

June 22, 1967

one past 65 years old with a monthly check that may not be big but that covers the grocery bill and then some.

There's also our new Medicare plan that enables elders to escape the shattering costs of lengthy hospitalization and medical care.

At the local level in most cities one finds day centers and golden age clubs and special recreational facilities for elders. There are meals-on-wheels programs for elders who are shut-in, and low cost housing developments.

Yet it is very difficult to find any specific projects which have been launched by older people themselves as a distinct contribution to their communities.

Quite a few letters have come to this column from organizations which have made definite appeals for volunteer help to groups of older people, only to be met with complete indifference.

One letter was from an officer of the famed St. Jude Children's Research Hospital at Indianapolis, Ind. This hospital is entirely supported by funds raised privately by young people and adult groups in cities across the nation. The officer writes:

"In one city we were having difficulty getting volunteers to staff the office during the daytime to answer the phone and sign up teen-agers being recruited for fund raising. Someone suggested that maybe senior citizens could help staff the office. There was no manual work involved and the chore consisted simply of answering the phone when it rang and taking down necessary information."

"We asked the local Senior Citizen's Club to publicize our plight to try to get us some volunteers. We also had the local radio stations broadcast an appeal asking older folks to help us out."

"What absolutely floored me is this: Not one—not even one older person in that community responded to our appeal and volunteered to put in so much as a single hour. It seemed incredible considering all we hear about old folks wanting some way to pass the time in useful occupations."

"The young folks running the campaign were a bit embittered by this experience, for they had put on several parties for senior citizens in the community, and had rented buses to take them on short trips."

"The indifference seemed particularly odd as most elders have grandchildren and it would seem they'd welcome a chance to perform a useful service for an institute as well known as ours which is dedicated to child health. It also seemed they'd welcome the chance to meet new people and pass some pleasant hours in a different atmosphere."

Let's hope that was just an isolated case where the message somehow did not get across to older people in the community.

Let's also hope that older people everywhere will make a special effort to keep their ears and hearts open to opportunities for useful and humanitarian service.

[From the Indianapolis Star, June 11, 1967]

SENIOR CITIZENS CENTER DOES SIGNIFICANT WORK WITH ELDERLY

To the Editor:

Robert Peterson's column on June 1, 1967, left an unfortunate impression that the older adults of Indianapolis have turned a deaf ear and a cold heart to the community's need for volunteer service. While I can not quarrel with his premise that older people have a vital role to play in serving their community, and accepting the idea that perhaps not as many older adults are willing to share their skills, time, and interest to meet the many pressing needs for volunteer workers in Indianapolis, I feel it is an unfair indictment of the Senior Citizens of our town to say they are "failing to help."

At the Indianapolis Senior Citizens' Center, during the 57 months it has been in operation, our members have contributed over

45,000 hours of volunteer service. About 3/4 of this time has been given to the Center in a variety of ways that makes it possible to more fully serve older adults. This is, in reality, service to the community, since their efforts mean fewer paid staff are necessary to operate this vital and important community agency. Their giving of self, time, energy, and love have made significant contributions to the happiness and well-being of all senior citizens.

The other third of the 45,000 hours has been given to many community health and welfare agencies. The obvious importance of this contribution needs no elaboration.

And, our Center is only one of many groups of old adults giving to and helping their community in a wide ranging volunteer service. One could cite the many church groups, community centers, and park department groups of older people who give so much—and have already given so much to their community.

It also seems important that our community take a look at why more older people aren't responding to the request and need for volunteers. We have done some preliminary exploration of this with our members, and some questions are being formulated that will require answers.

For instance, have we explored how realistic the expectation of performance requirements might be; have we considered the expenses of being a volunteer; have we wondered about the attitudes of younger staff and volunteers toward older people—and how this affects the desire to serve; have we recognized that for too many years the younger community has implied that older people should find a comfortable corner and stay out of the way? Surely, the answers to these questions present a better indication of why older citizens haven't been as responsive to requests to serve.

It is important to remember, also, the many older people who have so generously—and quietly—given of themselves to the community, and who continue to do so.

I feel there is a vast reservoir of skill, time and wisdom that our older citizens can give. Perhaps it is up to the community to work toward making volunteer service more attractive and desirable.

ALEXANDER MONRO,
Executive Director, Indianapolis Senior
Citizens' Center, Inc.
INDIANAPOLIS.

The Great Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations debating society is in full swing again.

An article appearing in the Washington Evening Star and an editorial written for the Christian Science Monitor, indicate what we are to expect from these talks, and specifically from Soviet Premier Kosygin.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article written by Richard Wilson for the June 21, 1967, edition of the Washington Evening Star and the editorial which appeared in the June 21, 1967, edition of the Christian Science Monitor.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 21, 1967]

KOSYGIN, FAILING AT U.N., NEEDS JOHNSON TALKS

(By Richard Wilson)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Alexei N. Kosygin didn't defiantly walk out of the United Nations; he sort of ambled out absentmindedly in protest against the scathing attack of Abba Eban, the foreign minister of Israel.

Eban had by far the better of the argument and it was no wonder Kosygin didn't care to sit through to the end. This kind of instant histrionics sets the tone of the Russian-sponsored emergency meeting of the U.N. General Assembly, a kind of diffident and desultory attempt to condemn Israel and push her back to her old borders.

Kosygin knows his effort will fail and so does everyone else. What he needs now is a meeting with the President of the United States and a start of talks with about the whole range of problems that divide the super powers, from the Sinai Desert to the DMZ in Vietnam.

Once Moscow's Arab clients have been placated by a repetition of the tired old cliches of Soviet diplomacy, and now that they have witnessed a poor imitation of Khrushchev-type behavior, it will be possible for Kosygin to get down to the real business at hand. This business, President Johnson has made crystal clear, cannot be conducted in the haphazard forum of the United Nations. It is too serious for that.

Everything taken into consideration, Kosygin was quite reasonable, from his point of view, in his attacks on the United States. Johnson, by the same token has adopted his blandest come-let-us-reason-together tone, not insisting on anything in the Middle East except the exercise of a little reasonableness. So there is as yet no barrier to their having a nice long talk, which everyone, except possibly the Arabs, would welcome.

Kosygin put everything in one package in his address to the United Nations—Germany, the Middle East, Vietnam. The fact that Ambassador Arthur Goldberg does not want to talk about anything in the United Nations except the Middle East does not change the fact that Johnson would be glad to talk about other subjects outside the United Nations.

As every day of the emergency session passes, it becomes clear that Kosygin, who really is not a politician but a technologist, feels compelled to establish himself as a world leader in the tradition of Stalin and Khrushchev, and he is not well equipped for it. This is all to the good. It will make it easier for Johnson to talk with him when the time comes.

Faced by a prospective defeat in the United Nations, Kosygin cannot wisely go back to the council of ministers in Moscow with nothing but press clippings of his early morning tours around Manhattan. He needs to see Johnson as much, if not more, than Johnson needs to see him. The odds are about 60-40 against the United Nations adopting any kind of a resolution condemning Israel, much less the censure, reparations and withdrawal demanded by Kosygin on behalf of his confused and frantic Arab clients.

Watching once again the charade on the floor of the General Assembly, one wonders if it is good for anything except the entertainment of the world's TV watchers. The United Nations could not prevent the war from starting; it could not stop it before Israel had reached its objectives; and now it has no effective way to find a consensus on what to do about Israel and the Arabs, or enforce a consensus solution if it could be devised.

Then what good is the United Nations? It is good for just what is happening now, the

June 22, 1967

ment of better performance, lower costs, easier installation and serviceability, and smaller over-all size to accommodate the needs of an ever-expanding market serving a more demanding public. Factory assembly of this type of equipment is essential if we are to continue to meet the demands of the public for these lower costs and this better performance.

This broadly based demand should not be stifled by the preservation of the prerogatives of a few at the expense of the many by maintaining outmoded work rules that are contrary to the trend of progress and technology.

The country is urgently in need of legislation to assure continued innovation and improvement free of artificial barriers to progress. We respectfully request your support for this legislation, which would result in lower costs and more reliable equipment in our buildings of the future.

Very truly yours,
 FRED E. WELDON,
 President.

METROPOLITAN DISTRICT COUNCIL,
 UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
 Philadelphia, Pa., June 16, 1967.

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG,
 Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EILBERG: Please accept my very warm thanks for your kindness in sending me a copy of the May 19, 1967, letter to you from the Environmental Products Division, International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation.

The Corporation's letter is typical of the thoughtless attitude of so many of our citizens, which leads them, whenever they are irked by something, to bellow, "There ought to be a law . . ." The Corporation's letter apparently intends to request you to sponsor or support legislation prohibiting both employers and unions to enter into collective bargaining agreements that contain provisions whose purpose is to protect the opportunity of workmen to earn a livelihood by requiring that the employer shall continue to use these workmen to perform any work that traditionally has been assigned to them. Since the U.S. Supreme Court only two months ago decided that such provisions do not violate any presently existing statute, the Corporation joins the chorus of other carping critics of that Court who would have Congress nullify any progressive or humane decision of the Court in the fields of labor relations, civil liberties, political equality, etc.

There is much reason for suspicion concerning the good judgment and thoughtfulness of persons or interests indulging in these hysterical attacks on one of the three constitutionally established arms of our government. In this instance, however, the Corporation's letter gives reason for more than a mere suspicion that its author is thoughtless and has poor judgment; I believe you will agree that the analysis of the Corporation's letter which follows demonstrates that it is quite clear that the proposals contained in the Corporation's letter are the result of thoughtless, poor judgment.

The Corporation's letter proposes restrictive legislation on the ground that the contractual provisions I have referred to above are "out-moded work rules" which are contrary "to the trend of progress and technology." We thus have, as the basic characteristic of the Corporation's letter, an emotional appeal based on the Corporation's ascription of progressiveness to itself and of devotion to obsolete notions to labor unions. I believe that one piece of evidence—aside from your own objective analysis—will dissipate such an emotional appeal as the quoted phrases of the Corporation's letter may have. All of our District Council's collective bargaining agreements have for many years contained the following provision:

"There shall not during the life of this agreement be any restriction on the use of machinery or labor-saving devices used in

carpentry work on the building. If any machinery or labor-saving devices are used, the same shall be furnished by the Employer and operated by the employees."

Aside from demonstrating our District Council's realization of its duties to the public at large not to obstruct technological advances and reduced costs in the building construction industry, the above quoted provision of our agreements demonstrates our basic philosophy that the benefits of technological progress to the community at large shall not mean the unemployment and impoverishment of a large sector of the community, namely, the men and women who perform the community's work. The sanctioning of the Corporation's letter for giving the community the benefit of technological progress is not coupled with even that kind of concern for affording the opportunity to earn a livelihood to that vast majority of the community who will not be able to enjoy the fruits of technological progress if they are unemployed or if their earnings are diminished. Until such time as some panacea can be found for the frequently injurious consequences of automation and technological progress, I believe that it is in the best tradition of our country to permit employers and their employees freely to negotiate and agree upon compromise methods of preserving work opportunities and a decent standard of living for employees who would otherwise be made tragically useless to our society by automation and technological advances. The contractual provision of our collective bargaining agreements which the Supreme Court held to be lawful and valid is the result of just such free and voluntary negotiation and agreement between employers and our Union and has precisely that humane and economically desirable objective.

The Corporation's letter gives two additional, though subsidiary, reasons for asking you to be the sponsor of the legislation proposed by the Corporation. Both of these reasons are so generalized and may be so far from the realities of our industrial society as to furnish no support for the proposed legislation.

The first of these subsidiary reasons is the alleged "limited availability of skilled" workmen at the job site. The Corporation's letter gives no supporting data for—and the public media of communication seem to contradict—this allegation. In any event, all modern thought is that retraining of the skilled work force in new methods and training of the unskilled or semiskilled work forces for skilled work is the economically and socially desirable procedure, rather than further restriction on employment opportunities for the work force by unbridled, thoughtless and precipitate introduction of technological advances.

The second subsidiary reason in the Corporation's letter in support of its proposed legislation to outlaw contractual provisions reserving to workers on the job site the work they have traditionally performed there is that the performance of such work away from the job site would result in lower costs. That this generalization is far from being a universally true economic axiom is demonstrated in the very Supreme Court to which the Corporation takes exception. The contractor in that case himself testified that upon the Union's protest against the use of pre-cut and pre-finished doors, he installed a small machine under a shed on the job site, which enabled the job site carpenters to cut and finish the doors at a minimal cost to the contractor. In other words, the use of the same resourcefulness to preserve employment opportunities for workers as is used to deprive them of such opportunities can readily solve the employers' problems in connection with automation and technological advances without either increasing costs or creating the equally undesirable, if not the greatly more undesirable, consequences of unemployment.

Finally, the Corporation's letter says nothing

directly about, but leaves to inference, the question of whether the alleged savings in cost to the employer will be passed on to the consumer. We know all too well that in the vast majority of instances savings in costs of production are not passed on to the consumer for many years; they are, instead, used to inflate to their notorious portions the corporate profits of already gigantic and extremely profitable industrial enterprises. It might be enlightening to inquire of the Corporation whether, as an analogue and companion to its proposed legislation, it would favor your sponsoring and promoting legislation requiring that the lion's share of any reduction in production costs must be passed on to the consumers and the workers engaged in the production whose costs have been reduced.

I hope that you will forgive my imposing on your valuable time at such great length. It seems to me, however, not only as the official of a labor union but as a citizen sensitive to the needs of the community as a whole rather than to the needs of any particular segment of the community, that the very troublesome questions and problems underlying the Corporation's facile proposals for the solution of what it deems to be its particular problem should be given profound thought, both by our country's citizenry as well as by its enlightened and patriotic legislators.

Respectfully and cordially,
 ROBERT H. GRAY,
 Secretary-Treasurer.

Elderly in Indianapolis Not Deaf to Community's Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, recently an article appeared in an Indianapolis newspaper noting that many elderly persons seem to expect to have things done for them and take little interest in their communities.

The article by Robert Peterson, which appeared June 1 in the Indianapolis Star, did not go unanswered for long.

On June 11, a letter to the editor from Alexander Monro, executive director of the Indianapolis Senior Citizens Center, Inc., was printed in the Star.

The letter from Mr. Monro cites facts and figures to make it clear that the elderly in Indianapolis have not turned a deaf ear on the needs of their community.

The accomplishments of these senior citizens in Indianapolis deserve the widest possible recognition. Accordingly, I insert the text of Mr. Peterson's article as well as Mr. Monro's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Indianapolis Star, June 1, 1967]
 LIFE BEGINS AT FORTY: SENIOR CITIZENS FAILING TO HELP COMMUNITIES

(By Robert Peterson)

Maybe the time has come to remind older people that they should take a keener interest in others and their communities, instead of sitting back and expecting things to be done for them.

Over the years many splendid programs have been created for older people. Social Security is a bonanza providing nearly every-

uninhibited and bitter expression of national animosities in words rather than gunfire.

In spite of all Kossygin's stylized invective, he recognizes the use of the United Nations in a nuclear age when war between the super powers is impractical.

Maybe now he has said something else of great importance. Local wars, he says, cannot be permitted because they may enflame the world in a general war. That sounds quite different than the old idea that wars of national liberation are OK, and will give Peking added cause for widening the breach with Moscow.

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
June 21, 1967]

THE GREAT DEBATE OPENS

It will be a sad day for the United Nations, the Middle East and for world peace if Soviet policy rather than American policy prevails in the General Assembly.

The speech of Soviet Premier Alexei Kossygin was hard, unyielding and clearly designed to restore the tension, animosity, and uncertainty which has so long prevailed at the troubled eastern end of the Mediterranean. Its aim was patently to harden Arab intransigence, however much this might increase Arab suffering.

In demanding that Israel be condemned by the United Nations, immediately withdraw from its present positions and make financial and physical restitution for all Arab losses, Moscow was—and knew it was—asking for what it is extremely unlikely to get. Note must, however, be taken of Premier Kossygin's reference to Israel's right to exist and to the need to avoid nuclear war and to find a common language for peace. These are interesting and hopeful hints.

Although President Johnson's own statement on the Middle East can be criticized for generality and imprecision at some points, it laid the basis for constructive criticism and action by the General Assembly and the Security Council. The assertions that each nation in the Middle East has the right to exist free from threats, and that the political and territorial integrity of each must be inviolate are policies upon which any peace-seeking nation can agree. We equally applaud his demand that something constructive be done about the vast tragedy of the Arab refugees, about ending the fruitless and impoverishing arms race, and about guaranteeing free waterway passage for all "innocent" cargoes.

Whether or not the American policies are adopted as guidelines for a Middle Eastern solution, they have the great merit of moving in the right direction.

But perhaps the greatest merit of the Johnson proposal, and the one which distinguishes it most sharply from Premier Kossygin's, is Washington's realistic realization that there can be no partial or piecemeal moves towards peace. Israel, as Foreign Minister Abba Eban made clear, will not agree to a proposal such as Russia's which asks Israel to surrender all with no compensating guarantees. The Arabs on the other hand, and if they can be brought to any sort of an agreement, will certainly give none until Israel has surrendered the territorial fruits of its military victory and something major and constructive is done for the refugees. Washington recognizes these conflicting viewpoints and, we believe, seeks to harmonize them.

There would be no greater tragedy for the Middle East, and first and foremost for the Arabs, then if the Soviet Union were again given free rein to play any deliberately and self-seeking disruptive role in the area. It has now become clear that such a role can only be a harmful and hurtful one. Now is a moment for a constructive and pacifying step forward. We deeply hope that the world will not let this opportunity slip.

National Arts Endowment Grants to States Are an Example of High Statesmanship by the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleagues in the House and the Senate should have been very pleased this past week by some observations printed in the New York Times related to the great success of the National Endowment for the Arts and its program of assistance to the States.

The column, written by an honored critic-at-large, Howard Taubman, contains an excellent review of the progress most of our States have been able to make in the field of the arts.

When we remember that less than half a dozen States had full-scale councils or commissions for the encouragement of the arts when the Congress approved the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities in 1965, it becomes clear that the seed money provided through the Arts Endowment has produced a remarkable harvest.

Mr. Taubman's article presents the case far better than could hope to do and I hope that all of my colleagues will read it. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

[From the New York Times, June 12, 1967]

ARTS ENDOWMENT GAINS—MATCHING GRANTS PROVIDED 2 YEARS AGO HAVE SEEDED PRO- GRAMS IN MANY STATES

(By Howard Taubman)

When Congress acts out of political motives, it is not necessarily narrow in its vision. Note the manner in which its imprint on the National Arts Endowment legislation has worked out. In 1965, when the endowment was enacted into law, Congress added a section authorizing matching grants of \$50,000 each year to each state and to the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. If the intention was the prudent one to take care of the home folks, the outcome nevertheless has been beneficial. An examination of the states' applications for matching funds for the fiscal year beginning July 1 reveals that many are moving forward, that they are taking careful stock of their resources and needs, and that they are devising programs that not only answer urgent requirements but also have imagination and validity.

A summary of applications, prepared by the Arts Endowment staff, has been circulated among state arts councils and commissions. It was not meant for publication, because revisions and modifications are still being made. But the changes are not likely to be great, and the quality of many of the projects are so impressive that they deserve analysis and comment.

FORTY-TWO STATES SEEKS GRANTS

Forty-two states have put in for the entire \$50,000, or nearly all of it. Only Alaska, Delaware, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, South Carolina and South Dakota have asked for substantially less, and Idaho's application had not arrived when the summary was sent out.

Alaska's situation is instructive. The state formed its arts council last March, and there

was hardly time to forge a full program. Other difficulties were the state's limited arts resources and problems of transportation. But the council was undaunted. Although it submitted a series of modest projects, requiring matching funds of \$25,683, it intended to file a supplemental request. For the present its plans include tours of performing and visual arts, help for several festivals, technical assistance and some work in arts education.

The most sophisticated proposals, not surprisingly, come from the states that have had the most experience in the arts and their public support. New York expects to use its entire Federal grant to assist in the establishment of a board program of residencies at various campuses of the State University for individuals and arts organizations like A. P. A.-Phoenix, the Merce Cunningham Dance Company, the Dorian Quintet and Danny Nagrin, the choreographer. The Federal contribution will cover only about 20 per cent of the program's total cost, but then New York has been notably forward looking in its allocation of funds to its arts council.

Illinois, Missouri and North Carolina have drawn up ambitious programs. The total cost of the Illinois projects, which have been planned for a period of two years, is \$847,000. What is especially striking about the plan is its emphasis on technical assistance and artists in residence.

The state has budgeted \$110,000 to pay experts stipends plus travel costs, to provide local arts organizations, at their request, with guidance, evaluation and instruction in such areas as administration, community relations, organizational techniques and artistic and technical problems of production. A total of \$187,000 will be used to send professionals in the various arts on stays of a year in a community, to live and work.

Among the proposals that catch the eye are a plan in Georgia to establish a low-interest emergency loan fund for writers, composers and artists; a project for environmental design in Hawaii; the continuation of Missouri's program of bringing students from rural areas into metropolitan centers for a weekend of exposure to the arts; North Carolina's seminars for art teachers, the Texas plan to conduct an intensive training program for string players and the blueprint to expand the availability of Virginia's four artmobiles.

TECHNICAL HELP POPULAR

Technical assistance recurs frequently in the state planning. Another commendable development is the readiness of neighboring states to turn to one another for art and artists. Thus Delaware counts partly on Pennsylvania, Vermont on New York, Kansas on Missouri, Montana on Utah. Maryland declares that it will cooperate with neighboring states, and the Virgin Islands is inviting New York's Theater-in-the-Street to play in Spanish and English.

It would be too much to expect all the states to be equally balanced and adventurous in their planning. Some, indeed, have so few cultural resources that they must almost begin at the beginning. For them the stress on state initiative may be a handicap. For the temptation is always there to use matching funds for local projects, no matter how uninspired they may be.

One assumes that the National Arts Endowment's staff will insist on minimum criteria. The objective must be to raise standards where they most need raising, not merely to give the appearance of abundant activity. If the Federal matching funds continue to be applied with increasing creativity, the Arts Endowment and the state's arts councils will make the original Congressional decision look like high statesmanship. Wouldn't that be nice for a change?

**Well Deserved Honor for Congresswoman
Leonor Sullivan**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Friday, June 16, an insertion by our colleague, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] which included the text of an address delivered at commencement exercises at Lindenwood College, St. Charles, Mo., on June 3, by the Honorable Patricia Roberts Harris, U.S. Ambassador to Luxembourg. According to the information placed in the RECORD by Congresswoman SULLIVAN, Ambassador Harris received an honorary degree of doctor of laws at that commencement. Mrs. SULLIVAN stated in her remarks in the RECORD that it was her privilege to hear Ambassador Harris make an excellent address on the subject "The Duty of Dissent." With characteristic modesty, however, Mrs. SULLIVAN failed to indicate in her statement how she happened to be at Lindenwood College commencement exercises that morning.

I happen to know why she was there. Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, the ranking member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which I am privileged to be chairman, and a ranking member of the Committee on Banking and Currency—one of the outstanding Members of the House of Representatives, and the foremost Member in the field of consumer affairs—was present at Lindenwood College on June 3 in order to be honored, as was Ambassador Harris, with the award of an honorary doctor of laws degree.

For this fine Member of Congress who is one of the hardest working Members in either body, the event was of more than routine significance, for it marked the award of her very first honorary degree. This undoubtedly will be something of surprise to most of our colleagues—that is, that after nearly 15 years in the House of Representatives, where she has served with such distinction and effectiveness, this would be her first honorary degree. I recently noted in the press that Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH of Maine had received her 50th honorary degree.

All I can say is that Lindenwood College, which is not in Mrs. SULLIVAN's congressional district, deserves the thanks of the entire House of Representatives for having the perspicacity and imagination to single out the gentlewoman from Missouri for this honor which I know Mrs. SULLIVAN will always treasure.

In noting the honor paid on that same day to Ambassador Patricia Roberts Harris, Mrs. SULLIVAN, in her remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 16, included a biography of the Ambassador as it appeared in the program of Lindenwood College commencement exercises. It occurred to me, Mr. Speaker, that it

would now be appropriate for me to place in the RECORD a biography of Congresswoman SULLIVAN to round out the documentation on the award of honorary degrees by Lindenwood College on June 3. I have obtained such a biography, brought up to date from an official publication of the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor, "Women of the 89th Congress."

The information contained in this biography makes it even more of a surprise to us that the degree which Mrs. SULLIVAN received on June 3 was her first such honor. The gentlewoman from Missouri has been the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal since 1957, and has done a truly outstanding job in that important responsibility; she also serves on the Subcommittee on the Coast Guard and on the Subcommittee on the Merchant Marine.

On the Banking and Currency Committee, she is chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Housing, and a ranking member of the Subcommittee on Small Business. She has carried out all of her tasks and duties with conscientious care and great diligence, and we are all proud of her. Furthermore, she has taken an active role in the consideration and passage of every piece of legislation which is of vital interest to consumers, and has initiated action in a great many areas of national legislation.

I think every Member of the House joins Lindenwood College at St. Charles, Mo., in applauding the achievements of this outstanding Representative from the city of St. Louis, who has played a great role in the transformation of her own city as sponsor of the legislation which led to the construction of the Gateway Arch and the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, and also through the changes for which she has been responsible in the laws dealing with housing and urban development.

