

By Mr. BINGHAM: H.R. 19710. A bill for the relief of Zorah Veronica Clarke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND: H.R. 19711. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Delina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan: H.R. 19712. A bill to permit the establishment and operation of certain branch offices by the Michigan National Bank, Lansing, Mich.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts: H.R. 19713. A bill for the relief of Catherine A. Gallagher and Annie E. Gallagher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON: H.R. 19714. A bill for the relief of Luis Chavez Guerrero, Guadalupe Chavez Guerrero, Alfredo Chavez Guerrero, Amador Chavez Guerrero, and Erineo Chavez Guerrero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California: H.R. 19715. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Luk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND: H.R. 19716. A bill for the relief of Peter Stroumpis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY (by request): H.R. 19717. A bill for the relief of Dady Balansay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENNEY: H.R. 19718. A bill for the relief of Hilario Anthony; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN: H.R. 19719. A bill for the relief of Vassiliki Vacalopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE: H.R. 19720. A bill for the relief of Ah-Ram Kotikula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN: H.R. 19721. A bill for the relief of Pereira Barreira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 19722. A bill for the relief of Maria Giraldi Favretto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 19723. A bill for the relief of Ferdinando Paniccia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 19724. A bill for the relief of Manuel Salgado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 19725. A bill for the relief of Michele Scommegna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 19726. A bill for the relief of Gillian Gail Stohler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN: H.R. 19727. A bill for the relief of Oscar Montesa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE: H.R. 19728. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Mazzoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: H.R. 19729. A bill for the relief of Juan Candido and Maria Juan T. Lopes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY: H.R. 19730. A bill for the relief of Honesto P. Bombon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 19731. A bill for the relief of Rosenda H. Taong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL: H.R. 19732. A bill for the relief of Rosalina L. Bautista, M.D., and her husband, Ireneo M. Bautista; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO: H.R. 19733. A bill for the relief of Carminda Tavares Da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania: H.R. 19734. A bill for the relief of Michael F. Mouzakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL: H.R. 19735. A bill for the relief of Miss Anna Seban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GEORGE ROSE SMITH, OF ARKANSAS, AND THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who is campaigning in Arkansas, I ask unanimous consent that certain correspondence between Senator FULBRIGHT's constituent, Mr. George Rose Smith, and the Internal Revenue Service be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE

In processing your latest Federal income tax return, we computed a different amount of overpayment than was claimed on your return. The enclosed check is for your overpayment as we computed it.

We either have sent to you, or will send within the next two weeks, an explanation of the difference between your computation and ours. You should, however, cash or deposit the enclosed check immediately, without waiting for the explanation.

After you receive the explanation, please review your return. If you are then not satisfied that the refund was in the correct amount, please request a further explanation from your District Director.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT, INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT, INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, Austin, Tex., May 19, 1967.

If you inquire about your account, please refer to the numbers below:

Social Security Number: xxx-xx-xxxx

Document Locator Number: 71211-113-04300-7.

Form Number: 1040. Period Ended Dec. 31, 1966. George R. and Peg N. Smith, 2 Cantrell Road, Little Rock, Ark.

INFORMATION NOTICE OF REFUND OR CREDIT

Checking the tax computation on your Federal income tax return revealed an error. The correct amount of your overpayment is shown in the column to the right below:

Table with 2 columns: Total tax shown on return, and amounts for corrected tax, tax withheld, estimated tax credits, and overpayment.

Your overpayment shown on line 8 is being refunded or credited as shown below:

Amount (excluding any allowable interest) to be refunded if you owe no other amount: \$445.90

This notice is not the result of an audit of your return. If your return should be selected for audit, you will receive a separate notice.

This notice requires no action by you.

MAY 25, 1967.

Social Security No. xxx-xx-xxxx. Document Locator No. 71211-113-04300-7. DIRECTOR, INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE CENTER, Austin, Tex.

DEAR SIR: I have received your income tax refund check for \$445.90 and your explanation thereof, both dated May 19, 1967. I have two observations to make, about which I want to hear from you.

First, you made the refund check payable to both me and my first wife. When I sent the check to her for indorsement she went south with it. This is your fault. The withholding tax was taken out of my salary and the estimated tax was paid by me with my own checks. So you should have sent the refund to me alone. What can you do to straighten this out?

Second, your figures puzzle me. As far as I can make out, you have given me credit for my estimated tax payments (\$400) only

twice. As generous as the Government is now, you might at least have given me triple credit for that item.

