That is why G-d raged against the Israelites when, in violation of these rules, they once gave the Ammonites no opportunity to run away and save their lives in defeat. It was considered a major sin.

Captives of war must be treated humanely. Women captives may not be treated indecently or as chattel. The man who desires to possess a beautiful captive could do so, but under humane restrictions (Deuteronomy 21:10-14) and by taking her as his wife. If later he tired of her, he could free her, but "not at all sell her for money," and "not deal with her as a slave." This should be compared with the treatment of women captives of war by other nations.

The treatment of Jewish soldiers by their officers is also of interest in this connection. No man who had recently betrothed a wife, or built a new house, or planted a vineyard, was required to risk his life in battle; moreover any man "that is fearful and faint-hearted was asked by his officers, before battle, to leave the ranks and return home.

All in all, it is evident that even in the act of unavoidable war-making the Torah sought to purify the heart of men, to regulate and control his passions, and to repress the brutish instinct in him.

In these very laws relating to war we see perhaps the highest expression of the Messianic idealism of the Jewish people, a demonstration of its divine election to purify the spirit of man, to sublimate his inclination to wickedness to keep him from violence and rapine, and to organize human society on a basis of peaceful and righteous cooperation among peoples.

These laws again demonstrate that mankind possesses no loftier code of laws than those given in the Torah.

Resolution on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include a resolution recently adopted by Members of the Sanford's Ridge Methodist Church, Glens Falls, N.Y. The resolution is on the subject of Vietnam and our efforts to aid the people of South Vietnam in their struggle against Communist aggression.

The resolution adopted by a majority of the members of this small country church corrects any impression that this congregation concurs with the action taken by the Troy Conference of the Methodist Church, which has called for an end to the bombing in North Vietnam.

The resolution follows:

A RESOLUTION BY MEMBERS OF THE SANFORD'S RIDGE METHODIST CHURCH, GLENS FALLS, N.Y.

Whereas, the Troy Annual Conference of the Methodist Church has passed a resolution calling for an end to the bombing of North Vietnam, which in the public's mind may be construed as representing a viewpoint held by a majority of Methodists;

Be it hereby resolved that the following be made a part of the public record:

1. That the resolution passed by the Troy Annual Conference reflects only the opinions of those attending it, and does not necessarily represent the opinions of the majority of Methodist Church members;

2. That the fact that no vote was taken by this and other congregations on this issue, and the fact that the issue was not even discussed with the congregation, makes the Vietnam resolution highly misleading and does an injustice to the lay members of the church who feel they are perfectly capable of determining their own position on the Vietnam issue;

3. That the members of the Sanford Ridge Methodist Church, whose signatures appear below, neither approve the resolution on Vietnam passed by the Troy Annual Conference of the Methodist Church, nor do we approve of the way the resolution was passed without prior consultation with the lay members of the churches supposedly represented. Furthermore, we do not believe that the Methodist Church, by resolution or otherwise, should try to engage in making military decisions which affect the lives of our fighting men.

To clear up any confusion as to the position which we as Americans (and only incidentally as Methodist Laymen) actually support, the following is a statement of that position for the public record.

"We support the actions of the United States and its decision to aid the people of South Vietnam in their effort to overcome the aggression supported and directed by North Vietnam, Communist China, and Soviet Russia against them. We recognize that this aggression is not an indigenous revolt on the part of fellow South Vietnamese, but is instead a deliberate and vicious campaign, conducted by the Communist North Vietnamese and their allies, to conquer the people of South Vietnam by force. We firmly believe that to disregard moral and international law by retreating or by compromising freedom in the face of Communist threats can only lead to larger and more dangerous confrontations elsewhere and will inevitably result in the loss of our own liberty.

We, therefore, support the decision of the United States and its allies to bomb North Vietnam and urge that military, political, and economic pressure against North Vietnam be increased to a point where its leaders recognize they must cease their aggression against South Vietnam."

4. We further resolve that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Troy Conference, and to other Methodist Church Laymen, with the hope that they make their individual views known.

Signed: Robert A. Davenport, Gail N. Davenport, Katharine M. Webster, Elizabeth W. Keech, Constance E. Scofield, John O. Webster, Bradley R. Wright, Doris M. Webster, John E. Doty, Carson Varnum, Palma Doty, Aldin Mead, Phyllis E. Joslyn, Ethel B. Mead, Donald E. Perkins, Bernice I. Perkins, George H. Savale, Carl F. Emanuelson, Marshall Andrews, Mrs. Dorothy Andrews Case, George A. Webster (member of the congregation), Irene Andrews.

Herbert A. Henderson, Dorothy W. Henderson, Mrs. Fred B. Swan, Fred B. Swan, Thomas J. Pasco, Mrs. Chloe Pasco, Sara C. Aldrich, Thomas A. Dickinson, Sue Dickinson, Karni Dickinson, Doris Dickinson, Kathryn N. Bovee, Marcus S. Bovee, Lucy Bullock, Ray-

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 29, 1967

mond M. Bullock, Francis E. Archambault, Dr. Harold R. Archambault, Norma M. Savale, Janice Savale.

Practical Consequences of the Poverty Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas City Star on June 25, 1967, expressed a sound and intelligent position regarding the Office of Economic Opportunity and the antipoverty program it administers. It presents in balanced fashion the debate over the antipoverty program. Based on this balanced study, the editorial reaches the very sound conclusion that—

This is not the time to give up. At this critical state of world turmoil and rapid change, the United States cannot admit defeat in a cause that much of the world—poor and hungry—is watching.

The Star's advice to the Congress is just as sound:
Congress—

The editorial states—
will ignore the critics of both the extreme left and the extreme right. The antipoverty program is new and must have every chance.

I am inserting the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

IN A CHANGING WORLD: PRACTICAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE POVERTY CAMPAIGN

At a very critical era in the history of the United States, the nation is in the midst of an experiment to reduce hard-core poverty—a nucleus of misery that no society ever has been able to eliminate. In the new American effort there have been mistakes. But this isn't the time to let up on the fight. This is, in fact, the time to press harder than ever with more money and an even stronger campaign.

Much of the world is poor by American standards and most of the world is watching to see whether the United States can meet the challenge of endemic poverty in this richest nation on the planet. The alternative, in the view of our adversaries, is a total collectivism that levels off income and opportunity to a common denominator at the cost of individual economic and political liberty.

Right now a relatively conservative Congress is looking at the whole poverty operation. The 1.61-billion-dollar appropriation for fiscal 1967 is being reviewed; the 2½-billion-dollar request for fiscal 1968 is under consideration.

The Office of Economic Opportunity, the principal anti-poverty agency, is a vulnerable target for critics on every side. Some of these critics are sincerely constructive. Others seem to regard the poverty program as a thing that unnecessarily calls our attention to the seamy side of life that would go away if we ignore it.

Some Republicans give the impression of wanting to abandon the whole thing as it now exists. They talk of "new structures." Some Democrats, especially those who have manipulated the poor in big-city machine politics, are fearful that the poor will begin to elect candidates of their own.

The far-out civil rights groups denounce the program as a plot to lure the Negro

poor into a middle-class mentality which they equate with selling out. The far-right groups seem to confuse the program with the outright dole of the last century, although the OEO goal is exactly the opposite.

The militant new-left denounces the poverty personnel as meddling social workers and the militant old-right denounces them as softheaded socialists. Sen. Robert Kennedy sends out a vague plea for a "virtual revolution in all social services" and Rep. Charles E. Goodell (R-N.Y.) says ominously that unless the program is set straight, "Congress may well kill off the whole thing this year."

To a very considerable degree, the administration already has altered the poverty war in a manner to answer the more realistic criticisms and even some of the emotional objections. Now a relatively modest expenditure of the total federal budget is proposed to continue the campaign.

Congress, we hope, will ignore the critics of both the extreme left and the extreme right. The anti-poverty program is new and must have every chance. The humanitarian aims of the effort are not nullified by partisan quibbling or ideological sniping. From a practical point of view, the United States cannot dismiss the internal flaw of poverty that weakens our over-all strength.

This is not the time to give up. At this critical stage of world turmoil and rapid change, the United States cannot admit defeat in a cause that much of the world poor and hungry—is watching.

Statement by Msgr. Bela Varga, Last Freely Elected President of the Hungarian Parliament, and Chairman of the Hungarian Committee, on the Presence of Kosygin at the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, though the Soviet Union's false accusations against Israel were expected, it still came as a shock to those people who vividly remember the brutal attack upon the Hungarian nation by the Soviet Union, to hear the Russian demand for the withdrawal of Israel troops from Arab territories.

Msgr. Bela Varga, last freely elected President of the Hungarian Parliament and present chairman of the Hungarian Committee, made a statement on June 19, concerning Kosygin's presence at the United Nations.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues that statement, which speaks not only for the oppressed people of Hungary, but for the people of the free world.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY MSGR. BELA VARGA, LAST FREELY ELECTED PRESIDENT OF THE HUNGARIAN PARLIAMENT AND CHAIRMAN OF THE HUNGARIAN COMMITTEE, ON THE PRESENCE OF KOSYGIN AT THE UNITED NATIONS

For Hungarians, it was a shock to hear Mr. Kosygin assuming the role of moral arbiter at the United Nations, demanding the condemnation of Israel by the General Assembly while the country he represents stands in contempt of 13 resolutions of that same body condemning the Soviet Union's massive armed intervention in the 1956 Hungarian

Revolution—a brutal, unprovoked attack on innocent populace, costing far more lives than the Israeli-Arab war.

The resolutions passed by the General Assembly for the withdrawal of Soviet troops and the restoration of Hungary's independence was never carried out. There are still 85,000 Russian occupying troops in Hungary.

Mr. Kosygin should first withdraw them, before demanding the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Arab territories taken in the recent war.

The Hungarian nation, in Soviet captivity, awaits the honoring of those resolutions, that it may regain its free and independent life.

File: NE

The State Department Gives Greece Cold Shoulder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, while the State Department is aglow over the dubious developments which might come from the summit conference at Glassboro, our foreign policy inconsistencies remain painfully dubious. I make specific reference to the cold shoulder that the State Department is giving the Government of Greece, which after all is only a pro-Western anti-Communist group. In contrast, the Department is looking for ways to accommodate the Soviet Union and restore aid to Nasser. Therefore, I deem it of special interest that Ray McHugh, of the Copley News Service, had occasion recently to visit Athens. His interview with Foreign Minister Economu Gouras of that Government is especially timely and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

(By Ray McHugh, Copley News Service)

ATHENS.—Continued cooperation with the United States and North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies, watchful caution toward Communist governments and scathing contempt for leftist socialist criticism are basic foreign policy pillars in the new Greek military government.

These were outlined here in an exclusive interview with Greek Foreign Minister Economu Gouras.

The military regime that took power April 21, Gouras said, emphasizes "the continued attachment of Greece to NATO."

The coup, staged to avert an alleged Communist plot to plunge Greece into political chaos or civil war, "has eliminated the danger of loosening the country's ties with the North Atlantic alliance," Gouras said.

Noting Russia's increasing naval strength in the Mediterranean and its growing influence with Arab States in the Middle East, particularly Egypt and Syria, Gouras said cautiously: "It is hoped that the Soviet Union, as one of the great powers, will not frustrate the rest of the world in failing to play a responsible and constructive role toward the maintenance of peace of which she claims to be a fervent advocate."

