

number of them could be brought home without weakening Europe's defenses.

It is long past time that Europeans make a larger contribution to their own defense. Furthermore, excessive American troop commitments to Europe are very costly in tax dollars and in dollar exchange.

It is one of the main causes for the continuing unfavorable balance of payments which permits foreign governments, such as France, to build huge dollar claims against the United States.

Dramatizing the need to bring substantial numbers of our troops home from Europe is the latest drop in our gold stocks of \$116,000,000 in July, the biggest monthly decrease in more than a year.

As often has been the case, France was the biggest purchaser of United States gold, converting about \$98,000,000 of its dollar claims into gold.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the New York Daily News of September 8, 1966, entitled "Guest Editorial" with respect to the actions of General de Gaulle, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

GUEST EDITORIAL

By Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, during Senate debate Tuesday on a proposal to reduce U.S. forces in West Europe:

"Paper gold we have been printing in increasing quantities for a great many years. At the same time, these European countries our troops continue to protect have been quietly collecting our real gold . . . If we sit back and do nothing, and Gen. de Gaulle continues his political and economic onslaughts against this country, he could place in jeopardy the integrity of the dollar."

RIOTING IN ATLANTA

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rioting in Atlanta," published in the Washington Evening Star of Thursday, September 8, 1966.

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

RIOTING IN ATLANTA

The most surprising thing about the riot in Atlanta is that it should have happened there. For Atlanta, by general agreement, has been a model for southern cities in its race relations.

Mayor Ivan Allen Jr. has walked the last mile in search of racial peace. He had almost solid Negro support when elected. He was one of the few southerners to testify in support of the 1964 civil rights bill. He has added Negroes to the police force. Atlanta's schools and city facilities are totally integrated. Many Negroes are employed by business establishments and the city has sent eight Negroes to the state legislature.

All of this counted for nothing, however, when a suspected Negro car thief was wounded while trying to escape from arresting police officers. When some 500 or more Negroes took to the streets the mayor climbed on top of an automobile and tried to reason with them. He was shouted down. Taunts of "white devil" and "black power" greeted him. Finally the mob surged around the car and the mayor was jarred loose from his perch and fell to the street.

No, this didn't happen in a Birmingham or a Selma. It happened in Atlanta. Little wonder that the Rev. Martin Luther King

Sr., who lives in Atlanta, was heard to ask: "What do they want? The mayor came down. He tried to speak to them and they wouldn't listen. What do they want?"

It was a good question, but hard to answer. For most of the members of the mob may not have known themselves what they wanted—unless it was an excuse to throw rocks and rant about police brutality.

The mayor says the riot was deliberately caused by some of Stokely Carmichael's SNCC henchmen, and he may be right. For the mob began shouting "kill the white cops" after SNCC representatives, according to the police, spread the false word that the suspected car thief "had been shot while handcuffed and that he was murdered."

Whatever may have been the case with the rioters, it seems clear that what the SNCC people want is trouble, trouble, trouble. And that is what they are going to get, though not in the form they want, if this sort of madness keeps up.

DOUGLAS BOOK RECEIVES RAVE REVIEWS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, Senator DOUGLAS, not only has the most thorough economic background of any man in this body, he also has the marvelous gift of being able to convey his vast store of wisdom to his colleagues in the Senate as well as the public at large.

Despite a hectic Senate schedule and the increasing pressures of a major reelection campaign he has found the time to write a comprehensive and scholarly work on trade, tariffs, and the balance of payments. Furthermore, this book, "America in the Market Place," has been greeted with virtually unanimous acclaim. Let me quote a representative comment from the New York Times review written by economist Robert Lekachman:

This admirably written exposition of America's place in the world economy effectively mingles lucid exposition, personal experience and policy prescription. I have seen no clearer account of the reasoning that underlies the traditional attachment of Anglo-Saxon economists to free trade. . .

Not only is the book given top grades by the academic community, but it has won the important accolade of being completely relevant to the debate carried on in the Nation's newspapers and magazines over the important economic issues of the day. For example, the Wall Street Journal, in an editorial, cites the book in arguing against certain types of international commodity agreements as a means of promoting the economies of underdeveloped nations.