And every poor person in the United States owes her a particular debt of gratitude for her indefatigable work over the last 14 years in making a reality of her proposal for a food stamp program to assure adequate and nutritious diets for our low-income families. She deserves every honor which has been accorded her over the years, including her first honorary degree.

Her biography is as follows:

BIOGRAPHY OF REPRESENTATIVE LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, DEMOCRAT, THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, MISSOURI

Mrs. Leonor K. Sullivan, now serving her eighth term, is the only woman to have served in Congress from the State of Missouri. She is the widow of Representative John Berchmans Sullivan, who was serving his fourth term in the Congress at the time of his death in 1951.

A native of St. Louis, Mrs. Sullivan represents a district located wholly within the borders of that city. She resigned as training executive for a St. Louis business machines corporation when she married the Congressman in 1941, and later served as his administrative assistant. In 1952, after a special election had filled the vacancy in the 82d Congress caused by her husband's death, Mrs. Sullivan decided to run for his former seat and won election to the 83d Congress. She was subsequently reelected to the 84th, 85th, 86th, 87th, 88th, 89th and 90th Congress.

Known throughout her career in Congress for her strong interest in consumer issues, Mrs. Sullivan is a senior member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency and chairman of its Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, with primary legislative responsibility for the "truth in lending" bill, which she introduced, and for other consumer issues within the committee's jurisdiction. As a member of the Subcommittee on Housing, she has played a leading role in the preparation of all housing bills passed by the House since 1955—sponsoring, particularly, housing for the elderly and a new FHA loan insurance program for non-profit organizations to rehabilitate inexpensive homes for sale at 3% mortgage financing to low-income families. She also helped draft a series of major measures to bolster national economic conditions, including the Area Redevelopment Act, the Small Business Investment Act, the Export Credit Insurance Act, the Mass Transit Act, and the Community Facilities Act. A ranking member also of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Mrs. Sullivan has served as chairman of its Subcommittee on the Panama Canal since 1957, directing numerous studies into the operational problems and activities of the Panama Canal Company.

Besides her own committee responsibilities, Mrs. Sullivan has actively participated on legislation of consumer interest before other committees, and was instrumental in the passage of the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957, establishing for the first time compulsory Federal inspection of poultry in interstate commerce; a series of annual increases in the appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration (Health, Education, and Welfare Department) and of the Meat and Poultry Inspection Divisions (Agriculture Department); the Food Additives Act of 1958, requiring pretesting for safety of all chemical additives used in or on foodstuffs; the anticancer provision—dealing with artificial coloring used in foods, drugs, and cosmetics—of the Color Additives Act of 1960; the Hazardous Substances Labeling Act of 1961; the far-reaching Drug Control Act of 1962, including the major provisions relating to prescription drugs first proposed by her 18 months earlier as part of an omnibus bill to rewrite the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938; and the Drug Abuses Control Act of 1965, dealing with "pep" pills, barbiturates, LSD, etc., also taken from her omnibus measure. Other provisions of the omnibus bill, H.R. 1235, not yet enacted, call for pretesting for safety of all ingredients in cosmetics; premarketing clearance of all health devices; a ban on flavored aspirin; stronger factory inspection standards for all products subject to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; stricter labeling requirements, and many other consumer protections. She has worked also for automobile safety and the regulation of hazardous materials in industry.

Congresswoman Sullivan was the author of the food stamp law enacted in 1959 for the distribution of surplus agricultural commodities to needy Americans through regular grocery stores. A modified food stamp plan was instituted by the late President Kennedy. This led to her introduction in the 88th Congress of an administration food stamp bill which was enacted on August 31, 1964, and now assures good nutrition for 2 million needy Americans.

In 1957 Mrs. Sullivan drafted and introduced for the first time the exceptional children educational assistance bill to encourage experienced teachers to take advanced training in the skills of teaching gifted children or those with physical or emotional handicaps. In subsequent Congresses, parts of this program were enacted to establish fellowship programs for teachers of mentally retarded children and those with speech and hearing defects. Congress finally broadened the program to include teachers of all categories of handicapped children. Mrs.

assured, however, that a newly-constituted court would strike down a carefully drafted eavesdropping law. Congress, in any event, can hardly do less than give it a try—unless all of the fine speeches about stamping out crime are devoid of substance.

Twentieth-Century Miracle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the Middle East crisis, American sympathy and admiration has been with Israel. It is not difficult to see why this brave, small state has won the hearts of so many of our citizens.

Yvette Scharfman has expressed this very idea in an article written for a Brooklyn newspaper.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues her column which appeared in the June 17, 1967, edition of the Bay News & Kings Courier.

The article follows:

TWENTIETH-CENTURY MIRACLE

(By Yvette Scharfman)

At this writing one week ago we heard that war had broken out in the Middle East. We wrote our column with heart-sick outrage at man's inhumanity to man. We saw Israel, the only bastion of democracy in the area, surrounded on all sides by those who openly threatened to annihilate her, the international tribunal notwithstanding. Enforcing the threats of the bully Nasser were hundreds of Russian communist "technicians and advisers" plus thousands of tanks, planes and other armaments costing millions of dollars. We write that only a modern David-Goliath confrontation; a veritable miracle would be needed to save Israel; but that the little country has proven herself worthy of a miracle.

Let us remind our readers that after the Hungarian revolt against Russia some ten years ago there were conferences at summit level by the western world as to the absorption of some 80,000 refugees over-running Vienna. The civilized world looked to our country to lead the way in welcoming the brave group who escaped the communist hordes. The then President (American history has shown that good generals make bad presidents) consented to the admittance of 35,000 Hungarian refugees—each of whom was submitted to a rigorous health examination, besides requiring a bond posted by an individual or organization testifying that said immigrant would not become a public charge. Let us compare that with the new little country, Israel, which could then comfortably fit into the state of Rhode Island. The Israelis, newly arrived, were themselves struggling for survival. But from the time they beat the Arab world in 1948 they declared an open-door policy for any Jew who wished to enter. Israel admitted one and a half-million people since she became a state! There are no health or medical qualifications here; no bonds required. On the contrary, she has welcomed the sick, the lame, the blind, the ignorant, and the penniless. She has sheltered them, fed them, healed them, clothed them, educated them, and at great sacrifice has tried to absorb them into the economic and social fabric of the country. In all the world there has never been a people so responsive to the needs of others! Is she not then worthy of the

miracle which we in the sophisticated, skeptical, cynical latter-half 20th century have been privileged to witness? For those of us who still believe in miracles, no explanation is necessary; for those who do not, no explanation is possible. Suffice it to say that the two million have conquered the whole Arab world (eighty million) and their communist henchmen who fed their vanity and their coffers.

But the Israelis have also lost; besides too many young brave soldiers, close to ten million dollars in their gross national product. Their economy, at a complete stand-still, has been set back ten years. Persecution of Jews in Arab countries and in the communist satellites is expected to be accelerated. Jews will attempt to flee to Israel, although the escape is fraught with peril. We Americans must help to take over the task of caring for the anticipated immigration and for the indigent refugees already in the country. Emergency meetings have been called for every night in the week since the war began! It is a great thrill to relate that some of the most successful of these meetings have been called by our Christian neighbors.

Al Hesterberg, President of the Flatbush Democratic Club, called one on Monday night. President Lester Sachs presided, and did much of the spade work behind the scenes. Al Hesterberg is no stranger to the mid-east situation. He read a resolution which he, in the company of Congressmen Rooney and Multer, presented to the State Department way back in 1956 when the situation was much the same. Congresswoman Edna Kelly reminded the audience that the only reason she didn't accompany the mission of mercy was because she was not our representative at the time. Her pithy remark that the Israelis were fighting the world's fight against communism was well taken; she will so state in a resolution she plans to offer in Congress. We don't know how much money was raised at the club, but we understand it was quite substantial.

Yes, it seems decent people of all faiths are indeed rallying to the side of Israel, who has exposed the evil forces in the world today. Let us support our President in his honest and sincere effort to stop the spreading of their tentacles!

Peace Is Still Possible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the recent tragic events in the Middle East are only part of a long history of Russian supported Arab aggression against Israel. In the June 20 issue of the Long Island Press an editorial on the cooperation needed for a permanent peace in the Middle East struck at the heart of the problem. This clear and eloquent editorial displays the deft hand of editor David Starr. Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include that editorial, which follows, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

If words and reason were bullets and bombs, Abba Eban did to the Soviet Union yesterday what Israel's armies did to the Arabs the week of June 5.

The eloquent Israeli foreign minister hurled battalions of logical arguments against the entrenched positions of Soviet Premier Alexei N. Kosygin in the opening

debate in the United Nations General Assembly.

The Russian quit the field, outclassed. But before he left the Assembly Hall, he heard Mr. Eban—in rolling, Churchillian oratory, never once lapsing into a cliché—demolish the narrow, legalistic Russian attempt to pin the blame for the Mideast mess on Israel.

Mr. Eban traced the "sad and shocking story" of 14 years of Soviet aid and encouragement to the Arabs. He ticked off in overwhelming detail the numbers of tanks, fighter planes and bombers, mortars, field guns and rocket launchers—the entire \$2 billion in Russian arms now either in Israeli hands or rotting in the desert. He exposed the fabric of Arab provocation that sparked the war Russia is trying now to pin on Israel. And he outlined, too, a blueprint for the cooperation that will insure the road to a Mideast peace.

The man from Moscow, true to the absolutist tradition of his country, could not get away from words like "categorical," "irrefutable," "without any condition," "restitute in full," "inadmissible," and so on. Israel was black, the Arabs, white. And back, in Moscow, television carried Premier Kosygin's speech in full and live, but cut the sound and ended the transmission as Mr. Eban took the rostrum.

But beyond style and words are facts. Israel stands at Suez, at Sharm el Sheikh and on both banks of the Jordan. The Arabs are in disarray—militarily, politically and economically. If the Russians are deficient in style and words, they're sharp about facing facts. They know today, as they knew two weeks ago, that to make their demands in the Mideast stick they would have first to cross nuclear swords with the U.S. This has not changed.

There is a way out of this blind alley, if Russia wishes to take it. President Johnson made it abundantly clear that the U.S. stands ready to tackle substantive issues that lie at the roots of world turmoil. His speech was clearly designed to create an atmosphere in which constructive moves would be possible—for all sides and with honor. The opportunity for peace is here. It simply must be seized.

Law Needed To Curtail Incitement to Violence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the violence and anarchy in our streets are corroding our country—eating away at the basic principles of law and order that are the foundation of our great Nation.

In this connection, Mr. David Lawrence, the nationally syndicated columnist, has written an article emphasizing the need for legislation to make it a Federal offense to travel between States for the purpose of inciting violence and insurrection.

I have joined other colleagues in sponsoring such a bill and because of the interest of my colleagues and the Nation generally in this matter of law and order, I ask unanimous consent that the article written by Mr. Lawrence be reprinted in the Appendix of the Record.

The article follows:

June 22, 1967

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star,
June 19, 1967]**LAW NEEDED ON INCITING TO VIOLENCE**
(By David Lawrence)

The most pressing problem that faces the American people is not the friction in the Middle East but the friction inside the United States—the violence in the streets of many cities involving personal injury, bombings and destruction of private property.

More than 90 bills have been introduced in Congress designed to make it a federal crime for persons to travel from state to state for the purpose of fomenting disorders. But up to now proposed legislation has not been acted upon, though within the last few days efforts have been made to get a bill before the House of Representatives for action.

One of the principal reasons for delay is the attitude of the administration and some of the Democratic leaders in Congress. Their feeling is that such legislation might be misused by local authorities to interfere with legitimate protest. This excuse could be applied as a barrier to almost any legislative proposal. The whole judicial system, however, was established to differentiate between abuse of the law and its proper enforcement.

The issue is not as fuzzy as some of the procrastinators in Congress would have the people of the country believe. For the Supreme Court of the United States has plainly stated again and again in many an opinion that it is a crime to incite to violence. In a recent case Justice Black, speaking for the majority of the high court, rejected the idea that in propagandizing protests people "have a constitutional right to do so whenever and wherever and wherever they please."

There are, of course, plenty of places for orderly demonstrations, not only in auditoriums and stadiums but also through properly conducted parades or marches. The key to the current trouble is the tendency of the agitators to harangue crowds, flinging insults and accusations, and too often this results in physical clashes and violence of all kinds.

Does "free speech" immunize from punishment a person who incites others to maim or kill or riot? While the laws of all states prohibit disorder, can it be argued that incitement to violence cannot be punished because "free speech" is impaired?

Last year the House of Representatives, by a vote of 389 to 25, approved a measure, sponsored by William C. Cramer, R-Fla., which would make it a federal crime to travel between states, or use interstate facilities, with the purpose of inciting riots, violence, arson, bombing, or any other felony under a state or federal law. This was an amendment to a civil-rights bill which later died in the Senate. Similar proposals have since been pigeonholed in the House Judiciary Committee, with the approval, of course, of the administration.

When will Congress act? The states have been struggling with the problem, and occasionally have to use their National Guard to intervene and prevent further violence. But the issue is whether the states and cities should be obliged to wait until a riot breaks out or whether the federal government will step in to investigate the plots and conspiracies when groups meet to select "target" cities for "demonstrations" which inevitably lead to outbursts of violence.

The federal government, through its machinery of investigation, could quickly put its finger on the individuals who are responsible for "demonstrations" that lead to disorder. Many of those who are behind the big "demonstrations" openly predict violence and indicate in advance that they will do things which are plainly provocative. This can be dealt with by federal law but not always by the states and cities. The difficulty is that the states do not know what is being plotted outside their borders where the arrangements are usually made for the provocation of disorders.

Congress, therefore, is the starting point for corrective action. Once a federal law is enacted making it possible to arrest and punish individuals who incite others to violence, it may be anticipated that those who wish to express themselves freely on controversial questions will find ways of doing it in an orderly fashion.

Voice of America**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the obvious failures of the administration is its unimaginative operation of the U.S. Information Agency and more specifically the Voice of America.

The Voice of America is an operation of minimum effectiveness since policy decisions have rendered its messages meaningless. However, there is growing concern developing across the country over the ineffectiveness of the Voice of America and I insert in the RECORD at this point a copy of a resolution adopted by the Slovenian Women's Union of America, at their recent national convention in Washington, D.C., which is self-explanatory and recommends a course of action which would be a practical step in the Voice of America's operations:

RESOLUTION OF THE SLOVENIAN WOMEN'S UNION OF AMERICA

Whereas, the Republic of Slovenia, in the northwestern part of Yugoslavia, is the only cultural and progressive nation of 2 million persons without the direct services of a United States Consulate or Information Service post; and,

Whereas, Members of the Slovenian Women's Union of America continue to receive complaints from their relatives and friends in Slovenia, concerning the time of broadcast and lack of medium wave lengths for the Slovenian broadcasts over the Voice of America; and,

Whereas, Two evening programs in Slovenia were replaced a year ago by two early morning programs of only 15 minute duration; and,

Whereas, For many listeners who have indicated their desire to listen to the broadcasts, this time is very inconvenient; and,

Whereas, The two early morning programs are not transmitted on medium length waves; and,

Whereas, Since the Voice of America program is the only direct American contact with the people of the Yugoslav Republic of Slovenia; now, therefore,

Be it known, that the Delegates convened at the 14th National Convention of the Slovenian Women's Union of America make this appeal to the Director of the United States Information Agency to re-establish the Voice of America programs in Slovenian language to the former, traditional broadcast time and to be transmitted over medium wave lengths.

Approved by unanimous decision of the 14th National Convention of the Slovenian Women's Union of America.

ANTONIA TUREK,
Convention Chairman.
MARIE A. FLORYAN,
Resolution Chairman.
ALBINEA NOVAK,
Convention Secretary.

Dated: May 26, 1967, in the City of Washington, D.C.

Boycotts**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the question of boycotts has produced some rather heated arguments in recent years. In my own district it was raised most directly and most recently when I received a letter from a large manufacturing plant in Philadelphia asking my interest in legislation "to assure continued innovation and improvement free of artificial barriers to progress".

As is my habit when one side of an obviously controversial issue is presented, I actively sought an opinion on the other side. The opinion I received was, I felt, so learned and interesting that I think it would be appropriate to enter it in its entirety in the RECORD so that other members faced with similar problems may gain some insight into the matter. I would like to pay tribute to Robert H. Gray the secretary Treasurer of the Metropolitan District Council of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. When you learn of his arguments you may well want to join many in thanking him.

The replies follow:

ENVIRONMENTAL PRODUCTS DIVISION,
INTERNATIONAL TELEPHONE
AND TELEGRAPH CORP.,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 19, 1967.

Congressman JOSHUA EILBERG,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE EILBERG: The U.S. Supreme Court ruled, on April 17, 1967 that unions have a right to boycott products shipped into areas of their jurisdiction if the major purpose is to protect workers' jobs. This decision arose from the complaint of the National Woodwork Manufacturers Association to the National Labor Relations Board concerning the refusal of the Metropolitan District Council of Philadelphia and Vicinity, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America to hang prefabricated doors at the Navy's Capehart Housing Project. The far-reaching potential effects of this decision were recognized by the Court in "holding back progress;" however, they advised the Manufacturer's Association that this argument was "addressed to the wrong branch of government," and indicated that legislative relief would be required. It is for this reason that I address this letter to you.

This Division operates two plants in Philadelphia and one in Mercer, Pennsylvania employing a total of 1300 people, with bargaining units at each plant represented by the United Steel Workers of America AFL-CIO. Our products are heating and air conditioning equipment, featuring prewired and pre-assembled piping arrangements following the "packaged" concept of design. While we recognize the desire of the construction workers to preserve their historic areas of work, we also recognize that in today's labor market there is limited availability of skilled "job site" assemblers for the types of quality equipment we manufacture. Further, the direction of design is toward more sophisticated equipment in which this availability will be more critical.

In a broader sense, the public has proven to be best served by the lower costs and inherently higher quality of factory-assembled equipment and components. The trend of design today in our industry continues, as it has been for some years, toward the develop-

A 3208

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 22, 1967

Also, please note that the Congress, which represents the American people and would force the public by law to pay the excise tax, would have no control over the public television to be imposed on the nation. The control would ultimately lie in the hands of the Executive Branch, for the report further proposes that the corporation be run by twelve directors—six of whom would be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate—not the House of Representatives—and the other six directors would be selected by the first six. Their terms of office would be for six years. Thus, the public television network, supported by the buyers of television sets, would be controlled by a select group of liberal-totalitarians whose job it would be to conceive of TV programs to serve the "full needs of the American public," whatever that means. That some of the programs will be of some value to some people is beyond question, but the very means of financing the program—by taxation, which is one of the government's most obnoxious and irritating uses of force—suggests that the network will not serve any pertinent needs of the American public, for if it did, it could easily find commercial sponsors to back it.

It is typical of the liberal-totalitarians that they should resort to force to impose their supposedly superior concept of television on the American people. Therefore they appeal to government to do for them with the stroke of a pen what three decades of private investment and development did for commercial TV.

What will "public television"—or, more appropriately, the Parasitic Network—transmit to the American people? James Reston, an articulate spokesman for the totalitarians, wrote in his column of January 26, 1967:

"They [the Carnegie Commission] are saying that while Jackie Gleason may be more amusing than Senator J. William Fulbright of Arkansas, and the battle between the Kansas City Chiefs and the Green Bay Packers more popular than the struggle for China, nevertheless there may be a difference between what is amusing and what is important."

"In short, the Carnegie Commission is suggesting that there is a difference between what sells on television and what endures, what takes people's minds off the troubling issues for decision in a democracy, and what keeps their minds on those decisions."

In other words, the proponents of "public television"—overly interested in the *minds* of the viewers—are telling the American people that their values are all mixed up. What they are saying is that the American people should want to listen to J. William Fulbright more than to Jackie Gleason, that they should be more interested in the struggle for China than in a football game. What the educators are saying is that the American people are a bunch of children who have to be instructed in what to want, in what to value. But please note that these arrogant, self-conceited instructors expect to be comfortably subsidized by the very consumers they despise and look down on but who are responsible and smart enough to earn the money to pay the taxes to support the parasitic educators, but not smart enough to know what they should want.

Of course larceny on so grand a scale requires connivance of an inordinately high caliber. The Commission's report itself is a good example of such connivance. But an even better example is the editorial which appeared in *Life* magazine of February 17, 1967. After opening on the theme of the "vast wasteland" and giving the Carnegie Commission a puff, the *Life* editorialist wrote:

"The commercial networks are both creators and the victims of the pressure for uniformity. Squeezed by ratings, they choose to appeal to the widest possible audience. Despite the magnificent job they can do, there

is little room in their schedule for the new or the unique—for the item that has great appeal if its audience is limited."

Life forgets that TV, like itself, is a mass medium, that it owes its entire success to the fact that it serves a mass audience. No one has suggested that the federal government subsidize a magazine similar to *Life* free of commercial pressures "to serve the full needs of the American public." So why should the cultural elite require television as a means of expression? Also, since when is the new or unique excluded from commercial TV if it is *any good*? But if the cultural elite want a TV network of their own, why don't they pay for it themselves? Why must they become parasites and demand that those whom they consider culturally inferior and despise subsidize them.

They don't like what their supposed inferiors like, but they do like their money. *Life* writes without finching an eyelash: "a massive financial transfusion from the federal government for noncommercial television is the only way to give the viewer a real choice when he turns on his set."

What is this "real choice" and why must the taxpayer be compelled to subsidize it? He doesn't have much of a free choice if he is forced to support it. The viewer now has as much free choice as he will ever have in the selection of programs. What guarantee does he have that Public TV will actually offer a real choice? None, of course. He will be offered whatever the educators think is good for him. *Life* states:

"A basic concern, held by many, on any large-scale undertaking of noncommercial television is the fear that it will develop into a 'Big Brother' voice of the government or of some cultural Establishment. To avoid this possibility, the Carnegie plan would establish a nongovernmental non-profit corporation as the core of Public TV. The corporation would act as a buffer between the sources of funds—tax revenues, foundations or private donors—and the creative producers who should be shielded from the influence that financial support often demands."

In other words, the "creative producers"—a new species of sacred cow—will be shielded from economic reality, which all of us plain folk must face in our daily lives. They will be insulated from the harsh economic realities of the outer world. What kind of "creativity" will come out of such a group remains to be seen. Supposedly, this detachment will make these creators free agents, beholden to no power clique or Big Brother. Thus, according to *Life*, they will be a power unto themselves, in positions to mold tastes, influence millions, and push their favorite writers and actors. Why should any group be given such power on a silver platter with no strings attached? Why should such a privileged group exist at all in a free country?

Life, of course, would hardly be expected to ask such legitimate and fundamental questions. Its main concern is in seeing that the Parasitic Network gets an expanded tax base. It writes:

"A tax on sets would fall directly on the consumers—the audience. It would seem more logical to insist that those who are profiting most should share the burden. That could be arranged by imposing a franchise tax on commercial television channels, or a tax on the advertising billings that support them."

The parasite knows just where to put the bite. The commercial developers made television possible. They are profiting from something they themselves nurtured, invested in, and developed. Yet, the impression *Life* gives is that they are profiting from something which is not really theirs. The editorials elaborate, and here his command reaches its epitome:

"Commercial television stations have a priceless stock in trade—monopoly control

of an air channel that belongs to the public. The public has never been paid for it. A tax on commercial operations to support Public TV would be a means of extracting revenues from the airwaves owned by all, to reach that part of the audience that is now substantially ignored."

It would take a book to disentangle the incredible fallacies jammed into that paragraph. In the first place, no air channel was ever owned by anyone, let alone the public. TV stations are assigned air channels in much the same way that airplanes are assigned a flight path. The problem is one of traffic, not ownership. The public, which is a loose term used to designate "everybody," never expected to be paid for the use of the air. Such a concept is so incredible that only an intellectual Svengali would even want to make use of it. Using the same logic, one could argue that the public owns the English language and that *Life* magazine, which has earned a huge fortune using it, ought to pay a special tax to the public just for using the language. But *Life's* twisted logic knows no limits. First, it puts forth the notion that the public owns the air channels. However, it doesn't then suggest that the commercial networks send dividend checks to every living person in the United States. It suggests that the commercial networks subsidize a group of educators who will be using the same air channels—supposedly owned by the public—free of charge. If the commercial operators owe something to the public, it is hard to fathom how they can square themselves with the public by paying for the upkeep of a parasitic noncommercial system.

Just because the Carnegie Commission calls their system "Public TV" doesn't mean that the public will own it. *Life* magazine stressed the point that the corporation would be a power unto itself, answerable to no one, including the public. And so, the *Life* argument holds as much water as a sieve. As for "that part of the audience that is now substantially ignored," we have seen no polls or surveys to indicate where that audience is or what that audience wants which it is now not getting from TV. Everyone has his own pet interests, but no one expects a television network to put on TV specials for the benefit of bird watchers, button collectors, and devotees of Sanskrit poetry.

All of these arguments notwithstanding, the totalitarian juggernaut just keeps rolling along. According to the *New York Times* of March 1, 1967:

"President Johnson asked Congress today to create a corporation for Public Television that could channel both public and private funds into noncommercial television and radio facilities and programs . . .

