

sponsibility and Federal authority. There also comes Bureaucratic red-tape and delay.

Local initiative and local funds reverse this trend. The GOP proposal to share Federal tax revenues with the States, if enacted into law, could have far-reaching effects in helping to find solutions to the complex problems we are facing. A good regional planning system must have at its base some consideration of financing methods. We must be able to create taxing authorities and levy taxes. The cost, as I have mentioned, may be great for all concerned; and ultimately, as Malcolm Forbes has stated: "We who live long enough to survive in our present environment will pay for it in the price of what we buy. But what's wrong with that?"

Secretary of Interior Udall has stated our dilemma very well, I think, in his book, *The Quiet Crisis*: "We have built, but in most places not with distinction. Ours is a powerful nation, but the question is do we have a civilization of distinction? This Nation leads the world in wealth and power, but also leads in the degradation of the human habitat. We have the most automobiles and worst junkyards. We are the most mobile people on earth and we endure the most congestion. We produce the most energy and have the foulest air. Our factories pour out more products and our rivers carry the heaviest loads of pollution. We have rich cities, but few handsome ones. We excel as developers but not as conservers of order and beauty. We will not restore balance and harmony that we once had in the best American cities unless we act with new respect for the land—and for ourselves. Can we bring the conservation idea in from the countryside to the city? Can we build with true distinction? We can, I believe, if we develop a new scheme of values and a new politics as well. Henceforth, all of must participate in the decisions that determine the face and character of tomorrow's America: the design of a bridge, the location of highways, the expansion of cities, the cleansing of air and water, the saving of open space, the preserving of wildlife and wild lands—rest on our involvement in the decision-making process."

This is why I feel we are at the turning point in life resource planning. If we take advantage of the opportunities available to us—through governmental cooperation, through the utilization of modern techniques to get proper resource management and through methods of adequate financing, as well as education, objective pre-planning of our requirements and effective utilization of our resources—we do have the opportunity to overcome the dilemma which faces not only the United States of America, but the entire world.

Future generations will not be building on the rubbish heap of a past civilization, but, rather, will be living in a well-maintained civilization, which has retained the best of the past and ordered the present, so that it can achieve the best of the future.

If we are not at a turning point toward accomplishment of this end, in the final analysis, we will be at a turning point toward ultimate failure in managing our own world audits resources. Then, it may not be the threat of nuclear war which mankind has most to fear, but his waste and pollution of his present resources and environment.

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR SOL M. LINOWITZ

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

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, Ambassador Sol M.

Linowitz, the U.S. representative to the Organization of American States, spoke before the National Press Club on the meaning of the recent Hemispheric Summit Conference. While Ambassador Linowitz was heartened by the commitment and dedication of the American Presidents, he was also disturbed by the failure of the Alliance thus far to ignite the spark of commitment in the youth of the Latin American nations.

This kind of balanced thinking is essential to any effective attack on the massive problems that remain throughout the hemisphere. Progress has been made to be sure, but we cannot rest content with its pace. Far more must be done to involve the people, all of all ages, in their own development process, and the first step toward the accomplishment of this task is the recognition of its importance. This the Ambassador has done, and I include the text of his remarks in the RECORD:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR SOL M. LINOWITZ, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., ON THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

What were the expectations with reference to the Summit Conference at Punta del Este and how well were they realized?

In launching and moving forward the Conference, the Latin American Presidents anticipated that the Presidents of this Hemisphere might come together, recognizing their common problems, and talk together frankly, freely, and with mutual respect about how to reach answers on the fundamental issues. The hope was that they might then undertake important commitments affecting the future of the Hemisphere. The Conference would be a Latin American Conference, organized and led by the Latin American leaders; and President Johnson would be present as a cooperating partner assuring the Latin Americans of our support and understanding and following their lead in hemispheric progress and unity.

What happened at Punta del Este was precisely that: eighteen Presidents, one Presidential representative, and the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago met, spoke frankly, and (with one exception) reached agreement on issues of profound significance to the future of Latin America. The Conference was a Latin American conference, led by the Latin American Presidents and involving fundamental commitments on their part more far-reaching than any since these countries achieved their independence. President Johnson was there as a helpful junior partner in the effort, making clear our own involvement and support and our willingness to walk at their side as they proceed along the bold path before them.