Senator DOUGLAS' book stands as a tribute to the brilliance and industry of one of the finest lights of the Senate. To find time among one's Senate duties to write a major book is rare. To find the energy to create a work that has both popular and academic appeal while maintaining Senator DOUGLAS' high standard of Senate activity is rarer still. My hat goes off to my good friend from Illinois.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times book review and the Wall Street Journal editorial be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 8, 1966]

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK: THE ROAD TO DEVELOPMENT

Despite the many billions of dollars of aid from the U.S. and other nations, the economies of the world's less developed countries are growing more slowly than in the 1950s.

The authority for that discouraging assessment is Paul Prebisch, secretary-general of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Even more discouraging, however, are some of his organization's proposed attacks on the problem.

Under the UN group's plan, more of the exports of developing countries would be brought under international commodity agreements, of the sort that now covers coffee. Moreover, poorer nations would get preferential treatment for their exports even while they were increasing tariffs against goods from the richer countries.

Superficially, this program may seem to have some appeal; at least the less advanced nations would be trying to lift themselves mainly through trade instead of endless grants and loans. Yet as Senator Paul H. Douglas indicates in a new book, "America in the Market Place," it's questionable whether this combination of price-fixing and protectionism is really the best approach to the poorer nations' problem.

Though the commodity agreements supposedly are aimed only at "stabilizing" markets, the Senator notes that their true goal usually has been to push prices upward. While increased profits on a product such as coffee, for example, may be of some general benefit to the economy of the producing nation, in the past they have chiefly aided a rather small group of wealthy planters and traders.

Furthermore, coffee consumption does not normally rise with income, so a price boost is a relatively greater burden on lower-income consumers. Senator DOUGLAS comments: "What a price increase of this type does, therefore, is to compel the poor and those of moderate means in the United States and other consuming countries to subsidize, among others, the rich planters in the producing countries."

The subsidy, though, may be shortlived, since the price-pegging pacts are prone to eventual failure. In the case of coffee, the Senator says, it's doubtful that the African countries will long be satisfied with their allotted 22% of the market. If they withdraw and start exporting more, the producing nations may wind up worse off than they were before the cartel was set up.

For our part, we find the plan to discriminate against imports from industrial countries equally unencouraging. The obvious aim is to develop more manufacturing in the less advanced lands. Unfortunately, where this approach has been and is being tried, the poorer nations have tended too often to waste their scarce resources on uneconomic steel mills and other "prestige" projects—meanwhile denying their people the chance to buy much cheaper manufactured goods from more advanced countries.

A more promising effort of Mr. Prebisch's group is its campaign to reduce or eliminate tariff barriers among less developed countries. Perhaps the poorer nations would begin to see the many-sided benefits of broader free trade if some of the industrial countries would do more to open their markets to goods from abroad.

If the less advanced nations really intend to speed their development, though, they need to make changes in internal as well as external policies. For one thing, many of them need to place more stress on private

we obtain as many pleas of guilty accompanied by a confession or admission as we did without such additional evidence.

Of the 223 defendants who had either court or jury trials 85% were found guilty. Of those found guilty there were one-third who had made an admission or confession. Admissions were present in 45 of those guilty verdicts and in only two of these matters were the admissions excluded because of Dorado. The trial deputies indicate that in only three of those cases where they obtained a guilty verdict did they feel that the admission was essential in order to obtain such conviction.

There were no court or jury acquittals in which a confession was admitted. There were no acquittals in any case where there was a confession even though one confession was excluded because of Dorado.

There were four acquittals in cases where an admission was excluded but there were also seven acquittals wherein admissions were admitted.

Again because of the limited sample and the limited nature of the questionnaire it would be difficult to arrive at any significant conclusion except to venture the view that Dorado is not presenting a difficult problem in the prosecution of current cases.

If there is any further information or explanations of these figures that you desire, please let me know.

(Copies: Evelle J. Younger, District Attorney; Harold Ackerman, Chief Deputy District Attorney.)

WORK SHEETS: CONFESSIONS AND ADMISSIONS
EFFECT OF DORADO
COMPLAINT STAGE

- (a) Total defendants, 616.
- (b) Defendants no confession or admission, 367.
- (c) Defendants confession or admission, 249.
- (d) Complaints issued—no confession or admission, 236.
- (e) Complaints issued—confession or admission admissible, 202.
- (1) Sufficient evidence without confession or admission to sustain conviction, 149.
- (2) Insufficient evidence without confession or admission to sustain conviction, 53.
- (f) Total rejections, 178.
- (g) Rejections—insufficient evidence without confession or admission and confession or admission inadmissible, 2.
- (1) Dorado,¹ 2.
- (2) Delay, 0.
- (3) Involuntary, 0.
- (4) Other, 0.
- (h) Confession or admission admissible, rejection for other reason, 45.
- (1) Rejection—no confession or admission, 131.