I await your advices.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE ROSE SMITH.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1967.

Social Security No. xxx-xx-xxxx. Document Locator No. 71211-113-04300-7. DIRECTOR, INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE CENTER, Austin, Tex.

DEAR SIR: The attached statement for the third installment of my 1967 estimated tax is based on your computation of my overpayment for 1966. As I wrote you on May 25, I'm not in agreement with your recomputation. And, as I said in that letter, the refund check ended up in the hands of my first wife.

I'm accordingly enclosing my check for \$75.00, which I consider to be the proper amount due at this time.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE ROSE SMITH.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF A REQUEST FOR ADJUSTMENT

[Taxpayer copy]

Name and address of taxpayer (No. and Street, City, State and Postal Zip Code): George R. and Peg N. Smith, 2 Cantrell Rd., Little Rock, Ark.

EI or SS No.: xxx-xx-xxxx

MFT: 30.

Period ending 6612.

Document locator number: 71211-113-04300-7.

Date received: 5-26-67.

This is to confirm your request for adjustment to your federal tax account.

We will review your request as soon as possible.

If additional information is needed you will be contacted.

Normal processing may take 60 days to complete. Contacting this office within this period may delay processing.

REASON FOR ADJUSTMENT

Enter number of exemptions omitted: _____

Joint computation.

Head of household.

Wages and/or tax withheld.
 Other (Specify): Erroneous Refund of Estimated Tax Credit.
 Prepared by: Chief, Adjustment Section.
 Office: SWSC.
 Date: 9-20-67.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
 INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE CENTER,
 Austin, Tex., October 6, 1967.

Mr. GEORGE R. SMITH,
 Little Rock, Ark.

Form: 1040
 Period: 6612
 7262-2-00045

DEAR MR. SMITH: Your inquiry concerning the tax account identified above has been assigned for special handling. We will write you again when we determine the cause of the problem.

Should you need to contact us before this reply is received, please furnish a copy of this letter with your inquiry.

Sincerely,

Mrs. BESS ROBISON,
 Data Processing Specialist.

U. S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
 INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
 November 17, 1967.

If you inquire about your account, please refer to these numbers.

Identifying Number:
 Document Locator Number: 71254-295-00035-7.

Form Number: 1040.
 Period Ending Date: Dec. 31, 1966.
 For IRS Use Only: 30 6612 670.
 George R. and Peg N. Smith, 2 Canirell Road, Little Rock, Ark.

Account adjustment-bill for tax due

Balance due on account before adjustment	0
Adjustment computation:	
Credit, decrease, (see explanation G on back)	\$400.00
Interest charged on this adjustment	13.91
Net adjustment, charge	413.91
Balance due	413.91

NOVEMBER 21, 1967.

Identifying No.
 Locator No. 71254-295-00035-7

DIRECTOR,
 Internal Revenue Service Center,
 Austin, Tex.
 Attention Head Computer.

DEAR HEAD COMPUTER: I'm addressing this letter to the head computer, as I'm out of patience with dealing with minor machines. Please give this your personal attention.

According to the enclosed Form 4188, I owe the United States \$400 plus interest amounting to \$13.91. The form is unsigned and really uninformative. By referring, as directed, to Explanation G on the back I find that this is a Withholding Tax credit adjustment.

Now, Computer old boy, I want to review the course of events that led to this supposed debt on my part. First of all, I duly filed my 1966 income tax return, which showed my tax liability as follows:

Total tax	\$3,234.10
Amount withheld	2,880.00
Estimate paid	400.00
Total	3,280.00
Overpayment	45.90

I asked that the overpayment be applied to my 1967 estimate.

On about May 20, 1967, I received an unsigned printed form, entitled "Important No-

tice." It enclosed a check for \$445.90, dated May 19, and stated that an explanation would be sent within two weeks. But the form went on to say: "You should, however, cash or deposit the enclosed check immediately, without waiting for the explanation."

You may imagine my pleasure upon learning that an unexpected \$400 was dropping in my lap. You may also imagine my disappointment when the explanation, dated May 19, arrived. It explained that "Checking the tax computation on your federal income tax return revealed an error. The correct amount of your overpayment is shown in the column to the right." This column then disclosed this calculation:

Total tax shown on return	\$3,234.10
Corrected tax	3,234.10
Tax withheld	3,280.00
Estimated tax credits	400.00
Overpayment	445.90

Now, Head Computer, some minor machine goofed. You just have to glance at the preceding page to see that the tax withheld was actually \$2,880 instead of \$3,280. So there was a \$400 error in my favor.

