

September 5, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 10315

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] may be allowed to proceed for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the majority leader.

THE TEST OF COURAGE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the first 8 months of 1968 produced one of the greatest tests of courage in this century. January saw the first halting step of a small country toward the goal of freedom. As the months passed, Czechoslovakia moved a little closer to its goal, and each month the Soviet Union became more threatening. The test of courage for the Czechs and Slovaks was whether, in the name of human dignity, they could stand face to face with an overpowering foe. The test of courage for totalitarian Russia was whether it dared allow one small country even a taste of freedom. Czechoslovakia won that test of courage.

The Russians used military force ruthlessly, not to suppress an armed rebellion as in Hungary, but to halt the mellowing of Communist Party rule of a satellite.

Freedom of expression for the Czechoslovak people, in the view of the Kremlin, was the most dangerous threat to the Soviet system. So the armed forces were ordered to crush the modest reform movement of Alexander Dubcek's Communist government.

The world watched the rape of Czechoslovakia. The courage of these people was magnificent. The cowardice of Russia was blatant. The President of the United States announced that the actions of the Soviet Union shocked the conscience of the world. Other countries, including Communist countries and Communist organizations, joined in the condemnation of this brazen act of oppression.

Western Europe, the United States, and the NATO organization were powerless to do little more than offer sympathy, express admiration for the heroic resistance by the Czechoslovak people, and issue statements criticizing the Kremlin.

The Kremlin may have underestimated the fierceness of the resistance of the people of Czechoslovakia, but I do not believe for a moment that these leaders miscalculated the reaction of the rest of the world.

For our own Nation that has thrived in freedom, it is especially painful to see the small spark of freedom's light crushed by the tread of Soviet tanks.

The proclaimed threat to Socialist order that was being put down by military might was the hint of freedom. Newspapers, intellectuals, students, men in

the street wanted to be able to talk and think. At its best, the January movement was not freedom as we know it—for example, over 900 specific categories of news were still to be censored in the press. However, it was an important first step in the relaxation of Soviet control.

Here in the United States, in our schools, in our Labor Day speeches, we talk of the spirit of freedom and the drive within men to be free. Perhaps, in this modern cradle of freedom, we have forgotten how powerful a force freedom can be.

There is a lesson we can learn: Freedom, decency, and dignity are incompatible with the Communist system. Russia has not forgotten that freedom—national and individual—is its natural enemy. In the Soviet view, their system was threatened, and they struck fast and hard to preserve it.

The harshness with which the suppression was carried out suggests that there has been little erosion in the historic ruthlessness of Soviet Communist leadership.

DETENTE

The brutal suppression of Czechoslovakia not only shocked the conscience of the world; it shocked the policymakers in the White House. A military invasion was, in their reasoning, the one step the Soviet Union could not take because it would threaten all the recent peaceful developments and destroy efforts or pretensions at detente.

For several years, the United States has followed what has been called a policy of convergence. It assumes that as Russia develops and prospers, its interests will converge with those of the western democracies and the United States, and detente will result.

To further this convergence, the United States has gone more than half way in seeking accommodation in many ways including working for East-West trade. No treaty or agreement was too minuscule, because the steps were supposed to lead to peaceful coexistence, as we understand the term, and ultimately even to close friendship.

Sensible men cannot fault such attempts to negotiate peacefully with the Communists. But the degree of reliance placed on the assumptions of convergence in attaining our foreign policy objectives has long been in question.

The subjugation of the Czechoslovak people should force second thoughts on even the most ardent disciples of the theory of Soviet melioration.

Let me review briefly six major assumptions underlying the United States recent attempts at detente, and let us consider them in the aftermath of Czechoslovakia:

First. The growing independence of Eastern European Communist countries, "polycentricism" as this loosening process is known, has convinced the Soviet Union that it cannot maintain an empire in which its own power is the final determinant.

This tenet of detente has been proven wrong.

Second. The growing demands of Soviet citizens for consumer goods has brought about an economic rationalism

in the Soviet economy and forced the country to adopt certain capitalist techniques. It has become increasingly apparent that external aggression and revolution are incompatible with the wants and needs of the Soviet people.

The need of international Communist power dictated external aggression against Czechoslovakia without regard to economic rationalism.

Third. After the years of Stalinist terror, liberalization is the only path which the Soviet Union can follow.

Terror is still an effective weapon in the hands of those ruthless enough to use it.

Fourth. After disappointments in attempting to use Communist ideology, the Soviets have turned to realpolitik in world affairs. They will conduct international relations in terms of enlightened self-interest and settle back into conventional patterns of international politics observed by traditional nation states.

"Enlightened self-interest" this time meant a violent reaction wrought by fear of freedom.

Fifth. Faced with a "China" problem, the Soviet Union has realized the necessity of seeking aid from the West.

Russia deliberately alienated the West in order to control Eastern Europe.

Sixth. The Soviets admitted during the Cuban missile crisis they could not match the strategic power of the United States. Logically, then, Russia must come to terms with the United States.

Strategic power was irrelevant in this crisis, and the Soviet Union continues to ignore the United States and NATO as it threatens Rumania.

Mr. President, the deliberate, indefensible attack on Czechoslovakia has shown each of the premises to be wrong or misinterpreted. The conclusion drawn from them was a miscalculation. Russia has not been forced to follow peaceful ways.

It is these premises, nonetheless, that have guided the detente mentality of our relations with the Soviet Union in recent years. Always fearing to offend, we pursued foreign relations and national security from a position of self-effacing courtesy rather than a position of strength and firmness.

It is under the protective umbrella of detente that we have allowed NATO to deteriorate, that we have redeployed military forces in Europe, and that we have considered substantial troop reductions.

It is under the protective umbrella of detente that our Nation has announced and pursued a program and policy of building bridges from West to East.

On August 20, 1968, it became fatefully obvious that the umbrella was illusory. The premises on which our detente policy was based were swept away when Warsaw Pact troops crossed the borders of Czechoslovakia.

OUR RESPONSE

Mr. President, our policymakers have had a rude shock, and it is time to re-evaluate and reexamine their decisions. I urge, therefore, thoughtful and serious review of U.S. policy in two critical areas:

First. A full-scale conference of North Atlantic Treaty Organization foreign ministers and defense ministers should

be convened to review mutual defense arrangements in Europe.

Second. Concurrently, the United States must review, in depth, its current policy of bridgebuilding to the Soviets.

The announcement this past weekend that NATO is reviewing defense arrangements is a welcome one. But there was no sense of urgency in that action. The response belies the seriousness of the situation.

I am not suggesting a provocative overreaction by NATO to events in Eastern Europe. I am suggesting that the invasion of Czechoslovakia, the rumored threats to Rumania, and the admitted shift in the balance of power in Eastern Europe requires a response equal to the gravity of the situation.

The policy of silence followed by the administration in the Czechoslovak crisis was obviously ineffective as a deterrent to the Soviet power play. The President's warning not to loose the dogs of war in Europe indicates concern over the continuing crisis. But we must go further and take those nonaggressive steps which will demonstrate the serious view which the United States and its NATO allies take of the actions by the "new" Russia.