PRELIMINARY STAGE

- Total defendants, 363.
- Defendants no confession or admission, 165.
- Defendants confession or admission, 198.
- Confession or admission introduced and received, 139.
- Confession or admission introduced and not received, 2.
- (1) Dorado, 0.
- (2) Delay, 0.
- (3) Involuntary, 0.
- (4) Other, 2.
- Confession or admission not introduced, 52.
- (1) Dorado, 0.
- (2) Delay, 1.
- (3) Involuntary, 0.
- (4) Other,² 51.

¹ One of these is not completely certain—information sheet incomplete.

² Most not introduced if not needed to hold defendant to answer—office time saving policy at preliminary level.

- Confession or admission and plea of guilty, 4.
- Confession or admission and dismissal for refile, 1.

TRIAL STAGE (1)

- Total defendants, 318.
- Total pleas of guilty, 96.
- (1) Accompanied by admission, 18.
- (2) Accompanied by confession, 31.
- (3) Unaccompanied by extrajudicial statements, 47.
- Total dispositions of guilty, no confessions or admissions involved, 126.
- Total confessions, 49.
- Total admissions, 74.
- Court or jury disposition of guilty accompanied by admission, 45.
- (1) Effect of admission on guilty disposition: Surplusage, 1; enhance, 36; essential, 3; unknown, 3.
- (2) Guilty disposition accompanied by admission excluded by Dorado, 2.
- Court or jury disposition of guilty accompanied by confession, 18.
- (1) Effect of confession on guilty disposition: Surplusage, 0; enhance, 12; essential, 3.
- (2) Guilty accompanied by confession, excluded because of no intelligent waiver, 1.
- (3) Guilty accompanied by confession excluded by Dorado, 1.
- (4) Guilty accompanied by confession excluded by Aranda, 1.

TRIALS (2)

- Court or jury disposition of not guilty, no confessions or admissions, 22.
- Court or jury disposition of not guilty accompanied by admission, 11.
- Court or jury disposition of not guilty accompanied by admission admitted, 7.
- Court or jury disposition of not guilty accompanied by admission excluded, 4.
- (1) Reason for exclusion: Aranda, 2; unknown, 2.
- Court or jury disposition of not guilty accompanied by confession or confession admitted, 0.
- Total confessions excluded, 3.
- (1) Dorado, 1.
- (2) Aranda, 1.
- (3) No intelligent waiver, 1.
- (4) Effect of exclusion on disposition: different result, 0; no effect, 3.
- Total admissions excluded, 6.
- (1) Dorado, 2.
- (2) Aranda, 2.
- (3) Unknown, 2.
- (4) Effect of exclusion on disposition: different result, 4 (Aranda and unknown); no effect, 2 (Dorado); unknown, 0.

[ENCLOSURE 3]

STATEMENT BY DISTRICT ATTORNEY EVELLE J. YOUNGER IN RE: DAN CLIFTON ROBINSON

We have now tried the murderer of Lewis Grego three times. Grego was shot by confessed-murderer Dan Clifton Robinson in a robbery on February 3, 1962, at the Fox Hills Country Club. The first trial, Robinson was convicted and sentenced to death. The Supreme Court reversed because of an error in instructing the jury that Willie Hickman, a co-defendant, who did not appeal and is serving a life sentence, was an accomplice. Again, Robinson was tried and this time, the jury gave him life. He appealed and the District Court of Appeals reversed because the police did not advise him of his rights before he confessed. This time, the District Attorney was forced to go to trial without the confession and the jury acquitted him. The confession was voluntary and admissible under the law as it then existed. The defendant now goes free because the law was changed after the crime. The result is a by-product of the Supreme Court's tendency to change the ground rules and apply the new rule retroactively. Ironically, Robinson, who was the trigger man, now is free. His two accomplices (Willie Warner Hick-

man and Fred Gullex) are in prison, one serving a 20-year maximum, the other serving life.

JULY 14, 1966.

TROOP REDUCTION IN EUROPE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two constructive editorials from newspapers in my State, one of September 3, 1966, from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "A Force Cut in Europe?" and the other from the St. Louis Globe Democrat of September 8, 1966, entitled "Cut U.S. Forces in Europe" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 3, 1966]

A FORCE CUT IN EUROPE?