Gouras acknowledged Greece's centuries-old tradition of friendship toward the Arab world, but supported international rather than unilateral actions to resolve the current Mideast turmoil.

"Greece has always deployed every possible effort for the maintenance of peace and order in the area," said Gouras. "Greece will stand by the United Nations, hoping in this

June 29, 1967

way to contribute toward international peace and understanding."

The Foreign Minister took a wary stand on Greek relations with neighboring Communist satellite countries—countries which allegedly supported Communist agitation in Greece and which have been increasingly hostile toward the military regime in Athens.

"Concern amongst the states of eastern Europe . . . is totally unwarranted," Gouras said. "Greece (has) a firm policy of peace and of maintaining and developing good relations with all the countries of the world. These relations can be maintained regardless of differences in political or social systems and should be based on the principles of non-interference in internal affairs, of equality and reciprocity and mutual respect of sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity."

Gouras had stronger words, however, for western nations that have criticized the military takeover in Greece. The Scandinavian countries of Sweden, Denmark and Norway have been particularly incensed over what they claim is the denial of human rights by the new Athens regime.

"The criticism," Gouras said, "is due to the fact that socialist governments with leftist tendencies are governing these countries. Almost all of those governments are supported in power by Communist or left parties and are forced to express such criticism to stay in power."

"Besides, international leftist propaganda plays its role more easily in these countries and parties of leftist organizations and syndicates regret losing their grip over Greece. That is why they are still shouting."

Gouras noted that there were no such protests when Turkey overthrew the Menderes regime and executed its leaders. This silence, he said, could be attributed to the fact that leftists had no organization or voice in Turkey.

The Greek Government-controlled press also has bitterly suggested that the Scandinavian countries concern themselves with human rights behind the Iron Curtain before they complain about alleged abuses in Greece.

Asked about the still-simmering Greek-Turkish crisis over Cyprus, Gouras took a conciliatory view.

"The Greek Government," he said, "has declared its willingness to seek a solution of the Cyprus problem by peaceful means. In that spirit we are ready to examine in common with Turkey the ways and means for the continuation of contacts."

What of future U.S.-Greek relations?

Gouras emphasized that Greece is looking to the United States for economic assistance that will help solve the nation's festering social and employment problems.

But he said Greece does not seek gifts. "The Government would like that the United States' financial contribution to the country continue not as a gift," he said, "but rather in the form of investments that may prove equally useful to the American investors as well as to the national Greek economy."

He urged that the United States increase its participation in a banking consortium that makes money available for industrial projects in Greece. He drew special attention to the need for electrical energy.

Gouras also urged private American firms to join with Greek firms in developing this country's natural resources. He cited the recent agreement with Litton Industries of Beverly Hills, Calif., to undertake a \$850 million study and development program in the Greek Peloponnesus and Crete.

"American capital has a very important part to play in Greece's effort for economic recovery and industrial development," he said. "Greece does not forget the generous assistance of the United States in the past. Now it hopes for a partnership that can bring mutual benefits in the future."

Speech by AFL-CIO President George Meany to the Seafarers International Union Convention at Washington, D.C., June 22, 1967

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, made a speech recently to the convention of the Seafarers International Union in which he commented on legislation now before Congress affecting members of the railroad unions.

Since I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that all of us would like to consider Mr. Meany's remarks I am pleased to insert his speech in the RECORD at this point:

TEXT OF SPEECH OF AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY TO THE SEAFARERS INTERNATIONAL UNION CONVENTION, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 22, 1967

I am very happy to come here this morning to say a word of greeting to you, the Seafarers International Union, and offer a word of welcome to Washington, the capital of the nation.

This is the home of rumors, also.

It is nice to greet you here in Washington and know that you are here collectively under the democratic labor system that we have in America.

You are here to make decisions that we hope will affect beneficially the welfare of the people that you represent.

Now, I am not going to discuss maritime problems. I see the sign in front of me stating Rebuild America's Merchant Marine flow—well, strange enough, I said that in 1940.

I wrote an article for the American Federation of Labor magazine at the time about the situation in the American Merchant Marine. I believed in a real American Merchant Marine then.

Surely anyone who believed in it 25 years ago and has seen what has happened since, certainly must be much stronger in his or her belief in a strong Merchant Marine today.

What I would like to talk to you about is what might be called the credibility situation here in Washington. You follow the news media these days and you follow television and radio.

It is pretty hard to know what to believe or what not to believe. The news and television media are not very helpful in these situations.

Three or four weeks ago in this hotel there were 3,000 delegates representing perhaps more than a quarter of a million people, representing government employees, and others representing half a million.

They were here for three or four days discussing problems that affect their families, their unions and the conditions, the working conditions, of their members.

There was practically no press coverage at all and no television or radio coverage. That particular week the television and radio and the front pages of the Washington newspapers were concerned only with the activities of eight or ten kooky kids who came down here from Boston.

They were unwashed, unshaven and long-haired boys and shorthaired girls.

They were down here and were misguided and all mixed up—on a pacifist meeting. Just who they were for or against never

became clear, but what they did was quite clear.

It was covered in every paper in the city, every edition, every radio program and every television program, six o'clock, seven o'clock, and later at night.

They went over to the Pentagon and laid down in the hallways. One little girl went on a hunger strike and that really brought the press out.

I say the press, the radio and television in this country, is missing a great opportunity to make a contribution to the solution of many problems that face the American people.

For some reason known only to them they prefer this sort of stuff, this sensational business, to something that is important.

This goes for the civil rights situation, too. We have a number of sound Negro organizations in the country and a number of sound Negro leaders.

They don't get the coverage in the news. Those who preach violence and have no real standing in the Negro community get the front pages and the television screen day after day.

I think the American people ought to think more about credibility of the news media and perhaps a little less about the credibility of those in official life.

This is certainly worthwhile to comment on. We have some legislation over on Capitol Hill that is quite important. This legislation pertains to the 130,000 railroad mechanics, shop mechanics who have exhausted all of the machinery of the Railway Labor Act and were free to go on strike about three months ago.

This is after many months of following the procedures of the Act and legislation was introduced postponing that right until Monday of this week.

In the meantime, legislation to carry this strike or dispute to a conclusion was introduced, which calls for another 60 or 90 days of mediation.

Now, it calls for these men to go to work and to stay at work under the conditions laid down by someone else until January 1, 1969.

They must work if the bill becomes law whether they will it or not, or whether conditions suit them, until January 1, 1969.

Incidentally, this is two months after the Presidential election.

We are told by the Secretary of Labor that this is not compulsory arbitration; this is just mediation to finality.

You try to buy that one. It is not compulsory. It is mediation to finality. It is not compulsory arbitration because it only affects 130,000 people, and it does not say forever, it only says until January 1, 1969, as such.

We are told by a great liberal Senator much the same story, that this is not compulsory, that this is something that we had in the War Labor Board days.

I know what we had then, American labor met and said to the government of the United States that for the period of the war, there would be no strikes, American industry agreed that for the period of the war there would be no lockouts.

Now, that was voluntary on the part of American labor. Labor and industry said together that the government shall provide the means to settle disputes in lieu of the strikes and lockouts, that we could not afford while fighting a war.

This agreement was made in December, 1941, just ten days after Pearl Harbor, and American labor lived up to that agreement.

We had a War Labor Board to settle these disputes. The War Labor Board depended on the leadership of American labor to observe that pledge. That pledge was observed 99 percent.

The Board depended on the President of the United States, with emergency powers, to compel industry to live up to the decisions of the War Labor Board. This was a war emergency.

ment announces it is looking at a particular section for a recreation area. Land owners are not adverse to gouging the government if they have a chance.

Today, the Land and Water Conservation Fund operates on a budget of about \$115 million a year. It gets its revenues from three sources: admission and user fees at federal recreation areas, the net proceeds from the sale of federal surplus real estate and the federal tax on motorboat fuels.

However, this is far from enough.

The committee has come up with a proposal which could keep this land buying on schedule. It recommends, for example, that the government take \$90 million a year from its oil and gas properties offshore in the Gulf of Mexico and on the Pacific coast as well as \$10 million more from its other mineral properties. It also suggests taking \$80 million a year from what the government earns on its national forests and grasslands.

Unfortunately, while the committee recommends this, it is not prepared to ask for legislation to carry it out. Reason for this, of course, is that the government is committed up to its ears on the war and the Great Society.

On the other hand, though, there is a group of conservation-minded Congressmen who think otherwise. They have introduced such legislation and are campaigning to have it enacted into law.

The committee stressed one important point: "The rising trend in the value of land suitable for outdoor recreation is expected to continue in view of the rapid growth in population and the increasing scarcity of land for all purposes."

Both these rising land costs and other factors have placed a severe strain on the Land and Water Conservation Fund. In the last Congress alone, our lawmakers established 23 new federal recreation areas involving the acquisition of about 250,000 acres of land at an estimated cost of \$119 million.

It is estimated that combined federal and state outdoor recreation needs during the next 10 years will cost in the neighborhood of \$3.6 billion. But that's in terms of 1967 dollars. If the rising cost of land were taken into consideration the needs would be 40 to 50 percent higher.

There is an excellent lesson to be learned from what happened when Congress established the Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area in the Ashley National Forest in Utah. It was planned as a 309-acre park.

In January, 1958, the Bureau of Reclamation bought 195 acres of the land for \$8,450 or about \$43 per acre. The 114 acres left were valued at \$3,550 or \$31 per acre.

In December, 1965, the State of Utah paid \$13,187 for 14.2 acres of the park land at an average value of about \$929 per acre. Since then the government appraised the remaining 99 acres at \$42,500 or about \$429 per acre.

That's a big jump—from \$43 an acre to \$929 in less than 10 years.

Vietnam Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the good people of my congressional district wholeheartedly support our men in Vietnam. The mayors of the various cities in Mobile County, Ala., have all proclaimed the week of July 2, 1967, as "We Honor Our Fighting Forces

in Vietnam Week," and have called on all citizens to reaffirm their allegiance to our great Nation and the men and women who are fighting and dying for our freedom on foreign soil. A typical proclamation is that signed by Mayor V. O. Capps of the city of Prichard, Ala., and I insert a copy of this proclamation at the conclusion of my remarks:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, of the many great days in the history of our country, none is more universally celebrated, none is more filled with meaning to true patriots, than July Fourth, 1776, the birthday of the United States of America, and

Whereas, the events which led up to the adoption of the Declaration of Independence tell the story of the birth of a new nation which was "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," and

Whereas, the search for liberty—religious, civil, or personal—brought thousands of our early settlers to these shores, and peopled the young America with a race of men to whom liberty was more precious than life, and

Whereas, it was because this liberty was threatened, and attempts at conciliation with the mother country had failed, that the colonial leaders finally declared on July 4, 1776, that "these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be Free and Independent States," and

Whereas, our Armed Forces are this very day fighting and dying in Vietnam to preserve those freedoms,

Now therefore, I, Vernon O. Capps, Mayor of the City of Prichard, do hereby proclaim the week of July 2, 1967, to be designated as We Honor Our Fighting Forces in Vietnam Week in the city of Prichard, and ask each citizen to reaffirm his allegiance to our great United States of America by participating in any or all activities planned to honor these men and women who are fighting and dying for our freedom on foreign soil. In this proclamation, I ask God's blessing.