NATO's effectiveness must be scrutinized in the light of this most recent Soviet action as a testimonial to Soviet intentions. It ranks alongside the smashing of Hungary, the installation of missiles in Cuba, the underwriting of North Vietnam's war effort, the recent increase in the Soviet military budget, and the building and deployment in new locations of formidable naval power.

The strength or, more accurately, the weakness of NATO military forces apparently gave the Soviets little cause for concern. The Communist armies moved with impunity on Czechoslovakia. They will have similar freedom of action if they decide to punish Rumania.

Cognizance should be taken of the recent buildup of Soviet naval power in the Mediterranean because it has further upset the balance of power in Europe and the Middle East. The Mediterranean is no longer a Western lake. Russia also has made striking gains in the Middle East, where her influence is substantial for the first time in U.S. history.

The nuclear superiority enjoyed by the United States immediately after World War II, and well into the 1950's, is gone. Our nuclear deterrent, although vital, is deterred. The balance of power in Europe now rests with nonnuclear forces. And the Soviets have an abundance of superiority on the ground. Our belief in the theory of Soviet mellowing has debilitated our entire military strategy. Now it appears that NATO must be revitalized.

Strengthening NATO does not mean larger U.S. forces and support. We are contributing our share or more than our share now. It does mean greater cooperation by our European partners.

A reappraisal of NATO should look carefully into the reasons for the lack of enthusiasm in Western Europe for support of this organization for common defense. Has, for example, U.S. strategy made NATO uncreditable in Europe? Did General de Gaulle order NATO forces

from France from mere petulance, or did he distrust the strategy that we dictated in NATO? If so, does the credibility gap extend to our other partners? These are questions the answers to which have been made urgent by Soviet actions.

Mr. President, I will not attempt to examine all facets of the need for reevaluation of our foreign policy in the light of our horror over Czechoslovakia. I do not have enough information or resources to carry out an exhaustive examination. But I do feel that the repressive steps taken by the Warsaw Pact nations are a clear and obvious rebuke to those who contend that communism is mellowing. It is in this light that we must review our policy of "building bridges" to the East.

The implication of Czechoslovakia, as well as other Soviet actions, suggest to me that U.S. policy toward Russia in recent years has been based on erroneous assumptions, and has been dangerous to our own best interests.

Seventeen months ago, I argued in this Chamber that the Communist threat to the free world had become greater and not less; that the increased threat was not just military, or political, or economic, but all of these—a strategic threat.

I raise this subject not as a partisan issue. Indeed, both party platforms recognize the real dangers offered by Russia today. The occupation of Czechoslovakia was called by the Democrats "a shocking reminder that we live in a dangerous and unpredictable world. The reimposition of Soviet tyranny raises the specter of the darkest days of the Stalin era and increases the risk of war in central Europe, a war that could become a nuclear holocaust."

The Republican platform, written before the invasion of Czechoslovakia, pledges that:

Only when Communist nations prove by actual deeds that they genuinely seek world peace and will live in harmony with the rest of the world, will we support expansion of East-West trade.

Candor is necessary to unravel the issues of detente, and without recrimination, I refer to my remarks on the floor of this Senate on March 14, 1967, during the debate on the Consular Treaty. Today, I repeat in part what I said then:

Basically, the entire matter boils down to how one views the Soviet Union and the international Communist movement today. If the Soviet Union is truly undergoing a period of deep and profound change, and if it is now charting a course of cooperation with emphasis on peace rather than conflict, then those who argue in the spirit of the "detente mentality" for "restraint" on the part of the United States and for expanded East-West trade are entirely correct. If, on the other hand, the Soviet Union has not undergone a meaningful change in terms of its long-range goals vis-a-vis the world, and if it persists in declaring that its ultimate goal is victory over the United States and other non-Communist countries, then the decisions made in the spirit of the detente and in such important matters as expanded East-West trade are wrong and, therefore, endanger in a most meaningful way our national security.

If we were in fact prepared to pursue, in the most consistent and dynamic fashion

certain political objectives vis-a-vis Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union in return for expanded East-West trade, then a very strong case could be made for a cautious and systematic expansion of the trade pattern with those nations. Thus, if we are prepared to make certain precise demands upon those countries which want and need our trade and credits necessary to support that trade, then our objectives should be clearly spelled out to the Congress of the United States and to the American people. Mere expansion of trade without accompanying concrete political goals will come to naught. Only the interests of the Communists will be served if we are not in fact able to achieve the political objectives which the Administration currently promises.

Far from manifesting good will, the Communists repeatedly underscore their own desire to "win" over us, to defeat us thoroughly, and to see us "buried." The latter statement has been rationalized by those who share the detente mentality as a misunderstanding on our part, or a slip of the tongue by its author, Khrushchev. That such is not the case is clearly indicated by the mountains of evidence which have accumulated in Communist documents and other Communist sources over the past years.

Mr. President, in Vietnam American troops are being killed by Soviet-produced and Soviet-financed equipment.

From Cuba subversion is being exported throughout South America.

In Guatemala City, the U.S. Ambassador John Mein was machinegunned to death by Castroite guerillas.

In the Middle East, Egypt rearms and Soviet ships ply the Mediterranean.

These are facts about the Soviet Union that must be weighed today.

Czech and Slovak patriots did not achieve freedom for themselves. They did, however, reach up to the Russian giant and strip away the mask of decency and reason. In this nuclear age, we must be willing to negotiate, but let us recognize the ruthless nature of our adversary.

OUR TEST OF COURAGE

In the light of this most recent shock of reality, I call upon the President to request a meeting of foreign ministers and defense ministers of the NATO countries; I call upon the Congress and the administration to reexamine the goals, the premises, and the interpretation underlying our policy toward the Soviet Union.

Just as for a man, it is difficult for a government to admit it was wrong. It is hard to search for realistic peace against a ruthless adversary. Regrettably, the optimists have nearly always been wrong concerning Soviet intentions. The threat has not diminished but has been successively intensified—politically, economically, and now militarily.

This Nation cannot allow wishful thinking to color the facts and obliterate obstacles. We must accept reality. This, Mr. President, is the test of courage for the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to compliment the Senator and commend him for this very hard-hitting and forceful statement with respect to the crisis that has been engendered in Czechoslovakia.

I think it is patent now in every part of the world that, little by little, a ferment has developed in the Soviet Union as the people there reach out, not merely for more consumer goods, but also for the chance to express themselves; and the very fact that they have carried on these programs against the authors and the writers of the Soviet Union who speak out freely is the best evidence I can think of as to whether or not the old Stalinist viewpoint is coming back.

The only sin that was charged against Czechoslovakia, certainly, was that Dubcek, their leader, refused to discipline at least 60 editors who were bold and courageous enough to present, all over again, the story of Jan Masaryk, the great Czech hero, on the front pages of their newspapers. When the Soviet demand was made that Dubcek discipline those editors, he very forthrightly refused to do so.

I noticed that of the five items that seemed to be at the base of this matter and its motivation, three of them, certainly, deal with freedom of expression, whether by individuals or by groups, or whether through the publications that are published in Czechoslovakia.

On the heels of this matter comes Romania and the threat to her freedom. Freedom is an indivisible fabric, Mr. President, and we do have to take account of it. I am glad that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has suggested that the President now convene our leaders and take a new look at our policy so far as it appertains to the Soviet Union, because if this destruction of freedom can go on, then, of course, freedom is in jeopardy in every part of the world, including the United States of America.