The White House has said "No" to Senator MANSFIELD's proposal for a Senate resolution favoring a "substantial reduction" of United States forces in Europe. But it said so in a rather faint voice, and we hope the Senate will not be dissuaded from expressing its own opinion on the question.

It has long been clear that such a reduction could be made without serious impairment of European security. The benefits, both to our balance of payments and to the cause of *detente* with the Soviet Union, would be great. The Russians might be encouraged to withdraw some of their own troops from Eastern Europe, and further steps toward establishing a new security relationship might follow.

The President does not always seek the "advice and consent" of the Senate on foreign policy initiatives, but in this case he might well find a troop-reduction resolution a useful warrant for doing what he may some day want to do without taking full responsibility himself. The facts that Senator MANSFIELD has the support of 13 members of the Senate's Democratic policy committee, and that he has taken care to consult Chairman RUSSELL of the Armed Services Committee and Republican Leader DIRKSEN, argue that more is involved than the personal disposition of a Senator who has long questioned the need for maintaining such a large military establishment in Europe.

In any case the Mansfield proposal deserves a sympathetic reception. At a time when Europe itself acknowledges no need to meet its original NATO troop commitments, when the conditions that gave rise to those commitments have sharply changed, and when we are spending far more dollars abroad than we are earning, it does not make sense to go on supporting 400,000 troops and nearly a million of their dependents in Europe. Even if the Administration is not ready to say so, there is no reason why the Senate should not.

[From the St. Louis Globe Democrat, Sept. 8, 1966]

CUT U.S. FORCES IN EUROPE

The United States troop commitment to Europe is much too heavy in light of Europe's dramatic recovery and renewed capability to take over the greater part of its own defense.

The commitment, made 15 years ago, is woefully outdated. It should be substantially reduced as recommended by 13 Democratic Senators.

Under vastly changed conditions of today there is no reason to maintain some 400,000 to 450,000 American troops and their 1,000,000 dependents in Europe. A substantial

point in her early visits to Japan and India. She was not only a radiant rebel, admired for her charm and disarming modesty, but also a practical idealist whose contribution will be realized by future generations.

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE IN ATLANTA

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, all responsible and thinking Georgians—and I am proud to say they constitute an overwhelming majority of the people of my State—were shocked this week by the racial riot that erupted in Atlanta last Tuesday.

It was an appalling display of the same brand of lawlessness we have witnessed on many occasions in recent months in a number of cities throughout the Nation. It was the kind of mob violence which can only result in chaos unless steps are taken to restore respect for law and order. And, just as in other places where racial agitation and disorder have resulted in rioting, the Atlanta riot can be laid at the feet of irresponsible leaders who have gone about the country preaching disrespect for authority and calling mobs into the streets, with no other purpose than to create strife and disorder.

I am truly sorry that Atlanta, whose record for peaceful and sensible race relations is second to no other large metropolitan area in the country, has been made a victim of rioting and disgraceful chants of "black power." However, I am pleased to note that because of positive and responsible leadership on the part of the mayor and the city police, as well as that of respected members of the Negro community, the riot was quelled and handled overall in a most commendable manner.

There appeared in the September 7 edition of the Atlanta Constitution an excellent column by Editor Eugene Patterson, giving an account of the rioting and the courageous and firm part of Mayor Ivan Allen and responsible Negro leaders in dispersing the rioters.

There also appeared fine editorials in the Atlanta Journal and the Washington Evening Star commending Mayor Allen and rightly placing the blame for the disorder where it belongs.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Patterson's column and the editorials be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Sept. 7, 1966]

A DAY TO FORGET

(By Eugene Patterson)

A fume of tear gas still stung the eye occasionally. It made Ivan Allen look as if he had been weeping.

The mayor stood in a pool of glass fragments in the middle of Capitol Avenue with his shoulders slumped wearily. A police car with blue light flashing passed on one side of him, and a Grady Hospital ambulance with a red light passed on the other.

He lifted his reddened eyes to the porches and looked at the Negro men, women and children whose rights he had long fought for at the risk of his own political life. They looked back at him.

On the upstairs balcony of a bleak apartment house—"four rooms, will redecorate, \$59.50"—a girl of about 15 perked and shook idly in a silent dance.