Americans United for Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague, the Honorable Christopher C. McGrath, Surrogate of Bronx County, N.Y., has transmitted to me, in his capacity as chairman of a rally of Americans United for Israel, a resolution which was unanimously adopted on June 20, 1967, at a meeting of 700 citizens of Bronx County. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

We, Americans of every faith, gathered in meeting assembled, on the 20th day of June, 1967, in the county of the Bronx, State of New York, United in support of Israel and her righteous cause, do hereby declare:

1. We have watched with ever-widening admiration the heroic efforts of the people of Israel to reconstruct their ancestral homeland, a Nation sanctioned 19 years ago by the United Nations and dedicated to the highest aims of peace and democracy.

2. We have observed, also, with evergrowing dismay the efforts of Israel's unfriendly

neighbor states to nullify the international decision creating the State of Israel by their unceasing endeavors to exterminate its people.

3. The United Arab Republic has attempted Israel's strangulation by the blockade of the international waters of the Strait of Tiran, by amassing armies at her borders, by endless incursions and bloody assaults upon its citizens, and by launching vituperative threats to annihilate the State. These attempts have been averted by Israel's gallant defense forces. The exercise of her elementary right of survival has served to heighten all our admiration for Israel's resistance to lawless aggression.

4. As Americans, we are acutely conscious of the obligations our Government has assumed to secure for Israel a just peace, free from armed invasions and the perpetual threat of war.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that it is the duty of the Government of these United States and the General Assembly of the United Nations firmly and unequivocally to demand face-to-face negotiations between Israel and the Arab States, conducted in the light of prevailing conditions and guaranteeing a durable and just peace which will respect Israel's sovereignty, her security and her international maritime rights.

Be it further resolved, that we united Americans here assembled, do solemnly pledge our solidarity in determined and continuing support of Israel.

Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent to: the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Congress of the United States, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, and the Israeli Ambassador to the United Nations.

Israel Reaffirms Religious Freedom for All Faiths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, unlike the Arabs who refused free access, even to Moslems, to the holy places, Israel has always insured this right to the people of all faiths who wish to visit the holy places in Israel.

In a statement made by Israel's Minister for Religious Affairs, Dr. Zerach Warhastig, he expressed Prime Minister Levi Eshkol's intention to not only retain this policy in Israel, but to extend it to the new territories which have recently come under Israel administration.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement made by Dr. Zerach Warhastig on June 8, 1967.

The statement follows:

ISRAEL REAFFIRMS FULL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM FOR ALL FAITHS

(Statement made by Israel's Minister for Religious Affairs on June 8, 1967)

The State of Israel has for nineteen years ensured full freedom of religious worship to adherents of all faiths, both Israeli citizens and pilgrims who came to visit their Holy Places. This fact has been commended repeatedly by the heads of the religious communities residing in Israel as well as those who came from abroad.

Now additional territories have come under Israeli administration, in which highly

Johnson was clearly elated after his first day of conferences with Kosygin. "I've got a surprise for you," he happily announced to his aides when he had finished talking to Kosygin. "We're going to meet again Sunday!" I could have cried," said one of them.

But on the second day the elation was over, though Johnson tried to preserve as much of it as he could in his television reports to the American people. A little more than the drenching rain at the end of the conferences dampened the spirit of Hollybush. Johnson had seen for himself what Presidents Eisenhower, Truman and Kennedy had seen—the implacable, unaltering collision between two kinds of life, two ways of thinking, two ideas on how the world should be ordered.

All the while the two men were talking new military supplies and economic aid were pouring into the Arab countries, new military supplies were going into the port at Haiphong, new assurances were being given that Soviet support lies four-square with those who fight American imperialism. We are imperialists all over—in Vietnam, of course, and also in the Mideast where it is contended our policy favors Israel.

So then Kosygin went to Cuba to see Castro to give evidence that Soviet policy has not changed there either, and he announced to the world that the Soviet Union supports wars of liberation everywhere, now and in the future.

A very subtle aspect of Kosygin's visit to the United Nations and the United States was the way he appealed to the people of the United States over the head of their President. He did that in his press conference in terms that eventually can only serve to revive intellectual discontent with U.S. policy.

He did it also in his little talks to the people of Glassboro, making distinctions between Russia's love for the American people and the policy of its leaders.

His badinage with the press was in the same vein and obviously was intended to convey the idea that he is a nice fellow at heart, much more polite to reporters than Johnson and so sorry that he could not tell them more.

Johnson played to the galleries also. If there was any doubt how he will utilize the Kosygin visit for domestic political purposes, that is dispelled by a reading of his speech at a fund raising dinner in Los Angeles. It was a skillful mixture of the Great Society with Johnson, the peace-maker, whose come-let-us-reason-together doctrines would prevail also in the troubled world of U.S.-Soviet relations.

But Kosygin is not a recalcitrant congressional leader; he wants a consensus on his own terms, not Johnson's, and the room for compromise and accommodation is both narrow and fleeting. Kosygin, to use American political terms, is simply not running on the same ticket with Johnson.

Officials of the state of New Jersey are talking of making Glassboro a historic shrine to take its place with other places in the state famed in the Revolutionary War. They had better wait a bit until they find out how history judges the spirit of Hollybush. History will say whether or not Johnson's supreme confidence in reasoning together, in eye-to-eye discussion, in the power of his own persuading personality, is misplaced when dealing with a hard-head like Kosygin.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 28, 1967]

KREMLIN NEEDS "PUBLIC RELATIONS" EXPERTS
(By David Lawrence)

What they need in Moscow is a few "public relations" men to keep the Kremlin from making such a mistake as it did in ordering Premier Kosygin to visit Fidel Castro, head of the dictatorship in Cuba.

For just as thoughts were turning toward a peaceful relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States, the premier's special trip to Havana reminds the American people of the military bases established in Cuba in 1962. From territory only 90 miles away, Soviet missiles with nuclear warheads could be launched to kill millions of Americans in the southeastern section of this country. The Kosygin-Castro conference also focuses attention on the guerrilla activities being constantly instigated in various Latin American countries by the Communist-controlled regime in Cuba.

Recent reports indicate that, while there have been some differences between Havana and Moscow, Cuba is still the principal base of the Communist apparatus in this hemisphere. This is a blatant defiance of the Monroe Doctrine.

The United Press International, in a dispatch from London yesterday, attributed to "authoritative diplomatic sources" in Great Britain this explanation of why Premier Kosygin went to Havana:

"The Mideast crisis and the demand for more Soviet aid from the Arab countries has heightened the Cuban problem for Moscow, which has been 'keeping' Cuba at the rate of some \$1 million a day . . .

"The timing of Kosygin's trip is significant, in that it comes on the eve of the so-called Latin American solidarity conference due to open in Havana July 28. It is being organized by the Latin American solidarity organization of some 27 revolutionary Latin American movements.

"Current plans envisage the setting up of Castro-type guerrilla groups in Latin American countries with armed insurrection as one of the key objectives."

Coincidentally, a special commission of the Organization of American States has just finished an investigation of charges by Venezuela that Communist Cuba is responsible for aggressive activities on its soil. The OAS findings are expected to substantiate the Venezuelan claim. Havana has officially admitted that Cubans landed in Venezuela with a group of guerrillas last month, and Castro is openly supporting revolutionary movements in Latin America. There are, of course, lots of Russian technicians and advisers still in Cuba.

Unwittingly, the Kremlin has aroused the feeling here that the emphasis given Cuba at this time is part of a Soviet policy of threatening the United States that, if it doesn't stop supporting governments on other continents, the Communists will step up their infiltration and subversion in Latin American states. Nearly every country in this hemisphere is troubled by Communist undergrounds. All this increases the friction between Moscow and Washington which has been steadily growing in the Middle East and in Vietnam.

Someday there could emerge in the Soviet Union an aroused public opinion to insist that a real peace be established with the United States. The Russian people have suffered huge losses in war. In World War I, more than 76 percent of the 12 million men in their mobilized forces were killed or wounded or listed as missing. In World War II, 7.5 million men in the Soviet armed forces were killed, and at least 14 million others wounded. These figures do not include the casualties among civilians, which ran into the millions.

The people of the Soviet Union don't want war, but they don't yet know that their own government is today sowing the seeds of another world war. If they once discover this truth, a revolution may be expected to break out. That's why the Soviet press and radio and television are always heavily censored and, indeed, why the Russian people were told so little about the critical problems that were not resolved in the Johnson-Kosygin meetings.

Park Land Gets Out of Reach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a fine editorial appearing in the Dearborn, Mich., Guide of Thursday, May 4, 1967, under the byline of Mr. Ray Vernon, pointing out that lands for conservation and recreation for the future are going to be impossible to acquire under the present level of expenditures and with present funding in the foreseeable future because of rapid upward spiral in land prices.

This excellent editorial points out clearly the need for enactment of H.R. 5320 and similar legislation to earmark offshore gas revenue for acquisition of land for these vital purposes in a growing and increasingly urban America.

As one of the sponsors of the legislation mentioned, I am pleased to see this matter pointed up in the local papers of the district I serve, and I am hopeful that this kind of support will generate the kind of attitude on the part of citizens that will permit early enactment of H.R. 5320 or some similar legislation sponsored by any of my many colleagues who joined in this endeavor.

WASHINGTON HIGHLIGHTS: PARK LAND GETS OUT OF REACH

(By Ray Vernon)

The Nation will make a big mistake if it doesn't acquire now—while the price is right—all of the land, forests, lakes and seashore that it can possibly get its hands on for the benefit of generations yet unborn.

If this is not done the day may come when our youngsters won't know what is meant to walk in the woods, to catch fish, walk along the beaches and swim in the clean, cool waters of an inland lake.

A growing population and the rapid spread of cities and industries are gobbling up land at an alarming rate. Where there were once great forests there are now factories. Lakes are filled with pollution. Seashores have been taken over by private owners and commercial enterprises.

So the time is here to make a decision. It is too late after the trees are cut down and the vacant land has been developed. America must have these recreation areas not only for those of us who are here today but all the millions who will inhabit this land in the years to come.

The Federal Government is taking commendable steps in this direction but it's losing ground all the time. Money which could be used to buy this land is either being diverted to the war in Vietnam or spent on the Great Society.

Money for these purposes comes out of the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund but there is not enough. A special committee, composed of top government people in several federal agencies, made a study of the problem and came up with some interesting conclusions.

Among other things, it warned that if this land is not purchased now it may be out of reach within 10 years. Land values are increasing on an average of five to 10 percent a year across the country. But this land increases in value even more when the govern-

important Holy Places are located: sites sacred to Judaism, to Moslems and to most of the Christian denominations.

The Prime Minister, Mr. Levi Eshkol, declared that the arrangement for safeguarding the Holy Places would be determined by the heads of the three religions—each one for the places sacred to his faith. The Prime Minister pointed out that the battles for Jerusalem exacted human losses, in an endeavour to avoid any damage to the Holy Places.

Within the next few days the Minister of Religious Affairs will set up committees composed of the various religions, with a view to safeguarding the Holy Places and laying down suitable arrangements for them.

and won honors in drafting and mechanical drawing.

During his semester at Montgomery Junior College he studied data processing.