The relationships established, the understandings reached among the Presidents and the spirit in which discussions were conducted, all give promise of a new era in Inter-American relationships.

It may be that the greatest contribution of this Summit Conference will have been not the decisions to move forward boldly along specific lines—fundamental as these decisions are—but rather its impact on the minds of men. The millions of the Hemisphere were watching as their top political leaders looked at their common problems, discussed their differences and chose the difficult way of peaceful revolution and development. This was a dramatic demonstration of a dominant fact of Latin America today: that the Alliance for Progress represents the mainstream of political, social and economic thought and action . . .

ON THE LATIN AMERICAN COMMON MARKET

Is a Latin American Common Market really a feasible objective? Taking into account the disparity of development among the countries of Latin America, is it reasonable to expect that there can indeed be fashioned a common market for the continent overriding political, economic and social barriers?

I believe that it is. And my belief is grounded in the knowledge that many of the leaders of Latin America today are men of vision, men who know how to dream and how to achieve; men who know that what is needed most for that break-through is a unified assault by their nations against their common problems—an assault that will launch both new life into the Alliance for Progress and a new era of common understanding in the Americas.

They also understand that nowhere is that unified assault more important than in this complex problem of Latin American economic integration. For success here truly could result in an upheaval of a continent that would cast out the ills now paralyzing so much of its potential.

And there is evidence that, vast though the undertaking may be, and potentially difficult though it admittedly is, it can be done. The first steps have already been taken through the organization of the Central American Common Market and the Latin American Free Trade Association. The countries of Central America, for example, have expanded intrazonal exports from \$33 million in 1960 to \$155 million in 1966. Upwards of 90 percent of all trade among the five countries of Central America is now restriction-free and the proportion of their intraregional trade has more than doubled.

It is true that in the larger Latin American Free Trade Association—which includes Mexico and all of South America—progress has been slower. But even there, intra-zonal trade jumped from \$775 million in 1962 to an estimated \$1.5 billion in 1966. In addition, some 9,000 tariff concessions have been negotiated since LAFTA was organized.

Will the development of a Latin American Common Market provide increased competition for some of our own export markets? Probably. The same was also true of the European Common Market. Yet the growth of the European market has not affected our industrial growth adversely; quite the contrary. For whether it be Europe or Latin America—or any region, for that matter—our prosperity is bound up with the world's.

We will have to make some adjustments and there may be some short-term losses, but these cannot be compared to our—and their—long-term gains as we engage in a mutually profitable trade. And the story does not end with economics. There is a political moral too: An economically viable Latin America will have an even greater stake than it does today in a free, stable and secure world.

In conjunction with steps toward economic integration, the Presidents agreed that there will have to be action to overcome physical obstacles to the regional flow of goods and services: this will mean continental road projects, interconnection of electric power systems and telecommunications, and joint investment in air transport, railroads and steamship lines, as well as in such basic industries as fertilizers, pulp and paper, iron and steel and petrochemicals. These and more are now grist for the Alliance mill as approved by the Presidents, and each project offers vast possibilities for transforming the map of Latin America.

I believe that much of this imagination and vision can be provided by private enterprise. Certainly it has both the technical know-how and the capital which are sorely needed.

Considerable misunderstanding still exists about the purposes and value of U.S. private investment in Latin American countries. Some of the blame for this may fall squarely on business, but less than popular conception has it.

Today, many of the Latin American countries are indeed making efforts to create a better environment for private investment; and United States businesses already supply one-tenth of the continent's production, pay one-fifth of all taxes, account for a third of all export earnings, and provide jobs for an estimated 1,500,000 Latin Americans. I hope it will continue to participate to an even greater degree, recognizing always the great role it can and must play in meeting the needs of the people of the continent.

ON THE HUMAN FACTOR

In concluding his address at the Latin American Summit Conference in Punta del Este, Uruguay, earlier this month, President Johnson spoke directly to the youth of the Americas. To them he said:

"All that has been dreamed in the years since the Alliance started can only come to pass if your hearts and minds become committed to it. . . . Here in the countries of the Alliance, a peaceful revolution has affirmed man's ability to change the conditions of his life through the institutions of democracy. In your hands is the task of carrying it forward."

Behind these words was the recognition that the people of Latin America today are basically a young people, younger than we. Three-fifths of the Latin American population are under twenty-four years of age, compared with two-fifths for the United States and Canada. These young people now constitute the bulk of the electorate in Latin America—the people the Governments must answer to and heed—the people who, in a few years' time, will be the leaders of the continent.