"Mr. Johnson said the board of directors would be appointed by him from the fields of education, communications and the creative arts, subject to confirmation from the Senate. It is thought that these should be men and women of sufficient stature to protect the corporation from interference by the Government, even though it may become dependent on sizable Federal subsidies."

And so the Great Swindle goes on.

file Let There Be Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Near East Report is an informative periodical which concentrates entirely upon the

June 22, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 3207

Tax-Free Brainwashing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the coming revolt against private ownership and operation of television and the airwaves called nonprofit educational TV is the ultimate in fully nationalized thought control and education. In many definitions it is known as the symbol controlled Socialist state.

Nonprofit, advertisement-free newspapers echoing the party line of the political ideology in power may be next.

Mr. Speaker, I include the release, "The Parasitic Network," from the March 8 Review of the News in the RECORD:

There is a very strong, concerted campaign afoot on the part of the Liberal Establishment to saddle the American people with subsidized, noncommercial television. Until now noncommercial "educational" TV has depended on foundation grants, viewer contributions, and government subsidies from the Health, Education and Welfare Department for its subsistence. However, these sources of income do not provide educational TV with any degree of financial stability or security. A foundation may or may not renew a grant, viewer contributions may fall off, and Congress may not appropriate funds to the HEW for such TV subsidies. And so, the would-be educators—those liberal-totalitarians who would like to mold and control the minds of Americans—have worked out a much more elaborate plan which would release the educators from having to worry about money, secure the financial stability of non-commercial TV, and even enable it to compete with the commercial system. The plan, conceived by the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television—a group of private visionaries financed by a Carnegie Foundation grant—was put forth to the public in late January.

As everyone knows, motion pictures, radio, and television are the technological children of capitalism. Their growth and development were possible only because they had commercial value. What is commercial value? Commercial value, as distinct from personal or individual value, is a value desired by large numbers of people, thus making it possible for other large numbers of people to earn their livelihoods by supplying this value to others. A value, in the most fundamental sense, is something a person desires to obtain or keep. We all want different things, and therefore we all have different values. Some values, of a sentimental nature, are so personal as to be of no value to anyone else.

On the other hand, there are some things which all of us want. Primary values concern our basic needs which we must satisfy in order to live. Of these, not all of them require an expenditure of energy to obtain. The phrase "the best things in life are free" refers to these particular values. They include sunshine, water, air, rain—all of which are abundant in nature in certain parts of the globe. In situations of scarcity, however, even these "free" values cost money. People fly south in the winter for the sun; they buy fresh spring water in bottles; they condition air; they irrigate soil when there is no rain.

There is also the popular notion that love is a "free" value. But as we all know, love requires tremendous expenditures of nervous energy to obtain and sustain—not to mention the other costs which go with love in the form of gifts, insurance policies, etc.

Thus, there are virtually no values which do not require an expenditure of energy to obtain. But some needs we must satisfy; others we do not have to. For example, we need food in order to live, and therefore, it is a primary value. We do not need television in order to live, and therefore it is not a primary value. However, in an industrial civilization which has provided the consumer with hundreds of new values, we want TV because it gives us pleasure, enlarges our view of the world, and enables many of us, particularly the old and retired, to enjoy the passing hours instead of being bored to death.

And so, people buy television sets in order to enjoy the delights which come through the picture tubes. Naturally, it is not possible for the TV networks to satisfy everyone at every hour. But it is possible for them to satisfy many people much of the time. The viewers pay for this entertainment in two ways, first by their purchase of the television set, and second by buying the products which sponsor the programs. Since the cost of the product includes the cost of advertising it over TV, the consumer pays for this entertainment, but in such an unobtrusive manner as to be hardly aware of it. In terms of cost, the consumer gets a tremendous amount of entertainment over TV for very little.

Much has been said about the poor quality of commercial TV, that its programs are geared to the lowest common denominator. This indeed may be true some of the time. However, it should never be forgotten that television owes its growth and development to the interest shown in it by large numbers of consumers. Because it was a value to them, they purchased the TV sets, bought the sponsors' products, and made the networks rich. It is their medium of entertainment, developed to serve them. But it is a costly system of entertainment which can only be profitable to its developers if it serves and satisfies large numbers of people.

Now, there is in our country, as in other countries, a small number of people—belonging to a kind of snobbish cultural elite—who look down on television because of its mass appeal. These are people who read difficult novels, attend avant garde cinemas, enjoy modern dance and non-objective art. They usually don't like anything with a happy ending. To them, if it isn't tragic, it isn't deep, and if it isn't deep, it isn't of value. Television is clearly not their medium. Such a medium could have never been developed to satisfy their narrow tastes.

Some cultural snobs refuse to buy television sets. Few, however, boycott the products advertised on TV. If they do own television sets, it is in order to enjoy specific programs which suit their taste. But, it is obvious that people who read books, visit art galleries, go to the theatre, and see avant garde films do not have much time for television anyway. The people who watch television most are those who do not read books, go to the theatre, see avant garde films or visit art galleries.

But because television is so successful a means of reaching large numbers of people in an almost effortless manner, the totalitarians among us have long coveted the instrument, not as a means of entertaining people but as a means of controlling them. A great deal of such control is already exerted in commercial television through news programs, documentary features, and other so-called "public service" programs. Also, in the field of drama such control is very obviously exerted. For example, "The Man From Uncle," an adventure series in which an American and a Russian work together to maintain their twisted version of world law and order, is clearly an attempt to condition people into accepting an eventual partnership between the Soviet Union and the United States now being pushed by the world-government power clique. However, a great deal of this brainwashing is mitigated by the commercial

necessities of television. And so the networks must limit their brainwashing for fear that too much of it will turn the viewers away from their sets, and thus destroy their commercial success. The consumer is still king in commercial television. His letters can persuade a sponsor to support or drop a particular program, for commercial TV must answer to the consumer.

This situation has long irked the liberal-totalitarians who dislike the idea of Joe Consumer being the final arbiter of what goes on TV. They know that TV belongs to the consumer, but in their view of things TV is much too valuable an instrument for mind control to be left in the hands of the consumer. In addition, commercial television, by its very nature and regardless of the prevalent socialist influences of the Trojan horses who run it, still generates too much implicitly pro-capitalist, anti-collectivist ideology to suit the tastes of the totalitarians. And so, the liberal-collectivists have had to work very hard to figure out a way to steal a large chunk of television away from the consumer. The main problem, however, was how to transmit hours and hours of uninterrupted brainwashing without having to worry whether or not it would be commercially successful. Leave it to the liberal educators to find a way. Their report states:

"The Carnegie Commission on Educational Television has reached the conclusion that a well-financed and well-directed educational television system, substantially larger and far more pervasive and effective than that which now exists in the United States, must be brought into being if the full needs of the American public are to be served."

The report never explains what it means by "the full needs of the American public." As we observed earlier, television is not a primary need to the viewer. However, it is a primary need to a clique which would want to control the minds of the viewers. The report continues:

"The programs we conceive to be the essence of public television are in general not economic for commercial sponsorship."

In other words, these programs are of limited value, for a sufficient number of people do not exist who would voluntarily support them. Therefore, there is only one solution to the problem: force people to support them. The report states:

"We recommend that Congress act promptly to authorize and to establish a federally chartered, non-governmental corporation, to be known as the "Corporation for Public Television." The corporation would be empowered to receive and disburse governmental and private funds in order to extend and improve public television programming. . . .

"We recommend that Congress provide the federal funds required by the corporation through a manufacturers' excise tax on television sets (beginning at 2 per cent and rising to a ceiling of 5 per cent). The revenues should be made available to the corporation through a trust fund."

"In this manner a stable source of financial support would be assured. We would free the corporation to the highest degree from the annual governmental budgeting and appropriations procedures: the goal we seek is an instrument for the free communication of ideas in a free society."

What the liberal-totalitarians want is something of great value for nothing. When they say that they want an "instrument for the free communication of ideas in a free society" what they mean is that they want free of charge and free of any control by the taxpayer, a valuable instrument whereby they can freely brainwash the nation. What kind of a society is "free" in which the taxpayer is forced by law to pay for the "free" communication of ideas? Who is getting the freedom? The term "free," as hypocritically used by the Carnegie Commission, can only mean "free of charge."

June 22, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—APPENDIX

A 3209

events of the Near East. In its most recent issue, this magazine reflected upon the problems facing the Arabs and Israelis in reaching a peace settlement, and discussed the roles of the East and West in this settlement. In addition, a calendar of events describing the day-by-day activities on both sides of the crisis has also been included.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial and chronology which appeared in the June 13, 1967, edition of the Near East Report, as follows:

LET THERE BE PEACE

The Israelis have defeated the Arab states in military battle three times in the last 20 years.

Now comes the hardest, and, we hope, the last battle.

It is to induce Arab leaders to enter into a peace settlement with Israel.

Arabs and Israelis should meet for face-to-face negotiations. There is no realistic alternative. But it will be difficult to convince the Arab states, because, in the past, world statesmen have spared them bilateral political confrontation with the Israelis.

They have permitted the Arab states the luxury of remaining in an illegal state of war with Israel. This has not been a favor to Arab leaders or the Arab peoples. That "state of war" has cursed all the peoples of the Near East—with an expensive arms race that has sapped their economies; with a propaganda of hatred which has poisoned Arab minds; and now with a devastating war that has taken the lives of thousands of people.

For years the Arabs have kept Israel in a state of siege—with boycotts and blockades, threats and terrorism. They have prepared for the final day, intoxicated by their battle cries. In the last month, the Arabs moved to carry that war to a conclusion—their "final solution" for the 2,650,000 Israelis.

They struck because they were emboldened by military and political support from the Soviet Union and by U.S. preoccupation with the war in Viet Nam. They believed that the United States would not move to stop them and that Israel was isolated and surrounded. They called for a holy war.

On Saturday, June 3, the Commander of the Egyptian forces on the Sinai frontier, Gen. Abdul Mouta, issued this proclamation:

"The eyes of the whole world are upon you in your most successful war against imperialist Israeli aggression on your fatherland, in the expectation of seeing successful results of our holy war to achieve the rights of the Arab nation. The outcome now is of tremendous historical importance to our Arab nation, and our holy war will restore the Arab rights stolen in Palestine. You will reconquer the stolen land with the help of God, the power of justice, the strength of your arms, and the unity of your faith."

Next day, on June 4, Nasser declared on Cairo Radio:

"The whole Arab nation has moved. We are facing Israel in the battle and are burning with desire for it to start in order to get revenge for the 1956 treachery."

Next day, on June 5, Egyptians began an attack to cut Israel's Negev in two.

The Israelis struck back swiftly. Within six days, the armies of Egypt, Jordan and Syria were smashed.

Much will now depend on the statesmanship of the great powers.

The Arabs have been able to maintain their political and military siege for the last 20 years because of the cold war.

Moscow gave the Arabs all-out diplomatic support at the UN, as well as more than \$3 billion in military and economic aid.

Washington always hesitated to mount any offensive for peace lest it alienate oil-

rich Arab states which profess friendship for the West but which threaten oil embargoes should the United States take initiatives to help Israel.

When the fighting began, both Moscow and Washington stayed out and the war was contained.

If they can now keep the cold war out of the struggle for settlement, perhaps now—once and for all—the peace can be obtained.

The great powers should now propose that the sovereign states of the Near East—Israel and the Arab states—work together to write the terms of their future cooperation and peace, free from cold war pressures. This is not the time for great power intervention for great power advantage.

Nor can the UN, always frustrated by the Soviet veto, play an effective role. The Near East should not be regarded as a permanent ward of international trusteeship. Instead of bringing the parties together for a final peace settlement, the UN machinery has served to perpetuate an intolerable and indefensible stalemate in which one side has been allowed—illegally and immorally—to remain indefinitely in a state of war.

The crushing Arab defeat has changed the map of the Near East. It has altered the balance of power and opinion. It has created a power vacuum, which should be filled by the peoples who live there—not by outsiders.

LESSONS FROM THE PAST

The great powers should now burn discredited and obsolete position papers.

The West has learned that the Arab leadership meant to carry out its frenetic threats. Washington can no longer delude itself into believing that "the words are substitutes for deeds." The words have proved to be lethal—against those who screamed them. Appeasement has not paid. No matter how hard Washington has worked to reassure the Arab states of American friendship, the United States is bitterly denounced as Enemy Number One.

Ironically, this U.S. decision to refrain from unilateral action to support Israel turned out to be a disaster for Nasser and his allies. If the United States and other powers had joined Israel in a move to break the blockade, the war might have been averted and the Arabs might have been spared their suicidal adventure.

It should never be forgotten that in 1956 we might have brought about a peace settlement if we had insisted on direct negotiations—if we had challenged the Arab aggression against Israel and if we had not taken the one-sided position that Israel had to withdraw forthwith without the blessings of a permanent peace settlement.

THE BIG LIE

Yet however scrupulously the United States avoided intervention, however ardently and vigorously the United States may have worked to preserve relations with the Arab world, our country has been the victim of the Big Lie. Facing disastrous defeat, President Nasser and King Hussein conspired to accuse Britain and the United States of providing air cover to assist Israel.

Did the Arab leaders hurl this reckless lie to provide an alibi for defeat?

Was it a desperate stratagem to force the Soviet Union to enter the war on the Arab side and precipitate World War III?

Whatever its purpose, the effect has been to inflame Arab peoples against America and to rupture U.S.-Arab diplomatic relations in six capitals. It has also injured the Soviet's position, for Arabs now believe that the Soviet Union let them down at the very moment when the West was allegedly moving against them.

Moscow's bellicose Arab proteges have been exposed as paper camels. Russia has lost a vast investment in arms, economic aid and political support.

NO CONFRONTATION

At a critical time, Washington was unable to carry out its commitment to support Israel's right to use the Gulf of Aqaba for her shipping. The Arab attack came before President Johnson's promised declaration could be signed by the maritime powers and before a way could be found to give effect to that declaration.

Later—when war came—the President worked to prevent the dreaded great power confrontation. There was an exchange of hot line messages—the first time the hot line was used—between President Johnson and Premier Kosygin.

Thus, neither the Soviet Union nor the United States emerges with any credit in the Arab world. This explains the Soviet Union's cynical bid for Arab favor, the severance of relations with Israel, and the brutal and vicious attacks in the Security Council. As in 1956, the Soviet Union has been trying to bully Israel into retreating and surrendering the territory she gained in the fighting.

Unwilling to repeat the tragic blunder of the past and eager to push forward toward a peace settlement, the United States thus far has refused to enter into a partnership with the Russians in an anti-Israel offensive which would rehabilitate Moscow's shattered clients.

UNDAID VICTORY

Israel had to act alone to defend herself from Arab attack. She has paid a huge price. Newspaper headlines report that the casualties were "slight" (679 dead and 2,563 wounded). But that is a high proportion of a total population of 2,650,000. We Americans would not consider our losses slight if we lost a similar percentage of our population—if we had suffered 51,000 deaths and more than 192,000 wounded (slightly less than American casualties in World War I).

[We do not know the extent of Arab casualties. But preliminary reports put them much higher than Israel's. Arabs have paid for Nasser's holy war.]

It is not surprising that the Israel government has announced that it will not return to the UN armistice lines which offered no defense against Arab snipers and terrorists in the past. It will insist on direct Arab-Israel talks to achieve frontiers that ensure life for its people.

Problems like the resettlement of Arab refugees, boundaries, the future of Jerusalem and the Holy Places—all these issues can be resolved within the context of direct negotiations.

NEW U.S. STAND

Significantly, the U.S. resolution introduced at the UN contained no references to ineffective pacts and agencies of the past. The United States called for "the establishment of a stable and durable peace in the Middle East." Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg said that U.S. policy aimed "to provide for movement toward the final settlement of all outstanding questions between the parties which the U.N. envisaged nearly 20 years ago."

That resolution happens to be a milestone. It is the first time that the United States has called for peace in the Near East in many years. For a long time U.S. diplomats took the line that it was "unrealistic" and "counter-productive" to urge negotiations. Back in 1961, in a deplorable lapse from principle, the U.S. delegation voted against a UN resolution calling for direct negotiations.

THE WEST IS STRENGTHENED

It is now widely recognized that the defeat of Nasser and the Syrian military junta has strengthened the position of the West. The Soviet Union has suffered a setback and the West has gained. Nasser menaced Israel. Nasser damned and vilified the United States. He threatened every Western interest in the Arabian Peninsula, the Persian Gulf and the East Coast of Africa.

Now Nasser's threat has been blunted and

A 3210

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 22, 1967

no American diplomat could justify pressure to roll back Israel, for this would mean rolling Nasser forward to a vantage point from which he could renew his war against the West.

There is no longer any valid reason to withhold full support from an Israel which has changed the balance of power in the Near East and which has encouraged and strengthened every regime willing to resist Soviet pressures.

Israel's victory is more than a military triumph. Indeed, Israel's victory may suggest to other nations that the democratic system promises freedom and survival. Soldiers fight best when they have a stake in the society they seek to defend.

CALENDAR

Monday, May 29: Washington sought the support of maritime nations to end President Nasser's blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba and appealed to Egypt in the UN. But the Soviet Union refused to cooperate.

Nasser announced assurances from Premier Kosygin "that the Soviet Union stands with us in this battle and will not allow any country to interfere." He said his aim was "to restore the pre-1948 state of affairs." And Syria's President Nureddin Attassi flew to Moscow.

Tuesday, May 30: The Soviet Union rejected a French proposal for a Big Four conference and moved ten warships to reinforce her Mediterranean fleet.

King Hussein flew to Cairo, embraced Nasser and signed a military alliance which put Jordan's 55,000-man army (and its American weapons) under Egyptian command—a blow to U.S. policy. Once again, as in 1956, Israel was encircled, facing the threat of a four-front war.

Patrick Seale commented in the *London Observer* that Nasser "has raised his sights from the Gulf of Aqaba and now thinks of settling the whole Palestine problem once and for all by force."

Wednesday, May 31: Iraq sent troops to Egypt and Jordan. Yemen, Kuwait, Morocco and Algeria promised the same.

Thursday, June 1: The Administration sought signatures of maritime nations to a declaration on the freedom of navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba.

Following criticism of his "procrastination," Premier Levi Eshkol broadened his coalition and named Moshe Dayan Defense Minister. Columnist Joseph Alsop recalled the return of Churchill in 1939.

PLO Chairman Ahmed Shukairy, now reconciled with Hussein, told reporters in Amman that he expected war, that Jordan might start it and that the Arab would win. "The Jews in Palestine will have to leave," he said. "Any of the old Palestinian Jewish population who survive may stay, but it is my impression that none of them will survive."

Friday, June 2: Foreign Minister Mahmoud Riad said that Egypt would close the Suez Canal to any country which tried to break the Aqaba blockade.

Nasser refused to meet Charles Yost, a special U.S. emissary sent to Cairo.

British Premier Harold Wilson came to confer with President Johnson. There were only "one or two days left to solve a tense situation," Wilson said.

Diplomatic efforts to lift the blockade were deadlocked.

Saturday, June 3: Dayan told newsmen that he "wouldn't like American or British boys getting killed here in order to secure our safety."

Sunday, June 4: Iraq joined the Egyptian-Jordanian defense pact, while Egyptian officers and artillery were airlifted to Jordan.

The concentration of Arab forces on Israel's frontiers became a greater threat than the blockade itself.

Monday, June 5: The war began. Egypt moved armored columns north of Ellat to slice the Negev in two and to link up with Jordan's forces. Simultaneously, there was shelling of villages from the Gaza strip. Israel repulsed the attack and swiftly moved to bomb major Arab airports, eluding radar defenses by flying low from the Mediterranean. Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq and Sudan declared war.

Egypt accused Israel of starting it and claimed to have "wiped out" huge Israel forces in Sinai.

Eshkol notified Arab governments that Israel would not touch any other state, "as long as it does not wage war against us," and sent a personal note to Hussein urging him to keep out. But Jordan attacked Jerusalem with heavy arms, and the New City was shelled for 36 hours. More than 1,000 buildings were hit.

Eban said that Israel's war aims were "to frustrate the attempt of the Arab armies to capture our land, to break their wall of encirclement."

Nasser announced that the Arab objective was the "liquidation of the shadow of Zionism from Palestine."

Washington called for a cease-fire.

A State Department spokesman said that the United States was "neutral in thought, word and deed." Secretary of State Dean Rusk softened the statement by calling the U.S. position "non-belligerence."

Britain announced that she would not take sides.

Moscow condemned "Israel aggression."

At the UN, the Soviet Union and Egypt rejected a call for unconditional cease-fire, insisting that it include a demand for a withdrawal of Israel forces.

Tuesday, June 6: Israel forces took the Old City, reached half-way across Sinai and repelled a Syrian attack on Tel Dan. Israel announced destruction of 389 Arab planes in the first 48 hours of the fighting. Israel lost 19.

Egypt hurled the Big Lie, charging U.S.-British air cover for Israel.

Israel forces intercepted and taped the conversation during which Hussein and Nasser agreed to launch this allegation.

Arab mobs sacked and burned several U.S. and British missions. Egypt ordered U.S. citizens to leave immediately.

Egypt severed diplomatic relations with the United States and Britain; so did Syria, Algeria, Iraq, Sudan and Yemen.

At the UN, Soviet Ambassador Nikolai Fedorenko agreed to a call for a cease-fire, giving up the demand for an Israel rollback. The Council was unanimous. Israel accepted but the Arab states were silent.

"Our neighbors would wish to turn the clock back to 1947," said Eban in an historic UN address. "The fact is that most clocks work forward, and not backward . . ." And, he added, "the clock of the Middle East should move not backward to belligerency but forward to peace."

India's shrill anti-Israel stand at the UN surprised observers. Premier Indira Gandhi charged that U.S. resentment of India's position was responsible for withholding some aid shipments.

Wednesday, June 7: Israel completed occupation of Sinai including Sharm el Sheikh, reached the Suez Canal and captured the West Bank of Jordan. Israelis prayed at the Walling Wall for the first time since 1948 and Dayan told his troops that Jerusalem will not be relinquished.

A new unanimous UN resolution called for immediate cease-fire. Israel again accepted and by evening Jordan concurred. Egypt and Iraq rejected the appeal.

President Johnson pledged efforts to transform the new Near East situation into a lasting Arab-Israeli settlement. He an-

nounced the formation of a special task force headed by McGeorge Bundy to draft a Near East peace plan.

Communist China called on Arabs to continue fighting and accused Soviet leaders of stabbing Arabs in the back.

Thursday, June 8: Egypt accepted the cease-fire but Syria fought on.

Israel jets and torpedo boats mistakenly attacked a U.S. Navy communications ship using electronic equipment, which was 12 miles north of El Arish on the Mediterranean coast of the Sinai Peninsula. Israel apologized for a tragic blunder in which nine sailors were killed and 15 wounded, with 24 listed as missing.

Later Israel officials were amazed by an absurd report published in *Newsweek* which suggested that someone in Washington held "a top-level theory that Israel armed forces ordered the *Liberty* sunk." Israelis pointed out that Israel ships offered help as soon as Israelis realized their mistake. And they recalled that they were the first to flash word of the error to the United States government.

Friday, June 9: Nasser resigned and accepted responsibility for Egypt's "grave setback." He said that "the peoples of the entire Arab nation . . . struck an attitude of manhood and dignity" in fighting "magnificent and honorable battles," but he omitted Saudi Arabia from the list of the countries he praised.

In Cairo, thousands roamed the streets screaming for Nasser's reinstatement. They attacked the Russian embassy. Apart from an unsuccessful attempt of Egyptian forces to break out from Sinai, the cease-fire was observed by Egypt. There was only sniper fire on the Jordanian front. Jordan reported her casualties as 15,000.

Algerian mobs denounced the cease-fire and demanded arms to fight Israel.

Syrians kept shelling 13 Galilee settlements. Israel air force, armored and infantry units knifed into Syria, capturing the Hagan range, silencing the batteries and reaching Quneitra, 35 miles from Damascus.

Saturday, June 10: Nasser agreed to yield to "the people's will," after the one-party General Assembly voted to reject his resignation. Most diplomats believe that Nasser was maneuvering to stay in power.

Israel declared victory over Syria. After 30 hours of fighting the UN cease-fire went into effect.

Israel announced she would not return to the 1949 armistice lines.

The Soviet Union severed diplomatic relations with Israel. So did Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria. Rumania declined to sign a six-nation Communist statement which branded Israel as the aggressor.

Washington declared an oil emergency and told the U.S. oil industry to deal with the shutdown of Arab pipelines—a blow to Arab economies, but only a discomfort to the West.

Fedorenko, seconded by his Bulgarian and Syrian colleagues, launched a vociferous campaign for an immediate Israel withdrawal.

Sunday, June 11: Nasser replaced 11 top army commanders. Marshal Ainer, who had resigned with Nasser, was not asked to reconsider.

Algerian President Houari Boumedienne flew to Moscow to ask the Kremlin for arms for the Arabs and to adopt a tougher line against Israel.

Public opinion polls show that the great majority of Americans sympathize with Israel and not with the Arab states, although most Americans want to see the United States remain out of the conflict.

Monday, June 12: Eshkol suggested direct negotiations which Arab envoys at the U.N. rejected.