But he left college to enlist in the Army "because he had very sincere feelings about patriotism," a brother said last night. He had talked about reenlisting after his current tour of duty was up.

In one of his last letters home, Private Boehm said he was due for a seven-day "rest and recreation" leave and that he hoped he would be one of a lucky few who would be sent to Hawaii.

Besides his father, he is survived by two brothers, John E. and Arthur J. Boehm, Jr.

dents voted 3-1 for increased taxes, knowing that the purpose was to achieve complete desegregation.

ROSEBUD DISTRICT (TEX.)

"The additional educational opportunity afforded to Negro students moving into formerly white schools can be illustrated in the Rosebud Independent School District," reports USOE's Mathis. It was in this district that the Negro girl won the drama competition sponsored by the Baylor University Drama Department.

Little progress was achieved in desegregation until the school district decided to desegregate fully. Superintendent Billy Bates says a policy of fully informing the community of the requirements of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Supreme Court decisions, and the steps necessary to comply with the law, account for his success in achieving considerably more desegregation than neighboring districts.

LITTLE ROCK (ARK.)

Ten years ago, Little Rock was the scene of violence that forced President Eisenhower to call out the troops so that Negro children could enter white schools. Today, Little Rock is the scene of quiet progress. "Though not outstanding on this score, there definitely is progress," a USOE official reports.

Its most notable move was in the appointment of a Negro principal to handle all the recruitment, hiring, and assignment of faculty.

GALVESTON DISTRICT (TEX.)

The Galveston Independent School District achieved 30 per cent desegregation under freedom of choice this year, expects to double that amount next year, and achieve full desegregation in 1968-69 by a complete changeover in the way students are assigned to three of its biggest schools.

"As a result, we're desegregating and improving our education program at the same time," says Dr. Morgan E. Evans, superintendent. "The NAACP said we were moving too slow. Others said too fast. But a vast majority in the middle said, 'We'll work together.'"

The district conducted desegregation work sessions for faculty and staff, and invited parents to attend. They also worked with a council of Negro leaders, the Chamber of Commerce, and other civic organizations. The school board ended its policy of requiring photographs of its teacher applicants.

COLDSRING DISTRICT (TEX.)

Formerly operated along the classic Southern dual arrangement ("separate but equal"), the Coldspring Independent School District, San Jacinto County, is now slowly working toward complete desegregation. This year, 77 of the 698 Negro schoolchildren attend former all-white schools. Next year, the figure will double. By 1968-69, when new buildings are finished, desegregation will be complete.

Because Coldspring has difficulty in finding and holding top-quality teachers, Superintendent M. C. Jones has used desegregation as a means of affording all his students a better education. For example, an outstanding physics teacher, who is a Negro, was assigned to a white school. Negro students taking physics are bused to her classroom. And, an outstanding chemistry teacher, who is white, was assigned to a Negro school. White students are shuttled to his classes, which, of course, are also desegregated.

The superintendent reports these temporary desegregation measures have served the following purposes: Afforded the students exposure to persons the superintendent feels are best in their fields in his district, increased desegregation; moved white students to what has always been a Negro school—which many Southern officials said was impossible; and, by these steps, paved the way

Two Maryland GI's Killed in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Edmond C. Sutton, of Baltimore, Md., an Army medic, and Pfc. William J. Boehm, of Silver Spring, Md., an Army paratrooper, were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of these two young men and to honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

An Army medic from Baltimore and an Army paratrooper from Silver Spring, Md., have been killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

The victims were Pfc. Edmond C. Sutton, 23, son of Mr. and Mrs. Willie Washington, of 1827 West Fayette street, and Pfc. William J. Boehm, 19, son of Arthur J. Boehm, of 802 Thayer avenue, Silver Spring.

Private Sutton had been in Vietnam since February and in the Army since he was drafted in August, 1966. He was assigned to the 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment. The Defense Department said he was killed last Thursday when the jeep in which he was riding struck a land mine.

WORKED FOR PHARMACY

Before he was drafted, Private Sutton had been in Philadelphia studying to be a mortician. He was a 1962 graduate of Edmondson High School. Before going to Philadelphia, he had worked for a pharmacy at Canterbury road and Thirty-ninth street.

In one of his last letters home, Private Sutton said he was in line to be promoted to specialist fourth class. He wrote often about the work of Army medics with Vietnamese civilians, his parents said.

Private Sutton was a member of Enon Baptist Church, at Edmondson avenue and Schroeder street, and of Masonic Lodge No. 22. As a boy he reached the rank of Eagle Scout in the Boy Scouts.

DIED IN MAJOR BATTLE

Besides his parents, he is survived by a half-brother, Irvin Washington, a student at Morgan State College.

Private Boehm was one of 80 members of the 173d Airborne Brigade who died last Thursday in a major battle with Communist forces near Dak To, about 270 miles north of Saigon.

He had been in Vietnam since the end of February. He had enlisted in the Army in March, 1966, after finishing a semester at Montgomery Junior College in Takoma Park, Md.

Private Boehm was a 1965 graduate of St. John's College High School in Washington

School Desegregation Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we all are well aware of the conflict and controversy which have accompanied school desegregation in some parts of our country. A few years ago, many people were saying flatly that it couldn't be done. But it has been done, and in many cases, desegregation is being accomplished quietly, effectively, and with community support.

Too often, the instances of successful school desegregation go unnoticed because of a lack of controversy. I was pleased to read recently an account in the publication, *Scholastic Teacher*, relating several school desegregation success stories.

These examples illustrate what can be done to improve equality of educational opportunity in school systems which have historically been operated on a segregated basis. I think the school officials in the South who are working quietly and conscientiously to bring their school systems into line with constitutional requirements deserve a great deal of credit, and I insert at this point in the RECORD the following article from the May 12 issue of *Scholastic Teacher*:

DESEGREGATION SUCCESS STORIES

A Negro girl in Texas recently won an interscholastic drama competition—a contest which she probably wouldn't even have entered if it weren't for desegregation.

Desegregation success stories similar to this are unfolding constantly in the South with little publicity. "And, contrary to general opinion," says Lou Mathis, of USOE's Equal Educational Opportunity Programs, "the superintendents I have talked to are not afraid of being recognized for having accomplished a degree of desegregation."

Latest figures show that the majority of Negro students in the South still are not attending desegregated classes. But the pace of desegregation is increasing rapidly. The Southern Education Reporting Service says that 16 per cent of the 3,000,000 Southern Negro students are now attending desegregated schools—a sharp increase from last year's six per cent.

Here are some of the desegregation success stories:

GUY PERKINS DIST. (ARK.)

After Superintendent I. H. Flieder proposed closing the Negro elementary school, a new wing was needed on the white school. Resi-

for joint use of the school facilities by 1968-69.

Asked how he smoothed the way for faculty desegregation, he said, "We prepared the way a year ago, talking to parents and teachers who would be involved. Quality teaching is what the parents want, and one good teacher can dispel a lot of fears, a lot of myths."

Developing Democracy in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the recent National elections held in the Republic of Korea marked the beginning of the second generation of the Third Republic. The people of Korea may be proud of the accomplishments of the Third Republic in its first 4 years and look forward to even more growth and development in the future.

I have often looked to that progressive republic with warmth and admiration. I feel that South Korea is an important member of the Pacific community and a good and valuable friend of the United States. Many reactions to the recent elections in the ROK were, however, pessimistic in nature. This kind of reaction is, furthermore, all too typical of America's general view of our neighbors to the west. We seem always prone to notice the negative aspects of Asian developments and consequently the more constructive side is lost from view. In the recent Korean elections there were, of course, a number of problems, yet I feel the overall evaluation must be positive. The Republic of Korea is making a valiant attempt to stabilize her democratic system, while working under tremendous handicaps. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that she is on her way to a successful and stable political future.

The three major areas of concern that have been reported by the American press with regard to the Korean National Assembly elections of June 6 center around: the accusation of the rigging of elections; the problem of excessive police power and its misuse; the possibility that the new DRP-controlled National Assembly will be nothing more than a "rubber stamp" for President Park. The extent of the problem is speculative, at best. The press reports, however, have unfortunately dwelt only with the negative aspects of the election; while many problems were evident in the election, still, viewed as a whole the recent Assembly elections offer the promise of improvement in the future. To allow the negative considerations to obscure the promising outlook for the future of the ROK would be a grave mistake.

The problem of election irregularities is a serious one in a democracy. As long as voters are not allowed to vote as they personally believe they should, the democratic process remains limited in its representative effectiveness. In Korea, two things must be pointed out, however, with regard to the reported election code

violations. The first is that the President, Mr. Park Chung Hee, has ordered law enforcement authorities to prosecute all offenders of election regulations—regardless of party. Supreme Prosecutor, Caksoo Shin, reported that Mr. Park called for action without delay and that he felt that incidents which took place in several of the districts spoiled the election atmosphere as a whole. Thus, President Park has openly faced the problem and has taken the responsibility upon himself and his administration to work for the betterment of election processes in the ROK. Second, it should be noted that in comparison to elections of the past, this one demonstrated great progress. In the past, Korea has had numerous difficulties in administering elections. However, the 1967 elections demonstrate progress from the past. These two considerations lead one to an optimistic speculation of the future of Korean elections.

The second issue in the recent Korean elections results from the fact that the Republic of Korea is exposed to one of the most severe threats of Communist subversion and infiltration in the Pacific community. The demilitarized zone is under continuous assault from the north and the threat of Communist collaborators working through South Korean Government channels necessitates constant attention. To combat these threats to democratic stability, Mr. Park's government has developed an efficient National Police Force. The DRP has such extensive control of the Government, the possibility of that party exploiting the use of the police force is a charge available to the opposition end of the press. This is an unfortunate situation. Yet it shall exist only as long as the Government remains so heavily weighted to one side. As I shall point out later, the next election may well bring a much more balanced government, eliminating the basis for the charge, usually unfounded, of police exploitation by the DRP. In the interim elections, the problem is not serious; and the Communist threat necessitates the maintenance of an efficient police program.

A third complaint registered against the June 8 elections was that President Park now has a rubber stamp legislature at his disposal since his party controls over two-thirds of the seats in the assembly. This allegation fails to consider three important conditions in the Korean Government. First of all, the DRP is not a monolith. It is a coalition of many smaller parties and subject to great internal problems. Moreover, President Park does not have singular control over the party. There are other men, such as DRP President Jong-pil Kim, who play major roles in formulating party direction. Second, the possibility for a workable two-party system is now very good. Only one splinter party candidate was able to find victory on June 8. Those who banded together in the NDP were able to find considerable success, especially in urban areas where voters are developing an admirable degree of political sophistication. If NDP leaders can learn from the June 8 election, they will work to incorporate many of the splinter groups into their fold. If the present two-party

system undergoes expansion in this manner, the DRP will not be nearly as powerful in 1971.

Finally, barring constitutional amendment, President Park will be ineligible for reelection in 1971. This will afford the NDP a tremendous opportunity to gain power and influence. They will, for the first time, face the DRP with Mr. Park—the man under whose leadership the Third Republic began. Through these three considerations, Mr. Speaker, we see that the problem of a rubber-stamp legislature is not nearly as serious as it appears at first glance. The NDP has a great opportunity for growth in the next 4 years, and the DRP may face the loss of their most effective leader in the next election.