We have those who think that communism is not a threat in this country, and who shrug off and laugh off the suggestions that it is. Mr. President, I went to a lot of trouble and took an awful scolding to carry on and keep alive the Subversive Activities Control Board. I do not know how much I was pilloried in the press and in the letters of people; but I was determined to keep it alive, because it is the only board in the executive branch of the Government that deals with the matter of subversion and our internal security; and if it had done even less than was alleged, I still would have made that struggle to keep it alive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of Virginia in the chair). The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I commend the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his kind remarks.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I, too, wish to express commendation to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] for the very forceful statement which he has made about the grave injustice perpetrated by im-

perialistic Russia upon the Czechoslovak people. I treasure what the Senator has said because I know of his Czech background. Probably more than any other Member of the Senate, Senator HRUSKA is sensitive to the heartbeat of the Czech people. He knows the ordeals through which they have gone in their history, in the effort to achieve freedom for themselves and other people around the world.

I am especially impressed by certain aspects of what the Senator has just said. He stated, if I may quote from his speech:

We must go further and take those non-aggressive steps which will demonstrate the serious view which the United States and its NATO allies take of the actions by the "new" Russia.

The Senator further stated:

But I do feel that the repressive steps taken by the Warsaw Pact nations are a clear and obvious rebuke to those who contend that Communism is mellowing.

I concur with what the Senator from Illinois said a moment ago, that too many in high public office in this country have taken the attitude that we have no cause for fear of Russia.

The Senator from Nebraska further stated:

It is in this light that we must review our policy of "building bridges" to the East.

Can we, Mr. President, continue telling our people throughout this Nation, "Russia has mellowed, and the communistic world is not a monolithic aggregation of nations"? Should we not rather tell them to dismiss the idea that communism is content to remain where it is, and that we have no reason to be fearful of it?

The Senator has sounded a call to awaken Americans to understand that the maw of communism will never be satisfied until it has attained domination of free people, their souls, and their purposes everywhere, and it does not contemplate sparing the United States.

I now go to the conclusion of the Senator's statement:

It is hard to search for realistic peace against a ruthless adversary.

We have yielded time and again. We have gone forward under the assumption that there has been a relaxation of Russian hostility to free people. Then the Senator makes the significant statement that "regrettably, the optimists have nearly always been wrong concerning Soviet intentions."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May we have 3 more minutes?

Mr. HRUSKA. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have been the object of abuse in the Foreign Relations Committee and on the floor of the Senate because I do not believe that Russia has relented.

The argument was made in a discussion in the Foreign Relations Committee that there is no communism in this world, that there is only socialism. It was stated that those governments in the Warsaw Pact with Russia are contem-

plating only to improve the economic and social conditions of their people.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] stated that the crisis was created in Czechoslovakia a brief time ago. I do not agree with him on that statement. The crisis has been with us. It was with us in 1962 when we thought we had triumphed in Cuba by having them pull out their missiles. However, the fact is that Cuban military power was greatly strengthened at that time.

The crisis has been with us. This is merely another incident that demonstrates that the purpose of Russia is to conquer the world.

I commend the Senator for his statement. My own view is that Russia's veto of the action taken by the Security Council revealed the weakness of its position.

I deeply hope that our Government will go to the General Assembly and cause its members to go on record as to whether in the spirit of the United Nations they tolerate the action of one world power descending upon a little nation and telling that little nation: "You shall not think. You shall not speak. You shall not pray except in conformity with the dictates that come from on high, out of Russia."

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 5 minutes, during which time I shall yield to the distinguished Senator from Iowa, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I shall not take a great deal of the time of the Senate. I commend the Senator most highly for presenting not only a well organized but also a most perceptive analysis of the situation in which we find ourselves.

Many people have been saying for years that Russian imperialism has not changed in the slightest, that only the raiments, the approach and the propaganda have changed from time to time. However, this travesty recently committed in Czechoslovakia indicates that when a country or an area over which the Russians have taken control deviates in the slightest from the basic principles of Socialist imperialism laid down by Russia, Russia then moves, if it possibly can, to squelch the freedom that is being developed in that country.

I think the six points developed by the Senator from Nebraska should be taken to heart by every American. I certainly urge the reading of his remarks not only by every Member of Congress, but also by every citizen of our country that has access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There are those in this country who keep preaching that there is a detente of sorts in existence now between our country and Russia. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is no more intention on the part of the Russians to accommodate themselves to an association with civilized freedom than there ever has been. Their purpose has been world dominion, and it continues to be world dominion. Every so often their

September 5, 1968

S 10318

fangs show, as they did in this travesty involving Czechoslovakia.

I know the world grieves about this matter. But public opinion has very little effect on Russian imperialism. The truth of that statement has been shown from time to time. It is only the opinion within the Russian orbit itself that, I think, may eventually have some effect on Russian attitude. The opinion of democracy means nothing. The attitude and public opinion of the free nations of the world have no real effect on them. They could not care less, and they have proven that so many times.

I only hope that a great many of the people who are saying that we should soften our association with NATO and build bridges with Russia will realize their mistake.

Successful building of bridges depends upon the solid foundation of each abutment. If we have a solid foundation at our end of the bridge but the foundation on the other side, in the Socialist country, is based upon quicksand, we have no bridge and no comity of action or approach.

I again congratulate the Senator from Nebraska on his very able presentation and on his perception.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Senator speaks from a long background in the field of international affairs. I am very grateful to him for his fine remarks.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I concur in many of the remarks just made by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and the distinguished Senator from Iowa. The world was shocked at the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union.

I was in Czechoslovakia several years ago, and I have a warm feeling for the people of that land.

It was 30 years ago, in 1938, that Czechoslovakia was sold down the river by the leaders of four great nations. Then, 20 years ago, in 1948, as a result of a coalition government, the Communists were permitted to take over that fine little country. Now again, in 1968, the heavy, mailed might of the Soviet Union is running roughshod over the people of Czechoslovakia.

Mr. President, the Soviet Union is doing great damage in Europe. However, it is also doing great damage in the furnishing of supplies to the North Vietnamese who, in turn, are causing great casualties to the American troops.

Mr. President, for more than 3 years now I have been, almost every week, inviting attention to the casualty figures.

This past week, the U.S. troops in Vietnam suffered 2,921 casualties. Mr. President (Mr. GORE in the chair), during the first 8 months of 1968, January 1 through August 31, the United States suffered 83,533 casualties.

The significant part of this, to me, is that of all the casualties we have suffered in Vietnam, 41 percent have occurred during the first 8 months of 1968—namely, January 1 through August 31. We have been engaged in Vietnam, in one form or another, approximately 7 years, but we have been heavily engaged there for more than 3 years. Yet, during the first 8 months of

1968, we suffered 83,533 casualties, which represents 41.6 percent of all the casualties we have suffered during this war.

In that connection, Mr. President, during the same 8 months, January through August, the number of free-world ships going into the ports and harbors of North Vietnam totaled 98.

The figure of 98 free-world ships going into the North Vietnamese ports during the first 8 months of this year compares with a total of 50 ships which went into those ports during the first 8 months of 1967. So we can see that the amount of free-world shipping going into the North Vietnamese ports has practically doubled during 1968.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Can the Senator state the nations whose ships are going in there? Which are the principal participants?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I shall be glad to supply those figures.