A3180

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 22, 1967

Some of the facts of growth in the federal establishment speak for themselves. First of all, the national debt presently carries a \$14 billion annual interest charge—10 cents out of every tax dollar. A \$300 billion budget is in prospect for 1980. New government welfare programs multiply, increasing from 239 in 1966 to about 450 in 1968. A great many of these have been started on a shoestring with unlimited potential for increased spending requirements. Forty-two million people now receive regular checks from the federal government, and this number is destined to grow every year. Since last year, spending authority in the fields of health, labor and welfare has risen nearly 28 per cent. The Secretary of the Treasury has requested a \$29 billion increase in the national debt ceiling. In the past, the debt ceiling has been raised on a "temporary" basis. This fiction is being dropped in the current request for a "permanent" debt ceiling of \$365 billion—up from the "permanent" ceiling now set at \$285 billion.

One of the fundamental myths arising out of the depression years that any problem can be solved by spending enough federal money seems still to be with us. Prolonged prosperity, with little painful inflation until recently has unquestionably dulled critical public appraisal. Various levels of government now purchase 30 per cent of the goods and services produced in the nation and the penalties of centralization are beginning to show up in the form of bureaucratic red tape, waste and duplication.

Some see a stirring of concern at the grass-roots level and among intellectuals and administrators in government itself. There is evidence of a growing recognition that many problems to be solved or dealt with most effectively, must be handled at the state and local level. There is much to suggest that the American political system may be entering a decisive period when the ability of central government to handle an ever-increasing share of the peoples' affairs and responsibilities in a country as large and diverse as this is to be questioned. In all this, it should not be forgotten that Congress possesses the power to control money appropriations which determine the size of government—and, in the final analysis, the people still control the Congress.

file

Situation in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter recently written to the President by Dr. Karl Applbaum, of Flushing, Queens County, N.Y., giving his reactions to the situation in the Middle East, and his suggestions for action by the United States.

Dr. Applbaum, a Rabbi for the past 30 years, is also a lawyer practicing in New York State and Federal courts, and a lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Army Reserve. He was an Army chaplain during his active military service in World War II, and has served as a chaplain with various units of the Jewish War Veterans, the American Legion, and the Reserve Officers Association.

He was Queens County chaplain of the Legion in 1961-62, and has been Queens J.W.V. Chaplain since then. In

1965-66 he served as national chaplain of the ROA, and in 1948-49, he was State chaplain of the VFW.

Dr. Applbaum holds two bachelor's degrees, two master's degrees, two academic doctorates, two honorary doctorates, and a third honorary doctorate is pending.

In a busy spiritual and professional career, he has found what seems to be unlimited time for all manner of good community, philanthropic, social welfare, and fraternal services.

I offer his letter for the attention of this House as being the reaction of a highly educated, dedicated leader in many fields of National, State, and local endeavor.

JUNE 8, 1967.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President, United States of America, White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: "These are the times which try men's souls." I know that the affairs of State weigh heavily upon your shoulders. My prayers include you and members of your family. May the Giver of Life bless you with health, long life and strength. May He endow you with the wisdom of a Solomon, the faith of Job and the strength of Samson to bear well the difficult affairs of the world which must weigh heavily upon your shoulders.

I write to you at this time as a leader of American Jewry, as a Rabbi who has served this beloved country in War and Peace, and as one to whom the American way of life is dear and meaningful.

I am respectfully asking that you review the whole attitude of our country towards the whole world and more particularly as it relates to the State of Israel. No country in the world has shown its love and respect for the American way of life and has been as devoted to our country as has the little State of Israel—small in size but large in stature. The State of Israel has been standing as a bastion of Democracy practicing the principles of life as enunciated by our Declaration of Independence, as taught by American History, and as set down by the Founding Fathers of our country.

In observing the proceedings of the United Nations it is easy to see the difference in caliber between the representatives of the State of Israel and the Arab. The presence of the Arabs in this country is a disgrace; dangerous and insulting. Their treading on American soil desecrates the ground for which thousands of American men and women have given their lives on the far flung battlefields of the world.

Mr. President I propose to you the following steps:

1. Recognition of the fact that the Arabs are the aggressors.
2. Recognition of the right of Israel to exist and to retain whatever new lands they acquire.
3. Complete discontinuance of any help to the Arabs as long as they maintain ties with the communists.
4. No help to the Arabs as long as 5% of the leaders are billionaires and 95% poverty stricken.
5. Internationalization of the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba.
6. Expulsion from this country of Fedorenko and his communist cohorts. They have used the United Nations as a base for spy operations and as a platform for spreading venom. Thank God that the American people realize this and ignore them. However, they are dangerous.
7. Trial of Nasser as a war criminal.
8. Help to rebuild the economy of Israel which has been practically destroyed by the ignorant Arabs.

9. Continued help to the people of the State of Israel.

10. Break off diplomatic relations with the Russians and Arab countries.

With kindest personal regards to you and the family,

Yours in the Service of God and Country,

Rabbi DR. KARL APPLBAUM,
Chaplain (LTC) USAR.

Partners of the Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, the Partners of the Alliance, consisting of 32 U.S. States and 31 Latin American counterparts, is an outstanding program of international understanding with concrete results. Michigan is fortunate to have developed under the leadership of Gov. George Romney and former Congressman Alvin M. Bentley, a flourishing partnership with British Honduras. The following success story, written by Mr. Bentley, deserves the attention of every Member of Congress. Mr. Bentley's article appeared in Michigan Challenge, the official publication of the Michigan State Chamber of Commerce.

The article follows:

PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE

Although the United States sends large sums of financial and technical assistance to the independent Latin American Republics each year through the Agency for International Development, a new concept has been born under the Alliance for Progress of the U.S. Department of State—the concept of direct assistance or, put more succinctly, private foreign aid.

Direct assistance, or private foreign aid, is the operating philosophy behind the partners of the Alliance programs which are currently functioning between 32 U.S. states and 31 Latin American counterparts. Rated as the foremost among these partnerships is the one between Michigan and British Honduras, soon to be the independent nation of Belize. And, it might be added, it is the only Latin American partner that does not receive AID funds or Technical Assistance.

The Michigan Partners of the Alliance was organized on February 24, 1966 at the invitation of Governor George Romney and under my chairmanship. The governor had called the organizational meeting after receiving a letter from Premier George Price of British Honduras expressing his country's interest in a partnership with Michigan.

Although privately incorporated in the State of Michigan, the organization operates in conjunction with the Partners of the Alliance Program under the auspices of the Alliance for Progress, Agency for International Development, U.S. Department of State.

British Honduras is located on the east coast of Central America facing the Caribbean Sea and bounded on the north and west by Mexico and on the south and west by Guatemala. The total land area is 8,866 square miles including a number of picturesque cays which lie off the coast and are protected by the world's second largest barrier reef.

With a population of slightly over 110,000, British Honduras boasts a 90 per cent lit-

June 22, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 3179

Tour: Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda; Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: Gilbert Stuart; Guest Speaker, James Thomas Flexner, author, Lecture Hall 4.

MONDAY, JULY 3, THROUGH SUNDAY, JULY 9

Painting of the week: Puvis de Chavannes. The Prodigal Son (Chester Dale Collection), Gallery 93; Wednesday through Saturday 12 and 3; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: The Exhibition of Gilbert Stuart, Portraitist of the Young Republic. Central Lobby, Wednesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda; Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Tuesday (Independence Day), 1; Sunday, 5.

Sunday film lecture: Thomas Jefferson and Early American Architecture. Speaker: John Brooks, Staff Lecturer, National Gallery of Art, Lecture Hall 4.

MONDAY, JULY 10, THROUGH SUNDAY, JULY 16

Painting of the week: Master of Flémalle and Assistants. *Madonna and Child with Saints in the Enclosed Garden* (Samuel H. Kress Collection), Gallery 35; Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour: Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda, Monday 11 and 3; Tuesday through Saturday, 11, 1, and 3; Sunday, 2:30 and 5.

Sunday film lecture: *The Impressionists*, Speaker: Carleen Keating, Staff Lecturer, National Gallery of Art, Lecture Hall, 4.

MONDAY, JULY 17, THROUGH SUNDAY, JULY 23

Painting of the week: Juan van der Hamen y Leon. *Still Life* (Samuel H. Kress Collection), Gallery 49; Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour: Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda, Monday 11 and 3; Tuesday through Saturday, 11, 1 and 3; Sunday, 2:30 and 5.

Sunday film: *The Art of the Conservator*, Lecture Hall 4.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office or telephoned to 737-4215, Ext. 272.

MONDAY, JULY 24, THROUGH SUNDAY, JULY 30

Painting of the week: Morisot. *The Mother and Sister of the Artist* (Chester Dale Collection), Gallery 89; Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour: Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda, Monday 11 and 3; Tuesday through Saturday, 11, 1 and 3; Sunday, 2:30 and 5.

Sunday film lecture: *Art in Exhibition*, Speaker: Ann Watson, Staff Lecturer, National Gallery of Art, Lecture Hall, 4.

The End of UNEF

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to put in the RECORD the following report from the Independent Observer, which is published and edited by Mr. and Mrs. Edward W. McVitty. I believe this report is a significant analysis of the results of the United Nations Secretary General's actions on the 18th of May:

THE END OF UNEF

At noon on the 18th of May 1967, the United Nations Secretary General was informed that the Government of the United

Arab Republic had "decided to terminate the presence of the United Nations Emergency Force in the territory of the United Arab Republic and Gaza Strip." On the evening of that same day, U Thant cabled the UN Commander in the field to withdraw UNEF.

The day before formal notice was received from the U.A.R., the Secretary General had held "an exchange of views" with representatives of governments having contingents in the Emergency Force. U.A.R. armed forces had already sought to remove UN personnel from their posts along the Armistice Demarcation Line. There seems to be little doubt that the usefulness of UNEF, if not the actual security of its men, was jeopardized by the advance of the United Arab Republic's Army.

The views that may have been expressed in the informal consultation on May 17th have not been disclosed, but U Thant did not refer the matter to the UN General Assembly or to the Security Council. Instead, he took executive action to withdraw the Force as soon as the U.A.R. made its demand.

In his Reports to the General Assembly and Security Council the Secretary General stated that the reasons for the U.A.R. decision "have not been officially stated." U Thant explained his own action by saying it seemed "fully clear" to him that "since United Arab Republic consent was withdrawn it was incumbent on the Secretary General to give orders for the withdrawal of the Force."

"The consent of the host country is a basic principle which has applied to all United Nations peace-keeping operations," he said.

The principle of consent is certainly one of the features that distinguish peace-keeping operations from UN military enforcement action. Host country consent is essential to the deployment of a UN Peace Force. There is, however, a question as to what happens thereafter with respect to maintenance of the Force in the territory for the fulfillment of its agreed purpose. It does not seem to have been intended that "instant" withdrawal of consent would be matched by "instant" withdrawal of UNEF.

When the U.A.R. consented to the deployment of UNEF, that Government and the UN Secretary General signed "good-faith" declarations. The host Government pledged itself, "when exercising its sovereign rights on any matter concerning the presence and functioning of UNEF," to be "guided in good faith by its acceptance" of the General Assembly resolution outlining the purposes and role of the Force. The Secretary General, on behalf of the UN, declared "that the activities of UNEF will be guided in good faith by the task established for the Force."

In 1958, Dag Hammarskjöld, in a report on UN peace-keeping experience, discussed the meaning of these "good-faith" declarations to which he had been a party. According to Hammarskjöld,

"The consequence of such a bilateral declaration is that, were either side to act unilaterally in refusing continued presence or deciding on withdrawal, and were the other side to find that such action was contrary to a good-faith interpretation of the purposes of the operation, an exchange of views would be called for towards harmonizing the positions."

The niceties of such "good-faith" agreements may have little relevance now that UNEF is out, and the Arabs and Israelis are again at each others' throats. The pity is that the Secretary General did not thus seek to gain a little time for "an exchange of views" in Cairo before, rather than after, the withdrawal of UNEF. The situation may have seemed hopeless, but the UN has saved other well-nigh hopeless situations by keeping its own foot in the door for a few days.

The pity is that Israel has not seized the opportunity to invite UNEF onto its side of the Demarcation Line. A more constructive and popular move could hardly be conceived

for that Government in present circumstances.

The pity is, that precedents set by the United Nations tend to be invoked on all similar occasions. UN peace-keeping capabilities were weak enough before the United Arab Republic demonstrated that the Organization would not challenge the breach of a good-faith agreement with respect to a UN Force.

Editorial Voices Concern of Many

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress and thousands of interested citizens are increasingly concerned with the alarming growth of the Federal Government and the resulting erosion of personal freedoms with this advent of bureaucratic control. At this time, there are approximately 400 grants-in-aid programs administered by no less than 21 different Federal agencies and 150 Federal bureaus. Perhaps this is the reason that Arnold Toynbee, noted British historian, said the United States now is encumbered with a semi-socialistic form of government.

Herein lies a very real and grave danger to the existence of this Nation as a democracy under a republican form of government. I commend to our membership an excellent editorial, written by Mr. Philip Foster, publisher of Foster's Daily Democrat in Dover, N.H. What he says makes good sense and the following editorial entitled "Growth of Federal Government" represents the convictions of many of us:

GROWTH OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The rapid growth of the federal government in the past decade continues at an accelerating pace and represents a condition of deep importance to every person making the United States his home. Many people fear that if the present trend continues historians of the future will record that the people of the United States and their elected representatives gradually lost the power to control their government, and as the bureaucracy expanded, the people also lost their freedom. But, no one can predict what the reaction of some 200 million people will be to developments now taking shape. Up to this point, evidence suggests one of three things—either the people have not been paying too much attention, they are confused by events, or they approve of the trend.

Ten years ago, when President Eisenhower proposed his 1958 administrative budget of \$71.8 billion, the public reaction was definite.irate taxpayers demanded reductions in the budget in a flood of letters to congressmen. The officials of government, including the President, the Democratic majority in Congress, and the Secretary of the Treasury condemned the upward trend of federal spending and joined in calling for substantial cuts. When Congress adjourned that year, it had succeeded in cutting the proposed budget by almost \$5 billion. Since 1960, the population of the United States has grown by 10 per cent, but the civilian bureaucracy of the federal government has increased by 25 per cent and administration requests for \$44 billion of new spending authority in fiscal 1968 have hardly caused a ripple of public concern.

June 22, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 7889

an opponent wide open, as if inviting a liver massage. After getting what he wants, he switches to the Irish attack, better known as "the back of me fist to you!" next, he tries "The Shoemaker's Revenge," or (giving it the heel.)"

His previews of the annual St. Patrick's Day parade up Fifth Ave. are part of the literature of journalism. His poetry was spell-binding. He composed an ode to the first Jewish bronco buster ever employed by the Garden's rodeo, which began:

*"I'm an old cowhand
From the Concourse Grand."
What a wonderful talent Dan.*

file
FIFTY CLERGYMEN SUPPORT ISRAEL

(Mr. BARING (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, on the 9th of June 1967, 50 clergymen, representing Protestant, Jewish, Catholic, Greek Orthodox, and Mormon faiths, met and by unanimous agreement adopted a resolution on behalf of the State of Israel.

This resolution was presented at two mass meetings in Las Vegas attended by over 1,500 Jews and Christians, and received a standing ovation.

In an accompanying letter signed by Rabbi Aaron S. Gold, of Temple Beth Shalom, and three prominent Nevans, Mr. Hank Greenspun, Mr. Jack Entratter, and Mr. Al Benedict, the fervent hope was expressed that our Government will act with courage in supporting freedom and justice for the State of Israel.

Under unanimous consent, I insert this resolution in the Record at this point, and urge my colleagues here in the House to read it, and to bear in mind the courageous efforts Israel made to survive as a nation, which deserves our support and gratitude.

CLERGYMEN'S RESOLUTION ON BEHALF OF ISRAEL

At a meeting held on Friday afternoon, June 9, 1967, at Temple Beth Shalom, and attended by over 50 clergymen representing Roman Catholic, Mormon, Jewish, Protestant and Greek Orthodox faiths, it was moved and unanimously agreed upon to offer the following resolution on behalf of the State of Israel, to be presented to the proper agencies of the United States Government and the United Nations:

1. We, as clergymen, cannot be neutral where an issue of freedom and justice is involved. We, therefore, raise our voices to state unequivocally that we believe the cause of Israel is just and right.

2. We favor direct peace negotiations and not an armistice between Israel and her Arab neighboring states, and that these negotiations are to be based on the fact that Israel is a sovereign state, meeting with Arab sovereign states, all participants having full rights and responsibilities in the international community. We further favor a permanent peace settlement as an outgrowth of these negotiations.

3. We favor that the old city of Jerusalem remain under the sovereign jurisdiction of Israel, thus insuring free access to all faiths, at all times, to the holy places located there.

4. We are in favor of Israel's borders becoming viable and defensible.

5. We hold that the following water ways should be international waterways: The Med-

iterranean Sea, The Suez Canal, The Gulf of Aqaba and the Straits of Tiran, and we favor free and unmolested passage through them to all nations, including Israel.

Signed by the Resolution Committee:

Father James Adams, St. John's Greek Orthodox Church; Reverend Marlon Bennett, Zion Methodist Church; Dr. Aaron S. Gold, Rabbi, Temple Beth Shalom; Reverend Douglas Harrell, First Methodist Church and President, Clark County Ministerial Association; Reverend Joseph Kohn, Cantor, Temple Beth Shalom; Father Tally H. Jarrett, Christ Episcopal Church; Father Patrick Toomey, St. Viator's Catholic Church; Mr. Reed Whipple, President, Stake of Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.

In line with the views expressed in this resolution I had already on the 20th of June joined several of my colleagues in introducing a resolution urging the President to work for five objectives in achieving peace in the Middle East.

This resolution calls upon the President to oppose preconditions for negotiations that would require "the relinquishment of Israel of territories possessed" at the time of the cease-fire.

The five objectives to which I urge the President to address himself, using all diplomatic resources and the United Nations are:

First, Arab acknowledge of Israel's existence and sovereignty.

Second, freedom of passage for all nations, including Israel, in the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba.

Third, final settlement and acknowledgment of Israel's boundaries by the Arab States.

Fourth, effective restrictions on the flow of arms into the Middle East.

Fifth, resolution of the refugee problem in the Middle East.

I urge the President to oppose preconditions to negotiations requiring Israeli withdrawal from territory held to avoid repeating the mistakes of 1956 which led to a resumption of hostilities 11 years later.

By United Nations declaration Israel legally deserves the status and rights of a sovereign nation and the territorial integrity which such status entails.

(Mr. YOUNG (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

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

PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE PROGRAM

(Mr. PURCELL (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest efforts of the Federal Government is the Partners of the Alliance program. This vital part of the Alliance for Progress depends primarily on the efforts of private citizens to build important links between citizens of the United States and citizens of countries in Latin America.

Mr. James H. Boren, an outstanding

Texan and Director of the Partners of the Alliance program spoke on the subject of the Partners program at a convention of the American Advertising Federation in Houston, Tex., on June 12. I commend the attention of my colleagues to his remarks at that time:

REMARKS OF JAMES H. BOREN, DIRECTOR OF THE PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE PROGRAMS, AGENCY FOR THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION, EASTERN AND CENTRAL REGION OF THE AMERICAN ADVERTISING FEDERATION, SHAMROCK HILTON HOTEL, HOUSTON, TEX., JUNE 12, 1967

Last year, the Government of Brazil honored the Partners of the Alliance which is a private sector element of the Alliance for Progress by issuing a Partners of the Alliance postage stamp. This particular stamp gave recognition to citizen level participation in the Alliance for Progress and it was the stimulus for the establishment of the first philatelic museum in Brazil. Another significant first is attached to this Partners of the Alliance stamp because Astronauts Thomas P. Stafford and Eugene Cernan carried a block of the stamps with them in the historic flight of Gemini IX on June 3, 1966. Those stamps were the first to orbit the earth. On the occasion of the Second Inter-American Conference, held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in which over 250 delegates from 15 nations participated, a letter bearing one of the orbited stamps and the signatures of Astronauts Stafford and Cernan was presented to Ambassador Pío Correa, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs in Brazil.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs issued a bronze medallion which bore a replica of the stamp on one side and on the reverse bore the statement honoring the Partners of the Alliance. Two additional medallions were specially struck for presentation to Astronauts Stafford and Cernan. At this time it is my honor to present to you the distinguished Consul General of Brazil, Minister Francisco Eulalio Nascimento e Silva.

PRESENTATION OF MEDALLIONS BY THE CONSUL GENERAL TO ASTRONAUTS STAFFORD AND CERNAN

Colonel Stafford serves as a member of the Board of Directors of the Texas Partners of the Alliance and as an advisor to the Oklahoma Partners of the Alliance. In recognition of the contribution which Astronauts Stafford and Cernan have made to the Alliance for Progress through the Partners program, it is my pleasure, in behalf of the Agency for International Development, to present to them this Partners of the Alliance Certificate of Appreciation "in recognition of leadership and significant contribution toward the attainment of the goals of the Alliance for Progress."

PRESENTATION OF CERTIFICATE

These gentlemen have done what men have dreamed about for centuries. They have flown through space as great explorers of the universe. Few men have the great skill, the raw courage, the physical and mental stamina and the driving motivation which combine to give them the opportunity to play a pioneering role in space exploration.

But there are other opportunities and other pioneering roles which are open to every American and it is of this that I wish to think together with you for the next five minutes.

My business is the business of selling opportunity—opportunity for every organization and private citizen in the three Americas to play a constructive role in the great revolution of development that is called the Alliance for Progress.

The Alliance for Progress is often considered to be a United States government program, but the U.S. government is only one Partner in the enterprise. The Alliance for Progress is an umbrella term for the total effort in Latin America through which free

H 7890

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 22, 1967

governments and free peoples are working in an economic and social development program which will move them into the sunlight of genuine progress.

A successful development program in Latin America require that governments work with governments in providing the environment, the incentives, and the means of building infrastructure and democratic institutions. Government-to-government programs are key elements in the building of roads, airports and seaports.

Governments are also important in the building of savings and loan institutions, private development banks, agricultural extension services, industrial promotion boards, practical programs of manpower development, educational institutions—in short, the building of Latin American institutions to resolve Latin American problems.

But governments alone cannot do the job. If the Alliance is to be successful, it must have the major involvement of the private sector . . . not only in terms of investments, but also in terms of citizen involvement in development at the community level. This is the task and the challenge of the Partners of the Alliance, and, indeed, this is the challenge which you have already accepted through the outstanding Amigo Program. Walter Guild and Charles Collier in the best tradition of your profession, developed the idea and then put it into operation.

Today, the private citizens of 32 states in the United States are working through statewide Partners of the Alliance committees in a direct alliance with the peoples of 32 areas in 14 countries of Latin America. They are working in the fields of education, agriculture, public health, cultural affairs and business and industry.

Educational activities include scholarships, teacher and student exchanges, teacher training conferences. High school student bodies in the United States are providing the funds for the materials to put the roof, doors and windows on a school built by the self-help efforts of villagers in the Andes and in the lowlands of the Amazon Basin.

Agricultural activities include assistance with farm equipment, volunteer teams of agricultural specialists to assist in the development of cooperative programs directed toward increasing the production of food. 4-H Club students in the United States work directly with 4-H students in Latin America on a wide variety of projects. Assistance is provided to rural campesino federations in self-help projects.

Teams of doctors have responded to requests from Latin American medical authorities to assist in training activities. Drugs and supplies have been provided to the mobile rural health program in Central America and volunteers have assisted in the drilling and equipping of wells for village water supplies.

In the business and industry field, businessmen of the Americas have been brought together to explore, not the general environment for investments, but specific joint venture investments which not only make sense from the standpoint of financial return, but which make a contribution to the development effort and create sources of employment.

But the Partners of the Alliance, as in any type of partnership, is not a one-way program. The people of Latin America have much to contribute to the United States from their great wealth of art, music, literature, and philosophy. Two weeks ago two young teachers of Spanish from Santa Cruz, Bolivia, returned to Bolivia after working with the school system in Little Rock, Arkansas, in a language improvement program. Next year 8 Bolivian teachers have been requested to assist Arkansas schools in elevating their Spanish instruction.

Three weeks ago a group of 12 ladies from a Latin American country completed a 4-week community development workshop sponsored by the Partners and the State League of Women Voters. They shared their working experiences in social action programs with their United States Partner. Collections of art and tours of performing artists have been made available to the United States Partners from Latin America.

The Partners of the Alliance is not an old clothes program nor is it one involving the collection of worn-out arithmetic books. It is a program through which the private community of the United States can work directly with the private community of Latin America on projects of mutual interest and of mutual concern.

Specific projects are not developed in my office in Washington but they are developed by representatives of the Partners committees.

Statewide Partners committees send program development teams to meet with counterpart Partners committees in Latin America. The United States teams visit the schools, hospitals, farms, businesses and unions during their program visit to their Latin American Partner area. During the last two days of the program development trip the participants identify those areas of activity through which they of the private sector will be able to assist through the involvement of their fellow citizens at home.

The Partners activity focuses upon the element of dignity and gives recognition to the principle that we, in the United States, can learn as well as teach and receive as well as assist.

The 32 state Partners organizations have formed the National Association of the Partners of the Alliance which is receiving outstanding leadership from its president, Edward Marcus of Dallas.