There were two points of an independently positive nature that merit mention here. The Assembly elections demonstrated a great deal of political independence on the part of the urban voters. The DRP suffer defeat in Seoul, Pusan, and other major cities. This has been seen as an attempt on the part of urban voters to put a check on the ruling party's control of the legislature. This kind of thinking demonstrates a feeling for political systems and is encouraging for the future.

Second, both major parties demonstrated the beginning of a sense of party attachment and party leadership. The DRP began the planning of their election in the summer of 1966. They were well prepared for the election effort by June of 1967. Although there remains much polishing in the future, the party idea has caught on in the ROK, and again leads to optimism for the future.

Mr. Speaker, we have a proud and just democratic system in America. Yet it is still not flawless, and we have been at it for nearly two centuries now. Further, we did not face many of the hindrances that the young Republic of Korea faces. It is, indeed, understandable that the Koreans have problems with their democratic development and stabilization. We must, however, recognize the significant progress that the ROK is making. I feel certain that they will demonstrate much more growth and progress in the years to come.

Further, I commend to the consideration of my colleagues a series of three articles appearing in the June 14, 1967, edition of the Korea Herald Weekly, which expand upon some of the considerations of the elections of June 8:

DRP OMNIPOTENT AS ELECTION RESULT

(By Joong-Sup Bae)

The ruling Democratic Republican Party (DRP) is now omnipotent as the result of the National Assembly elections Thursday, and the nation enters a new phase of politics as it approaches the 1970s when the legislature will have served its term.

The ruling party became able to control a total of 130 seats in the 175-man assembly, 13 seats more than a two-thirds majority—117 seats—enabling the party to amend even the Constitution if it wishes.

In the final vote count, the ruling party had 103 elected in the 131 constituencies and is entitled to 27 out of the 44 proportional representative seats.

The major opposition New Democratic Party and the Taejung (masses) Party became the only opposition parties to hold seats in the forthcoming legislature. But

A 3388

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 29, 1967

aid bond financing may distort the rational location of business by encouraging a corporation to establish a plant in an area which would be otherwise unfavorable. It is argued that if a certain locality is advantageous for a corporation, it could or should be attracted without aid. The contention that aid bonds encourage the "pirating" of industry is also common. It refers to instances where a corporation established in one town pulls up stakes and moves to another town which offers financing, thereby creating employment in one area while reducing it in another.

Surveys have revealed that few firms move to a new area solely because a municipality offers to build a plant. Most choose a region for various economic and financial reasons. This follows from the fact that any savings realized through aid financing, while they may seem sizeable *per se*, are only a small fraction of the firm's total cost of operation. Within a region or state, however, the offer of aid financing and property tax exemption may bias a firm in favor of a particular locality. While few disagree with the general censure on "pirating" of industry, it is an uncommon, not common, occurrence. Most aid bonds are used to build branches, or new plants for new companies.

Criticism of aid bonds is also forthcoming from those who fear that the tax exempt status of all municipal bonds is threatened by adverse publicity attending the use of aid bonds. They point out that the Treasury has been opposed to such tax exemption for some time, and that this position may receive more support than it has in the past from those who regard aid financing as an abuse of the privilege. This is one of the IBA's chief objections.

Probably the most widespread objection to tax free industrial aid bonds is their increasing use for large, financially healthy corporations, frequently in areas with no outstanding labor surpluses. The growing use of revenue bonds is symptomatic of this trend. Tight money accelerated the pace of revenue bond sales in 1966 as corporations sought less expensive sources of financing. During the first half of 1966, the IBA recorded 70 industrial aid bond offerings totaling about \$327 million. Of this total, \$267 million of bonds were accounted for by only six offerings, each of which exceeded \$20 million. Of the six localities benefited, only two were areas with unemployment over 6 percent. Of the seven corporations to be aided, five are listed on the New York Stock Exchange and one on the American Stock Exchange. One of these six offerings was the largest single issue on record. It consisted of \$70 million of bonds sold by a town with a population of approximately 1,200 to build plants for two large manufacturing concerns. Retail businesses have also benefited from aid financing recently, along with a major international hotel chain.

Two specific practices have been singled out for much criticism. One is the purchase by the corporation of the municipal bonds which were sold for its benefit. It has been argued that if the company could afford to purchase the bonds, it could have provided its own financing. Second is the sale of bonds to purchase an *existing* facility which is then leased back to the corporation already using the facility. This amounts simply to a re-financing scheme using tax exempt bonds, since no new jobs are created.

CONCLUSIONS

In June 1963, after a thorough study, the Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations published a report on industrial aid bonds. This committee, which was established by the Congress, concluded that this type of bond "tends to impair tax equities, competitive business relationships and conventional financing institutions out of proportion to its contribution to economic development and employment." While recognizing the beneficial uses of this device in

connection with nonurban, poor regions, the Commission deplored instances of pirating, and the growing use of such bonds to finance large corporations in areas which do not have high unemployment rates.

The Commission, as well as many others concerned with the present trend of aid financing, would prefer that these abuses be remedied by action at the state level. With interstate competition becoming so keen, however, it seems unlikely that any state would care to pioneer legislation of this type. Therefore, many view action by the federal government as the only feasible solution. Several bills have been introduced into Congress, but so far none has been acted upon. One of the most frequently suggested remedies provides that corporations be prohibited from deducting rental payments from taxable income if its facilities are financed by aid bonds.

Americans United for Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a resolution, adopted at a Bronx rally of Americans United for Israel, which sets forth the views and conclusions of many of my constituents on the Mideast problem. I insert the text of the resolution in the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION

We, Americans of every faith, gathered in meeting assembled, on the 20th day of June, 1967, in the county of the Bronx, State of New York, united in support of Israel and her righteous cause, do hereby declare:

1. We have watched with ever-widening admiration the heroic efforts of the people of Israel to reconstruct their ancestral homeland, A nation sanctioned 19 years ago by the United Nations and dedicated to the highest aims of peace and democracy.

2. We have observed, also, with ever-growing dismay the efforts of Israel's unfriendly neighbor states to nullify the international decision creating the State of Israel by their unceasing endeavors to exterminate its people.

3. The United Arab Republic has attempted Israel's strangulation by the blockade of the international waters of the Strait of Tiran, by amassing armies at her borders, by endless incursions and bloody assaults upon its citizens, and by launching vituperative threats to annihilate the State. These attempts have been averted by Israel's gallant defense forces. The exercise of her elementary right of survival has served to heighten all our admiration for Israel's resistance to lawless aggression.

4. As Americans we are acutely conscious of the obligations our Government has assumed to secure for Israel a just peace, free from armed invasions and the perpetual threat of war.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That it is the duty of the Government of these United States and the General Assembly of the United Nations firmly and unequivocally to demand face-to-face negotiations between Israel and the Arab States, conducted in the light of prevailing conditions and guaranteeing a durable and just peace which will respect Israel's sovereignty, her security and her international maritime rights.

Be it further resolved, That we united Americans here assembled do solemnly pledge our solidarity in determined and continuing support of Israel.

Be it further resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to: the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Congress of the United States, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations and the Israeli Ambassador to the United Nations.

Portuguese Naval Training Ship Visits the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last week the city of Newark, N.J., was host to the naval training ship *Sagres*, from Portugal. In light of the close relationship that this country has had with Portugal for many years, and the great many Americans of Portuguese descent, who have contributed so much to the growth and development of our country, I would like to make special notice of the arrival of this fine ship.

On Saturday, June 17, 1967, I personally toured the ship while it was at anchor in Port Newark. It was a proud honor for me to meet the captain of this ship, Comdr. Daniel Farrajota Rocheta, and his fine 282-man crew. It was also gratifying to see a large number of Portuguese Americans turn out to greet the *Sagres*.

The *Sagres* is a magnificent ship, and it is one of the few three-masted schooners still sailing the high seas. Before coming to Port Newark, the ship participated in a 3-day 200th anniversary celebration of the U.S. Naval Station at Norfolk, Va. After spending 6 days in Newark, the ship sailed to Fall River, Mass., and then departed for Portugal.

In honor of the visit of the *Sagres*, I would like to call to my colleagues' attention the following letters of greeting and information on the ship, which were contained in the commemorative brochure, *Sagres*.

THE "SAGRES"

The training ship "Sagres" is the second unit of the Portuguese Navy to bear the name "Sagres", a name which comes to it from the promontory by the same name and which is located in the extreme southwest of the Portuguese coast near Cape St. Vincent.

Sagres makes up a part of the region which ancient writers called "Sacrum Promontorium" and was considered by them to be the outer limits of inhabited earth.

Estrábao, referring to the forementioned ancient writers, as Artemidoros and others, says that the Sacred Promontory was "a sacred place, uninhabited, where there was no water and to which it wasn't even possible for anyone to go at night because the Gods gathered there."

The privileged geographical situation of Sagres was, of course, the main reason which led Infante D. Henrique to choose that locale for "isolating himself from society" and to be able to better devote himself to his work of initiating the glorious series of discoveries.

It was there that the Infante gathered together master national and foreign astrologers who became pilots to try to discover the unknown world, in his service and that of the country.

June 29, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 3387

ing this type of financing are frequently laced with such strong statements as:

"The subsidizing of private corporations through tax exempt bond sales is incompatible with the free enterprise system and represents an abuse of the tax exempt privilege;" or

"Any intimation that the financing of industry through tax exempt municipal bonds does not serve the public purpose is hypocritical."

Why is it that this particular type of municipal bond issue, which accounts for only about 5 percent of all tax exempt bond offerings, arouses such controversy? This article will summarize the development of industrial aid financing, the chief characteristics of the bonds, and the principal arguments for and against their use.

WHAT ARE INDUSTRIAL AID BONDS?

Industrial aid bonds are bonds sold by a state or local government, or instrumentally thereof, for the express purpose of raising funds to acquire, build, or improve a commercial site or plant which is then leased to a private corporation. The lease is generally for 25 to 40 years, and usually contains an agreement whereby the corporation may purchase the rented facility when the lease expires. Rental payments by the corporation are set to cover the principal and interest payments on the bonds. A government or authority sells industrial aid bonds because it believes that the corporation's presence will boost the local economy. The corporation finds industrial aid attractive because it is spared the expense of building a new plant and its lease payments are lower than the costs associated with other sources of financing, due in large part to the tax exempt feature of the bonds.

The bonds may be general obligations, secured by the full faith and credit of the issuing government, or they may be the nonguaranteed, "revenue" type, secured only by the capital asset they financed and by the rental payments as established by the lease. State laws generally specify which types of bonds may be sold. Because industrial revenue bonds must be marketed on the basis of the credit rating of the company, their use is limited generally to financing projects for fairly sizeable companies and therefore individual issues also tend to be large. In 1965, for instance, the average size of industrial revenue offerings was over \$3 million, compared to only about \$600,000 for general obligation industrials. General obligation bonds are used typically in behalf of small or new corporations.

Industrial aid financing has grown from slightly over \$7 million in 1957 to \$216 million in 1966, an average annual increase of 41 percent since 1960. The volume of \$439 million for the first three quarters of 1966 was more than double the total for all of 1965, and industrial issues as a percent of total municipal bond sales jumped from 2 percent to slightly over 5 percent in these nine months. Because these data do not include issues advertised and sold locally, the total amounts are understated to some extent. Estimates for the actual volume of aid financing in 1965, for instance, range up to \$1 billion. The average size of individual issues has also increased sharply, from less than \$400,000 in 1957 to \$2.3 million in 1965, and this figure also almost doubled in the first three quarters of 1966.