During this 8-month period, January through August, a total of 98 ships carried cargo into those ports. Of those 98 ships, 77 flew the flag of Great Britain. These 77 ships, 77 ships flying the flag of Great Britain, which carried cargo to and from the North Vietnamese ports during the first 8 months of 1968, compare with 41 ships flying the British flag which carried cargo to those ports during the first 8 months of 1967.

Here, again, we see that the number of ships going into the enemy port of Haiphong has almost doubled during the first 8 months of this year compared with the same time last year.

Is there any wonder that our casualties are increasing?

Is there any wonder that more and more Americans are being killed and wounded? Forty-one percent of all the casualties we have suffered during the Vietnamese war have occurred during the first 8 months of 1968.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that while the peace talks are going on in Paris—and certainly we want to do everything possible in the way of negotiations and in the way of discussions in an effort to bring the Vietnam war to a conclusion—we must not let the troops in Vietnam become the forgotten men.

I submit that these casualty figures—2,921 killed and wounded last week—suggest that we are permitting our troops to become the forgotten men. We are being lulled into a false sense of security and as a result we are suffering heavier casualties.

VIOLENCE IN CHICAGO

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, with many of my Democratic colleagues, I spent most of last week in Chicago at our national convention. A celebrated former

Senator and a distinguished Member of this body were nominated to head our ticket. But these nominations seem to have been overshadowed by the public outcry over the television reporting of the proceedings and of the confrontation outside between the police and the collection of just plain observers, the protesters, and the troublemakers.

Some reporters from my hometown press have strong opinions on this matter, and I have in my hand three columns which I submit for the information of the Senate. I call attention particularly to the column by Dan Valentine. I do so because the title "Nothing Serious" implies that this is a humorous column. Dan ordinarily writes in a humorous vein. I do not believe he has written more than three columns of straight serious comment in a decade. But this time his report is straight and serious, and it comes from personal observation at the convention. The column by Gordon White also comes from personal exposure in Chicago.

I ask unanimous consent that these two columns and a column by Harold Schindler be printed in the Record at this point.

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

NOTHING SERIOUS (By Dan Valentine)

I return from five days at the 1968 Democratic convention in Chicago disenchanting, disappointed . . . and with a deep feeling of despair.

I have seen the sleaziest element of our unthinking youth, manipulated by professional rabble rousers, defy all standards of decency—while adults cheered them on.

The real heroes of the Democratic convention in Chicago are the thousands of Chicago police officers—who laid their lives on the line for unholly stretches of time to maintain law and order.

And let's praise the soldiers of the National Guard units who stood strong against the barrages of vile language and tasteless actions of the "Hippies" and the "Yippies."

Yet, thanks to biased, emotional, undisciplined electronic reporting, the police officers and National Guardsmen have been pegged as the villains of this unsavory chapter in American history.

Television, by its very nature, has only one eye. Because it is essentially show business, and not a news media, it can show only the dramatic end-results of what is taking place.

TV viewers were treated to segments of young "Yippies" demonstrating in Chicago being dragged and kicked while being arrested.

But the other side of the story is not shown—the provocation!

IT WORKED LIKE THIS:

For stretches of three and four hours at a time police officers and National Guardsmen stood silent and stolid facing the "Yippies." The police were stoned and mauled. Their authority was flouted. Obscene taunts were yelled at them by thousands of young malcontents.

Finally, after hours of this, a youth races up to a police officer and slashes at him with his foot—on the edge of the shoe is a sharp razor blade. To protect himself, the police officer subdues the youth. This is the part filmed by the TV reporters and flashed on the air—just the incident of the youth being arrested—not the provocation!

In another isolated incident, a "Yippie" throws a brick at the head of a young police

September 5, 1968

S 10319

officer. The police officer is taken to the hospital. In retaliation, other officers drag the youth to a police van.

The TV cameras shoot the segment of the youth being dragged to jail. But no picture of the police officer hit on the head by a brick.

The TV newsmen interview the poor lad in jail . . . and he relates how the police were brutal to him. But the TV cameras do not interview the injured police officer in the hospital.

To make things worse, these sequences of so-called brutality, are shown over and over again to the TV viewers across the nation—creating an unfair sympathy for the "Yippies."

When I left Chicago Friday afternoon, more than 50 Chicago policemen were hospitalized with wounds from bouts with the the "innocent young people" protesting for a better world. Two Chicago policemen reportedly had lye thrown in their faces by "Yippies."

An innocent woman was hit on the head by a glass thrown from a top story of the Hilton Hotel . . . Most of the lobbies in major Chicago hotels were made unbearable by the throwing of "stink" bombs by the young hoodlums.

One of the "cute" devices used by the protesting youths who keep shouting for a better America was to fling a large potato into a group of policemen or National Guardsmen. Sticking out of the potato are several razor blades, the sharp sides pointing out . . .

Chicago's Mayor Daley has been labeled "a Hitler" for his tough police enforcement during the convention. But without it, the city would have been riot-torn. And perhaps the rest of the nation, too.

The long-haired hoodlums had vowed publicly to "tear-up Chicago" . . . The police kept them from doing it. That's their job.

The 1968 Democratic convention in Chicago is an ugly chapter in the saga of the United States. It will be a long time before the bad taste is out of America's mouth.

ANOTHER SIDE TO VIOLENCE IN CHICAGO (By Gordon Elliot White)

CHICAGO.—The Democratic Party and Mayor Richard J. Daley of Chicago took a partly bum rap here on charges of racism and Gestapo tactics during the nominating session Wednesday night.

National television coverage of the riot areas was so restricted that only the final stages of the protest could be shown, when some Chicago police had lost their self-control and were using their nightsticks freely in a confused melee.

Earlier, thousands of Yippies had charged into police lines with rocks, sticks, and bottles flying. In a rapidly shifting pattern, the protesters had outflanked the police and National Guardsmen to get into the downtown Loop area across an unguarded Chicago River bridge.

What was shown on television in the International Amphitheatre consisted of scenes of helmeted Chicago police beating the demonstrators as they attempted to load them into paddy wagons, plus shots of the police using chemical Mace and tear gas on crowds, some of which were only bystanders. Some film footage showed the police working over reporters and cameramen.

There was, clearly, some brutality by the police, who finally attacked almost anyone in the riot area.

At the same time, bitterly disappointed backers of Sen. Kennedy, Sen. McCarthy, Sen. McGovern and Rev. Channing Phillips turned the rioters downtown into a symbol of their own defeat.

Even though the police lost control at the climax of the riot, when the demonstrators had moved within range of cameras at the Hilton Hotel, the television film could not

show the hall of bottles, rocks and caustic solutions being tossed by the rioters, nor the water glasses being dropped on police from windows in the Hilton itself.

The police clearly made serious mistakes in beating newsmen and bystanders, and their strategy was faulty: If the bridges into the Loop area had all been blocked, only a few score of the rioters would have been able to confront the police at the Hilton.

Also, the police several times hemmed in groups of relatively passive demonstrators who appeared to panic and try to break through the police lines. Crowd dispersal tactics generally call for leaving open an avenue of escape through which demonstrators may be channeled harmlessly away.