We are proud of the roll call of men and women of the three Americas who are answering the challenge of the Alliance for Progress through the Partners program. This includes such men as Edward Marcus, Astronauts Stafford and Cernan and Emory Williams, Chairman of the Illinois Partners of the Alliance and Vice President & Treasurer of Sears, Roebuck Company. Frank Prins, a manufacturer in Tennessee, who as Chairman of the Tennessee Partners arrives this morning in Manaus on the Amazon River as the head of a program development team. The roll call includes Robert Hansburger, President of Boise Cascade, and Sandy Morgan, a student leader. Dr. John Hannah, President of Michigan State University; Ed Smith, a California businessman and Dr. Glenn Dumke, Chancellor State College System of California; Edwin Brennan, a high school teacher in Wyoming; Marilyn Stafford, a teacher in Herndon, Virginia; Alvin Benley, business leader and philanthropist, of Michigan; Pearl Raupe, wife of a hog farm operator; Bill Suttle, President of the U.S. Jaycees; Al Acken, President of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce and Jimmy Jones of the U.S. Steelworkers in Pennsylvania.

High on the roll of business leaders who are working in the development spirit of the Alliance for Progress is the gentlemen I am privileged to present to you at this time, Mr. Harding Lawrence, President of Braniff International.

NEW THINKING FOR FOREIGN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

(Mr. REES (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)
Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, at times it would seem that our international obli-

gations and responsibilities are virtually limitless. Our commitments stretch from the Nile to the Mekong from the Amazon to the Ganges. No corner of the globe escapes our influence and no action is beyond our notice and concern.

In recent months, there has been an increasing murmur of resentment over our extensive international commitments. This neo-isolationism sometimes expresses itself in terms of the need to direct our energies and resources to the solution of domestic problems. At other times, and by other groups, it is expressed as a desire to remain disengaged from people whose mores and institutions are different from our own. In either context the impact of this approach would be the same. Its results would be disaster, constituting a return to medieval relationships between nations where we would sit in our castle in xenophobic solitude, moats filled and drawbridges raised.

While I believe that such a retreat from our present position in the world is unlikely, attempts to impose wanton reductions in our foreign economic aid programs threaten those programs and inhibit our ability to take necessary forward steps. The need for such new action is skillfully and compellingly expressed in a recent article by Harrison Brown in the Saturday Review of Literature of June 24, 1967, entitled "The Combustibility of Humans." An honored and able scholar, Mr. Brown warns us anew that we face world famine and and population crises if present programs are not improved. Waging war against poverty, disease, and ignorance is not only less expensive than its military counterpart, but if successfully accomplished, eliminates the major breeding ground for such military action. We are forewarned that the cost of such programs will be great, but that our failure to take such action will result in even greater costs.

I commend Mr. Brown's article to my colleagues and include it in the Record at this point and urge its careful inspection and consideration:

THE COMBUSTIBILITY OF HUMANS (By Harrison Brown)

The United States Government has now been in the business of providing technical and economic assistance to a number of the poorer nations of the world for about twenty years. It seems likely that had we not become involved with assistance programs, certain countries would be worse off economically than they actually are. And the Agency for International Development points with pride to Taiwan as an example of a country in which our efforts have been so successful that it is no longer necessary for us to continue them. Yet when we look at the plight of the poorer countries today we find that from certain points of view they are worse off today than they were twenty years ago. In particular during the last ten years the situation has been deteriorating at an alarming rate.

Although the economies of both the richer and poorer countries have grown at about the same rate during the past decade—about 4 per cent per year, the economic well-being of the average individual in the poorer countries has not improved very much. The reason for this is the relative rates of popu-

June 22, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 7873

itself "The Voice of Truth" is broadcasting daily propaganda tirades into Greece.

"It is an indisputable fact," he repeated, "that Communists in Greece were receiving direct orders daily from the Communist parties in eastern Europe."

Sharing borders with three Communist states and harboring centuries-old Balkan suspicions, Greece has been slow to join the Western trend toward coexistence and rapprochement with eastern Europe. Athens' governments had taken small steps in the last two years under prodding from Washington, but this movement has now been halted by the new government.

Does Kollas expect Greek Communists at home and in the neighboring satellite countries to turn now to guerrilla tactics and terrorism?

"It is completely out of the question," he said. "The army revolution has asserted itself so effectively throughout the country that any Communist uprising would be crushed."

"The revolution has gained the highest confidence from an overwhelming majority of the people. They know that it has saved them from political chaos and that it is dedicated to restoring stability so that all can prosper."

Kollas appeared at an armed forces display at Salonika and was greeted by more than 100,000 persons. It was in Salonika that George Papandreou was to speak on April 23.

Word that Communists planned major street disorders and a possible grab for local power touched off the revolution of the colonels—a startlingly swift, efficient maneuver based on a NATO contingency plan to deal with internal subversion.

After more than an hour in the huge, high-ceilinged office of the old royal palace, Kollas rose from behind his desk to end the interview.

"Do not take my word for all this," he said. "I could be giving you propaganda. Go out into Athens and into the country. Talk to the people. They will tell you that this revolution has saved Greece."

"We have no illusions about the Communist countries. They attack us every day. But it is important, very important, that our friends and allies understand that we are still dedicated to NATO, freedom and democracy."

Mr. Speaker, Members should be reminded of the fact that the State Department and the administration do not approve of the new Government in Greece but are merely maintaining formal but "cool relations," an interesting contrast to the frantic policy of building bridges to accommodate the Soviet Union.

STATEMENT ON MIDDLE EAST BY POLISH GOVERNMENT-IN-EXILE

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. BIESTER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Polish Government-in-exile, August Zeleski, has expressed the concern of his Cabinet over the Soviet involvement in the Middle East crisis. I deem it especially significant that the Polish Government-in-exile adopted a very practical statement at the height of the armed conflict in the Middle East. I insert the statement in the Record at this point:

STATEMENT OF THE POLISH GOVERNMENT [IN-EXILE] OF JUNE 6, 1967, ON THE POLISH NATION'S ATTITUDE TOWARD THE WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST

LONDON.—At a Cabinet meeting on 6th June 1967 presided over by Prime Minister Aleksander Zawisza, the Polish Government [in-exile] drew up the following statement in respect of the Polish nation's attitude towards the war in the Middle East:

"The Government of the Republic of Poland [in-exile] declare that the attitude towards the present armed conflicts in the Middle East by the so-called "Government of the Polish People's Republic"—actually an agency of imperialistic Communist Russia's occupation of Poland—is contrary to the sentiments of the Polish nation.

The representatives of the Warsaw regime, in their invariable parroting of Russia must also on this occasion support her attacks on the Israeli nation as also the imperialistic aim of Egypt—merely one of the elements in the totality of Russia's subversive plans. But the Polish nation, with its keen realization of the wrongs inflicted upon the weaker nations by the powers that be in this world, is particularly moved by this fresh attack on the Israeli nation and state, an attack long prepared and supported by Russia.

The Israeli people have during the last few decades recovered their age-old heritage neglected for the whole centuries past by intruders with an alien culture. They have transformed the land by the effort of mind and hands, in the sweat of their brow, into a built-up, developed and prosperous country which arouses the envy of their neighbours and evokes their chauvinism so skillfully directed and exploited by the destroyers of peace in the world—with Russia as the ringleader.

We observe and admire the courage of the Israeli people in the determined and devoted defence of their country. It inevitably reminds us of our own, still so recent fights, often shoulder to shoulder with representatives of this people, in the defence of our own native country—then our common motherland.

This brings on the thought and the desire to reciprocate towards the Israeli nation, to come to its aid in these difficult times. But we Poles in exile are at present powerless in the military sense whilst the Communist regime's authorities of occupation in Poland stifle every noble reaction of the Polish nation, now deprived of their liberty behind the Iron Curtain.

May our heartfelt thoughts and moral support be with you in the heroic efforts of your patriotic nation and may our voice calling for justice, also for the Israeli nation and state, reach the powers of this world still plunged in their egotism and blind to the future as they passively regard the organization of international crimes. Just as the Ribbentrop-Molotov conspiracy was aimed against Poland, so now the Kosygin-Nasser conspiracy is directed against Israel.

The western powers should remember that, whilst handing over Poland to imperialistic Communist Russia was the beginning of their difficulties with Russia and of growing international complications, the handing over of Israel to the Russo-Egyptian combine could mark the beginning of their decline and the undermining of our civilization.

It is sincerely to be hoped that those who slumber during the coming storm will awaken in time."

"SEND ME A BORE ROD AND A PAINT BRUSH"

(Mr. MCCLURE (at the request of Mr. BIESTER) was granted permission to ex-

tend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MCCLURE. Mr. Speaker, two worried parents in my district have sent me a letter they received from their son, a marine in Vietnam. He wrote them as follows:

Our M-16s aren't worth much. If there's dust in them, they will jam. Half of us don't have cleaning rods to unjam them. Out of 40 rounds I've fired, my rifle jammed about 10 times. I pack as many grenades as I can plus bayonet and K bar (jungle knife) so I'll have something to fight with. . . . If you can, please send me a bore rod and a 1 1/4-inch or so paint brush. I need it for my rifle. These rifles are getting a lot of guys killed because they jam so easily.

The parents now ask me: "What can I do, more than send a bore rod and a paint brush?"

The Pentagon assures us that the M-16 is a superior weapon to the M-14 because of its suitability to jungle warfare. They say that malfunctions are due to improper cleaning and lack of maintenance.

Evidently those using the rifles in Vietnam feel differently.

It is indeed a strange war. We are not being told the full story.

I think we have a right to know how effective these weapons really are.

I think we have a right to know if there is a shortage of cleaning rods.

I think we have a right to know what effect this is having on morale.

I think we have a right to know if a significant number of casualties are attributable to faulty equipment.

And then I wish someone would tell me how I can relieve the minds of the families of our fighting men when I harbor the same doubts as they do.

CONCESSIONS AND OUR POWER BALANCE

(Mr. MCCLURE (at the request of Mr. BIESTER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MCCLURE. Mr. Speaker, I am very alarmed at the regularity with which the Johnson administration allows our military and scientific superiority over the Russians to decline. In a world in which we are totally committed to out-producing, outmaneuvering, outarming, and, hopefully, outliving the Soviet system, we consistently betray ourselves.

In past weeks, Congress has given a good deal of attention to two of the methods we are using to defeat ourselves. Many Members of Congress have noted the economic concessions we offer the enemy in Vietnam by proposing to trade with the Communist bloc countries. We have also heard recently that the balance of power may indeed be thrown out of balance by the Soviet antiballistic-missile system. The Secretary of Defense finds that the only defense is an adequate offense.

But now I understand, Mr. Speaker, that this administration intends to offer still another concession to the enemy,

H7874

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 22, 1967

Incredibly, I find that the Atomic Energy Commission intends to invite the Soviet Union to use the 200-billion-electron-volt nuclear accelerator that will be built at Weston, Ill. Are we to understand that the Soviet Union's ever-increasing fund of scientific knowledge will be supplemented by the Atomic Energy Commission?

Mr. Speaker, the Soviets are pulling ahead of us in this field. Although the largest nuclear accelerator in existence today is the 33-billion-volt machine at Brookhaven, the Russians will open experimentation on their own 70 billion-electron-volt equipment at Serpukhov next year.

This will give them more than double our present ability to conduct sophisticated experiments in high energy fields and matter constitution. Since we would prefer not to have the Soviets move ahead of us in this field, we will build a still larger and more complex machine at Weston. With this in mind, I find it difficult to believe that we now plan to invite the Soviet scientists to take advantage of these facilities.

Although I am assured that our scientists at present cannot foresee any military applications which could be developed from the accelerator, I feel that our folly is obvious.

If we are to continue to subscribe to principles which are opposed to those of the Soviet Union, and if these principles are to be defended by superiority of knowledge and balance of power, then we must immediately stop granting aid to our enemies.

MORE MEDICAL SCHOOLS NEEDED

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

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, on June 1 of this year I called the attention of the House to the large number of foreign medical doctors practicing in the United States and pointed out the need for new medical schools so that the richest nation in the world could adequately supply its people with needed and qualified medical assistance. I am reminded today as we are asked to authorize an expenditure of \$4 billion for the space program how woefully short we are in appropriating and planning for the future health of our country. While I realize that dollars alone cannot build, staff and maintain medical schools, I am convinced that this Congress through its appropriate committee must begin immediately to require necessary planning and to appropriate necessary funds to protect future generations of Americans. Aside from the \$4 billion the committee recommends we authorize today for the space program, it is estimated that we are spending 10 times that sum to put a man on the moon and directing more billions to explore extraterrestrial space. Since World War II we have poured untold billions into foreign aid and are today spending an estimated \$2 billion per month to fight a war in Southeast Asia to protect the peoples of that area from

Communist aggression. If we can do all of this, I find it impossible to believe that we cannot spend whatever money is necessary to build and staff necessary medical schools to produce the additional physicians required to preserve the American standards of health. I have heard it said that the most difficult thing today for a young man to do is to gain admission into a medical school. How many times have I heard—and you, my colleagues, heard—qualified, able, motivated young men anxious to serve their fellow man in medicine complain that in spite of high grades in college and ability to pay the cost of medical school training, they are denied admission because of lack of space in our medical colleges. The time is now. Our responsibility is now, and we must act now. I urge the appropriate committees of this Congress to immediately take whatever action is required in order to commence construction and staffing of the necessary number of new medical schools so that the needs of the 1970's can be anticipated and the funds started in the 1960's. This is a vital and necessary need of the country and demands immediate attention.

JUNE 24, 1915, THE DAY OF CHICAGO'S WORST DISASTER

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, June 24 of this year falls on a Saturday. June 24, 1915, also was a Saturday. It was one of the darkest Saturdays in the history of Chicago—that June 24 of 52 years ago.

It was on that day that 812 persons died in the Chicago River at Clark Street when the steamer *Eastland* turned on its port side in 20 feet of water. It was the city's worst disaster.

On that day of tragical disaster Gov. Edward F. Dunne was absent from the State and I was the acting Governor of Illinois. My memory is vivid of the hours I spent helping to carry to conveyances the lifeless bodies of the victims of that terrible accident as they were lifted from the lake. I have never known such a day of anguish.

Later I served on a board of inquiry appointed by Mr. Secretary Redfield and aided in framing recommendations that were enacted into law by the Congress and have prevented similar disasters on the Great Lakes for the more than half a century intervening.

Mr. Speaker, I am extending by remarks to include the following article from the Chicago Tribune of June 19, 1967:

The 2,000 to board the vessel were pick-nickers, the employees of Western Electric company, their families and friends, bound for Michigan City. Those lost were drowned or suffocated below decks of the excursion ship, which had a length of 300 feet and a 38-foot beam.

On that morning, the tanks had been emptied to make the vessel ride higher in the water with the gangplanks level with the dock. Passengers streamed aboard, and the *Eastland* began to list, first to port, then to

starboard. The crew began pumping water into the tanks.

However, before they were full, passengers began to gather on the port side and the water in the untopped tanks sloshed to port also and this caused the ship to turn on its side.

Tugboats and other small craft in the vicinity raced to the rescue, picking swimmers from the river while other persons scrambled aboard the *Eastland* and cut holes in her exposed side and pulled survivors thru them.

Rescue work continued all thru the day and night. But this was not the end of the *Eastland*. The vessel was righted and refloated by salvage crews and towed to a northern Indiana port until a group of Chicago business men, headed by the late utilities magnate, Samuel Insull, purchased her. The group believed the United States might become involved in World War I and would have use for the ship.

When the United States did enter the war, the *Eastland* was sold to the navy for just what Insull and his colleagues had paid for her. She was renamed the U.S.S. *Wilmette* and the intention was to send her to the east coast. A section of her bow had to be removed because she was too long for the locks then in use in the St. Lawrence river. Once in eastern waters, the bow section would be replaced.

The war ended, however, before this could be done so the vessel was reunited in the Great Lakes. It was used as a navy training ship in the period between wars and during World War II.

At the close of the second war, there was no further naval use for the *Eastland-Wilmette*. She was old—built in 1903—and was destined for the scrap heap. That was her end in 1946.

CRIME IN THE STREETS OF AMERICA

Mr. SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, fear rules the streets of American cities, as assault, robbery, rape, and plunder continue to run rampant. Men, women, and children are not safe from thugs and hoodlums in the streets, in the parks, in the subways, even in their own homes.

It is an incautious girl or woman who dares to walk home alone late at night, or even to drive a car in dark, deserted streets. Men look over their shoulders and avoid the shadows. Almost every door bears both a chain and a lock, and is rarely opened without trepidation.

I cannot accept this as a way of life in the cities of our Nation. There must be a way to stop the prowling hood, and to make our cities safe for their people again. I am convinced that such a way can be found by the Congress, and we must waste no more time in setting out to find it.

A joint resolution introduced in this House by the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) proposes a broad, deep, and determined investigation which can lead the way toward the solution of this, one of our most pressing and depressing urban problems.

In offering this proposal, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) has once more demonstrated his legislative leadership and his dedication to the welfare of all the people of America. I feel privileged today to introduce a similar resolution for the same purpose.

H 7872

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 22, 1967

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

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

SENATE RESOLUTION, STATE OF ILLINOIS

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the diabolical foreign policy maneuvers of the Kremlin are visible in the Middle East. With the administration pursuing its plans to subsidize Eastern European Communist governments through trade agreements, it was with great pleasure that I noted the Senate of the State of Illinois adopted a forceful resolution urging a halt to this policy of the administration which truly represents a national disaster in foreign affairs. I insert this resolution, sponsored by Senators Robert W. Mitchler and James C. Soper, at this point in the RECORD:

STATE OF ILLINOIS, 75TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 56, OFFERED BY
SENATORS MITCHLER AND SOPER

Whereas, Our nation is involved in a struggle for human freedom against the forces of communism in Viet Nam; and

Whereas, Thousands of our service men have already paid the supreme sacrifice and thousands more risk their lives daily; and

Whereas, Some within our country find pleasure in lawless demonstrations, draft card burnings and other forms of opposition to the cause for which so many have given their lives; and

Whereas, Some nations with which we trade continue to supply our enemy with goods, thus supporting the forces of communist aggression; therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of the Seventy-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein, that for the reasons mentioned in the preamble, we declare our support for our fighting men in Viet Nam, and strongly urge the President and the Congress to stop all trade with countries supplying goods to the enemy and refrain from establishing any new trade "bridges" with the Soviet Union and satellite nations; and be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, and each Congressman from Illinois.

Adopted by the Senate, April 12, 1967.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,

President of the Senate.

EDWARD E. FERNANDES,

Secretary of the Senate.

Concurred in by the House of Representatives, June 15, 1967.

Speaker of House of Representatives.

FREDRIC B. SELCKI,

Clerk of House of Representatives.

SITUATION IN GREECE

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, completely obscured by the developments in the Middle East is the situation in Greece where necessary changes were made in the government to prevent anarchy and a possible Communist takeover. As a continuation of my remarks I ask leave to insert at this point an interview reported by Mr. Ray McHugh, Washington manager of the Copley News Service, based on his recent conference with the new Prime Minister of Greece, Constantine Kollias.

ATHENS.—"This Government has no ambition to carry on the burdens of office. Since the day it took office its fundamental aim has been to return Greece to parliamentary government as soon as possible."

Prime Minister Constantine Kollias spoke slowly with emphasis, obviously anxious that the interpreter relay the full meaning.

A short man with a little moustache and dark-rimmed spectacles, he seemed uncomfortable, almost out of place behind the huge desk in the red-carpeted room. A pudgy figure in a dark blue suit and a thickly knotted gray and black tie, Kollias looked like a man who would rather be doing other things than running the Greek Government.

But Kollias also looks like a man who is determined to see a job through.

"I have already told the American ambassador that even if Greece is left to stand alone in its struggle for freedom and democracy, it will continue that struggle," he said in an exclusive interview.

Nettled by foreign press criticism of the military regime he heads and concerned about the "review" of American aid programs to Greece, Kollias said Greece needs no reminders or lectures about the basic values of democratic government.

"The history of this land is soaked with the blood of its citizens," he said.

"We do not have to prove that Greeks know how to fight for freedom and democracy."

His voice had a tart quality.

"The government has set as its aim the reconstruction of the political and economic ruins left by the corrupt policies of political parties who ignored the national interest for strictly partisan goals and spent the national treasure in a selfish bid for votes."

Once this reconstruction job is finished, Kollias said, his regime, placed in power April 21 in a bloodless coup by army colonels, will step from the scene.

He said a committee of 20 specialists has been drawn from a cross section of the Greek society to revise the national constitution. It has been instructed to report within six months.

"When the draft is completed," he said, "the government will review it and then submit it to the people for approval at a referendum."

"If approved, the government will then select the proper time for election of a new parliament."

Kollias declined to set a time limit for his army-installed regime, but the head of the Greek Supreme Court emphasized several times during the interview that "The government has decided this should come as soon as possible."

From the United States, he said, Greece "expects not only material but moral support."

Though disappointed by Washington's review of military aid to Greece—an implied disapproval of the power grab—the prime minister said Greece will proceed to ask more help from the United States.

Washington, he indicated, has not yet realized that the colonels saved Greece from political chaos and a well-organized Communist plot to seize control of the country and take it out of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The plot, said the Prime Minister, was organized in conjunction with Greek Communist exiles and the Communist governments of Eastern Europe, principally Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Romania.

"It is an indisputable fact, that the Union of the Democratic Left (EDA) leftist party in Greece was headed by five exiled Greek Communists who are in an eastern country," said the Premier. "The EDA took direct orders daily from the Communist Parties in Eastern Europe."

The Prime Minister mentioned no names, but he said some Greek political leaders in recent months openly adopted extremist EDA slogans and accepted Communist support in a bid for victory in elections that had been scheduled for May 28.

This was an obvious reference to George Papandreou, former Premier and head of the Center Union Party, and his son, Andreas, former University of California professor and the most controversial figure in Greek politics.

Greece has moved from one political crisis to another since 1964 when the elder Papandreou was named Premier, then resigned in a clash with King Constantine over efforts to establish political controls in the military.

Kollias declined to comment on the activities of the younger Papandreou. He pointed out that the man has been indicted on charges of high treason and he said it would not be proper for him to discuss the case in view of his jurist background. He did say, however, that the "Aspida" group in the Greek army—with which the younger Papandreou was allegedly allied—sought to overthrow the monarchy, seize power and take Greece out of NATO into a neutralist phase that could easily have been a prelude to communism.

Other Greek officials dismiss fears voiced in the United States that young Papandreou might be executed. Greek law does not provide the death penalty on the charges he faces, said one high official.

"Besides," he added, "We have no intention of creating any martyrs. This has been a bloodless revolution and we have given our pledge to King Constantine that it will continue to be bloodless."

Kollias indicated that he does not believe that most Greek political figures who accepted Communist help were themselves Communists.

"They thought they would use the Communists and their methods and slogans to gain power," he said. "Then they thought they could deal with the Communists. But the Communists had other plans."

In the early days of April, the prime minister said, there was increased infiltration of Communist guerrillas into Greece from Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania. He said this was accompanied by the reactivation of Greek Communists who had been released from prison by previous governments, or had been allowed to return from exile.

"We also have evidence that large numbers of Communist guerrilla fighters were brought to the Greek-Bulgarian and Greek-Yugoslav borders in early April," said Kollias. "They were concentrated particularly in the Skopje region of Yugoslavia."

These forces, he said, were made up largely of Greek Communists who fled to eastern Europe after defeat in the 1947-49 civil war. They also were believed to include some indoctrinated Greek-born youths who had been kidnapped by the Reds during the civil war and raised in Communist countries.

"We do not know the exact size of these forces," Kollias said. "We know there were several thousand. Some estimates speak of tens of thousands."

The headquarters of the Greek Communists in exile has been in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Romania at various times, he said. It is now believed to be in Bucharest where a radio station that calls

June 22, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 7871

berg in a dramatic gesture, took off his preaching gown and stood before his congregation clad in a uniform of a colonel in the American Revolutionary Army. Using the text which I have used this morning, he said, "There is a time for peace; a time for war," and walked out of that church that day, recruited some 300 persons to go and eventually join Washington's army at Brandywine—there to save the day for the American forces. Nothing so dramatic this morning, but I wish God would give me the power to rip aside all the disloyalties to God and country in my life, my love of luxury, all of my fear of standing up and speaking out, and standing before you clad only in my love of God and my devotion to country, so that I could place upon your heart the challenge of our world today; that I could urge you to a greater commitment to God and in that greater commitment to God, the power to rise up and face the challenge of those who would destroy religion, of those who would destroy our nation and its liberty.

Dr. Martin Luther King must walk his way, but I hope in his mind and his heart, he realizes that there are Christians and Americans, both black and white, who must take a different pathway on the issue of Vietnam;—walking that pathway to preserve his freedom and liberty to speak out against our way. Amen.

MILESTONE PROPERTY TAX LAW ENACTED IN NEW JERSEY

(Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. BIESTER) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the importance of the local property tax in providing revenue to State and local government. In 1960, it produced approximately \$25 billion for local governments and school districts, and accounted for over 87 percent of their total tax revenue.

While this tax is a prime revenue producer, it also has a rather notorious reputation due largely to inequitable tax assessment procedures. Yet, major reforms on the assessment front seem to move at a glacial pace.