It is the young people who must be convinced that the Alliance for Progress holds out a true promise for their future. It is they who must understand that while the Alliance for Progress can be their revolution, all of us in both North and South America share its ideals and its aspirations for something better; for hope, for dignity, for democratic institutions under law to carry on the fight in the only way it must be carried on—constructively, compassionately, and concerned with the right of the individual.

In my visits to Latin America, I've talked to university students about the Alliance and the relations between the United States and Latin America. I've been disappointed in their lack of awareness of how much the Alliance has been and is doing, and their lack of excitement about its potential. Yet unless we can arouse that sense of excitement, that feeling of enthusiasm and loyalty among the masses of people of Latin America, neither the Presidents' program nor the Alliance can succeed.

There are, of course, some who are afraid of change, who fear that rocking the boat can only lead to Communism in a region so scarred with misery, poverty and special interests. I think that the reverse is true—that the sure way to Communism or to any other extreme, right or left—is not the change, not to understand the needs of the people, not to give them the opportunity to attain the economic mastery of their lives and, perhaps even more important, social justice. The United States must, of course, deeply concern itself with methods of opposing any overt or covert Communism attempts to infiltrate this Hemisphere. But in doing so we must also remember that anti-Communism as such will not automatically command the attention of the average Latin American, who is steeped in his own personal struggle to keep his head above water. We

must show that we stand for something better.

City slum dwellers denied hope and illiterate rural Indians denied even a glimpse of the Twentieth Century cannot offer a foundation to sustain or nurture democracy. A demagogue who elbows his way upward through the masses and who offers them protection and food will have their sullen support or mute acquiescence. For these are the staple commodities they desperately want and need. No promise or vision can vie with that.

And that is the meaning of the program undertaken at Punta del Este which must become known to the people in human terms. They must recognize that the Alliance for Progress is their charter, that the commitments at Punta del Este are their promise; and that even though "social justice" was not listed on the formal Summit Agenda, it was never absent from the Presidents' Conference table. As President Johnson said in his address:

"Our discussions here are couched in the technical terms of trade and development policies. But beyond these impersonal terms stands the reality of individual men, women and children. It is for them—not the statisticians and economists—that we work. It is for them—and especially for the young—that the hope and the challenge of the Alliance exists."

The promise of Latin America will be a difficult one to fulfill. We will incur many disappointments and encounter many frustrations. We shall probably become discouraged from time to time, and then there will be voices raised urging us either to withdraw or to turn our backs on Latin America. Yet this is a risk which we do not dare take. If we lose heart in Latin America now there may never be another place nor another day anywhere or anytime. For the stakes there are high—just about the highest for which we have ever played, and we cannot afford to lose.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO OUR CONGRESSIONAL SECRETARIES

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

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, for 16 years the United States has been observing National Secretaries Week, noting for a brief time the dedicated and effective work of the secretaries of this country.

The theme suggested by the National Secretaries Association for this year is "Better Secretaries Mean Better Business."

I might suggest a variation on that theme by stating that "Better Secretaries Mean Better Government."

It can be said that there would be no service to any constituent, there would be no historic debate on the national issues preserved for posterity, and indeed there would be little government at all today in the United States, without the secretary.

It is a pleasure, therefore, to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our secretaries. Without them the Congress could not function. They are most important cogs in the Federal machinery, without which, we would all fall short of our goals.

I urge the Members to join in this observance.

GENERAL DE GAULLE'S REPLY TO JEAN-PAUL SARTRE CONCERNING THE RUSSELL TRIBUNAL

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that France is our oldest ally, there continues to be those in this country—some of them in positions of great influence—who believe President de Gaulle is hostile to the United States and seeks ways to frustrate or embarrass our policies. In my judgment, these opinions are unjustified. This position was substantiated by President de Gaulle's letter to Jean-Paul Sartre, dated April 13, concerning the "Tribunal" proposed by Lord Russell.

Lord Russell and Mr. Sartre had requested President de Gaulle to permit the "tribunal" to meet in Paris. This gathering was for the purpose of putting President Johnson on "trial" for his "crimes in Vietnam." Since France is not only a member of NATO, but SEATO as well, Sartre believed he would score a propaganda coup if President de Gaulle would permit this event to occur on French soil. President de Gaulle's letter must have been a bitter disappointment to Sartre, because he refused permission for the undertaking in France.