THE MARKET

According to estimates made by Goodbody & Company, a New York securities firm, about 90 percent of all industrial aid bonds are marketed initially through municipal bond dealers, with the remainder sold through civic groups, such as Chambers of Commerce, to local banks and residents. Not all municipal bond dealers underwrite industrial aid bonds, however. Some refuse to handle these because they disapprove of their use. Indeed, the Investment Bankers Association (IBA) adopted

a negative position on aid bonds in 1951, to which it still subscribes. Reasons for such opposition are discussed later.

As the use of industrial aid bonds has become increasingly common, the average spread between the issuing yield of good grade aid bonds and good grade general obligation municipals has narrowed from about 143 basis points in 1957, to 80-70 basis points in 1963, according to estimates of Goodbody and Company. At present, the yield on industrial aid bonds falls about midway between good grade tax exempts and prime corporates.

It has been estimated that insurance companies buy around one-third of all industrial aid offerings, but commercial banks also acquire a sizeable amount.

The secondary market for industrial revenue bonds is much thinner than for most other tax exempts. Dealers often have difficulty in arriving at an appropriate price for a specific bond because of the very small turnover of this type of security, and because the quality of the bond cannot be determined without knowing the terms of the lease which secures it. Since uncovering such information may prove to be time consuming and costly, a dealer will often refer a potential buyer or seller to the original underwriter.

The present type of industrial aid financing originated in 1936 when Mississippi established her "Balance Agriculture with Industry" program. Changes in techniques of cotton culture, the depletion of her timber supply, combined with the Depression, left Mississippi with large pools of surplus farm labor. The state had little industry, and no large institutions able to finance the establishment of new industries. The constitution barred the use of public credit for private purposes. To circumvent this barrier, the Mississippi legislature declared industrial development to be a public purpose. Legislation was passed enabling cities and counties to raise funds through the sale of general obligation bonds for the express purpose of constructing industrial plants for lease to private industry. Between 1936 and 1950 only Kentucky followed Mississippi's example in authorizing industrial aid bonds, and few issues were sold.

Although Mississippi and Kentucky set a precedent by authorizing the sale of municipal bonds to provide direct assistance to corporations, the concept of public aid for the private sector was not new. In the 1800s, railroads and canals were often financed with public credit. Partly as a result of adverse experience at this time, many states adopted constitutional provisions prohibiting municipalities from extending public credit to private business activities. Today, industrial aid bonds are not the sole financial inducement for attracting industry. Among others prevalent are loans from business and industrial development corporations, both privately and publicly financed, state financing of industrial buildings through insurance or guarantees of private loans, and the offering of various types of tax immunities or concessions to corporations.

During the 1950s 21 states passed legislation enabling municipalities to sell bonds for industrial aid, and today 20 states have such laws. Five more states are either able to issue aid bonds for certain purposes, or are in the process of passing and validating the necessary legislation. Only a few years ago, over 90 percent of all industrial aid bond sales originated in the southern states, reflecting their emphasis on official programs to encourage industrialization. Now, however, states in all parts of the country have authorized their use, including such heavily industrialized states as Illinois, Michigan, Delaware, and New York. It should be pointed out that, to date, these states have utilized this right very little or not at all. In the first three quarters of 1966, nine southern states accounted for almost 80 percent, or

\$345 million, of the total volume of aid issues, and 83 percent of the total number. Mississippi, Alabama, Kentucky, and Arkansas are the leading states in total volume of aid financing.

Many state legislatures have authorized the use of revenue bonds only, but in several states, including most of the southern ones, general obligation issues are also permitted. From 1961 through 1964 revenue bonds accounted for between 74 percent and 84 percent of the total volume of aid bonds sold, but during the past two years they have risen to 96 percent.

The widespread existence of constitutional and statutory restrictions on general obligation borrowing is to a large degree responsible for the preponderance of industrial revenue issues. In particular, the fact that in many states revenue bonds are not restricted by the necessity of holding referendums or otherwise obtaining public consent also contributes to their popularity. Mississippi is an exception to the general pattern and continues to issue mainly general obligation bonds despite legislation in 1960 permitting revenue bonds. Through the years, Mississippi has aided a large number of small, often new, corporations which might have been unable to secure financing elsewhere. In the first nine months of 1966, for example, Mississippi accounted for only 3 percent of the dollar volume of aid bond sales, but 24 percent of the number of issues.

Municipalities and statutory authorities account for the majority of all aid bond sales. In 1965, municipalities sold 36 percent of the total volume. Statutory authorities, which are often created by municipalities for the sole purpose of borrowing money, sold 55 percent of the total. Counties contributed another 7 percent, and states and special districts 1 percent each. Direct state participation in industrial bond sales is a fairly recent development.

ARGUMENTS PRO AND CON

A fairly common objection to aid bond financing is that it may affect adversely the financial health of the issuer. In the case of general obligations, it is pointed out that while taxpayers may voluntarily accept the liability by approving the bonds in a referendum, most of them were not in a position to assess the company's soundness or potential before voting. Although revenue bonds are not a direct liability of the government they are generally recognized as a contingent liability, in fact if not in law. Default could jeopardize a community's credit and render future borrowing for recognized public needs more difficult and costly. Small towns which attract large corporations may find their finances undermined by the property tax exemption which is virtually always granted the corporation, and by the need to expand such facilities as water and sewer works, roads, and schools, to accommodate the new plant. This situation would be most apt to occur in those instances where the size of the corporation attracted far exceeded the pool of available labor, and labor had to be imported.

In regard to these objections, it should be pointed out that an extremely small number of corporations have defaulted on their lease payments, and that so far there has been little, if any, deterioration in the credit of those localities utilizing aid bonds. However, most experience with aid bonds has been in a period of economic expansion and growth. Also, the ability of the electorate to judge soundly on such questions is usually greater the smaller the community. Whether or not a referendum is held, citizens in small towns generally are informed on current local questions. Abuses are more apt to occur in larger cities, where the interests of a smaller percentage of people would be directly involved, and where word-of-mouth news would not be effective.

Another frequently heard argument is that

any lasting harm to U.S. relations with Latin America, and in the Dominican Republic itself there is considerable evidence that his intervention did quite a lot of good. But we certainly don't see very many out of the thousands of intellectuals who protested the President's Dominican policy now coming forward by letter, picket line, lecture, editorial, paid ad, or any other of our many available means of free speech to say, "Well, Johnson was right, and I was wrong."

I wonder if it will be this generation of university graduates—your generation—that could perhaps teach Americans how to be wrong. All it takes is courage, honesty, self-respect, grace—and sometimes a sense of humor can help. You might give quite a lesson to some of your elders—politicians, journalists, even some professors and preachers.

I know many students of New York University have felt deeply, and spoken up strongly, on Viet Nam, the issue that has dominated the public life of the United States for half or more of your college years. I as a Trustee of this University am proud that so many of you have taken a stand in this passionate debate.

Some of you will turn out to have been wrong. It is in the way you react to that moment, I suggest, that you will get a chance to take another stand—in behalf of a mature and civilized style of public life in America.

How to be *right* is something of an art, too, and some of you will get a chance to show your skill at that, when the Viet Nam results are finally in. How to be right in ways that make it a little easier for the people who were wrong to decide that they were wrong, and that make it easier for all of us to turn together to a fresh agenda.

You know after a war we Americans do a beautiful job of binding up the wounds of the enemy. Look at Japan and Germany today. After Viet Nam, I think many of the most serious wounds will be internal, right here at home, and some of the most grievous will be in this very deeply divided city of New York.

Looking ahead to that time, we might perhaps begin even now, without in any way restricting the Viet Nam debate, to let a certain measure of modesty and generosity into the dialogue. As to what will or won't work in Viet Nam, we might begin by admitting that we are all to some extent guessing. Nothing is guaranteed. So far as the morality of the policy is concerned, we might do well to credit all parties to the debate with decent motives and a normal sense of human compassion. We might also try, even as we go on arguing, to reawaken some sense among us of community. As Americans we have come a long way together; our history, when you get right down to it, really reads pretty well.

I was in Viet Nam last month, and one day in Saigon I met a New York University alumnus named Hoang Nang Oanh. He took a Master's degree here in Comparative Jurisprudence, Class of 1964. He is now a Third Lieutenant—they have such a thing—in the South Vietnamese army. In the course of our conversation, he said to me, "You know it is only two days from Saigon to Washington, but it is also 200 years."

The incredibly audacious thing that Third Lieutenant Oanh—and a few million other people in South Viet Nam—and we Americans—are trying to do, is to defend not so much a nation as the possibility that South Viet Nam can become a nation. It's a very tough proposition. We may fail. If so I hope that I, as one who has supported the policy, will be prompt to admit that we had attempted something beyond our powers. But you know, we may just succeed. And if that happens, I hope that the many thoughtful and dedicated Americans who have opposed the policy will be glad to acknowledge that their country is sometimes capable of even more than we should dare to dream.

Kosygin's Duplicitious Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Nashville Banner, Monday, June 26, 1967, entitled "Kosygin's Duplicitious Hoax."

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

LOST WEEKEND: KOSYGIN'S DUPLICITIOUS HOAX

One needn't go back to Kipling's day for substantive warning to beware of "The Truce Of The Bear." It unfolded last night in the climax of a Lost Weekend. The Soviet Prime Minister, Alexei Kosygin—having made gestures of peaceful overture, ascending a mountain to view the Promised Land—turned at the crest to detonate and scuttle the very hope he had helped fabricate.

In an hour and a half of policy summation, he made it clear that the Kremlin had altered not a single position—nor retreated an inch from its course of bluff, bluster and blackmail, to affront the United States and coerce the Free World into total surrender.

Let none misread this threat by resort to wishful thinking. He moved agreement no closer by his pronouncements in the tone of ultimatum—bearing on both the Middle East and Vietnam. His were words of a studied contempt, and of unconcealed malice—unchanged by the hospitality that had been accorded him. The Glassboro conferences were behind him. In the setting of an international forum, and as doctrinaire obstructionist, he was back at the same old stand, Master of Deceit, doing what came naturally.

No phase of his billingsgate bore a heavier touch of personal insult than the conditions he attached to any prospective visit of President Johnson in Russia. The Chief Executive would be welcome there, he said, only if the United States withdraws from Vietnam, and sides with the Soviet and Arab countries against Israel. The "bridges" Mr. Johnson has been striving to build for amity toward East Europe (the Communist bloc) evidently are construed as for one-way passage only.

Whatever hopes Kosygin dashed in this vulgarian performance as a final curtain call were ephemeral and groundless in the first place; and few with a working knowledge of the Kremlin operation entertained any expectation of solid accomplishment through this round of official *tete-a-tete*.

Let America's answers be no less clear concerning its policy position—and solid stand—on the principles thus brought into challenge again by the top voice of the world's blackmail bloc. No enduring peace can be brought by surrender of honor and justice in the Middle East—nor in Vietnam, where American sons still are dying for national and Free World security against this identical chief conspirator, meaning Russia no less than Red China.