Swallowing my disappointment at having been hornswoogled by a machine—and a mechanical undertaking at that—I struggled mightily with my conscience over the question whether to steal the money or to notify you of the error. Conscience won, to my present regret—considering the train of subsequent events.

On May 25 I wrote you what was intended as a facetious letter. Moral: Don't get facetious with a minor computer; it has no sense of humor. Anyway, in my letter I notified you (a) that my first wife had gone south with the check, and (b): "Second, your figures puzzle me. As far as I can make out, you have given me credit for my estimated tax payments (\$400) only twice. As generous as the Government is now, you might at least have given me triple credit for that item."

Computer dear, you can see at once that the error was so simple and so obvious that it could be detected even by an adolescent computer in less than 60 seconds. But it has taken a solid six months for the mills of Internal Revenue Service to grind.

My letter of May 25 has not been acknowledged to this day. Instead, I got a notice dated—correction, the notice is not dated—stating that I owed some more money on my 1967 estimate (presumably, though this wasn't stated, because you had returned the \$45.90 that I asked to be credited on that estimate). I at once wrote you on September 1, explaining my disagreement with your computation and enclosing my check for what was unquestionably the correct amount due.

In response to that letter I received still another unsigned printed form saying that my request for an adjustment would be reviewed as soon as possible. The form added: "Normal processing may take 60 days to complete. Contacting this office within this period may delay processing." Needless to say, I did not "contact" your office within that period, as I lived in trembling fear of delaying the matter.

Next, I received an actual letter, written to me and signed by Mrs. Bess Robison, bless her friendly soul, in which she stated that my inquiry had been assigned for "special handling. We will write you again when we determine the cause of the problem."

Finally, as I said at first, I received yesterday an unsigned printed form stating flatly and unequivocally that I owe the Government \$400, plus \$13.91 interest.

Now listen closely, Head Computer. I'm not even thinking of paying this demand for interest, for either of two reasons:

First. The original error was entirely yours. The protracted delay that resulted in the demand for interest was entirely yours.

Second. The Government has not been out

one nickel. I have never cashed the check for \$445.90 and have no intention of doing so. Furthermore, I have paid my 1967 estimated tax in its correct amount. There is simply no basis on which you could conceivably make this demand for interest stand up in court.

Here is what I want you to do. After you have digested the contents of this letter from a poor suffering taxpayer please turn it over to a human being, with a suggestion that he write me a note something like this: "(Four lines of identifying numbers)"

"DEAR JUDGE SMITH: We goofed. We just plain goofed. We appreciate your being sufficiently conscientious (or scared of the law) to call the error to our attention. If you will return the Government check for \$445.90 we will forget the whole thing (if we can)."

"Sincerely,

"_____."

I'm sending a copy of this letter to Senator William J. Fulbright, not with any idea whatever that he take any action but just to let him know that the computers are getting out-of-hand in their public relations. So far, thank goodness, the machines haven't been permitted to vote, else those of us who hold elected offices might be in a bad way.

Sincerely,

GEORGE ROSE SMITH.

P.S.—By the way, Head Computer, if you're ever in Little Rock to drop by to see me.

GRS.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
 INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE CENTER,
 November 27, 1967.

In reply refer to: T:TCT:OLO:egh.
 Mr. GEORGE R. SMITH,
 Little Rock, Ark.

DEAR MR. SMITH: Your case has been referred to me for special handling.

We did erroneously give you credit twice for the \$400.00 paid as estimated tax. Therefore, we have corrected our records showing \$400.00 plus interest due on your 1966 account.

I am sorry to say we cannot collect this money from your first wife. Since you filed a joint return in the names of George R. & Peg N. Smith, the refund check was issued in both names. This must be settled between you and your first wife.

If I can help you in any other way, please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ORA LEE OLSON,
 Data Processing Specialist.

NOVEMBER 30, 1967.

Mrs. ORA LEE OLSEN,
 Internal Revenue Center, Austin, Tex.

DEAR Mrs. OLSEN: I have your letter of November 27 (the extra copy is herewith returned).

On November 21 I wrote a long letter to the Center, explaining my views about this matter. If that letter isn't automatically routed to you (which I doubt, red tape being what it is), please pursue it and let me hear from you again.