In concluding his letter to Mr. Sartre, the French President pointed out that the execution of justice belongs to the state alone and that Lord Russell's group "are invested with no power nor do they have international mandate . . . they do not give more weight to their warnings by wearing robes borrowed for the occasion."

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the text of the De Gaulle letter be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

GENERAL DE GAULLE'S REPLY OF APRIL 19, 1967, TO THE LETTER FROM MR. JEAN-PAUL SARTRE, DATED APRIL 13, CONCERNING THE BERTRAND RUSSELL TRIBUNAL

In your letter of April 13, you asked me to examine the case of Mr. Vladimir Dedijer and, more generally, that of the persons called on to take part, in one or other capacity, in the work of the Russell Tribunal.

The sponsors of this tribunal propose to criticize the United States' Vietnam policy. There is nothing in this to cause the Government to restrict their normal freedom of assembly and of expression. Besides, you know what the Government thinks of the Vietnam war and what I myself have said about it publicly and unequivocally. Regardless of the fact that, in our country, freedom of the pen and of expression exist, it would, therefore, not be a question of restricting private individuals whose theses on this subject are, moreover, close to the French Republic's official position.

In any case, it is a question neither of the right to assemble nor of the freedom of expression but of the duty—all the more binding on France since she has taken the stand she has on the substance of the matter—to make sure that a State with which she has relations and which, despite all their differences, remains her traditional friend, be not the subject on her territory of proceedings that greatly oversteps international law and customs.

Now, this would seem to be the case of the action being undertaken by Lord Russell and his friends, since they intend to give a legal appearance to their investigations and the semblance of a verdict to their conclusions. You are well aware that all justice, in its principle as in its execution, belongs to the State alone. Without questioning the motives that inspire Lord Russell and his friends, I must not that they are invested with no power nor do they have any international mandate and that, therefore, they could not carry out any act of justice.

That is why the Government is bound to oppose the holding on our territory of a meeting which, by the form it would take, would be contrary to that very thing for which the Government is bound to enforce respect.

I will add that, to the extent that some of the people gathered around Lord Russell may have moral credit, lacking a public jurisdiction it does not seem to me that they give more weight to their warnings by wearing robes borrowed for the occasion.

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

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

BOY SCOUTS 12TH WORLD JAMBOREE "FOR FRIENDSHIP"

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

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, if Congress decides to recess each August, I would suggest that my colleagues consider a vacation this year on Lake Pend Oreille in Idaho's First District. Here, at Farragut State Park, over 8,000 Boy Scouts and their leaders from all over the world will join our Scouts in a mammoth encampment—the 12th World Jamboree "For Friendship," August 1 through 9.

We must acknowledge that the Scouts of today will be the leaders of tomorrow. Therefore, this meeting has an important bearing on world peace and international understanding.

The President has indicated that he will attend. I take this opportunity to invite all Members of Congress to be there as well. Not only will this meeting be an opportunity to see the seldom-publicized constructive side of today's youth, but an opportunity to see Idaho at its loveliest.

Because the jamboree is to be held in Idaho, the officials of my State have worked endlessly for the authorization of a commemorative stamp. Governor Samuelson, Louise Shadduck, the State director of the department of commerce, and the Idaho congressional delegation have seen their requests fall on deaf ears.

But this is not the only or even the best reason to support recognition of this event. This kind of face-to-face contact among young persons of demonstrated good character holds much more promise for the future than most of the dubious "bridge building" efforts being

proposed today. It is this example of international goodwill which we seek to recognize. The fact that the Boy Scouts are the instrument of contact and will share in that recognition, merely adds another reason for this action.

This will be the first world jamboree to be held in the United States. It also appears that we are to be the first host country in the last 30 years which has failed to issue a special stamp. Certainly, we do not want to do less to support this event than other countries have done.

And so, today I am offering two bills. One, as you might suspect, directs the Postmaster General to issue a commemorative stamp. The other calls upon the President to proclaim the first week of August as Boy Scouts World Jamboree "For Friendship" Week.

Since 328 Members of Congress have participated in the scouting movement at one time or another, I know there is a great deal of sympathy within this body for what these bills would do. I hope that many of you will see fit to support in this manner, the Boy Scouts and their contribution toward a peaceful world.