Far more than a half century ago, the prophetic Kipling poem detected and phrased it—and our diplomatic staff could well remember as developments fulfill it:

"When he stands up like a tired man, tottering near and near;

When he stands up as pleading, in wavering, man-brute guise,

When he vells the hate and cunning of his little swinish eyes;

When he shows as seeking quarter, with paws like hands in prayer,
That is the time of peril—the time of the Truce of the Bear!"

File: N3

How Nasser Used Poison Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, recently there were reports that Egypt, in violation of international law and the Geneva Convention, and as an affront to all humanity, used poison gas against the people of Yemen. Documents of the International Red Cross published in the July 3, 1967, issue of the U.S. News & World Report confirm that General Nasser did, in fact, permit this dastardly deed. The disgust aroused by the use of poison gas strikes deeply. That Egypt would resort to such inhumane tactics is shocking in the middle of the 20th century.

Words alone cannot express the deep revulsion Egypt's conduct on the international arena causes me. Let me only say that if this is what men are made of, mankind's future is dim.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the report from the U.S. News & World Report:

HOW NASSER USED POISON GAS

(NOTE.—Published below, for the first time, is the proof that Egypt used poison gas in its war against Yemen. The proof is in these secret documents of the International Red Cross. The full text has not appeared before in English.)

GENEVA.—The undersigned doctors, members of the International Committee of the Red Cross medical mission to the Yemen, arrived at Gahar [North Yemen] in the Wadi Herran, on May 15, 1967, following an appeal for assistance from the inhabitants who claimed to have been under gas attack by airplanes on the morning of May 10, 1967.

The following statements were made by the inhabitants who witnessed the incident:

1. Seventy-five persons died of poison gas shortly after the raid.

They showed the following symptoms: shortness of breath, coughing, pink foam at the mouth, general edema, especially the face; no physical injuries.

2. The undersigned doctors examined the four surviving victims and observed the following:

Subjective symptoms: burning eyes and trachea, internal thorax pain, extreme fatigue, anorexia.

Objective symptoms: dry cough, negative auscultation in two patients, signs of bronchitis in the other two, conjunctivitis, facial edema, no traumatic lesions, tympanum intact.

3. The undersigned doctors examined a corpse, four days after death and 12 hours after burial.

Immediately, the common grave was opened, and, well before the corpses—which were only wrapped in shrouds, without coffins—were visible, there was a sweet penetrating smell not unlike garlic. The bodies showed no traumatic lesions. The skin was pink. Advanced and general edema all over the body.

Examination of lungs: reddish-brown throughout, enlargement, consistence and

June 29, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 3361

now you have had at least a brief experience of another face of war.

I am not suggesting that everyone who admired the operations of the Israeli army last week must now necessarily support the operations of the American forces in Viet Nam. We might well wish that we could see in Viet Nam such surgically exact use of force as the Israelis so masterfully demonstrated. We might also wish that South Viet Nam had the cohesiveness and discipline and national spirit of Israel. We are there, of course, precisely because South Viet Nam does not have those things, but might in time develop them, and meanwhile occupies a piece of ground that has become enormously important, geographically, politically, and psychologically.

By the way, General Moshe Dayan, the Israeli Defense Minister, made a tour of the Viet Nam war last year. When he returned to Israel he published some articles supporting the general objectives of the U.S. stand in Viet Nam, criticizing some aspects of the U.S. performance there, praising others. Just this past Sunday, on a C.B.S. program, somebody said to General Dayan wouldn't it be nice if South Viet Nam would fight like Israel, and the General was tactful enough to say that it would also help if the Viet Cong were Arabs.

My own amateur guess is that within the next year—or two years at the most—we will see the shape of the final outcome in Viet Nam, not the last shot but an unmistakable trend. It will begin to come clear that the Viet Nam policy of the Johnson Administration is a failure, or that it is a success. This war is just not going to grind along forever.

I would define any of the following situations as constituting clear failure of the Johnson Administration's Viet Nam policy: Any significant reduction in the percentage of the South Viet Nam population now under control of the Saigon government; or a disruptive new round of coups among the South Vietnamese Generals; or a condition in which the rural pacification and development programs were completely stalled, and very large increases in the American troop commitment—such as a quarter million more men—were being requested. A more advanced stage of failure would be a negotiated American evacuation, in a situation which gave the Viet Cong control of South Viet Nam or put them in a good position to take it over soon. The latter of course is a settlement we could have had at any time with no effort whatever, so if that should be the final result of all our sacrifice, the whole policy would have been a sorry mistake indeed.

Confronted with a failure of the policy in any of these forms, there are several lines of rationalization by which an individual supporter of the policy could avoid saying he himself had actually been wrong. One obvious line would be that the policy was right but it hadn't been prosecuted vigorously enough, that we should have gone all-out to win. Another argument might be that our Viet Nam stand had already brought about certain strategic benefits—that it had helped, for instance, make possible the anti-communist revolution in Indonesia—but now this effort was no longer needed. Other ways of evading an acknowledgment of failure are fairly easy to think up. What is perhaps more difficult to visualize is any important number of politicians, editors, generals, or ordinary citizens stepping up and saying, "I was wrong. I thought the policy would work, but it didn't."

But now consider another possible outcome, that the policy succeeds. I would define success as a situation in which the percentage of Viet Nam population under government control is increasing; political stability in the countryside is improving; enemy troop strength is declining; U.S. and Allied casualties are declining, though guerrilla

operations might still continue for quite a time. U.S. troop strength has leveled out; and a schedule can be set up for the first gradual withdrawals of U.S. troops. If that should be the situation sometime within the next year or two, I would say the Administration's Viet Nam policy had been vindicated.

Again, however, there could be many possible ways for opponents of the policy to evade such an admission. One would be to say that such stability as existed had been achieved in spite of the Johnson Administration's policy, that the big U.S. military effort had served to magnify rather than reduce the underlying political and economic problems of Viet Nam. Another argument would be: Yes, we did finally succeed but it just wasn't worth the cost. And still another argument could be that our policy was morally indefensible from the beginning, and therefore any apparent successes for the policy are morally unacceptable.

But I wonder if any Senator, columnist, professor, clergyman, pediatrician might come forward and simply say, "Well, what do you know, I have to admit Lyndon Johnson was right about Viet Nam." It is kind of fun to try to imagine some of these scenes, and I admit there are one or two particular individuals it would be especially interesting to watch in these roles.

But there is a much more serious point involved. Viet Nam has been a bitterly divisive issue in American life for some two and a half years, ever since we began the air attacks on the North and made the first commitment of U.S. ground combat units. Viet Nam will continue to be a highly divisive issue until the Johnson policy has unmistakably failed or succeeded. I think that realization will come not in a single thunderclap some Monday morning, but in an accumulation of evidence over several months.

And when that happens—and I believe it will happen in 1968 or 1969—then surely there is a plenty of other business America should be turning to. But if at that time everyone must still insist he was right about Viet Nam, and no one is willing to admit he was wrong, then I am afraid we are doomed to go on arguing about Viet Nam: This could perpetuate a very sour political and intellectual atmosphere in this country for years to come. It would not be an atmosphere favorable to trust and confidence and purpose in our national life.

Politicians, of course, are notoriously reluctant to admit error. Few of them have ever gone so far as Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia, N.Y.U. Law School, 1910. You remember his famous line—"When I make a mistake, it's a beaut."

The President of the United States at the time of my graduation from college, indeed for more than a decade afterward, was Franklin Roosevelt. There is no instance of President Roosevelt ever publicly acknowledging a mistake.

Harry Truman once went to a seminar at another university of this city—I hope it's all right to mention the name—it was Columbia—and said "On the big things, I was right. And on the little things . . . well, if there's anyone listening here who hasn't ever made a mistake, let him put on his wings and fly the hell out of here." You notice, of course, that President Truman was conceding mistakes only on the occasional little thing, and even this confession did not come until 1959, six years after he had left the White House.

President Kennedy has been credited by some biographers with a particularly generous confession of error after the Bay of Pigs, when he said he would not try "to conceal responsibility . . . because I am the responsible officer of the government." This was a manly but I think entirely obvious statement of a simple constitutional fact. In a great many private and semi-private remarks which got leaked to the press quite

rapidly, President Kennedy made it very clear that he felt he had been given very bad advice by the CIA and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and that his error was in underwriting their error. They in turn have let it be known that they, of course, were right, and that the crucial error was President Kennedy's, because he watered down their plans.

Lyndon Johnson is another President who is not on the record with many acknowledgments of fallibility. He did say at a press conference in February, "From time to time we will make mistakes," and then just last month he said, "We try not to think ourselves in possession of all truths . . ." At first glance these are appealingly humble statements, but then you begin to wonder a little about that "we." It's somewhat ambiguous, perhaps a trifle imperial. Or maybe it's merely the "editorial we."

Coming to the editorial, I would have to say that journalists have never been notoriously eager to acknowledge their mistakes. Many, indeed, have perfected a smooth, effortless way of taking a new position without ever noting that they once held quite the opposite view.

I do know one editor, however, who developed a remarkable facility in confessing error, and he used this to play upon the sympathies of his staff; they felt so sorry for a man who could make so many mistakes that they would do almost anything for him. Indeed one of his colleagues once accused him of practicing "wrongmanship." This is really very rare.

A few weeks ago in New York I attended a ceremony where some of the most prestigious prizes in journalism were being distributed. One of the recipients made a graceful little speech saying, among other things, that reporters in specialized technical fields do from time to time make mistakes. But I thought the particular language chosen by the reporter for this confession was revealing, and so I wrote it down. "No reporter in these fields has totally escaped from being had in some particularly difficult and humiliating way." *Being had*—here you will note that the main burden of error rests not so much on the reporter as on the people he was unlucky enough to listen to. Perhaps a little like the President and the Bay of Pigs.

Maybe journalists and politicians are hopeless cases, though I prefer to think not. But surely everyone would agree that the people who should be first and frankest in admitting error would be the academic intellectuals with their totally disinterested dedication to free inquiry and the pursuit of the truth. If the academy is indeed faithful to the rigorous standards it professes, one might expect to see it lead the way when there are errors to be acknowledged. But the recent record is not reassuring.

It may seem hard to remember now, but only two years ago much of the intellectual community of the United States was in a fever of indignation against Lyndon Johnson's intervention in the Dominican Republic. There were protest meetings, angry letters to the editor, paid ads in the papers with hundreds of professors' names in fine print, and so on. A much louder protest, as a matter of fact, than the President's Viet Nam policy had then begun to draw.

Well, you don't hear much about the Dominican Republic any more. It has not turned into a land of milk and honey, or a nice clean Anglo-Saxon model democracy, and like almost any one of the 131 countries in the world with the exception of the dozen or so richest and most stable, the Dominican Republic could have a revolution tomorrow. But in the meantime, by any reasonable standards for its part of the world, it is getting along pretty well. There is no evidence that President Johnson's intervention did

June 29, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 3363

fragility greatly increased, crepitation considerably reduced.

The undersigned doctors draw the following logical conclusions from their findings:

I. None of the victims examined, whether survivors or corpses exhumed from the common grave, showed any traumatic lesions.

II. The statements made by witnesses who escaped from the raid unharmed, in respect of the circumstances in which 75 inhabitants were killed, are consistent with the International Committee of the Red Cross medical mission's own findings by examination of the four survivors and the corpse exhumed from one of the common graves.