But the Hippies were not innocent. They tossed stinkbombs into the Hilton and the Palmer House and other Loop hotels, broke scores of windows, smashed police car windshields, and themselves manhandled many bystanders.

The militants—nearly all of them white—appeared to oppose the war in Vietnam, but did not back any of the Democratic candidates. At one point earlier in the week they had threatened to mob Sen. McCarthy in the Hilton, and jeered him as a Fascist, finally chanting Ho Chi Minh, Ho Chi Minh, Ho Chi Minh, at the Minnesota senator.

Yippie publications bitterly wrote of McCarthy, McGovern, and even Sen. Kennedy as members of the "establishment" who had voted for military spending bills in the Senate.

At two points the police called in National Guardsmen, who stood shoulder to shoulder with fixed bayonets on their weapons. The appearance of the guard in late afternoon quieted the demonstrations, which later resumed when the guard was withdrawn. The troops returned after midnight and quickly restored order at the Hilton.

The Yippies had threatened violence in Chicago for weeks, and had trained their cadres in guerrilla tactics in Chicago parks. Led by Tom Mayden, of the Students for the Democratic Society, David Dellinger, a self-described Communist who headed the 1967 march on the Pentagon, and Jerry Rubin, of the Youth International Party, the protesters were carrying out what Staughton Lynd has called the "politics of confrontation."

The liberal wing of the party threw the disturbances at Mr. Humphrey's supporters all night Wednesday, attempting to hang "police state," "Gestapo," and "mindless brutality" tags on their party's nominee. Humphrey opponents spoke of "racism," and an "aura of suspicion" as though the Vice President were responsible for the demonstrations, the police tactics, and all else that the liberals objected to.

Some of the beaten newsmen may have been mistaken by police for rioters. Large numbers of cameramen, from both national media and the Hippie press, plus some reporters, have been covering the convention in tattered old cloths, sandals, and long hair that could easily be mistaken for Hippie attire. Some, at least appear to have actually taken part in the rock-throwing, though at least 35 legitimate accredited reporters were beaten in Tuesday's and Wednesday's rioting.

CONVENTION COVERAGE: WHAT REALLY HAPPENED?

(By Harold Schindler)

The International Amphitheatre is empty, the last gavel has sounded, and while Hippies and Chicago police lick their wounds perhaps this is the time—here in the Demilitarized Zone—to pause for a more penetrating look at television's coverage of the Democratic National Convention.

Millions of stunned Americans watched last week as the convention and its accompanying scenes of violence unfolded before

their eyes. But now, after sober reflection, many of those viewers are wondering just exactly what it was they did see, for reports filed out of Chicago during the weekend are beginning to paint a substantially different picture than the one which dominated living rooms screens five days ago.

More disturbing than the incidents themselves is the nagging notion that much of the convention confusion and police confrontation with demonstrators—both on the floor and beyond the Amphitheatre's doors—may have in a large part been brought about by the presence of television.

(Sunday night the networks denied an allegation by Chicago police that militant demonstrators had been able to learn beforehand the location of television cameras outside convention hall.)

Since its appearance 20 years ago, commercial television has been considered an entertainment medium; an industry which accepts or discards programs solely on the basis of rating, with an almost fierce disregard for quality.

For weeks the political conventions have been a source of heated competition between the Big Three, each network scrambling for viewers. NBC alone budgeted seven million dollars for the Miami Beach and Chicago sessions, exclusive of regular schedule pre-emptions and the resultant loss of sponsor money.

With that kind of cash at stake, the networks went all out to enliven Chicago coverage rather than risk a repeat of the GOP convention, described by Vice President Humphrey as "a wake."

Once on convention floor, harried network reporters, admittedly rankled because Chicago Mayor Daley had restricted their numbers, flagrantly created, nurtured and mongered rumors among the delegates while anchormen treated these manufactured myths as legitimate leads.

One video reporter nailed a delegate with this pertinent query: "And you're here on the floor for what purpose, Senator?"

To which the bemused Democrat responded, "Frankly, Dan, I came down because you asked me."

"Of course," said the reporter.

That delegates were taking advantage of the TV situation became obvious as the convention continued. United Press International writer Robert Musel wondered, "Since most other delegates had gone to dinner, would the New York delegation mixed choir have continued singing and swaying as long as they did in the emptying amphitheatre if the cameras had stopped?"

Efforts to sustain coverage from gavel-to-gavel reached a low water mark when actress Shirley MacLaine, attending as a delegate, twittered, "I keep abreast of what's happening on my little TV set over there."

David Brinkley solemnly confided that "nameless, faceless men" were dogging his floor reporters, eavesdropping on interviewers. "We don't know who they are," he said. And on CBS Walter Cronkite noted the convention was being conducted "in a police state."

For a man anchored to one spot during the entire proceedings, he editorialized more than homeviewers would have dared with the facilities of all three channels and newspaper coverage available to them.

Through it all the networks had a single overriding concern—one best summarized by this lead paragraph from a publicity release:

"NBC News' television coverage of the four days of the Democratic National Convention attracted a national audience 16 percent greater than CBS-TV's convention coverage and beat ABC-TV's combination of entertainment convention by 17 per cent during the 2½ hours of coverage estimated by National Arbitron (a rating service)."

Would you believe that single sentence is worth seven million dollars?

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE NATIONAL GUN CRIME PREVENTION ACT—THE TYDINGS BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, along with 17 other Senators, I have joined the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] in introducing S. 3634, the National Gun Crime Prevention Act, which provides for firearms registration and licensing. To answer the questions most frequently asked about the National Gun Crime Prevention Act, I have, with the assistance of Senator TYDINGS, prepared a brief document entitled "Questions and Answers on the National Gun Crime Prevention Act," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE NATIONAL GUN CRIME PREVENTION ACT

INDEX OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. What is the National Gun Crime Prevention Act?
2. Why not just enforce existing state gun laws?
3. Congress just passed a gun law. Why do we need another?
4. Are registration and licensing proposals merely steps toward confiscation of all firearms?
5. Aren't registration and licensing bills actually just taxation measures?
6. Are registration and licensing constitutional?
7. What will the National Gun Crime Prevention Act cost the gun owner?
8. How does registration work?
9. Must every firearm be registered?
10. Would private firearms sales be registered too?
11. Doesn't registration impose a burden on the law-abiding?
12. But won't criminals refuse to register their guns?
13. Must an owner of several guns register each of them?
14. What about weapons which have no serial number?
15. What about antiques?
16. How does licensing work?
17. How about my son under 18 years old? Could he still hunt and shoot?
18. What's the difference between registration and licensing? Do we need both?
19. Must every gun be separately licensed?
20. Would there be any discretion to deny a license?
21. Won't criminals get guns anyway?
22. Why not just punish gun crimes more severely?
23. What about the argument that "guns don't commit crimes, people do"?
24. What about the argument that "No dictatorship has ever been imposed on a nation of free men who have not just been required to register their privately owned firearms?"

1. What is the National Gun Crime Prevention Act?

The National Gun Crime Prevention Act is a bill introduced by 19 Senators to help detect and deter gun crime. It provides for registration of all firearms and licensing of all firearms owners and ammunition users. It encourages state action by providing for state pre-emption of the federal law. Where a state enacts its own registration and licensing law, the federal law would not apply. Where a state fails to act to protect its own citizens, the bill would provide a minimum floor of federal protection in that state.