CRAMER CALLS FOR ACTION ON ANTICRIME AND ANTIRIOT BILLS TO ASSURE SAFE STREETS

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege today of appearing before the Committee on the Judiciary hearing evidence relating to anticrime proposals.

Because I believe that the combating of the ever-increasing rate of crime in the United States is one of the most critical problems facing the Nation and believing that this matter must be dealt with by the Congress this session and dealt with effectively, I am incorporating in the RECORD a copy of my testimony before the committee calling for enactment of my bills on the subjects of establishing: H.R. 421, antiriot bill; H.R. 6051, obstruction of justice; H.R. 6052, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Crime; H.R. 6053, immunity of witnesses; and H.R. 6054, Joint Committee on Organized Crime.

In addition, I asked the committee to consider "clear and precise laws which spell out the conditions under which the police may interrogate a suspect, how long the suspect may be retained, when a confession is 'voluntary,' and when the right to counsel begins."

TESTIMONY BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM C. CRAMER BEFORE THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ON HIS BILLS, H.R. 6051 AND H.R. 6053, APRIL 27, 1967

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, may I preface my testimony today by expressing to this Committee my pleasure in having an opportunity to appear here today. Having had the privilege of serving as a member of this Committee for twelve years, it is with a sense of nostalgia that I return.

As a former member of this Committee, I developed a strong interest in anti-crime legislation. Much of my time over the past twelve years was devoted to this serious prob-

lem. And, because I was a member of this Committee and participated in its considerations, I can fully appreciate the heavy responsibility you have in recommending legislation that toes that oftentime narrow lines between Constitutional permissiveness and social necessity. It is never an easy matter to adjust the delicate balance between the protection of the accused on the one side and the rights of society to be safe from criminals on the other. Nevertheless, when the scales get out of kilter, it is this Committee's duty in the first instance to recommend ways to adjust them. In my judgment, the heavy thumb of Supreme Court decisions has placed the scales of justice out of kilter and weighted them—indeed, overweighted them—in favor of the accused. I might add that when law-abiding, taxpaying American citizens appear before a Committee of the United States Congress with their heads masked in sack cloth, for fear of criminal reprisal, then it's rather obvious crime in America is out of hand. It is high time that this Congress accept the challenge and give serious consideration to the enactment of laws which will really make our streets safe and our persons and property secure.

In this connection, I am amazed that the Administration would recommend a bill which it calls the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act which doesn't include a provision for keeping the streets safe from rioters and rabble-rousers. The crying need in America today is for a strong anti-riot law which will give the Federal Government authority to apprehend those who would incite others to violence and then escape the jurisdiction of local law enforcement authorities by crossing state lines. I urge this Committee to consider my anti-riot bill, H.R. 421, which passed the House last session as an amendment to the Civil Rights Bill of 1966, by a vote of 387 to 25. Such people as Stokely Carmichael, George Lincoln Rockwell, and Ku Klux Klanners, must be put out of business and enactment of my anti-riot bill and vigorous enforcement thereof would accomplish this goal.

I would also hope this Committee would lend its support to the establishment of a Joint Commission on Crime, a bill I introduced and which is pending before the Rules Committee. Surely, if we can support a Joint Economic Committee which looks after the economic health of the nation, we should be able to support a Joint Committee on Crime to look after the moral health of the nation. Crime is constantly on the move and yet from my past experience on this Committee, the only time it considers anti-crime legislation is when it's told to do so by the President. A Joint Committee on Crime would have constant oversight responsibility, would be able to keep pace with the growing rate of crime, and hopefully would be able to come forth with timely legislative recommendations to deal with the growing criminal octopus.

I emphasize that these bills are only a first step on what is a long journey towards making it easier for law enforcement authorities to secure criminal convictions. Congress also has the responsibility to cast light on the dark cave in which the Supreme Court has, through ill-considered decisions, thrust the field of law enforcement. This it must do by setting forth clear and precise laws which spell out the conditions under which the police may interrogate a suspect, how long the suspect may be retained, when a confession is "voluntary," and when the right to counsel begins.

Likewise, Congress must consider laws which assist State and local law enforcement agencies in improving their capabilities, techniques, and practices in the prevention and control of crime and juvenile delinquency. In this connection, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 6052, which would establish a National Institute of Law En-