Sincerely,

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
 INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE CENTER,
 December 4, 1967.

In reply refer to: T:TCT:OLO:wj; 429-03-3154.

Judge GEORGE R. SMITH,
 Little Rock, Ark.

DEAR JUDGE SMITH: "We goofed. We just plain goofed."

If you will return the check for \$445.90 to me, I'll see that it is applied to your account. I have enclosed an envelope so that your reply will be routed directly to me.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ORA LEE OLSEN,
 Data Processing Specialist.

DECEMBER 6, 1967.

Mrs. ORA LEE OLSEN, Internal Revenue Service Center, Austin, Tex.

DEAR MRS. OLSEN: I'm delighted to find that there is actually a warm, living, breathing human being within that vast complex of machines and unsigned forms.

Enclosed is the Government's check No. 83,195,960. Just to be perverse I have folded and spindled it, though I stopped short of mutilating it. Please credit this to my account and cancel the \$13.91 interest charge as having been made in error.

With best wishes, Sincerely,

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT, INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE CENTER, Austin, Tex., December 14, 1967.

In reply refer to: T:TCT:OLO:hw; 429-03-3154.

Judge GEORGE R. SMITH, Little Rock, Ark.

DEAR JUDGE SMITH: Thank you for returning the refund check we erroneously sent you.

We are correcting our records to show \$400.00 applied to your 1966 account and \$45.90 to your 1967 account. Please disregard any notices you may receive concerning these amounts.

If I can help you further, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ORA LEE OLSON, Data Processing Specialist.

DECEMBER 18, 1967.

T:TCT:OLO:hw; Mrs. ORA LEE OLSON, Data Processing Specialist, Internal Revenue Service Center, Austin, Tex.

DEAR MRS. OLSON: Thank you for your note. I assume that your bookkeeping entries also have the effect of canceling the interest charge that was set up.

Merry Christmas to you and the computers!

Sincerely,

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT, INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,

If you inquire about your account, please refer to the numbers below:

- Social Security Number
Document Locator Number
Form Number
Year Ending

NOTICE OF ESTIMATED TAX PAYMENT DUE

Your installment payment of estimated tax due is

Please make your check or money order payable to "Internal Revenue Service" and return it with this notice to our address as shown above. If you wish to amend your declaration, complete Part II. The duplicate copy is for your records.

Part I. Summary of Account

- 1. Total estimated tax (excluding withholding tax)
2. Payments already made
3. Credit for overpayment of last year's tax
4. Remaining estimate
5. Amount of line 1 required (before credits applied) as of installment date
6. Amount of credit for overpayment of last year's tax (line 3) applied through installment date, plus payments made this year (line 2)
7. Net installment due—pay this amount

Part III. Amended Declaration of Estimated Tax

- A. Your amended estimate of tax (include self-employment tax)

- B. Estimated income tax withheld or to withheld in the year
C. Estimated tax (Line A less Line B)
D. Overpayment claimed from prior year Form 1040
E. Payments already made
F. Balance (C less sum of D and E). May be paid in full or spread evenly over remaining installments
G. Amount paid with this amended declaration

This declaration has been examined by me and to the best of my knowledge it is correct.

Signature(s)
If joint estimate, both husband and wife must sign.

Date:
Notes for item 3:

- (1) Amount reported on declaration and tentatively allowed subject to later verification.
(2) Amount allowed from your income tax return, as mathematically verified.
(3) Credit claimed has not been allowed since your prior year return does not appear to have been received. If you have filed, please take credit and submit an explanation of when and where return was filed.

JANUARY 16, 1968.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, 700 West Capitol, City

DEAR SIR: I am returning the enclosed assessment about my 1966 income tax return. All this confusion began when the Internal Revenue Service Center at Austin, Texas, erroneously sent me a refund check for \$445.90. I did not cash the check and eventually returned it to the Service Center. I enclose a xerox copy of their letter to me, acknowledging the check and conceding that I do not owe the charge that had been set up by mistake.

Sincerely,

DRAFT OF EXECUTIVE ORDER ENDANGERS VA MEDICAL PROGRAM

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House know of my belief in and strong support of the medical care program operated by the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration for the benefit of veterans who need such care and treatment. Inherent in the operation of the agency has been the concept of "one-stop" service to the veteran in connection with his claim for disability compensation, pension, medical care, education, and so forth. The veterans organizations, along with others who are aware of activities in certain circles of the executive branch continue to be concerned at the draft of an Executive order which proposes to in effect transfer the medical program of the Veterans' Administration to the control and jurisdiction of an agency operating under the guidance of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The latest example of this opposition to come to my attention is from the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the national commander of that organization has recently addressed a letter to the special assistant to the President, Mr. Douglass Cater, which under leave to extend my remarks I include at this point:

SEPTEMBER 9, 1968.