Registration of all firearms will give the police the means to quickly trace guns used in crime to their owner.

Licensing of gun users will weed out persons who, by reason of criminal record, drug addiction, alcoholism, mental incompetence, or age should not be entrusted with a gun in the first place.

2. Why not just enforce existing state gun laws?

Most states' gun laws are totally inadequate to protect their citizens. Many states have practically no gun laws at all, eight states have no law against felons buying firearms. In 35 states lunatics can legally own guns. Only 3 states require a license to own or possess a gun.

Most state gun laws are either obsolete or meaningless, such as a Texas law forbidding carrying guns in a satchel, except when you are traveling. Vermont's law forbidding schoolchildren to have guns in the classroom, or Arkansas' law forbidding using a machine gun for offensive purposes. Clearly, existing state firearms laws are totally inadequate to protect the public.

3. Congress just passed a gun law. Why do we need another?

The law Congress enacted as part of the Omnibus Crime Bill in June was a watered-down compromise which, while worthwhile, for practical purposes only requires that pistol purchases be made in the purchaser's home state. The new law does make it illegal to transport or possess a gun if you are under indictment, a fugitive, a felon, an adjudged mental incompetent, an illegally entered alien, have renounced U.S. citizenship, or have been dishonorably discharged from the armed forces, but provides no means to actually prevent such persons from making firearms purchases.

The provisions of the Omnibus Crime Bill do not provide any way to trace a gun lost, stolen, or used in crime. They provide no way for gun dealers to determine whether the man they are selling to is who he says he is, does not intend to use the gun in crime, is not a felon, addict, or mental patient or otherwise disqualified from gun ownership. These dangerous people can still get guns by simply lying.

To make the law passed in June enforceable, we need firearms registration and licensing. Firearms user licensing would prevent criminals, addicts, lunatics, and juveniles from purchasing firearms, and registration would help find them if they used a gun in crime.

4. Are registration and licensing proposals merely steps toward confiscation of all firearms?

Certainly not. Firearms ownership and use by law-abiding citizens is a healthful recreation and does not contribute to the gun crime problem. But we urgently need adequate records of gun ownership to help trace guns used in crime to their criminal users. Registration of all firearms is the only way to gather these records. And we urgently need to deny access to firearms by criminals, addicts and mental incompetents. A licensing system, in which all law-abiding citizens automatically are entitled to licenses and all criminals, addicts and mental incompetents are automatically denied licenses, and which punishes purchase, possession or use of a firearm without a license, will severely inhibit criminal access to guns.

Those who oppose reasonable firearms control because they fear "confiscation" should be much more concerned that the rapidly rising gun crime rate may well lead to public demand for confiscation if reasonable measures to stem the gun crime rate are not taken now. The threat of confiscation arises not from reasonable action to stem the gun crime rate, but rather from no action at all.

5. Aren't registration and licensing bills actually just taxation measures?

No. The National Gun Crime Prevention Act contains no fee at all for either licensing or registration. It would be paid for out of the general revenues. Direct controls

against criminal access to guns and good records for tracing guns used in crime—no taxes—are the best way to control the gun crime rate.

6. Are registration and licensing constitutional?

Yes, without question. Here's what the Library of Congress says about the National Gun Crime Prevention Act and the Second Amendment's "right to bear arms": "From what we know of the history and construction of the Second Amendment, it would seem that the major current proposals for gun control are not subject to any serious Second Amendment challenges." (Library of Congress Study UC480B, 450/77 A-251: "The Second Amendment as a Limitation on Federal Firearms Legislation," July 8, 1968)

The U.S. Attorney General has stated: "A federal system requiring the registration and licensing of firearms is a necessary and proper means to two legitimate legislative goals, the regulation and protection of interstate commerce and the preservation of the peace of the United States . . . it is within the power of Congress to enact."

The bill also contains a special provision, Section 935(c), to conform to recent Supreme Court decisions (*Haynes v. U.S.*) dealing with the Bill of Rights provision on self-incrimination.

7. What will the National Gun Crime Prevention Act cost the gun owner?

The bill imposes no fees. The operation of the licensing and registration system proposed by the National Gun Crime Prevention Act would be paid for out of the general tax receipts of the country. As a law enforcement and public safety measure, the cost of the Act should be borne by all citizens. As originally introduced, the Act did provide a \$1 fee for licensing and registration, but this provision has been deleted.

8. How does registration work?

A gun owner simply sends a law enforcement agency the makes, models, and serial numbers of his guns and his own name and address. It can be done completely by mail. Then, when a lost or stolen gun is found, its true owner can be discovered and his gun returned to him. If a gun is found at the scene of a crime, its last known owner can be quickly traced. When a suspicious character is arrested with a gun in his possession, its ownership can be quickly determined. If the gun has been stolen or is unregistered, the suspect can be booked for possession of stolen goods or possession of an unregistered weapon.

If a state enacts its own registration law, guns would be registered with whatever state agency the law designated. If the state failed to act, guns would be registered with the federal government.

9. Must every firearm be registered?

Yes, otherwise many guns lost, stolen, or used in crime could not be traced.

10. Would private firearms sales be registered too?

Yes. All firearms transfers, by dealers and private persons, would be registered so that up-to-date records of actual gun ownership could be maintained.

11. Doesn't registration impose a burden on the law-abiding?

Not a significant one. Everything can be done by mail on a form like this:

FIREARMS REGISTRATION FORM

Name: _____
 Address: _____
 Firearm: _____
 Make: _____
 Model: _____
 Serial #: _____

The registration would be free and permanent. No fees. No renewals.

12. But won't criminals refuse to register their guns?

Some criminals may refuse to register their guns and risk being jailed for having an unregistered gun. But any suspected criminal found with an unregistered weapon can be jailed on that charge alone, *even if no other crime can be proved*. So it will become very risky for a criminal to have an unregistered weapon.

13. *Must an owner of several guns register each of them?*

He must supply the make, model, and serial number of each, but could do so for all his guns on a single form.

14. *What about weapons which have no serial number?*

The bill provides that firearms dealers can imprint serial numbers on such weapons for identification purposes.

15. *What about antiques?*

No firearm manufactured prior to 1898 is covered by the bill.

16. *How does licensing work?*

Licensing is simply a way of denying fugitives, criminals, addicts, and mental defectives access to firearms and ammunition. Every purchaser, possessor, or user of firearms or ammunition would have to have a license, except for juveniles with their parents' consent and hunters or sportsmen who have borrowed a weapon for temporary use.

To get a license, you would simply submit a statement affirming that you are over 18, have never been convicted of a felony or committed to an institution by a court on the grounds of alcoholism, narcotics addiction, or mental incompetence, that you are not under indictment or a fugitive, and are not otherwise prohibited by law from obtaining a weapon. In addition, you would supply a physical description like that required for a driver's license and proof of identity (in the form of a draft card, driver's license, social security card, etc.).

If a state enacted a licensing law, the statement and identification would be supplied to whatever agency the state prescribed, but if the state does not act, then to any federal firearms dealer. The entire transaction could be conducted by mail.