"They don't know," Mayor Allen said gently. "They just don't know."

But the SNCC leaders knew. When Stokely Carmichael's crowd finally got a police shooting to play with, they stirred up those men, women and children as skillfully as white demagogues used to get a night ride going.

Like the old white mobs, the rock-throwing Negroes didn't have a very clear idea what had hold of them Tuesday. Demagogues had hold of them. SNCC was in charge.

SNCC comes in on a scene of trouble like an ambulance. But not to heal any fractures. It had been a long, chilly summer in the Vine City slum. SNCC's sound trucks had failed to stir riots. Maybe Vine City residents got toughened to the black power demagoguery and immune to it. Here, almost in the shadow of Atlanta's new stadium, was a fresh neighborhood with a built-in incident. And here was SNCC.

As Allen said, the people just didn't know. But SNCC did. To say past white injustices to Negroes was fair provocation for what the black power zealots did to Atlanta Tuesday is about like justifying white bombers and burners on grounds some Negroes are criminal.

The major understood what was going on, even while the Negro rock throwers who literally threatened his life did not. He gave them their target. He walked in the open down the middle of the street while some policemen were taking cover behind an armored car under the hail of stones. His courage was remarked by every tough cop present. He acted like a man who didn't want to be safe if his city wasn't.

ALMOST—BUT NOT QUITE

For a while it looked as if the mayor might pull it off. He waded into the middle of the riotous crowd at Capitol and Ormond (you go past the stadium on Capitol, and across Georgia, and across Little and Love—that's right, Love—and there's Ormond) and tried to lead them out to the stadium. They followed him for a block. Then SNCC got hold of the thing again, yelling black power.

They weren't gonna go to any white man's stadium. Pretty soon they had the crowd back at Ormond and Capitol. Allen got up on a police car and tried to talk to them. Demagogues knew what to do about that.

They rocked the car violently until he was shaken off it. Encircled and shoved, he simply bored deeper into the black crowd, demanding order, exhorting peace.

Rocks flew. Windshields and windows crashed in. Police cars had their glasses smashed. A white woman's car was hit; she paused at the stadium parking lot to shake the glass out of her hair. People were getting hurt. While Allen stood between them, Negroes threw rocks and policemen fired into the air.

Tear gas finally broke that one up. The police ran out of tear gas. But they stood on the street corners with their gas guns at the ready and nobody knew they were empty until new supplies came.

Policemen are always targets in mobs like these. The strain showed in their faces and you couldn't blame them. Shotguns, pistols, gas guns, bilbies—the tense brandishing of so much hardware was imposing. They had seen too many cars smashed, too much anger, to be easy. They were as tight as coiled springs, looking all about. There in the middle of them, unarmed and unrattled, was Mayor Allen.

"I wish I could slow that guy down," said Capt. George Royall, his police aide and bodyguard, sprinting up Little Street. The mayor had suddenly walked up there to insist that a crowd of Negroes disperse and go to their homes. The crowd moved slowly.

Two policemen were assigned to herd the crowd back up that side street. They were white, though many of the policemen on the scene were Negro. The two white policemen

had company. "This is the Rev. Sam Williams," Capt. Royall told the pair of policemen. "He is going with you and he is going to ask the people to go to their homes peacefully."

The Rev. Williams did. A tough, smart NAACP militant, the Baptist minister and college professor had been fighting for his people against white oppressors all his life and he did not hesitate to go to the scene Tuesday and fight against their being hurt by SNCC. It took great courage. He went up the street with the policemen, commanding respect.

Like Sam Williams, the Rev. Martin Luther King Sr. was there, deploring violence and laying the blame on those who incited it. "We have got to have law," the old man said. "If I only had my strength, I would tell these people we have got to have law. Else we have no protection."

"You've got your strength, old friend," Ivan Allen said, taking his hand in the street.

NEGRO LEADERS GAME

Negro politicians like Q. V. Williamson and John Hood were there, laboring to lead their people out of folly. Clergymen like the Rev. William Holmes Borders were there, and leaders like Jesse Hill. The Negro leadership turned out to do what it could, just as staunchly as the white leadership used to do when the Klan mentalities threatened violence. But the violent and the disorderly always have an advantage in seizing leadership of a crowd. They are unhampered by responsibility and they have emotion going for them. Responsible leaders, rational men, often look vulnerable and even futile in such a setting. But they have to go.