It is, therefore, with a sense of hope and enthusiasm that property tax reformers view the recent major breakthrough in New Jersey. Last month, Acting Governor S. D. R. Ridolfi of New Jersey signed a law which provides for the qualification, certification, and examination of tax assessors. This has been widely hailed as a milestone in property tax legislation. In signing the bill, Acting Governor Ridolfi, who was sponsor of the legislation, stated that probably no other single factor is so important as tax assessments being made by well-qualified persons in insuring that the burden of the tax is distributed equitably among the taxpayers.

The law provides that the director of the New Jersey Division of Taxation shall examine all persons applying for the position of tax assessor, and the successful applicants will receive the tax assessor certificate. The new law also provides that after July 1, 1971, no assessor may be appointed or reappointed, elected or reelected, as tax assessor unless he holds a tax assessor certificate.

Another important feature of the law is the provision of tenure for assessors. Under the law, one may acquire tenure

of office upon reappointment or reelection after having received a tax assessor certificate and having served as tax assessor for at least four years immediately prior to such reappointment or reelection.

The law empowers the director to revoke or suspend a tax assessor's certificate for dishonest practices or willful or intentional failure or neglect, or refusal to comply with the Constitution and laws relating to the assessment and collection of taxes.

The Governor's news release also noted, Mr. Speaker, that the signing of this law fulfilled one of the key recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations calling for the professionalization of tax assessors and certification after examination.

Along with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN], I sponsored legislation in the 86th Congress to create the Advisory Commission and I have been privileged, along with my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, to represent this House on the Commission since its creation in 1959. During the intervening years, the Advisory Commission has published many reports dealing with problems of State and local government, but none have been more widely acclaimed than the report on "The Role of the States in Strengthening the Property Tax."

This is a source of personal satisfaction to me because I had an opportunity to vote both in favor of placing this subject on the Advisory Commission's study agenda and in support of the policy recommendations set forth in this report.

It is my sincere hope that the New Jersey legislation will not only improve the administration of the property tax in New Jersey, but will serve as an example to other States seeking to improve their tax and thus improve their major source of revenue as well as strengthen State and local government.

Under leave to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, I also include an informative column on the subject of the new law by John O. Davies, the Gannett News Service correspondent at the State capital, published in the June 12 issue of the Plainfield Courier-News.

The column follows:

TAX ASSESSORS LAW—STANDARDS SET FOR VALUATION JOBS

(By John O. Davies)

TRENTON.—Under a new state law, the business of assessing your property for taxing purposes is gradually approaching the non-political professionalism such critical work warrants. At present some 900 assessors process the valuations throughout the state on which local property taxes approaching \$1.5 billion are based.

Notices already have been mailed by the State Division of Taxation to all assessors that examinations will be held next spring for the tax assessor certificates—without which, after July 1, 1971, few assessors will be allowed to serve in office.

Exceptions will be granted to assessors who have served continuously from next July 1 on through reappointment or re-election. Assessors who can prove successful completion of special courses at Rutgers University also

may be certified without taking the state tests.

These are the highlights of a new law upgrading the increasingly complex task of determining the property value of homes, businesses and industries on which taxes are levied. It was signed May 4 and Tax Director William Kingsley already is setting up the first examination program.

Under the law, tests will be held in March and September of each year.

An important aspect of the statute is its provisions granting tenure to assessors who are reappointed or re-elected after receiving a certificate who also have had at least four years in office prior to their new terms.

Tax collectors were granted similar tenure privileges if they passed Rutgers courses in their vocations under a 1963 law.

As in the case of the tax collectors, the assessors' law will eventually take these local officers out of politics by protecting those with proof of professional qualification—the state certificates—from the perils of seeking re-election or reappointment. Tax division officials say about 300 of New Jersey's assessors are elective and that close to 150 are either elected or re-elected or appointed or reappointed throughout the state yearly.

The tax division feels that some problems might arise among elected assessors who may qualify for tenure possibly after having been defeated in a local election but prior to the expiration of their term in office. Assessors, according to the division, customarily take office on July 1, many months after an election.

According to William G. Coward, head of the State Division of Local Government, this problem has not developed under the 1966 law providing for certification and tenure of tax collectors.

He recalled cases involving the tax collectors of Westville and South Plainfield who filed as primary election candidates but later obtained certificates. In each case, Coward said, a county court ordered their candidacy withdrawn from the primary ballot on the grounds tenure had been won.

Kingsley listed these key points of the new law:

"After July 1, 1971, no assessor may be appointed or reappointed, elected or reelected, as tax assessor unless he holds a tax assessor certificate. This limitation does not apply in the case of an assessor who shall have served continuously in office from next July 1 to the date of reappointment or re-election.

"Under the law, one may acquire tenure of office upon reappointment or re-election after having received a tax assessor certificate and having served as tax assessor for at least four years immediately prior to such reappointment or re-election.

"Tenure may also be acquired by assessors who, on or before June 30, 1969 shall have received a tax assessor certificate while actually in office as assessor and who, on or before June 30, 1969 shall have served as assessor for at least four consecutive years."

(Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. BIESTER) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mrs. DWYER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

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

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

H 7874

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 22, 1967

Incredibly, I find that the Atomic Energy Commission intends to invite the Soviet Union to use the 200-billion-electron-volt nuclear accelerator that will be built at Weston, Ill. Are we to understand that the Soviet Union's ever-increasing fund of scientific knowledge will be supplemented by the Atomic Energy Commission?

Mr. Speaker, the Soviets are pulling ahead of us in this field. Although the largest nuclear accelerator in existence today is the 33-billion-volt machine at Brookhaven, the Russians will open experimentation on their own 70-billion-electron-volt equipment at Serpukhov next year.

This will give them more than double our present ability to conduct sophisticated experiments in high energy fields and matter constitution. Since we would prefer not to have the Soviets move ahead of us in this field, we will build a still larger and more complex machine at Weston. With this in mind, I find it difficult to believe that we now plan to invite the Soviet scientists to take advantage of these facilities.

Although I am assured that our scientists at present cannot foresee any military applications which could be developed from the accelerator, I feel that our folly is obvious.

If we are to continue to subscribe to principles which are opposed to those of the Soviet Union, and if these principles are to be defended by superiority of knowledge and balance of power, then we must immediately stop granting aid to our enemies.

MORE MEDICAL SCHOOLS NEEDED

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

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, on June 1 of this year I called the attention of the House to the large number of foreign medical doctors practicing in the United States and pointed out the need for new medical schools so that the richest nation in the world could adequately supply its people with needed and qualified medical assistance. I am reminded today as we are asked to authorize an expenditure of \$4 billion for the space program how woefully short we are in appropriating and planning for the future health of our country. While I realize that dollars alone cannot build, staff and maintain medical schools, I am convinced that this Congress through its appropriate committee must begin immediately to require necessary planning and to appropriate necessary funds to protect future generations of Americans. Aside from the \$4 billion the committee recommends we authorize today for the space program, it is estimated that we are spending 10 times that sum to put a man on the moon and directing more billions to explore extraterrestrial space. Since World War II we have poured untold billions into foreign aid and are today spending an estimated \$2 billion per month to fight a war in Southeast Asia to protect the peoples of that area from

Communist aggression. If we can do all of this, I find it impossible to believe that we cannot spend whatever money is necessary to build and staff necessary medical schools to produce the additional physicians required to preserve the American standards of health. I have heard it said that the most difficult thing today for a young man to do is to gain admission into a medical school. How many times have I heard—and you, my colleagues, heard—qualified, able, motivated young men anxious to serve their fellow man in medicine complain that in spite of high grades in college and ability to pay the cost of medical school training, they are denied admission because of lack of space in our medical colleges. The time is now. Our responsibility is now, and we must act now. I urge the appropriate committees of this Congress to immediately take whatever action is required in order to commence construction and staffing of the necessary number of new medical schools so that the needs of the 1970's can be anticipated and the funds started in the 1960's. This is a vital and necessary need of the country and demands immediate attention.

JUNE 24, 1915, THE DAY OF CHICAGO'S WORST DISASTER

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, June 24 of this year falls on a Saturday. June 24, 1915, also was a Saturday. It was one of the darkest Saturdays in the history of Chicago—that June 24 of 52 years ago.

It was on that day that 812 persons died in the Chicago River at Clark Street when the steamer *Eastland* turned on its port side in 20 feet of water. It was the city's worst disaster.

On that day of tragical disaster Gov. Edward F. Dunne was absent from the State and I was the acting Governor of Illinois. My memory is vivid of the hours I spent helping to carry to conveyances the lifeless bodies of the victims of that terrible accident as they were lifted from the lake. I have never known such a day of anguish.

Later I served on a board of inquiry appointed by Mr. Secretary Redfield and aided in framing recommendations that were enacted into law by the Congress and have prevented similar disasters on the Great Lakes for the more than half a century intervening.

Mr. Speaker, I am extending by remarks to include the following article from the Chicago Tribune of June 19, 1967:

The 2,000 to board the vessel were picknickers, the employees of Western Electric company, their families and friends, bound for Michigan City. Those lost were drowned or suffocated below decks of the excursion ship, which had a length of 300 feet and a 38-foot beam.

On that morning, the tanks had been emptied to make the vessel ride higher in the water with the gangplanks level with the dock. Passengers streamed aboard, and the *Eastland* began to list, first to port, then to

starboard. The crew began pumping water into the tanks.

However, before they were full, passengers began to gather on the port side and the water in the untopped tanks sloshed to port also and this caused the ship to turn on its side.

Tugboats and other small craft in the vicinity raced to the rescue, picking swimmers from the river while other persons scrambled aboard the *Eastland* and cut holes in her exposed side and pulled survivors thru them.

Rescue work continued all thru the day and night. But this was not the end of the *Eastland*. The vessel was righted and refloated by salvage crews and towed to a northern Indiana port until a group of Chicago business men, headed by the late utilities magnate, Samuel Insull, purchased her. The group believed the United States might become involved in World War I and would have use for the ship.

When the United States did enter the war, the *Eastland* was sold to the navy for just what Insull and his colleagues had paid for her. She was renamed the U.S.S. *Wilmette* and the intention was to send her to the east coast. A section of her bow had to be removed because she was too long for the locks then in use in the St. Lawrence river. Once in eastern waters, the bow section would be replaced.

The war ended, however, before this could be done so the vessel was reunited in the Great Lakes. It was used as a navy training ship in the period between wars and during World War II.

At the close of the second war, there was no further naval use for the *Eastland*-*Wilmette*. She was old—built in 1903—and was destined for the scrap heap. That was her end in 1946.

CRIME IN THE STREETS OF AMERICA

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, fear rules the streets of American cities, as assault, robbery, rape, and plunder continue to run rampant. Men, women, and children are not safe from thugs and hoodlums in the streets, in the parks, in the subways, even in their own homes.

It is an incautious girl or woman who dares to walk home alone late at night, or even to drive a car in dark, deserted streets. Men look over their shoulders and avoid the shadows. Almost every door bears both a chain and a lock, and is rarely opened without trepidation.

I cannot accept this as a way of life in the cities of our Nation. There must be a way to stop the prowling hood, and to make our cities safe for their people again. I am convinced that such a way can be found by the Congress, and we must waste no more time in setting out to find it.

A joint resolution introduced in this House by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] proposes a broad, deep, and determined investigation which can lead the way toward the solution of this, one of our most pressing and depressing urban problems.

In offering this proposal, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] has once more demonstrated his legislative leadership and his dedication to the welfare of all the people of America. I feel privileged today to introduce a similar resolution for the same purpose.

June 22, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 7873

itself "The Voice of Truth" is broadcasting daily propaganda tirades into Greece.

"It is an indisputable fact," he repeated, "that Communists in Greece were receiving direct orders daily from the Communist parties in eastern Europe."

Sharing borders with three Communist states and harboring centuries-old Balkan suspicions, Greece has been slow to join the Western trend toward coexistence and rapprochement with eastern Europe. Athens' governments had taken small steps in the last two years under prodding from Washington, but this movement has now been halted by the new government.

Does Kollas expect Greek Communists at home and in the neighboring satellite countries to turn now to guerrilla tactics and terrorism?

"It is completely out of the question," he said. "The army revolution has asserted itself so effectively throughout the country that any Communist uprising would be crushed."

"The revolution has gained the highest confidence from an overwhelming majority of the people. They know that it has saved them from political chaos and that it is dedicated to restoring stability so that all can prosper."

Kollas appeared at an armed forces display at Salonika and was greeted by more than 100,000 persons. It was in Salonika that George Papandreou was to speak on April 23.

Word that Communists planned major street disorders and a possible grab for local power touched off the revolution of the colonels—a startlingly swift, efficient maneuver based on a NATO contingency plan to deal with internal subversion.

After more than an hour in the huge, high-ceilinged office of the old royal palace, Kollas rose from behind his desk to end the interview.

"Do not take my word for all this," he said. "I could be giving you propaganda. Go out into Athens and into the country. Talk to the people. They will tell you that this revolution has saved Greece."

"We have no illusions about the Communist countries. They attack us every day. But it is important, very important, that our friends and allies understand that we are still dedicated to NATO, freedom and democracy."

Mr. Speaker, Members should be reminded of the fact that the State Department and the administration do not approve of the new Government in Greece but are merely maintaining formal but "cool relations," an interesting contrast to the frantic policy of building bridges to accommodate the Soviet Union.

STATEMENT ON MIDDLE EAST BY POLISH GOVERNMENT-IN-EXILE

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. BIESTER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Polish Government-in-exile, August Zeleski, has expressed the concern of his Cabinet over the Soviet involvement in the Middle East crisis. I deem it especially significant that the Polish Government-in-exile adopted a very practical statement at the height of the armed conflict in the Middle East. I insert the statement in the Record at this point:

STATEMENT OF THE POLISH GOVERNMENT [IN-EXILE] OF JUNE 6, 1967, ON THE POLISH NATION'S ATTITUDE TOWARD THE WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST

LONDON.—At a Cabinet meeting on 6th June 1967 presided over by Prime Minister Aleksander Zawisza, the Polish Government [in-exile] drew up the following statement in respect of the Polish nation's attitude towards the war in the Middle East:

"The Government of the Republic of Poland [in-exile] declare that the attitude towards the present armed conflicts in the Middle East by the so-called 'Government of the Polish People's Republic'—actually an agency of imperialistic Communist Russia's occupation of Poland—is contrary to the sentiments of the Polish nation."

The representatives of the Warsaw regime, in their invariable parroting of Russia must also on this occasion support her attacks on the Israeli nation as also the imperialistic aim of Egypt—merely one of the elements in the totality of Russia's subversive plans. But the Polish nation, with its keen realization of the wrongs inflicted upon the weaker nations by the powers that be in this world, is particularly moved by this fresh attack on the Israeli nation and state, an attack long prepared and supported by Russia.

The Israeli people have during the last few decades recovered their age-old heritage neglected for the whole centuries past by intruders with an alien culture. They have transformed the land by the effort of mind and hands, in the sweat of their brow, into a built-up, developed and prosperous country which arouses the envy of their neighbours and evokes their chauvinism so skillfully directed and exploited by the destroyers of peace in the world—with Russia as the ringleader.

We observe and admire the courage of the Israeli people in the determined and devoted defence of their country. It inevitably reminds us of our own, still so recent fights, often shoulder to shoulder with representatives of this people, in the defence of our own native country—then our common motherland.

This brings on the thought and the desire to reciprocate towards the Israeli nation, to come to its aid in these difficult times. But we Poles in exile are at present powerless in the military sense whilst the Communist regime's authorities of occupation in Poland stifle every noble reaction of the Polish nation, now deprived of their liberty behind the Iron Curtain.

May our heartfelt thoughts and moral support be with you in the heroic efforts of your patriotic nation and may our voice calling for justice, also for the Israeli nation and state, reach the powers of this world still plunged in their egoism and blind to the future as they passively regard the organization of international crimes. Just as the Ribbentrop-Molotov conspiracy was aimed against Poland, so now the Kossygin-Nasser conspiracy is directed against Israel.

The western powers should remember that, whilst handing over Poland to imperialistic Communist Russia was the beginning of their difficulties with Russia and of growing international complications, the handing over of Israel to the Russo-Egyptian combine could mark the beginning of their decline and the undermining of our civilization.

It is sincerely to be hoped that those who slumber during the coming storm will awaken in time."

"SEND ME A BORE ROD AND A PAINT BRUSH"

(Mr. McCLURE (at the request of Mr. BIESTER) was granted permission to ex-

tend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, two worried parents in my district have sent me a letter they received from their son, a marine in Vietnam. He wrote them as follows:

Our M-16s aren't worth much. If there's dust in them, they will jam. Half of us don't have cleaning rods to unjam them. Out of 40 rounds I've fired, my rifle jammed about 10 times. I pack as many grenades as I can plus bayonet and K bar (jungle knife) so I'll have something to fight with. . . . If you can, please send me a bore rod and a 1/4-inch or so paint brush. I need it for my rifle. These rifles are getting a lot of guys killed because they jam so easily.

The parents now ask me: "What can I do, more than send a bore rod and a paint brush?"

The Pentagon assures us that the M-16 is a superior weapon to the M-14 because of its suitability to jungle warfare. They say that malfunctions are due to improper cleaning and lack of maintenance.

Evidently those using the rifles in Vietnam feel differently.

It is indeed a strange war. We are not being told the full story.

I think we have a right to know how effective these weapons really are.

I think we have a right to know if there is a shortage of cleaning rods.

I think we have a right to know what effect this is having on morale.

I think we have a right to know if a significant number of casualties are attributable to faulty equipment.

And then I wish someone would tell me how I can relieve the minds of the families of our fighting men when I harbor the same doubts as they do.

CONCESSIONS AND OUR POWER BALANCE

(Mr. McCLURE (at the request of Mr. BIESTER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, I am very alarmed at the regularity with which the Johnson administration allows our military and scientific superiority over the Russians to decline. In a world in which we are totally committed to out-producing, outmaneuvering, outarming, and, hopefully, outliving the Soviet system, we consistently betray ourselves.

In past weeks, Congress has given a good deal of attention to two of the methods we are using to defeat ourselves. Many Members of Congress have noted the economic concessions we offer the enemy in Vietnam by proposing to trade with the Communist bloc countries. We have also heard recently that the balance of power may indeed be thrown out of balance by the Soviet antiballistic-missile system. The Secretary of Defense finds that the only defense is an adequate offense.

But now I understand, Mr. Speaker, that this administration intends to offer still another concession to the enemy,

June 22, 1967

H 7779

deadlines which larger applications must observe.

Mr. Speaker, it would be most unfortunate if such worthwhile projects were belittled by a foolish and misleading label. If this practice persists, we may soon have mini-highways, mini-schools, mini-dams, and even mini-missiles.

I urge my good friend, Commissioner Howe, to be sure that the term "mini-grant" will have mini-life.

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMUNITY ACTION COMMITTEE OF THE OEO

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, 1967, I wrote the Honorable Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, asking a question directed to me by one of my constituents about the propriety and legality of the local community action committee engaging in controversial political issues.

On March 3, I again wrote Sargent Shriver and asked him if he would respond to my initial letter.

On March 15, I received a letter from the Honorable Sargent Shriver telling me that personnel matters were local responsibilities. However, he would have the regional Great Lakes office look into the matter and report to me. Why it took him 7 weeks to give me that information I do not understand.

But here it is, June 22, 1967, Mr. Speaker, some 5 months after my initial request, and I still have not received a reply. This could hardly be called "running a tight ship."

FRAGRANCE OF ROSES IN THE HOUSE

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily I enjoy the fragrance of roses, and once in a while I unite the several knots of my purse strings and buy my wife a small bouquet. But the fragrance in the House yesterday during consideration of the debt ceiling was a little heavy—the fragrance from the rose garden over at the White House.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am going to look around today in the House Chamber to check on the walking wounded. Yesterday, I tried to find the space in the Capitol where the arm splints were being applied, but I could not locate it.

I will be looking again today.

SETTLEMENT OF THE CURRENT RAILWAY LABOR MANAGEMENT DISPUTE—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 81) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees, insist on the House

amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STAGGERS, FRIEDEL, DINGELL, PICKLE, RONAN, ADAMS, SPRINGER, CUNNINGHAM, and KUY-KENDALL.

NOMINATION?

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

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the following letter to the editor, printed in the June 18, 1967, issue of the Joplin, Mo., Globe:

NOMINATION?

To the GLOBE:

Seems like it is about time for Stokely Carmichael to be awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.

A. P. RUSSELL.

JOPLIN, MO.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A JUST PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of the House to the statesman-like quality, the clearness, and the logical aspects of the address of our Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Arthur Goldberg, which he so effectively delivered on June 20. In my opinion, his outline of our Government's plan for the successful institution of peace in the Middle East indelibly stamps upon our side of the controversy, our genuine desire for peace.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we should be grateful as a nation to be represented in the United Nations by a man of the superb statesmanship of Arthur Goldberg. We are deeply indebted to President Johnson for putting him there as our representative in that great assembly, which has upon its shoulders the responsibility for establishing peace in the world.

In this respect, Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by the fact that the Soviet Union evidently will not sincerely join in the establishment of a just peace, but from the words and actions of her Premier seeks to use the United Nations as a sounding board for propaganda which aims to advance, even if indirectly, her own selfish interests.

SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 136)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the Second Annual Report of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Poverty defies simple description. It is a cycle which begins with an infancy of deprivation, continues in a youth of hopelessness, extends to a jobless adulthood, and finally ends—for those who survive—in a bleak and despairing old age. At every stage, the conditions of life are poor housing, inadequate education and training, deficient health care, and often, gnawing hunger.

When we began our concentrated effort to eradicate poverty in America less than 3 years ago, we knew that no single program could accomplish so complicated a task. We knew that the campaign would have to be waged on many levels and in many ways.

We knew that a coordinated attack led by a single Office of Economic Opportunity would be necessary.

We knew that—if the cycle was to be broken—the keys would have to be opportunity and self-help.

We knew that the Federal Government could not undertake alone the programs which would offer opportunity and encourage self-help. Initiative would have to come from, and responsibility be shared by, the communities in which poverty festered.

The programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity are built upon these principles.

This report provides heartening evidence of the substantial progress this Nation is making on the entrenched patterns of poverty. In fiscal 1966—

Seven hundred and thirty-three thousand young children from poor families were given a chance to make a decent beginning in life through the Headstart program.

Five hundred and twenty-eight thousand jobs were made available by the Neighborhood Youth Corps, enabling disadvantaged youths to stay in school or prepare for meaningful employment.

Fifty-seven thousand four hundred and thirty young people, once lost and forgotten in our society, found new confidence and new skills with the Job Corps.

More than 20,000 high school students from poor homes received the educational help they needed to go on to college through Upward Bound.

More than 335,000 adults began to overcome illiteracy with basic educational instruction.

Three thousand five hundred and ninety-two VISTA volunteers helped communities across the land undertake needed self-help projects.

More than 1,000 lawyers provided legal services in 43 States, showing that the law can serve the poor as well as it serves the rest of society.

The list of statistics goes on. All point to the same basic fact. These programs are sturdy ladders in the deep well of poverty where millions of Americans have been trapped. And—despite the crippling effects of a lifetime of deprivation—many have been able to begin the long climb up. But the real story lies behind the statistics, in the individuals who have escaped from hopelessness and

H 7780

despair and are contributing to our society far more than they have received.

All Americans can take pride in the solid advances that have been made. As disease can be conquered, as space can be mastered, so too can poverty yield to our determined efforts to bring it to an end.

But our pride cannot obscure the job that remains to be done.

During the past 2½ years, these programs have reached some 8 million of America's poor. But some 24 million of our impoverished fellow citizens have not yet been reached.

The challenge that remains with us is to insure that all Americans share in the prosperity of our land.

A light has been turned on. We must keep it aglow.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 22, 1967.

CORRECTION OF LIVE PAIR

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, on page H7624, it is shown that I had a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI]. I had a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

	[Roll No. 149]	
Ashbrook	Fraser	Nichols
Ashley	Gialmo	O'Hara, Mich.
Bolling	Gibbons	Pool
Brock	Goodling	Rooney, N.Y.
Brown, Calif.	Hansen, Wash.	Roush
Burton, Utah	Hathaway	St. Onge
Cabell	Hawkins	Schneebell
Carey	Hays	Skubitz
Carter	Herlong	Thompson, N.J.
Conable	Johnson, Calif.	Williams, Miss.
Dawson	Kee	Wyman
Diggs	Kluczynski	
Edmondson	Kuykendall	
Fino	Long, La.	
Ford	Meskill	
William D.	Moore	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 388 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SEVEN YOUNG LOUISIANA LADIES

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

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the pleasure of meeting personally in my office with seven young ladies from my congressional district who were recruited to work for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington, and whose names and addresses are as follows:

Glynne Mouton, Lafayette, La.
Jeanne Klumpp, Lafayette, La.
Carmen Hebert, Lafayette, La.
Jerrilyn Guidry, Lafayette, La.
Janet Hebert, St. Martinville, La.
Sue Daigle, Lafayette, La.
Carole Wise, Lafayette, La.

Having successfully passed a civil service examination, these young ladies are working for their Government, either as clerk-typists or clerk-stenographers.