III. The cause of death in the case of the corpse examined was pulmonary edema. The over-all consistency of the ICRC medical mission's findings shows that in all probability this pulmonary edema was caused by inhalation of toxic gas.

RAYMOND JANIN,
ICRC Doctor-Delegate.
WILLY BRUTSCHIN,
ICRC Doctor-Delegate.

Signed at town Najran, May 18, 1967.

Here is the forensic medical report by the University of Bern Institute of Forensic Medicine:

DEAR SIRS—

In accordance with your instructions of May 21, 1967, we have duly examined the report drawn up by two doctors of the International Committee of the Red Cross on observations made by them after the bombing of a village in the Yemen. Their investigations can be summarized in the following manner.

1. Information collected from the survivors in that village regarding the death of 75 persons.

2. Medical examination of four survivors.

3. Examination of a corpse four days after death and 12 hours after burial.

The phenomena observed are the effects of skin irritation, conjunctivitis and of mucus in the respiratory tract and lungs. General edema had been noted, especially facial and also haemorrhagic pulmonary edema. On autopsies, red hepatization and a liquid of reddish scrapings were observed in the lungs.

The observations collected are gradually diversified and unspecific, but form a definite entity as a whole.

We know of no epidemical disease presenting a similar symptomatology or clinical development. The conclusion, according to which the death of the deceased persons as a result of bombing is ascribed to a toxic gas, seems to us to be perfectly justified. This conclusion is supported by the total absence of traumatic lesions caused by the effects of pressure—explosion.

Amongst the various poison gases which can produce the effects observed, phosphonic esters—nervine gas—would not, in our opinion, be involved, in view of the local irritations observed. Their effects would, moreover, have been characterized by copious salivation, myositis and muscular cramp.

On the other hand, the employment of halogenous derivatives—phosgene, mustard gas, lewisite, chloride or cyanogen bromide, or Clark I and II, etc.—would appear to us the most likely. However, neither bromide nor cyanogen chloride causes an edemic irritation of the skin. This also applies to phosgene.

As against this, all the symptoms observed are explainable by the hypothesis of the use of mustard gas, lewisite or similar substances. The odor resembling garlic, smelled on opening the common grave, would indicate the employment rather of mustard gas. These toxic substances are pulverized when the bomb explodes in the form of aerosol.

Yours sincerely,

Prof. D. E. LAUPPI,
Director of the Institute.

Hail "Glassboro State"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, herewith is an editorial from the perceptive and sharp pen of Mr. Bob Lowry, publisher of the Aurora Advertiser, June 24, 1967 in Aurora, Mo. It deals in all expertise with the Midwestern heartfelt appreciation of fellow citizens in Glassboro, N.J., and their attitude during the recent so-called summit meetings. The importance is not in the meetings which perhaps came to naught, but in the attitude of the American people. This is representative of the true outlook of over 95 percent of our informed and prudent public which recognize a real contribution with "service above self," by one community to the Nation.

We join in the salute to Glassboro.

HAIL GLASSBORO STATE

Raise a glass to the new star in the educational firmament! Hail Glassboro State!

When the little town of Glassboro, N.J. was named as the meeting place of Russia's Prime Minister Alexi Kosygin and America's President Lyndon Johnson and the campus of the college as the actual site, the students of Glassboro State, as students these days do when something unusual is about to take place, prepared placards for a demonstration. Glassboro, it was determined, was not about to be tested and found wanting.

But these were different placards. They read "Glassboro State College Loves America" and "GSC Loves USA", and when the television cameras of the world focused upon the little campus for the very first time there they were, unprofessionally lettered, to be sure, but clear, distinct and readable.

What a wonderful thing it was for old-fashioned Americans fed up to the gills with the slander, untruths and treason upon the placards carried by students at Berkeley and those of other institutions who ape it to see on TV! Think of it, a college whose students actually love the land of their birth and are wise enough to recognize the only chance the student body of Glassboro State is ever likely to have to send that message to the rest of the country! Maybe, just maybe, there is still good in higher education worth the tremendous burden it is upon taxpayers and parents. If so, Glassboro State seems to possess it in great measure.

Yes, we for one, have a soft-spot in our heart for Glassboro State, a college we didn't know existed before this week. And we think the same thing must be true in many, many hearts across this land of ours which Glassboro and a lot of others still love.

We do not know whether Glassboro State has a football team or not. We suppose it does. We know that we can be counted among the rooters for Glassboro this fall, and we will be reading down toward the bottom of the game lists come September Sunday mornings to see how one of our favorite schools came out.

We think the rest of the country and the world owe an expression of appreciation not only to Glassboro State, but to the people of that small town which found itself so suddenly smack in the center of the world's spotlight. Glassboro came through with flying colors, in a hurry, without much time to get ready.

Out came flags, up went banners welcoming the representatives of two great powers.

And as they arrived, the people of Glassboro cheered and waved their hands, engulfing the two statesmen in an atmosphere so friendly, so free from hate, it was bound to have an effect upon the meeting which followed, for good-will, like hate, is infectious.

Who knows just how much has been contributed to history by the people of Glassboro? After all, it seemed pretty clear that neither Premier Kosygin or President Johnson was particularly anxious for a meeting they expected could bear little, if any, fruit and which would be, it seemed, merely a formality.

If Glassboro's outpouring of hope and friendliness created an atmosphere which helped make what was to be merely an empty gesture a real discussion of the problems of the world which set the stage for a second one which we may now hope will be fruitful, then Glassboro may well have made the most important contribution to world peace by any small town this century.

Over and beyond international considerations, however, Glassboro, we believe, has also made another contribution. Its performance on the nation's TV screens has reminded us that there are really two Americas.

It has demonstrated by its hospitality, friendliness, good manners and tolerance that behind the ill-will, turmoil, violence and intolerance so often pictured in the cities and on the famous campuses of the land there is hidden the real America, the America which in an amazingly short time has built itself from a handful of wilderness outposts into a land which is the wonder of the world. And it is that America which stands fore-square for the truths upon which this nation was founded and in which it has always persisted when the chips are really down.

And for showing this on the behalf of all of us, to Glassboro we say "well done."

Dodd Case: The End or Just the Beginning?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate feels that the Dodd and Powell excursions should not now end but continue into the realm of Earl Warren's donations and gifts.

It would be interesting, wouldn't it? But Drew Pearson will not get into Mr. Warren's finances and staff because they have been known to be fellow junketeers.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the editorial from the Baton Rouge, La., Morning Advocate of June 25, 1967, at this point in the RECORD:

SOME ADDITIONAL SOUL SEARCHING

What with all the soul searching as related to the financial affairs of Sen. Tom Dodd and the sordid tale of Adam Clayton Powell, maybe some further excursions in such self-examination are in order in the field of fiscal morality.

Purely public funds are involved in the matter in mind, not gifts or contributions from private sources.

Chief Justice Earl Warren and Mrs. Warren drew \$948 from the State Department recently for a 13-day trek to Peru, Colombia and Bolivia in the roles of "United States

specialists," whatever that expression may mean. Mrs. Warren was rated as a "welfare service volunteer," which entitled her to \$362.

Mr. Justice Warren, who is paid \$40,000 a year for some highly original interpretations of what the Constitution says, perhaps ought to have a few fringe benefits—such as this trip. He has made ample contribution to this kind of thinking, this kind that prevails among the Wizards of Washington.

Then there was Ralph McGill, the Atlanta publisher-editor who has recognition in many quarters as a pundit of distinction. He was a "United States specialist" who drew \$5,918 for "lectures on journalism" in Ghana, Kenya, Tanzania, Zambia and South Africa.

There also were the coach and two track stars from Tennessee, who participated in track "clinics" and demonstrated the American skills of running around a track and jumping over little, wooden fences in Kenya, Malawi and Ethiopia. Their take was a total of \$8,223.

Whether these and similar enterprises are worth what they cost the taxpayer is judged best by that same taxpayer.

Congressman Shriver Announces 1967 Kansas Fourth District Opinion Poll Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF
HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1967

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice since coming to Congress to send to my constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas a questionnaire on important issues facing the Nation on the foreign and domestic fronts.

This year my 1967 opinion poll was sent to approximately 100,000 households in the seven counties of the Kansas Fourth District. This was done with the assistance of interested volunteers throughout the district who aided me in

addressing envelopes from telephone directories. I am pleased to report that approximately 18,100 questionnaires have been returned and tabulations on these are complete. This is an excellent response. It represents the keen interest and concern which citizens of my district have regarding Government and legislative matters facing the Congress.

For the first time this year husbands and wives in the household had an opportunity to express their individual views on the issues. I was pleased to receive additional comments and personal opinions on many of the questions from my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I am again placing the tabulations which have been made on the questionnaire in the Record in order that Members of Congress and the President may be apprised of the opinions of citizens in the Kansas Fourth Congressional District on the issues included in the poll. Under the leave extended, I also include a few of the comments which accompanied the ballots.

Tabulation of 1967 opinion poll in 4th Congressional District of Kansas

[In percent]

	His	Her
1. Do you favor combining the Departments of Commerce and Labor into a single Department of Business and Labor?		
Yes.....	40.9	40.6
No.....	38.1	32.0
No opinion.....	11.0	27.4
2. Do you favor increasing social security benefits providing it does not require an increase in the social security payroll tax?		
Yes.....	64.5	65.5
No.....	31.4	30.3
No opinion.....	4.1	4.2
3. Do you favor an increase in social security benefits which would require an increase in the social security payroll tax?		
Yes.....	20.6	19.2
No.....	76.4	77.1
No opinion.....	3.0	3.7
4. The present draft law expires June 30, 1967. Do you feel that the selective service law as it now operates is fair to all citizens?		
Yes.....	24.7	22.4
No.....	66.6	67.4
No opinion.....	8.7	10.2
5. Would you favor Federal legislation to regulate the sale of firearms?		
Yes.....	37.4	48.5
No.....	60.5	46.7
No opinion.....	2.1	4.8
6. The administration has pledged to follow "a sensible course of fiscal and budgetary policy." To achieve such objectives, do you favor:		
a. A 6 percent surcharge on individual and corporate income taxes as requested by the President?		
Yes.....	17.6	15.1
No.....	76.7	73.3
No opinion.....	5.7	11.6
b. Postponing and/or reducing certain domestic spending programs until the Vietnam war is ended?		
Yes.....	88.2	86.3
No.....	9.4	10.3
No opinion.....	2.6	3.4
c. Imposing wage and price controls?		
Yes.....	24.2	26.7
No.....	71.2	65.7
No opinion.....	4.6	7.6
7. Do you favor expansion of East-West trade between the United States and the Soviet Union and other Communist countries in Eastern Europe?		
Yes.....	41.0	39.3
No.....	51.4	47.7
No opinion.....	7.6	13.0
8. Do you favor limiting foreign imports of certain agricultural products such as meat and dairy products?		
Yes.....	70.3	72.9
No.....	24.1	20.0
No opinion.....	5.6	7.1
9. Would you favor lowering the voting age from 21 to 18?		
Yes.....	36.2	34.3
No.....	61.8	63.0
No opinion.....	2.0	2.7
10. Do you favor enactment of Federal legislation prohibiting restrictions on the sale or rental of housing on the basis of race, color, or creed?		
Yes.....	21.8	22.6
No.....	78.1	71.1
No opinion.....	5.1	6.3