Issuance of licenses would be automatic to all law-abiding citizens, without any discretion on the part of the issuing officer. Denial of a license would be automatic in the case of felons, fugitives, adjudged alcoholics, addicts and mental incompetents, and those under 18.

17. *How about my son under 18 years old? Could he still hunt and shoot?*

Yes, definitely. Although he could not own a gun in his own name, the bill expressly provides that he will be able to hunt and shoot with his parents' consent.

18. *What's the difference between registration and licensing? Do we need both?*

Registration is a means of tracing guns used in crime. Licensing is a means of reducing the gun crime rate itself by denying access to guns by known criminals, addicts, and mental defectives. Registration is a means to solve gun crime once it has been committed. Licensing is a means to prevent gun crime from being committed in the first place.

19. *Must every gun be separately licensed?*

No. Firearms purchasers, owners and users are licensed, not the guns themselves. The purpose is to deny licenses to criminals, addicts and mental defectives.

20. *Would there be any discretion to deny a license?*

Not where the federal law applies. If the applicant is not under indictment, or a fugitive, a felon, an adjudged addict, alcoholic or mental incompetent, or under 18, the license must be issued. The state could establish a different system, if they wish, just as they can today.

21. *But won't criminals get guns anyway?*

If a licensing law were in effect a criminal, addict, or mental defective could not legally purchase, own or use a gun, because he would

not be entitled to a license. Thus, lawful channels of purchase would be cut off to him. Today they are not.

Today, in most states, criminals, addicts and idiots have access to guns on the same basis as the law-abiding. Even if, after enactment of the National Gun Crime Prevention Act hard-core criminals may be able to get some guns, the small-time but frequently deadly crook who holds up liquor stores, bus drivers and filling stations or housebreaks will find it much harder and much riskier to possess a gun.

No one claims gun laws are airtight or foolproof. The question is whether we should do what we can to detect and prevent gun crime or continue to do nothing, as we do today.

22. *Why not just punish gun crimes more severely?*

Heavier penalties for gun crimes already exist, but haven't answered the gun crime problem. Armed robbery is a more serious offense than simple robbery; aggravated assault is more heavily punished than simple assault. Murder is the most heavily punished crime of all. Yet the commission rates of all these crimes are climbing intolerably. Armed robbery increased from 42,600 crimes a year in 1964 to 71,000 in 1967; aggravated assault by gun from 27,700 cases in 1964 to 55,000 in 1967; murder by gun from 5,000 in 1964 to 7,700 in 1967.

Gun crimes should be more heavily punished. But clearly, heavier penalties do not answer the gun crime epidemic. They do not help solve gun crimes, as registration would. They do not prevent criminal access to guns, as licensing would. They do not bring gun crime victims back to life, repair their wounds, or return their property. Only disarming the criminal can do that.

23. *What about the argument that "guns don't commit crimes, people do"?*

Of course, guns don't commit crimes, but people using guns certainly do. People using guns last year alone robbed 71,000 Americans, assaulted 55,000 Americans and murdered 7,700 Americans. People using guns murdered John Kennedy, Martin Luther King, and Robert Kennedy, along with more than 25,000 other Americans between 1963 and 1967.

24. *What about the argument that "No dictatorship has ever been imposed on a nation of free men who have not just been required to register their privately owned firearms"?*

That argument does not hold water. It is unsupported by fact and refuted by history. For example, regarding the German occupations of Europe, the Library of Congress has concluded:

"We can make no positive correlation between gun laws and dictatorships, as the following examples will show.

"First, four countries were examined which are democracies now, but in recent history came under Nazi dictatorships (Germany, Italy, France, and Austria). One may reasonably assume that if gun registration laws constituted a primary factor in the rise of dictatorships, these countries would have since revised their laws to prevent future dictatorships. This has not been the case. The four countries today have substantially the same gun laws as those in force prior to the advent of dictatorship. In fact, in Italy, where gun laws were relaxed by Mussolini, they have recently been strengthened approximately to their pre-Mussolini level.

Secondly, two democracies were examined which have not suffered dictatorships in their recent history (England and Switzerland). Switzerland has had gun registration laws since 1874, England since 1831.

"It would be inaccurate of course to suggest that a dictatorship would be unconcerned about the possession of firearms by its populace. Nevertheless these few examples would seem to indicate fairly conclu-

sively that there is no significant relationship between gun laws and the rise of dictatorships at least in these countries."

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HILL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a recent issue of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association News contained an editorial saluting Alabama's retiring senior Senator, Hon. LISTER HILL, and his identification with the Tennessee Valley Authority during all of the years of the life of TVA. The editorial recalled that Senator HILL, who was then a Member of the House, coauthored the TVA Act which was signed into law by President Roosevelt on May 18, 1933. The editorial is a fitting tribute to one whose congressional efforts have meant so much to the Tennessee Valley. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

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

HISTORIC HEARING

An era in the development of the Tennessee Valley and TVA came to an end last month.

It appeared to be a routine hearing on the 1969 TVA budget before a subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

But this hearing had significance far beyond the TVA budget request for the new fiscal year. It marked the final appearance of U.S. Senator Lister Hill as Chairman of the Appropriations Committee subcommittee on TVA matters.

Senator Lister Hill is not running for reelection. His term as Senator expires before the next Congress goes to work.

And when he is no longer in the Congress, TVA will have lost the best friend it ever had. This is a broad statement, because TVA has had—and still has—many knowledgeable, capable Senators and Congressmen supporting its multipurpose program. But close observers agree that no member of the Congress has done as much for TVA as Senator Lister Hill.

There was no major production made of the fact that the June 28 hearing was the last TVA hearing at which Sen. Hill would preside. TVA Board Chairman A. J. (Red) Wagner and Board Member Frank Smith paid brief tributes to the Senator, who responded by thanking them "for those kind and gentle words."

Red Wagner said there were developments all over the Tennessee Valley which stood as tributes to Senator Hill and his work. Director Smith said that few things in American government could equal Senator Hill's leadership on TVA matters.

But Wagner and Smith knew full well that they had not adequately stated the significance of Senator Hill's years of work in behalf of TVA. It was impossible, with ordinary words, to do so.

It was typical that at this appropriations hearing Senator Hill was asking probing questions about the need for added funds for TVA's fertilizer and chemical facilities at Muscle Shoals. The smile, the gentle manner and voice, the occasional "uh-wuh" as he searched for the exact word he wanted—these were familiar to those who have attended TVA hearings over the years. And the Senator displayed his usual vast knowledge of TVA and its programs.

But with Lister Hill it was more than knowledge. With him it was understanding. He knows, more than any other member of the Congress, why TVA carries on its multipurpose program of water and power and resource development.

He should know why. He was—with Nebraska Republican Senator George Norris—a co-author of the TVA Act, signed into law on May 18, 1933 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. He was a member of the House-Senate conference committee which threshed out the final specifics of the TVA Act; and today he is the only member of that important conference committee still serving in the Congress.

He once said:

"In TVA we tried something new and bold. The heart of the concept lies in the fact that for the first time in the history of Federal legislation Congress accepted the unity of nature. For this one river basin the inter-relationship of land and water, of trees and pastures, of men and nature, was recognized in a Federal statute."

"We gave one agency responsibility to inaugurate a total program committed to the full development of all nature's resources for all the people."

On May 18 of this year, TVA completed its 35th year.