Dusk was falling. "Are you hurt? Did any of the rocks hit you?" Allen was asked in the lull. He looked at his friend Sam Williams there in the street and laughed. "Man," he kidded, "you know they can't throw anything as fast as I can run."

"I've got great peripheral vision. Blind to color, blind to class. I've got to be blind, haven't I, Sam?"

The Rev. Williams smiled. "That's right," he said quietly. The two strong men, one white, one black, looked at each other for a second in the gathering night, then moved off to see if they could calm and disperse some more of the silent, staring spectators.

Walking along the center of the Capitol Avenue sidewalk, a tall, thin Negro man wearing a striped sport shirt and a wisp of beard met a policeman and deliberately confronted him head-on, refusing to yield room for him to pass. The policeman held a shotgun at port arms and stood there of a minute. He jerked his thumb to the side but the Negro did not move.

Blind hatred contorted his face into a furious mask.

The policeman shrugged and walked on around him. The thin goateed Negro walked on, muttering, looking over his shoulder and hating the white man with a passion that seemed to be consuming him like some foul, fatal fever.

Shattered glass lay in the street. Flickering lights glinted on the police guns. Night was falling and the mayor was thinking about opening up the schoolhouse at the corner of Capitol and Little and inviting everybody in to talk instead of fight, burn, stone and shoot.

It was almost as if the mayor, after half a day of presenting his body in the street, was as intent on willing peace and a return to normality as he was in building up his forces of police to crush any renewed disorder.

In the gathering darkness, somebody said to the tired mayor, as he stood there in the street, that he ought to go on home and leave the night peril to his policemen and the people on the porches.

"Listen," he snapped, "if anything is going to happen here tonight, it's going to happen over me."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 8, 1966]

RIOTING IN ATLANTA

The most surprising thing about the riot in Atlanta is that it should have happened there. For Atlanta, by general agreement, has been a model for southern cities in its race relations.

Mayor Ivan Allen Jr. has walked the last mile in search of racial peace. He had almost solid Negro support when elected. He was one of the few southerners to testify in support of the 1964 civil rights bill. He has added Negroes to the police force. Atlanta's schools and city facilities are totally integrated. Many Negroes are employed by business establishments and the city has sent eight Negroes to the state legislature.

All of this counted for nothing, however, when a suspected Negro car thief was wounded while trying to escape from arresting police officers. When some 500 or more Negroes took to the streets the mayor climbed on top of an automobile and tried to reason with them. He was shouted down. Taunts of "white devil" and "black power" greeted him. Finally the mob surged around the car and the mayor was jarred loose from his perch and fell to the street.

No, this didn't happen in a Birmingham or a Selma. It happened in Atlanta. Little wonder that the Rev. Martin Luther King Sr., who lives in Atlanta, was heard to ask: "What do they want? The mayor came down. He tried to speak to them and they wouldn't listen. What do they want?"

It was a good question, but hard to answer. For most of the members of the mob may not have known themselves what they wanted—unless it was an excuse to throw rocks and rant about police brutality.

The mayor says the riot was deliberately caused by some of Stokely Carmichael's SNCC henchmen, and he may be right. For the mob began shouting "kill the white cops" after SNCC representatives, according to the police, spread the false word that the suspected car thief "had been shot while handcuffed and that he was murdered."

Whatever may have been the case with the rioters, it seems clear that what the SNCC people want is trouble, trouble, trouble. And that is what they are going to get, though not in the form they want, if this sort of madness keeps up.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal, Sept. 7, 1966]

WHO RUNS THE CITY?

Magnificent work on the part of the police, the personal courage and leadership of Mayor Ivan Allen and the cooperation of responsible Negro political and religious leaders kept Atlanta out of murderous trouble Tuesday evening.

There was major trouble as it was, in response to an invitation to trouble promoted by SNCC and its irresponsible new leader, Stokely Carmichael, to protest a case of alleged police brutality.

There was rioting in the streets south of the Stadium (where a detachment of state patrolmen stood by), but the coalition of those devoted to the welfare of the city prevailed. May it continue to hold together and prevail for years to come.

The trouble followed the demagogic pattern the country has now come to recognize since this no longer is one of those peculiar Southern problems.

But the familiarity of the pattern does not make it any less shocking.

Atlanta so far has maintained a reputation for law and order, and the determination of the mayor to keep this reputation could not be more obvious.

Tuesday night proved who was running the city, and it is not the mob.