I was tremendously impressed with the neat, charming, and attractive appearance of these young ladies and highly impressed with the fact that they are not only conscientious workers but that they are all taking advantage of their stay in Washington to visit places of interest in the Capital and to familiarize themselves with the operation of the functions of our Government, thereby preparing themselves not only to become future leaders in their respective communities but better and more dedicated citizens of our great country.

NATURAL RESOURCES OF THE SUBSOIL AND SEA BED OF THE CONTINENTAL SHELF

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, in 1945, President Truman, taking view of the growing value and future needs of the resources of the Continental Shelf, made the following proclamation:

Having concern for the urgency of conserving and prudently utilizing its natural resources, the government of the United States regards the natural resources of the subsoil and sea bed of the continental shelf beneath the high seas but contiguous to the coasts of the United States as appertaining to the United States, subject to its jurisdiction and control.

This proclamation was followed by similar actions by other countries around the world with one glaring distinction: they also claimed the water above the Continental Shelf as appertaining to themselves.

Panama, in 1946, claimed sovereignty over its Continental Shelf, the air above it, and for fishery purposes, the water between. And Chile, a year later, with no appreciable Continental Shelf, simply laid claim to the sea bottom and the water and airspace above it for a distance of 200 miles from shore. Peru, Ecuador, Costa Rica, El Salvador, and Honduras made similar claims to sovereign control over a 200-mile offshore belt in 1947 also.

Our claim to the resources of the Continental Shelf, which gained quick international sanction, includes, in addition to minerals, sedentary creatures of the shelf—such as crabs. Why have we

failed to extend our claim over the waters above the Continental Shelf? Why must we draw a line between creatures who swim above the shelf and those who crawl on it? They are both creatures of the ocean and are equally important to the future needs of this Nation. Both are worthy of protection from foreign exploitation.

Currently, the flood tide of exploitation by foreign fishermen of the fishing stocks of our coastal waters coupled with the growing world demand for fish and the diminishing status of our fish industry demands that we take effectual legislative action to assure this Nation of fulfillment of its future needs and proper place in the world fish industry.

While the fishing fleets and the catches of foreign nations continue to grow in accordance with the growing world demand for fish, the United States, since 1957, has dropped from second to fifth place among nations in total world catch, accounting for less than 6 percent of the world catch in 1963 as opposed to 13 percent in 1950. Not only have we failed to keep abreast of this growing world demand for fish, but we have also greatly contributed toward the mounting foreign dominance of this industry by allowing foreign fleets to exploit our coastal waters and by importing approximately 50 percent of the edible fish consumed in this country. In other words, Mr. Speaker, in many instances we are buying back from foreign nations—in various forms—the fish that they may have gathered from our coastal waters.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend the 12-Mile Fishing Zone Act to provide for an exclusive fishing zone over the entire Continental Shelf. I strongly believe that the time has long since arrived for this Nation to legally harness, for our own future use, the Continental Shelf, comprising some 10 million square miles of rich fishing area. If we are to regain our rightful status in the world fish industry and meet our future needs for food, we must take legislative action now to insure this.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 139 of Monday, June 19, I am recorded as voting "nay." On that day I was in my district on official business. I was not here. I did not vote. If I had been here, I would have voted in favor of the legislation that was then before the House. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on

H7866

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 22, 1967

It now appears that, after dropping 10 of 13 charges against Otepka—evidently to avoid having to broach their highly suspect actions—the State Department has eliminated tape recordings made from wiretaps installed on Otepka's telephone, and is seeking to keep key figure John Reilly out of the harsh light of testimony.

The circumstances which surround the Otepka case cannot go unchallenged. Neither can the precedent setting decision to classify the testimony, thus removing from the scrutiny of the public and the press.

A total and thorough examination of this fantastic coverup must be made.

The above-mentioned article follows:

THE SECRET OTEPKA HEARINGS

"What's the department hiding?" That's the question that appears to pop up among observers of the State Department hearings involving Otto Otepka, the former high-ranking security officer who was fired three and one-half years ago after challenging the department's security procedures.

Secrecy appears to be the hallmark of the case. The department, for example, refuses to open the hearings to the public or the press; neither will it permit transcripts to be read. When the department explained that certain documents to be introduced were confidential, Otepka's attorney, Roger Robb, exploded: "Every one of those documents has been made public in the published hearings of the Senate Internal Security subcommittee on the case. Even if they are to be classified, there is no excuse for secrecy on the remaining portions of the transcript. There is no precedent for such a ruling.

For years, too, the government has blared forth the charges that Otepka has been guilty of declassifying and mutilating confidential documents, but recently the government mysteriously threw out 10 charges against Otepka relating to his alleged document "mutilation." Apparently, this was done to "cover up" reprehensible action by the department itself.

The *Government Employees Exchange*, the factual Washington paper covering the activities of federal employees, revealed that reliable information had it that the Justice Department decided to expunge the charges since Otepka had "obtained positive information" regarding the persons who had actually mutilated the documents and, in the event these charges were pressed, Otepka would be able to expose the real culprits. Thus, said the *Exchange*, the charges were dropped.

Last week the department was again attempting to throw a cloud of secrecy around the case by attempting to thwart Otepka from bringing out the full facts. Otepka and Robb asked the department to produce two tape reels of conversations of Otepka obtained through a secret tap put on Otepka's office telephone back in 1963. Evidence of the secret tap, whose installment was against federal law, came to light through hearings conducted by the Senate Internal Security subcommittee. But Irving Jaffe, who is pressing the case against Otepka before the State Department's hearing examiner, informed Robb that these reels have now been conveniently "erased."

The department has tried to hinder the hearings in other ways as well. Both Otepka and Robb have also requested the department to call in John Reilly, who was thoroughly involved in the Otepka matter when he was with the department and had knowledge of the telephone tapping. Indeed, Reilly initially failed to tell the truth about his knowledge of the "tap" and, when he reversed his position under threat of a per-

jury indictment, he resigned his department position but then wound up in a plush job with the Federal Communications Commission.

Though intimately involved in the Otepka matter, the department has not been urging Reilly to make an appearance at the Otepka hearings. Thus the State Department continues its weird performance in the Otepka affair.

OIL SUPPLIES OF THE FREE WORLD AND THE MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. BROTZMAN (at the request of Mr. BIESTER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, "blackmail" is a blunt word, not normally to be found in the diplomatic lexicon. But I cannot find another term to adequately describe a statement by President Hourari Doumedienne of Algeria which appeared in the news media of the world this week.

Basically, President Doumedienne—far from joining in the effort to calm the antagonisms which touched off the brief, violent Middle East war—is urging the Arab countries to cut off oil supplies to the United States and Western Europe for 1 year.

This strikes me as a desperate effort to gain through international blackmail a bargaining position which could not be won on the battlefield.

It also further underlines a simple truth—that the United States and Western Europe cannot any longer afford to be dependent upon the oilfields of the Middle East, because the political instabilities which led to the current crisis will not likely pass for many years, and perhaps decades.

Mr. Speaker, the free world has lived in fear of losing the oil supplies of the Middle East for many years. We have been forced, by the implied and sometimes overt threat of having these tremendous oil reserves lost to the free world, to pay tribute to blackmailers and perpetuate the reign of tyrants.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has in the palm of its hand the means to end all future free world dependence upon the Middle East for oil, not only by ourselves but by Western Europe, as well.

Interestingly, this alternative to Middle Eastern oil—a resource known as oil shale—also offers the United States a way out of its balance-of-payments dilemma. It could add, very conservatively, \$5 million to the credit side of our balance of payments, and thus give us, for the first time in several years, an inflow of gold.

Oil resources which dwarf the combined reserves of the Arab nations lie in the oil shale beds of the United States, which are centered in Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah.

An estimated 2 trillion barrels of oil are contained in these shale beds. This is 70 times the known petroleum reserves of the Nation and perhaps five times the crude oil reserves of the entire world.

For the past 50 years there has been talk of developing a great industry for the extraction and refining of shale oil.

Both the Federal Government and private industry have invested money in basic research.

Last January the Interior Department announced a five-point program to mildly stimulate the development of technology and regulate the development of a shale oil industry.

The drafting of this policy was a step in the right direction, if only because it filled a vacuum and gave the Nation a baseline from which to proceed.

However, the defects in the policy soon became evident. For one thing, it was a low-gear program at a time when the Nation's interests suggested a shift into high gear.

For another, it placed obstacles in the path of private industry which could not help but discourage expenditure of risk capital on a large scale.

The Denver Post ably described these defects in the Interior Department's policy in an editorial last Sunday. The editorial said, in part:

The U. S. Department of Interior has shown real fear in having private industry develop oil shale. Interior Secretary Stewart Udall's proposed shale research and lease program shows he's afraid of his shadow.

He's afraid of allowing oil firms to be competitive, afraid of permitting them to develop their own confidential research techniques—above all—afraid of letting them have a profit incentive which might bring them into shale production.

The Post also suggested that the oil firms might intensify their efforts to develop the technology and make a beginning on privately owned oil shale deposits, rather than waiting for a workable leasing arrangement on the richer deposits which occur under public domain lands.

As this Colorado newspaper put it:

The United States cannot afford to be in a position of potential subservience to every small war and palace coup which flares in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, almost on the eve of the outbreak of the war in the Middle East I wrote a letter to President Johnson expressing concern over the possible unavailability of Middle East oil to the free world, and suggested that the Interior Department examine further means to accelerate the development of a substantial shale oil production capability in the United States.

I was notified by the White House that the matter would be passed along to Mr. Udall for comments.

Last week I received a letter of acknowledgement from Mr. Udall, but no comment on whether the Interior Department is studying means to encourage the shale oil industry to shift into high gear.

In view of the statement by President Doumedienne and other recent Far East developments, I am again writing to the President and Mr. Udall strongly urging positive actions toward this end.

MORAL AND ETHICAL CHALLENGE TO COLLEGE GRADUATES

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN (at the request of Mr. BIESTER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this

June 22, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 7865

promptly, either S. 355 as it passed the Senate, or even a modification of S. 355, and grant an open rule providing for adequate general debate so that the House may work its will and move this important legislation toward final passage.

The editorial I referred to is as follows:

SLUGGISH REFORM BILL

A few persistent members of the House of Representatives are courageously struggling to save the reorganization bill passed by the Senate. They might be called the realists of the House. The established leaders of that body seem to care little whether the reform efforts initiated by a joint Senate-House committee might come to naught. But the realists know that failure of the bill would cause another grave sag in the prestige of Congress.

The latest compromise designed to appease old-line committee chairmen was offered by Representative Bolling. As a member of the Rules Committee, Mr. Bolling is in an excellent position to understand the complaints about the Senate bill and to know what will be necessary to dislodge the measure from a potential Rules death-trap. Some of the concessions he has made, particularly in restoring prerogatives of committee chairmen, may be unfortunate, but as a practical matter some means must be found of getting the measure out of the Rules Committee and of passing it on the floor. The most important thing is to get the measure into conference where the final bill will be drafted in any event.

We do not share the belief that the bill is of little importance because it is only half a loaf or less. The lobbying provisions alone would be worthy of enactment as a separate bill. The same is true of the provision relieving Congressmen of their hangover of responsibility for the naming of postmasters, the strengthening of the Legislative Reference Service and the improvement in information resources available to Congress.

Beyond the need for these and other specific reforms is the need for a show of congressional willingness to put its own house in order. The public is well aware of the fact that this bill would leave untouched numerous grave defects in the operations of Congress. But it would be a beginning. We do not see how members of the House can face their constituents if they fail to enact these relatively modest reforms that the joint committee and the Senate worked so hard to perfect.

INTELLIGENCE GAP HAMPERE ECONOMIC POLICYMAKERS

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, M. J. Rossant, writing in the New York Times of June 21, 1967, supports the conclusion of the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee in their March 17, 1967, report that limitations of economic statistics and forecasting "raise grave doubts about the ability of Government to 'finely tune' its policies to the needs of the economy."

Mr. Rossant compares the administration to the Egyptian Army in its disappointing penchant to be caught by surprise by economic changes. Their slow recognition of the threat of inflation in 1966 and their inadequate preparations for the current slowdown are examples of how their radar is blurred by faulty forecasts and imprecise data.

He emphasizes several statistical series which must be improved before realistic diagnoses and sensible cures for the ailments of the economy are possible. Among the improvements he emphasizes is the development of comprehensive data on job vacancies. As we did in our minority report, he urges that a job vacancies series would "help policymakers determine with greater certainty whether aggregate demand at any particular time was deficient."

Mr. Rossant's analysis leads him to the conclusion that "Until improvements are made in these areas, forecasting may be hazardous and fine tuning downright dangerous." The administration lacks the intelligence to make sophisticated economic adjustments.

This article offers fresh proof that the Johnson administration's "push button" economic policy is unworkable without better economic data and forecasting. It also suggests several areas, especially job vacancies, where better data is urgently needed. Therefore, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

THE INTELLIGENCE GAP—ECONOMIC POLICYMAKERS TRY TO BASE PRECISE FORECASTS ON IMPRECISE DATA

(By M. J. Rossant)

There's fresh proof that the Johnson Administration is trying to formulate precise policies to "fine tune" the economy on the basis of statistical intelligence that is anything but precise.

Geoffrey H. Moore, director of research for the National Bureau of Economic Research, provided the proof in calling for improvements in information on wage trends and other vital statistics in the nation's "stock of basic economic measurements."

While the National Bureau is scrupulously nonpartisan in its research activities and while Dr. Moore studiously refrains from direct criticism of the Administration's policies, the discrepancies he notes in wage statistics make plain that Washington's economic intelligence has glaring gaps.

Writing in the National Bureau's annual report, Dr. Moore states that "we do not really know, within a reasonable narrow margin, what the recent trend of wages has been."

This admission from one of the country's top scholars in one of the country's most respected research institutions helps to explain the impracticality of the Administration's wage guidepost and its failure to frame more accurate forecasts and more appropriate policies.

The Administration, of course, doesn't concede that its forecasts or policies are faulty. But, like the Egyptian army, the economic policy makers have often been caught by surprise.

Thus they were slow to recognize the threat of inflation that created distortions and pressures on the economy in 1966. And their radar was again blurred and their preparations inadequate for the slowdown now taking place in business activity.

What is most disappointing about the Administration's effort is that, despite its elaborate machinery and its wealth of information, it has not done as well in forecasting as some private seers. Obviously, the Administration has put too much trust in questionable intelligence.

But, though they have made big mistakes, it is unfair to label the Administration's policy makers as the Egyptians among economists. Once the policy makers were aware that they were on the wrong track, they were quick to take corrective action.

Since this year's slowdown became apparent, for instance, Washington has eased

credit, increased spending and cut taxes for business, which was not the prescription it had originally concocted.

But the Administration's control over policy gives the policy makers a special advantage, enabling them to make their predictions come true. Nevertheless, they have still gone awry. Money has been tighter, the deficit far bigger and the slowdown deeper and longer than had been expected even after corrective action was taken.

* * * that the policy makers can influence activity but that they do not have the intelligence—or the weapons—to call economic turns or make sophisticated economic adjustments. They may lay things on with a trowel well enough, but fine tuning seems beyond their grasp.

The ability to come up with a realistic diagnosis of what ails the economy and sensible policies for curing it requires more than an improvement in wage statistics. There also are serious discrepancies in information on inventories, retail sales, productivity and defense spending. These discrepancies have made it difficult to tell where the economy is, much less where it may be going.

Arthur F. Burns, chairman of the National Bureau, recently noted still other trouble spots where intelligence—and policy making—is deficient.

"We need to develop comprehensive data on job vacancies, so that it will no longer be necessary to guess whether or when a deficiency in aggregate demand exists," he said. "We need to improve our measures of price and costs, so that inflationary pressures can be recognized more promptly. We need to develop quarterly projections of Federal revenues and expenditures, similar to the information now compiled by the Government on business sales expectations and investment intentions, so that the changing requirements of fiscal policy can be evaluated better than in the past or at present."

These gaps do not exhaust the list. Dr. Burns himself wants more information on the state of the labor market, the problem of seasonal unemployment and "the subtle forces that shape the state of confidence." It is clear, too, that more intelligence is needed on the impact of monetary policy, which has not been working in the way the policy makers have hoped.

Until improvements are made in these areas, forecasting may be hazardous and fine tuning downright dangerous.

FAIRPLAY FOR OTEPKA

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, several times during the past few days I have remarked on the State Department hearings concerning Otto Otepka. This matter long ago was removed from the realm of an internal Department matter and placed into the context of national security, the right of the American people to know the facts concerning public figures, the question of loyalty of Government employees and use of unprincipled tactics by Government departments in attempts to cover over their own misdoings.

To my previous remarks I would now like to add an article from the June 24, 1967, issue of Human Events which points out several ways in which the State Department has "tried to hinder the hearings."

June 22, 1967

A 3169

repayment that occurs when the Treasury pays off a debt at maturity. The Federal Reserve, as established by the Congress, keeps separate accounts from those of Treasury, and that arrangement seems appropriate to me. There is no more reason to cancel the Federal Reserve's holdings of Treasury obligations than there would be to cancel the holdings of Treasury securities in Federal Government trust accounts such as the Social Security or Unemployment trust funds.

In short, we see no significant advantage to the proposal that the Treasury debt held by the Federal Reserve be cancelled, and believe instead that such a step could be harmful.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER.

Northern Michigan Helped To Establish Reindeer in Alaska 60 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, northern Michigan, which I represent in the House of Representatives, played an important role in the establishment of the reindeer industry in Alaska 60 years ago. This is our 50th State's centennial year. I am happy to insert a letter I have received from Mr. E. A. Jasberg, from Calumet, in northern Michigan's copper country. Mr. Jasberg tells about eight Finnish Americans, originally from northern Finland, who traveled from northern Michigan to Alaska to help the Eskimos learn how to keep reindeer herds. Our largest State, now so ably represented in the House of Representatives by our friend and colleague, the Honorable Howard W. Pollock, has come a long way in the last 60 years. We in northern Michigan are proud of the small contribution our people made to Alaskan development. I know all Alaskans must be proud of the tremendous contribution they have made to the United States.

The letter referred to follows:

DEAR MR. RUPPE: I am writing to you with reference to the Alaska Centennial this year. You undoubtedly are unaware of the fact that the Copper Country played a role in establishing the reindeer industry in the territory of Alaska some 60 years ago. Dr. Jackson, Commissioner of Bureau of Education, contacted your predecessor, H. Olin Young, 12th District Congressman from Ishpeming for assistance in finding capable herders to teach Eskimos how to manage reindeer herds. Mr. Young, in turn, contacted my late father, J. H. Jasberg of Hancock (Michigan), a personal friend of his, for information. My father had no personal experience with reindeer in Finland, but advertised in Finnish language newspapers for men capable of handling them. Numerous applicants appeared and eight men—all Finns—from the Calumet district were selected. The Government shipped the men to outlying islands off the coast of Alaska on Bering Straits. Reindeer from Russian Siberia were purchased and shipped to these islands where Eskimos spend a period of training in herding and were then allotted a limited number of animals to start them off in the business. They, in turn, paid the Government from the

natural increases until they owned their herds free of encumbrance. You may be interested in calling attention of Alaska Senators and Congressman to the fact that your district contributed materially to the success of this project.

Complimenting you on our aggressive and positive activity in all phases of Upper Peninsula and Northern Michigan progress, I remain

Sincerely,

E. A. JASBERG.

Community Leadership Conference on World Problems—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as previously reported, at the February 22 community conference in my district, a panel discussion was held on the world problem area of the Middle East. Such distinguished authorities as H. E. Avraham Harman, Ambassador of Israel to the United States; Kemal Karpaz, associate professor of comparative governments and international relations at New York University and a citizen of Turkey; and Rabbi Israel Miller of the Kingsbridge Heights Jewish Center, former president of the American Rabbinical Council and currently chairman of the American Zionist Council, participated in the panel which was moderated by Hon. William L. Cary, professor of law at Columbia University and former Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Their remarks, which are of particular interest in the light of recent events, are summarized below:

PANEL ON THE MIDDLE EAST

The moderator of the panel discussion on the Middle East was Hon. William L. Cary, professor of law at Columbia University and former Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. The first speaker was H. E. Avraham Harman, Ambassador of Israel to the United States.

Ambassador Harman stated that the Middle East is, and has always been, an area of great diversity. This diversity has created several sources of conflict.

One of the sources of conflict relates to the attempts to impose on a section of the area, if not the whole of it, a dominant hegemony. In the world the search for international unity has proceeded along two paths. There have been attempts to impose a world order by a hegemony of a country, a race or a language. This path always leads to world conflict since military methods are used and they are resisted. The other path is that followed by the U.N. This path recognizes diversity and allows different peoples to express their own personality as they choose. This path is one of peace and harmony.

The Middle East is not a monolith, with its many nationalities, religions, and

languages. A hegemony cannot be established there.

There are two historic forces at work within the Arab world, Ambassador Harman went on to say. There is the historic desire for Arab unity. But there is also the insistence on the separation of Arab statehood. State consciousness resists the idea of an overriding political unity. Attempts to impose a hegemony within the Arab world will continue to result in armed conflict. Yemen is an example of this fact.

A second conflict engendered by a desire for hegemony is the Israel-Arab conflict. The Arab States do not recognize Israel as a state, do not want to do so, and envisage a future without Israel. Israel will not accept this policy and will use force to resist force.

In 1947, the U.N. began to examine the problem of Palestine. There then existed two national communities, each with a right to self-determination, and each mature enough to govern itself and also all of Palestine. Neither side was completely satisfied when the U.N. attempted to follow a path of peace through partition. Israel did not like the partition, but cooperated since peace was worth the price. By December 1947, the Arabs used force to resist and continued to fight until the middle of 1949. In 1949, four armistices were established. These form the legal and political basis for today's reality and a future peace. All the armistices say that the countries will work peacefully to solve problems. The agreements also set the boundaries and state that the territory of each country will not be used as a base for warlike acts.

However, hostility still exists; hostility of the Arabs to Israel, but not vice versa. Israel's policy is one of peace and Israel would like to work with the Arab nations on common policies and problems.

In today's U.N. the members cannot tolerate a doctrine of hostility. A state of war is incompatible with the U.N. Charter and the armistices. It is the duty of the Arabs, as members of the U.N., to terminate the state of war. The desire of the Arabs to change the borders or destroy Israel by force is also against the precepts of the U.N. The great powers agree that this doctrine is unacceptable. They also recognize, as does the entire U.N., that a conflict in the Middle East could spread throughout the world.

There are no basic problems not capable of speedy resolution once the state of war ceases and the Arabs acknowledge that change can only be through peace and mutual agreement.

Another basic problem is created by the social and economic reality of the Middle East. The area has been greatly lived in, and has been much used and abused through history. Today, it needs a process of renewal—of land, of water resources, of economy—in order to advance the interests of its people.

The regional effort needed to effect the renewal is now diverted by the conflicts mentioned before. However, these conflicts could be eased by disarmament, especially if a world disarmament occurred. The lethal weapons are all imported,

A3170

and a world disarmament would cut off the supply.

Ambassador Harman concluded by saying that all the peoples of the Middle East have a great stake in cooperation. The end of conflict would release much energy to help the region and let the area again become as important to civilization as it once was.

The next speaker was Kemal Karpaz, associate professor of comparative governments and international relations at New York University, and a citizen of Turkey.

Professor Karpaz stated that he would discuss the Middle East's problems and the U.S. interest there. It is necessary to understand the internal forces working in the area today and the possible impact of those forces on foreign policy to understand the Middle East.

Most important internal forces are two ideologies—nationalism and socialism.

Nationalism has had both internal and external implications. Internally, the first phase of Arab modernization has been a search for a modern political life and a political apparatus capable of meeting the aspirations of the peoples. The establishment of several Arab States was the immediate result of those aspirations. The external manifestation of Arab nationalism is seen in the attempts to secure and maintain internal sovereignty and to promote self-interest by pragmatic policies.

The final goal of Arab nationalism is to establish one Arab State.

As used in the Middle East, socialism is a loose generic term for economic and social reform. The Arab nations desire to achieve economic sufficiency. They also wish to rearrange group relations within society so as to best use all resources. The ultimate goal in this area is to achieve social justice. It should be explained that Arab "socialism" is basically non-Marxist.

In the United Arab Republic, due to socialism a workers group has been established, a large civil and military bureaucracy has come into being and the peasants have been mobilized. Aspirations and material expectations have been created far beyond the capacity of the system to fulfill. The United Arab Republic will soon be faced with the problem of choosing either full state control or other political alternatives to solve economic problems. Some Marxists want to create an integral socialist system as an alternative.

Basically, however, the United Arab Republic is a pluralist society. It is not prepared in its ideology and its structure for full Marxist socialism. It would probably prefer a relaxation of controls and assurance that the socialist system will not destroy its way of life.

President Nasser is an important force in this regard, Professor Karpaz stated, but he is probably a nationalist using socialist means to further his nationalistic aims. If Nasser could be forced to choose today, he would probably follow the pluralistic course with its implications for policies with regard to the West.

Relations among Arab States have been affected by socialism. Socialism has disrupted much of the unity orientation

created by Arab nationalism. Socialism has laid bare the social and political differences among various Arab societies. It has undermined various interests based on those differences.

A cleavage has developed between the monarchies and the republics based on social differences. Also, a cleavage has occurred among the republics reflecting the social differences in various nations. Syria has recently swung to the left, but it is likely to be forced back to the right. Syria seems unable to develop a stable government or unifying philosophy and has become unpredictable in its policies.