During every one of those years, Lister Hill has been in the Congress—as a member of the House, and, since 1938, as a U.S. Senator. He helped write the TVA Act . . . he fought, year after year, to keep TVA moving ahead, to help it fight off its powerful enemies . . . he used his great prestige and influence, time after time, to pull TVA out of a legislative problem . . . he was the moving spirit and inspiration on TVA for new members of the Senate and House who turned to him for guidance.

Next May 18, when TVA observes its 36th birthday, Lister Hill will not be in the Congress. And TVA will, it deserves repeating, have lost its best friend.

For Senator Hill and for TVA, this should be an occasion for celebration, not sadness. For Senator Hill, there is a record unparalleled in American history in support of his unique Federal agency. A plaque on his office wall from the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association makes some small attempt to give him credit.

But the real credit, over the years, will be—as TVA Chairman Wagner put it—the developed resources, the controlled floods, the low-cost power, the growing, thriving region—all tributes to the genius and the dedication of this brilliant, mild-mannered gentleman from Alabama.

The Tennessee Valley salutes its greatest TVA statesman.

WYOMING RANCH WIFE "TELLS IT LIKE IT IS"

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, in these times of depressed prices for America's livestock producers, many persons and organizations have presumed to speak or write at length about the causes of this worsening situation.

Cattle producers themselves know their problem and what causes it, but because they comprise such a small portion of the country's population, their voice is usually lost in the din from the consumer and from others who seek to advise the world about the cattle industry.

Every now and then someone comes forth with a hard-hitting, right-to-the-point explanation of the reasons for low income to cattlemen and the ties that bind the consumer and the producer.

Such an explanation was recently presented to a group of women consumers by Mrs. James May, of Laramie—the articulate wife of a cattleman in my State of Wyoming.

In comments directed at "Mrs. American Housewife," Mrs. May bridged that mysterious gap between the beef grazing on the range and the beef sizzling on the patio barbecue grill.

In "straight from the hip" language, she told the housewives why it would be to their benefit to know the facts about cattle production and income and why factors which hurt the livestock industry, such as inflation, have a direct bearing on the price of food.

Noting that the double-edged sword of inflation cuts into the already low income of the producer, while adding to the food costs of the consumer, Mrs. May said:

Let's go where the action is to protest—not to the supermarkets, but to Washington, D.C., where inflation should be attacked.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. May's excellent speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

A SPEECH BY MRS. JAMES MAY OF LARAMIE, WYO.

There is an old story that says you can't kill a frog by dropping him in boiling water. He reacts so quickly to the sudden heat that he jumps out before he is hurt. But if you put him in cold water and warm it up gradually, he never decides to jump until it is too late. By then he is cooked! People are just as foolish. Take away their freedom over night and you have a violent revolution. But steal it from them gradually (under the guise of "security," "peace," or "progress") and you can paralyze an entire generation. Look at the income tax. It started with a harmless sounding 1%. It would have been easy to have jumped out of water as warm as this, but like the frog, we waited while it climbed ever higher. Try jumping now!

Worst of all we never learn. Even today we cannot believe that Medicare is the same warm water that will one day boil us in socialized medicine. We see no connection between farm price supports and nationalized agriculture. And if we draw a parallel between subsidized teachers' pay and federal control of education, we are called "extremists." The tragedies of history are always repeated by those who refuse to learn. To seek guidance from the past is not turning back the clock as we are so often told. It is merely a good way to stay out of hot water.

I want to visit with you about an aspect of Beef which probably interests you most—the price. I don't claim to fully understand why beef costs so much in the market but I'll relate some of the things that are involved. We, the rancher, receive a small amount of the price you pay retail. So what happens between us and you, the consumer? In the first place, only 60% of a carcass is edible meat and in the second place, only a small part of a carcass is steak, and there are many necessary costs between beef on the hoof and meat on the table.

Let's say the packer pays 25 cents a pound for the whole steer—the meat, but every other pound too—the hide, the hoofs, the head, the bone, the blood, the water, etc. So from a 1000 lb. steer he has only 600 lbs. of salable beef left. This has brought the price up to about 45 cents a pound. The packer has had the costs of buying, slaughtering, selling, delivering, etc., so he has to make a few cents to cover these costs before it goes to the retailer.

The retailer has many costs to prepare the beef for the consumer. Rent, help, taxes, equipment, refrigeration, supplies, advertis-

ing, losses due to trimming, shrinkage, etc. Now I believe the housewife asks for some of these costs because she wants her meat packaged and pan ready, and she has to pay for it. I call it built-in maid service.

When the retailer buys the carcass he pays the same price for every pound. But a carcass yields much more of some cuts than others; some cuts are in greater demand than others. He has to sell the cuts at varying prices—some for nearly twice as much and some for less than half. The more desirable and higher priced cuts represent a small portion, while the medium priced roasts, stew meat and hamburger, make up a larger part of the carcass. The price the retailer gets must average out to cover the original cost plus the cost of marketing.

Consumer boycotts of food stores might eliminate trading stamps and other gimmicks designed to build sales, but there is virtually no chance that consumers will be getting cheaper food in the future. Elimination of trading stamps and other promotion might cut 20 cents from a \$10 grocery bill. Retail profits, food advertising, transportation and storing food amounts to 50 cents of a \$10 grocery bill. So here is a total of 70 cents or 7% from the grocery prices without taking price cuts back to the farm. But of this total, only the stamps and gimmicks could be eliminated without also eliminating the food processors, storers, transporters and retailers. Food industries are simply low profit operations and modest levels of profit are necessary to keep them in business.

We'd like to boycott along with the women who have this in mind. But first we'd have to get together on what we are actually trying to accomplish. They have elected to boycott the supermarkets in protest of high food prices. This is quite understandable because that is where they feel the pinch. We'd like to register our protest in Washington, D.C. against the basic cause of the "symptom" toward which they have directed their boycott.

Let me, a cattleman's wife, tell you how it looks out in the country. For the past six years our husband's share of the food dollar has consistently gone down. This has meant that the budget to run our ranch, feed and clothe our family, has been mighty tight. Meanwhile, we are told our husband's pay has been increasing. Chances are, as in many reports, the increase is bigger in the report than in the pay envelope. Even so, we on the farms and ranches have not generally shared in the recent American affluence. We are receiving the same price today that we did 20 years ago, while our production costs have gone up 25%.

These are the facts—from ranch to plate is a small profit operation; at the ranch level it has been a hand to mouth deal for years. The cattle feeder has lost more than he has made in recent years; the meat packing business has the lowest net earnings of any similar sized business in the nation; the net earnings of the wholesalers and retailers would amaze you because they are so slim.

What you are looking at is inflation. Inflation finally catching up with the market basket. You've been spared that unpleasantness up to now by every one on the food team foregoing reasonable profits. But we are backed to the wall now and boycotts which might momentarily depress food prices cannot provide a permanent solution.

So let's go where the action is to protest—not to the supermarkets, but to Washington, D.C. where inflation should be attacked.

Farmers and ranchers are a minority group, but don't sell them short. Agriculture's progress has resulted in sharply lowered food prices relative to income. This both reduces inflationary tendencies and provides a larger market for industry. U.S. consumers last year paid out only 17.7% of their disposable