It is Mayor Allen, and the magnificent backing given him by the police and by sane and responsible Negro leaders pulled us through this time.

But it is too much to expect that Tuesday night is going to be the end of it.

There are irresponsible white people, seekers after public office included, as well as irresponsible promoters of "black power" who find this sort of dangerous idiocy helpful.

Certainly we'll see other attempts to pit race against race, make a smoking shambles of Atlanta and set back orderly progress for years to come.

But the combination which pulled us through Tuesday night can do it again with the help and the backing of the decent, law-abiding citizens of all Atlanta, and run the inviters to riot out of town.

This has been a week of crisis in Atlanta, with a good part of the Fire Department on strike, and the police on extended duty.

It's the sort of occasion which separates the wheat and the chaff rapidly, and makes us appreciate the value of the kind of good citizenship shown by those who stay on the job when trouble comes. These are the mayor, the police, the loyalists among the firemen, and the Negro leaders who kept the faith with their city and truly with their people.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM SIGNIFICANT CHILD HEALTH MEASURE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, fiscal 1967 appropriations for maternal and child welfare activities went from \$187 million in fiscal 1966 to a House-approved figure of \$228,900,000. This is a whopping increase of almost \$42 million.

Every bit of this increase is necessary. Most of it would provide for an expansion of the program in accordance with the 1965 amendments to the Social Security Act. But it is significant that while we are providing an additional \$41,900,000 for child welfare activities in fiscal 1967 we apparently can afford to boost the special milk program for schoolchildren by only \$1 million from last year's appropriation level of \$103 million to \$104 million this year. Yet if ever a program were important to the welfare of our children, the school milk program is.

The milk program helps most those who can least afford to help themselves—the children from poor families living in depressed areas and the slums of our Nation's cities. It helps them by providing a Federal payment toward the cost of a half-pint of milk once or twice a day, between meals. Often the local community provides the remainder of the needed funds. Furthermore the cost to the taxpayer is minimal, because milk not purchased under the program would probably have to be bought and stored under the price support program at Government expense.

At least \$110 million is needed for the school milk program this year if last year's 10 percent cut in the Federal reimbursement rate is to be restored. I intend to fight hard for an additional \$6 million for the program in a supplemental appropriation bill. I fully believe that this program is essential to the health and welfare of our children as the maternal and child welfare program. I intend to see that it is properly funded.

THE NEED FOR REGULATING THE WIDE-OPEN TRAFFICKING OF FIREARMS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the records of this Congress include volumes of testimony on the need for regulating the wide-open trafficking of firearms in interstate commerce.

The bulk of those volumes are public hearings conducted by the Judiciary Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of which I am chairman. The purpose of those hearings was to determine whether or not there was a need for the Federal Government to strengthen its own gun laws, and if possible, to aid the several States in making their statutes more enforceable.

The results of our inquiry, Senate bill 1592 is now awaiting the action of the Judiciary Committee.

I had hoped that the full Senate would have had the opportunity to vote on the measure before now, but the minority opposing any improvement in our gun laws has succeeded in blocking Senate action.

The gun lobby has been most effective. Leading the opposition to a law that would thwart criminals, drug addicts and mental patients hell-bent on arming themselves is the National Rifle Association, a tax-free group of some 750,000 members whose most recent slogan is "America needs more straight shooters."

In easy-to-understand language a lobbyist is any person or group who seeks the passage or defeat of any legislation in the Congress of the United States.

However, though not a lobby under the law, the NRA's antigun legislation philosophy is adopted and followed by registered lobbyists among them, for instance, the gun industry.

On August 14, 1966, on the Frank McGee Report on the NBC Television Network, an NRA spokesman described its nonlobbying activities of the NRA in this way:

A teletype in the legislative suite receives reports from state capitals. Whenever a state lawmaker introduces a gun control bill the information is quickly fed to this office.

By "this office" the spokesman meant the upper reaches of the multi-million-dollar national headquarters of the National Rifle Association in downtown Washington, D.C.

Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks, I would like the text of the Frank McGee report printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, consistent with the nonlobby image it spends into the seven figures each year to project, on September 1, 1966, the NRA shelled out almost \$10,000 for full page ads in the Washington Post and the New York Times throwing its weight behind "enforceable measures to keep firearms from irresponsibles, incompetents, and criminals," amongst other things.

The advertisement was discussed at some length in the September 9, 1966,