Iraq also was unpredictable, but now it seems to have properly appraised its own heterogeneous society and taken a midway course based on self-interest.

Strong Arab organizations, such as the Arab Socialist Union, seem to have had their immediate chances of success destroyed by emphasizing socialism to the detriment of national unity. But unity and Nasser's leadership are still alive, though faced with great obstacles.

The civil strife in Yemen, where the United Arab Republic is aligned against Saudi Arabia, is likely to have lasting impact. The situation includes an intervention in the internal affairs of another state, and an attack on other states. It ignores Arab brotherhood and has created a government by force without sufficient support. It is an attempt to modernize a traditional society by force, and appears to be more costly than it is worth.

The development of a modern political structure in Saudi Arabia may have a very important effect. Saudi Arabia is the center of Islam and contains the purest Arabic element. But it had failed to exert leadership so far because failure to create a modern bureaucracy and military organization until Nasser's challenge forced it to adopt new methods of military and civilian administration. It had relied on sheer religious identification, which was not enough. Potentially it is a great power in the Arab world, and the consequences of its political development could be great: it would eliminate competition in the Arabic peninsula and create a new political subsystem which may determine the political fate of Yemen and Aden; it would make the peninsula and its oil resources relatively immune to the vicissitudes of Arab policies. But political modernization in Saudi Arabia would create a military and intellectual group sharing the nationalist-socialist aspirations of other Arab intellectuals and speed up the establishment of a republican regime.

Turkey is different from the rest of the Middle East. Turkey's intelligentsia are today moving away from the West. The new large and aggressive middle class with political power has replaced the old elite, who now look to socialism as a means to regain power. Also, the Cyprus crisis has influenced the intellectuals greatly. Turkey was not allowed to enforce its binding treaty rights and found that NATO restricted its freedom, while Greece was free to aid President Makarios. The West exaggerated the military and economic dependence of Turkey. As a result, Turkey has moved

toward an accommodation with Russia and is attempting to improve her relations with the Balkan nations. Turkey's relations with the other Arab nations have improved also.

Turkey is still committed to the West through NATO and CENTO, but an effective partnership in these bodies depends on restoring Turkey's confidence in the West and the United States in particular.

Internally, Turkey is growing quickly and has achieved better civilian-military relations than existed in the past.

The Middle East, in general, seems destined again to become a playground for the great powers. Though Chinese influence has been minimal so far, a detente between the United States and U.S.S.R. might cause the Arabs to support China as an alternative to any agreement the two great powers may reach to the detriment of the Arabs.

The Middle East is important for Soviet-Sino relations. It should be remembered that the central Asian regions disputed by the U.S.S.R. and China are actually inhabited by Turkic people. Both sides will try to neutralize or use the appeals of Turkey and Iran to the peoples of central Asia who have linguistic, religious and cultural ties with Iranians and especially the Turks.

The United States should review its Middle East policy in the light of the changes I have outlined and in light of the Soviet-Chinese dispute.

The commentator on this panel was Rabbi Israel Miller of the Kingsbridge Heights Jewish Center, former president of the American Rabbinical Council and currently chairman of the American Zionist Council.

Rabbi Miller based his remarks on the idea that the world is diverse and yet one. The large powers have interests in the Middle East which are frequently in conflict.

The U.S. interests are those of all people of good will, to help develop the area and help it achieve its own fulfillment. Peace is needed to accomplish these goals.

We should look at values as well as events, especially in relation to the Arab-Israel conflict. Israel and the United States have an identity of values—freedom, democracy, self-fulfillment, and the government as the servant of the people.

The basic U.S. interest is peace. The United States should use all diplomatic means to bring the two sides to a peace conference. Such a peace settlement would allow the resources of the Middle East to be used for the benefit of the people of the region. The United States should give aid only to be used for development. It should try to achieve a rapport with the U.S.S.R. to allow peaceful development of the area.

QUESTIONS

As the Arab States reach a more mature phase, will their attitude toward Israel change?

Answer. By Ambassador Harman:

A change will occur when the Arab states realize that their top priority problem isn't Israel, but internal problems that won't be solved by destroying Israel. Also, when the

June 22, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3171

Arabs realize that it isn't possible to destroy Israel, then an accommodation can occur. This change will be a gradual process and will take a long time.

What is the U.S. role with respect to armaments in the Middle East?

Answer. By Ambassador Harman:

The United States doesn't like nations spending resources on competitive armaments. Neither does Israel. Israel has never introduced a new element of weaponry in the Middle East. Its defense policy is not military superiority but to maintain a minimum sufficient to deter aggression. Russia supplies most of the Arab arms and a U.S.-U.S.S.R. disarmament agreement would help lead to an Arab-Israeli disarmament. Until that goal is reached, however, Israel cannot allow imbalances to develop.

What compensation has Israel offered to refugees? What is the Arab counter-demand?

Answer. By Ambassador Harman:

The Arabs originally wished to talk about refugees as an independent issue, but Israel wished to speak about it as part of the peace problem. Israel has been flexible and has made many efforts to discuss the issue. The Arabs insist that the refugees be allowed to return to Israel and hence make Israel an Arab country. But Israel won't accept likely fifth-columnists. Rather it is willing to compensate the Arabs whose property was taken, while the Arabs absorb the refugees. This absorption process is occurring today, and if resettlement in Arab countries were allowed, the process would go faster. Also, Israel would expect that the property left behind by the 800,000 Jewish refugees from Arab nations it has accepted would be considered in the final account. However, as of now no one is willing to discuss any of the alternatives Israel has raised.

Contribution of a Proud Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. S. JOHNNY WALKER
OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding contribution by a very proud family. I have here a news release which was brought to my attention by Mrs. Mary E. Chavez of Santa Fe, and which explains why this family is justifiably proud.

The news release follows:

One of the most outstanding contributions of manpower in the defense of this country has been that of six mothers, daughters of Mrs. Senaida Rodriguez and the late Eduardo Rodriguez of Santa Fe, New Mexico, and Alamosa, Colorado.

These six women have a total of ten sons actively serving in the war effort at present, as follows:

L/Cpl. John I. E. Chavez is at an undisclosed overseas destination. He is the son of Mrs. Mary E. Chavez and the late Louis Chavez of Santa Fe, N.M. Immediately upon graduation from St. Michael's Cpl. Chavez enlisted in the Marine Corps. He has just turned 18 years of age.

Mr. and Mrs. John B. Martinez of Albuquerque, N.M., have two sons in the Service: S/Sgt. John B. Martinez is in the Air Force stationed at Omaha, Neb; Anthony Martinez, A2C, is stationed at Heester AFB, Miss.

Jose A. Romero, A2C, is stationed at Homestead AFB, Fla. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Manuel L. Romero of Albuquerque, N.M.

Mr. and Mrs. John B. Romero of Denver, Colorado, have three sons in the Service: Lt. John Romero, stationed at Whiteman AFB, Mo., is Deputy Missile Combat Crew Commander there; S/Sgt. Raymond Romero is stationed overseas; David Romero, A2C, is also stationed overseas.

Daniel De Herrera, A2C, is stationed overseas. He is the son of Mrs. De Herrera and the late Joe De Herrera of Alamosa, Colorado. Another son by a previous marriage, S/Sgt. James Martinez, is also overseas.

Bill Handlin, son of Mr. and Mrs. Rex Handlin of Sublette, Kans., is serving overseas in the Navy as Flagship Quartermaster.

Carl Lewis Estes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RAY ROBERTS
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to pause for a moment to remember a great American and mourn his passing. On Monday, May 29, Carl Lewis Estes of Longview, Tex., was suddenly taken from this life. Surviving him are his wife; two brothers, U.S. District Judge Joe E. Estes, of Dallas, and W. Neal Estes, of Stanton; and a sister, Miss Mary Lou Estes, of Dallas, and several nephews and nieces.

Mr. Estes was no ordinary man. He was a newspaperman who used his paper as a voice crying out for whatever was needed to benefit his people. But he did not stop with the printed word. He would personally go to bat for the cause of the moment—and usually win.

The Carl Estes story relates one accomplishment after another. During his third of a century in Longview, Publisher Estes initiated and championed many civic and industrial campaigns that benefited the people of the entire east Texas region.

He went to St. Louis and got the Union Station and a modern underpass approved. He came to Washington in search for a new post office and Federal building. When he was told an appropriation of \$65,000 would be made, he turned thumbs down, notifying local civic leaders that he was holding out for at least \$300,000, in keeping with Longview's needs. This amount, and more, was later provided.

Many east Texas highways have been built because of the push given for them by Estes. He came to Washington and Longview got the \$5 million Harmon General Hospital to take care of the sick and the wounded from World War II. Later, it was Estes who blocked the attempt to dismantle the hospital, and eventually turned the site into a technical school. As an outgrowth of this, Longview is now the site of the vast LeTourneau operations.

Returning home after World War II, the publisher with Mrs. Estes covered many thousands of miles in search of industry for the Longview area. He was successful, so successful that Longview

now has the Texas Eastman Co., as well as many, many more plants and industries.

One of the chief benefactors of this colorful crusader is the independent oil operator. Carl Estes was the founder of the Texas Oil Journal, a monthly magazine devoted to the petroleum and associated industries with national circulation. He had published it in Longview since 1934, the early boom days of the huge east Texas oilfield.

His newspaper career began in Denison, Tex. Later he went to Commerce, Tex., where he attended East Texas State University and also worked for the Commerce Journal. Prior to acquiring the newspaper properties in Longview, he was general manager of the Tyler, Tex., newspapers owned by the T. B. Butler Publishing Co.

Whatever benefited people, interested Carl Estes. The people across this land, big and little, mourn his passing and offer their sincere sympathy to his family and to those who were closest to him.

Man Chooses Best of His Kind for Slaughter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Memphis, Tenn., Commercial Appeal for Sunday, June 18, carried on its editorial pages a column by the noted writer Jenkin Lloyd Jones, entitled "Man Chooses Best of His Kind for Slaughter."

The article deftly points out that it is the ablest and the best who have found life to be toughest—not the ungifted, the disorganized, the listless, and lazy.

Members will find the article thought provoking.

The article referred to follows:

MAN CHOOSES BEST OF HIS KIND FOR
SLAUGHTER

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

We are in an era when it is fashionable to commiserate with the ungifted, the disorganized, the lazy and others who, for a variety of reasons, can't cut the mustard. So perhaps it is well to remind ourselves that the world has been tough on the able, too.

To this end we are indebted to an article by Nathaniel Weyl in The Intercollegiate Review in which he explores "aristoclide," or the periodic slaughter of the smartest.

He points out the vast difference between natural aristocracies composed of people of intrinsic worth from either side of the tracks and prescriptive aristocracies based on hereditary position. These latter have a way of running out of gas before they run out of ermine, as witness the Hapsburgs and the Bourbons.

Aristoclide is as old as history. It was the common result when a primitive people overran an advanced people, and there was a measure of self-preservation in it. The brutish conquerors butchered the leading citizens, knowing well that these harbored the seeds of rebellion and would make restive serfs.

A 3172

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 22, 1967

The Mongol conquests did the job so well that the creative capacity of the Middle East was destroyed for generations.

In ancient and medieval times, ambitious and energetic people tended to flock into cities. Conquerors didn't bother much with chasing fleeing herdsmen into the woods. But they put the cities to the sword. Plagues hit the cities hardest.

Only the Romans were smart enough to treat their brilliant slaves well and sit at their feet as pupils. Tamerlane and Genghis Khan knocked off all the teachers and philosophers they could find.

The Russian Communists encouraged technicians and scientists, but they looked with great suspicion on artists, poets and other independent minds. Even the old Bolshevik "intellectuals" were pretty well eliminated in the various purges, and the Russian arts, which had flourished in the climate of the Czars, have suffered badly.

In hustling the Jews to his gas chambers, Hitler killed off a creative minority that had stood at the forefront of German medicine, philosophy and science for generations.

No one has a close estimate of the number of Chinese aristocrats and "exploiters" whom Mao butchered after the Red takeover—the most quoted figure is 20 million. If true, he must have bagged a good proportion of those Chinese smart enough to take a pinch of salt with the words of Mao.

The level of national ability takes a licking in modern war. The slack jaws and dim bulbs stay at home to breed while the boys who can pass the exams suit up. Often, the higher one's aptitude, the more dangerous the combat job. Half the RAF came from the best schools of England. No wonder what was left sat around bawling for free toupees and cradle-to-grave security.

Even without war or massacres or plague there can be progressive deterioration. The welfare state is designed to remove the privations which have been the penalty of incompetence, but it cannot remove the taxes necessary for subsidy. Thus, two classes of people can have all the children they wish—the rich who can afford them and the poor who can call on public aid to support them.

But the vigorous, rising middle class, which provides most of the reservoir of national talent, is inclined to limit births in order to provide educational advantages for its children. This tendency will increase as the tax burden grows. The future of the national IQ in those nations which oversubsidize low competence and overpenalize high competence is cloudy.

If man had not spent 200 generations selectively slaughtering and discouraging his ablest representatives, perhaps there would be by now no audience for bullfights, no screaming crowds trying to catch sight of The Animals or yodking off after Twiggy.

The War on Poverty Must Go On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the New York Post expresses precisely my view on the necessity for renewing our commitment to the Office of Economic Opportunity as the principal coordinating agency in the war on poverty. The editorial follows:

THE HOMEFRONT WAR

As alarming new communiques pour in from the ghetto battlefronts in Tampa, Cincinnati and Los Angeles, the House Education and Labor Committee resumes hearings tomorrow on the Administration's poverty war—specifically, on the \$2,000,000,000 program for 1968.

Republican strategy at this stage is to abolish the Office of Economic Opportunity and to scatter about \$1,700,000,000, among federal agencies.

If there is one thing the poverty campaign does not need, it is further fragmentation of top authority and administration. We urge New York's Congressional delegation to bear that in mind. On the outcome of this GOP-Administration battle may hinge the outcome of the poverty war.

Flag Desecration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report." The subject discussed is desecration of our flag.

The report follows:

This is Jim Kee, bringing you the Kee Report.

Recently, there was an outdoor meeting in New York sponsored by those citizens who oppose American participation in the Vietnamese war. There was nothing illegal about this meeting because the right of dissent is as old as the Constitution itself. Even in time of war, the citizen has a right to express his views—provided he is not guilty of giving aid and comfort to the enemies of our country.

But suppose we take a closer look at what happened at that New York meeting. This gathering went far beyond the mere expression of protest. What happened there will shock every American who has pride in his country and his flag. The speakers at this anti-war meeting denounced, in the strongest terms, the President of the United States and the Secretary of State. They denounced the policy of our Government in the most violent and offensive terms they could think of. And then they went beyond the mere expression of opinion.

A few young men were invited to burn their draft cards publicly, which they did. As a final act to this shabby drama, the flag of the United States was burned to the jeers of thousands of onlookers.

The newspapers reported that on the day this sorry event took place, several American lads were killed defending this same flag in the far-off jungles of Asia. Yet these flag burners escaped bodily harm at the hands of indignant citizens because under the American system, even flagrant wrong-doers are protected against mob action.

This incident in New York revealed a glaring weakness in our legal system. There is no Federal law against desecrating or defiling the flag of the United States. The punishment for that offense is left to the individual states. Unfortunately, the punishment in most states is inadequate and too often, there is no prosecution at all. The reason is that the practice of flag burning is of very recent origin.

To fill this gap, I introduced legislation during the 89th Congress and in this Congress, the 90th Congress, which, it is my earnest hope, will be enacted into law at this Session of Congress. I am pleased to report that the appropriate committee granted me an opportunity to testify in behalf of this proposed legislation. This proposed law says this:

"Whoever publicly mutilates, defaces, defiles, tramples upon, or casts contempt, either by word or act, upon any flag, standard, colors, or ensign of the United States shall be punished by imprisonment of not more than five years and a fine of not more than \$10,000."

The foregoing statute is necessary because the flag does not belong to any individual state. To millions of our citizens, our flag is the sacred emblem of our political rights. In this century alone, millions of young Americans have fought under our flag at the four corners of the globe. Since the United States became a nation, nearly one million young Americans have died in wartime to keep our flag floating in the skies.

The motive of the flag burners, of course, is to outrage the patriotic feelings of their fellow Americans. Too often, in the past, they have been able to get away unpunished or by the payment of a small fine. But the threat of five years in prison should be enough to discourage the flag burners.

Thank you for listening.

Indiana Veterans of Foreign Wars Speak Out on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Indianapolis, Ind., News of June 19, 1967, is certainly correct. The Indiana Veterans of Foreign Wars are much more representative of what Americans think than the noisy, unwashed minority that seems to get all the headlines.

THE VETERANS SPEAK

The Indiana Veterans of Foreign Wars, in calling for military victory in Vietnam, has given what we believe to be the authentic American answer to peacenik agitation against the war.

The VFW consists of men of varied backgrounds and differing political views whose common experience is that they have fought in the foreign wars of this century to keep sworn enemies away from America's gates.

They came to Indianapolis on the weekend from the cities, the small towns, and the byways of Indiana to elect officers and formulate a position on issues confronting the nation. Consequently, when they speak they should be considered more representative of American thinking, and more deserving of a hearing, than the minority of campus radicals that holds public attention with its noisy antics.

The assembled veterans don't like war any more than the peace marchers do. They want it ended in victory—a victory that will do honor to the Americans who have already given their lives and that will deter the enemy from new adventures.

Their resolution calls for "whatever action is required to conclude the Vietnam war with victory" and opposes "any kind of

H 7778

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 22, 1967

agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STEED, PASSMAN, ADDABBO, COHELAN, YATES, MAHON, CONTE, ROBISON, BOW, and Mrs. REID of Illinois.

RUSSIAN BEAR

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, to have listened to the Soviet Union make use of infantile invective in the Security Council debate on the Middle East has been a most distressing experience. Surely it was to have been expected that a great power would have wanted to display to the world that it is capable of employing the accents of civilized exchange. It is incredible that a nation which seeks to influence world opinion should have adopted tactics of such low intellectual content as to alienate thinking men and women of good will. The world has been subjected to such a lack of finesse as to bring into the minds of all small nations a most frightening vision of the Russian Bear, who crushes even as he embraces. The U.S.S.R. fought the adoption of a cease-fire resolution until it became unmistakably clear that Israel was the indisputable victor.

I am not speaking of the Soviet's obvious bias. The bias looms so large as to hardly need comment. What I am speaking of is to my mind the tragic display—in full-blown view—of the raging, the vituperation, so like that of a child in a tantrum.

I speak in true sorrow because it is so disheartening that one of the major powers could have so little regard for the opinions and sensibilities of thoughtful people.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 145 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE UNITED STATES IN SOUTH VIETNAM ELECTIONS

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the people of South Vietnam will go to the polls in September in the exercise of a fundamental right: the right to select in free elections the country's chief executive officers and legislators.

The United States has the unquestionable responsibility to support self-

determination for the people of South Vietnam.

Therefore, I am introducing a resolution in Congress providing that six Representatives and three Senators go to Vietnam to observe the elections and protect the honesty and impartiality of the voting.

The presence of these representatives of Congress will serve as a deterrent to challenges to the freedom of the electorate, from without or from within.

Their presence will also reaffirm our responsibility to aid the people of South Vietnam in the protection of their right to self-determination.

FLAG DESECRATION BILL

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

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to make crystal clear my intent, and I believe the intent of most, if not all, of the membership in connection with the passage on Tuesday of the flag desecration bill, H.R. 10480. As one of the sponsors of this legislation, I believe it is also no secret that in the committee I moved to add the word "burning" to the group of offenses against the American flag which the Congress intended to prohibit. In addition, the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union adopted another amendment on page 1 by adding the word "knowingly" on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BIESTER], so that the offenses which we intended to prohibit were described in the following language:

Whoever knowingly casts contempt upon any flag of the United States by publicly mutilating, defacing, defiling, burning, or trampling upon it shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

The parliamentary situation which developed resulted in the words "knowingly" and "burning" being omitted from the final version of the bill as passed. As I stated to the membership immediately prior to the time when the Committee rose, I advocated and recommended a vote on the bill which included those two words. I am confident that most, if not all, of the Members of the House intended their vote to include that language. Certainly there was nothing said in the Committee or on the floor of the House prior to the passage of the bill which would have indicated to the membership that those words were not included.

Accordingly, it is my hope that in the consideration of this legislation by the other body due respect for this language will be given and that the intent of the membership of the House as I have described it will be recognized.

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

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the gentleman has made this statement and I wish to associate myself with his statement.

QUALIFICATIONS OF FEDERAL JUDGES

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, more and more people are complaining to their Congressman, and each other, about the nature of decisions being rendered by our courts.

The most recent decision of J. Skelly Wright, of the U.S. Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, has brought a new rash of demands by the public that "something be done about these goofy judges" who think they have the power to legislate by judicial mandate.

Everybody talks about the increase in crime, except Attorney General Ramsey Clark who merely tries to wish it away. It is becoming increasingly clear the preoccupation of protecting the "rights" of criminals has superseded the interest of the overwhelming number of the members of society that are respectable, law abiding citizens. This philosophy seems to be "judicially inspired" by numerous split decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court and inferior courts.

About the only way to restore some semblance of reason in the thinking of the judges of this country is to try to apply some guidelines, or set basic qualifications for those who may serve in the judiciary in the future. Today, they are negligible.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, as I have in previous sessions, I am introducing legislation to accomplish this result and I trust the chairman of the Judiciary Committee will set prompt hearings.

A "MINI-LIFE" FOR THE "MINI-GRANT"

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

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the first day of summer, and it seems that the heat has already gotten to the Office of Education.

Yesterday I received a notice from the Office of Education announcing a new concept in Federal funding—the "mini-grant." Appropriately this great step forward is made through title III of ESEA, which is devoted to innovative projects.

When I first saw this announcement, I had a vision of "mini-grants" as very small grants for tiny programs to serve very little children—plagiarizing, of course, the modern educational styles of Carnaby Street.

I was glad to learn that this image is not accurate, but is only the product of a strained sense of humor. It seems that "mini-grants" are actually substantial projects with serious purposes. The four very welcome grants approved yesterday for my district total \$70,443 and are for curriculum revision, science instruction, and aid for delinquent boys. They seem to be called mini-grants only because the Office of Education was able to process them without regard to the



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 113

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 1967

No. 99

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
Rev. Hensel E. Hendrickson, Trinity
Evangelical Lutheran Church, Bismarck,
N. Dak., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Dear Heavenly Father, as a prelude to
this day's labors, we would turn our
thoughts to Thee.

Help us not to think higher than we
ought of our own achievements, but
learn to count as success that which is
accomplished to bring glory to Thee and
hope to fellow man.

Keep us in tune with Thee so that what
we lack in faith, we will not make up in
frenzied activity.

May each one of us, individually and
corporately, be led by Thy Spirit to re-
flect the truth that as our Nation has
been blessed so we have the mandate to
be a blessing to the many of our Nation
and of our one world who look to this
place for guidance.

In the name of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the Presi-
dent of the United States was communi-
cated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one
of his secretaries, who also informed the
House that on June 13, 1967, the Presi-
dent approved and signed a bill of the
House of the following title:

H.R. 6950. An act to restore the investment
credit and allowance of accelerated depreci-
ation in the case of certain real property.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr.
Arrington, one of its clerks, announced
that the Senate disagrees to the amend-
ment of the House to the joint resolu-
tion (S.J. Res. 81) entitled "A joint
resolution to provide for the settlement
of the labor dispute between certain
carriers by railroad and certain of their
employees," requests a conference with
the House on the disagreeing votes of the
two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr.

YARBOROUGH, Mr. MORSE, Mr. RANDOLPH,
Mr. PELL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. KENNEDY of
New York, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey,
Mr. JAVITS, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. FANNIN, and
Mr. GRIFFIN to be the conferees on the
part of the Senate.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TO- DAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask
unanimous consent that the Committee
on Education and Labor may sit during
general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MA- RINE AND FISHERIES TO SIT DUR- ING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask
unanimous consent that the Subcom-
mittee on Fisheries and Wildlife of the
Committee on Merchant Marine and
Fisheries may sit during general debate
today.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TO- DAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask
unanimous consent that the Subcom-
mittee on Elections of the Committee on
House Administration may be permitted
to sit during general debate today.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving
the right to object, will there be anyone
here this afternoon for the debate on
the pending legislation?

Mr. ALBERT. It is my understanding
that most Members will be here.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PRO- GRAM, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask
unanimous consent that the Subcom-
mittee on Federal-Aid Highway Pro-
gram of the Committee on Public Works
may be permitted to sit during general
debate today.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COM- MERCE TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask
unanimous consent that the Committee
on Interstate and Foreign Commerce
may be permitted to sit during general
debate today.

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

There was no objection.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DE- PARTMENTS, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, AND INDE- PENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIA- TION BILL, 1968—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unan-
imous consent to take from the Speaker's
table the bill (H.R. 7501) making ap-
propriations for the Treasury and Post
Office Departments, the Executive Office
of the President, and certain independ-
ent agencies, for the fiscal year ending
June 30, 1968, and for other purposes,
with Senate amendments thereto, dis-
agree to the Senate amendments, and

H 7777