Mr. DOUGLASS CATER, Special Assistant to the President, The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CATER: This is to let you know that as the newly elected Commander-in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, I am opposed to approval of the Executive Order which would make the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare the "health czar" of the nation.

I am referring to your letter of July 17 to my immediate predecessor, Past Commander-in-Chief Joseph A. Scerra, concerning the report of June 14, 1968 to the President by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, which could drastically curtail the independence of the Veterans Administration hospital system.

At our recently concluded Detroit National Convention, at which I was elected Commander-in-Chief on August 23, 1968, the delegates adopted a resolution identified as No. 241 entitled "Oppose Creation of Federal Health Czar," a copy of which is enclosed.

Behind this mandate is the long standing position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that medical and hospital care for the veterans of this nation should be second to none. The draft of the Executive Order refers to national health goals for all citizens. It does nothing to insure that the special status accorded veterans medical and health care for over a century will be preserved. The upgrading of national health goals for citizens generally is a worthwhile purpose but it must be accomplished without encroachment upon the administration and quality of hospital and medical care provided for veterans and servicemen.

The draft of the Executive Order fails to include the specific assurances concerning veterans hospital and medical programs provided in your letter of July 10, 1968 to the Honorable Olin E. Teague, Chairman of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs.

More specifically the main thrust of the Executive Order in no way allays our fears that the Veterans Administration will play a subservient role to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare should this Executive Order be signed. There is every reason to believe that the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, pursuant to the authority vested in him by this proposed Executive Order, will, in truth, become a "health czar." For the Veterans Administration this could well mean the end of the Veterans Administration hospital and medical system, which has operated so successfully over the years, and is undoubtedly one of our great national assets.

For these and previous reasons indicated by my predecessor, Mr. Scerra, the Veterans of Foreign Wars urgently recommends against the finalization of this Executive Order to the extent that it would involve the Veterans Administration and subordinate it to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. By all means, the Veterans of Foreign Wars further urgently recommends that no action be taken by the President which would in any way lead to the disestablishment and loss of the independence of the Veterans Administration to operate independently the present hospital and medical programs for veterans.

Sincerely,

RICHARD HOMAN, Commander in Chief.

LIBERTY OR LICENSE?

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, the second in an excellent series of articles on

the American Civil Liberties Union has been published in Barron's, a financial weekly newspaper. Mrs. Shirley Scheibla has done an outstanding job of looking into the activities of this organization which we all hear so much about, but actually most Americans are unfamiliar with either the history or the total work of the ACLU. The facts uncovered in Mrs. Scheibla's articles deserve wide attention and understanding. I ask unanimous consent that the second in her series of articles on the ACLU be printed in the RECORD.

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

LIBERTY OR LICENSE?—THE ACLU SOMETIMES HAS TROUBLE TELLING THEM APART
(By Shirley Scheibla)

WASHINGTON.—An influential lobbyist told a Senate subcommittee last May that the Communist Party constitutes no threat to the United States, and that the advocacy of violence is all right as long as it's not accompanied by violent action. His name: Lawrence Speiser, Washington director of the American Civil Liberties Union (Barron's August 26). Mr. Speiser's testimony in opposition to the Internal Security bill of 1968, before the Senate Internal Security subcommittee, provides an apt illustration of how far ACLU can and does go—outside the courtroom—in its ostensible defense of civil liberties. Some of these tactics are, to say the least, questionable. Virtually all of them follow a central theme that runs through case after case of litigation as well: a clear attempt to undo law and order and undermine the nation's ability to defend itself from its enemies.

The chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) says Mr. Speiser has misrepresented facts in public statements about the committee. The record indicates that several of Mr. Speiser's fellow-officials are guilty of much worse. No "Philadelphia lawyers," their activities include membership in a variety of subversive organizations, overt defense of Communism and the aiding of—even participation in—unruly demonstrations. Indeed, one ACLU official currently is charged with attacking a policeman; meanwhile, a federal court and a grand jury both have shown that widely circulated ACLU charges of police brutality were, in fact false.

DEFENDS CLOSED SHOP

Some idea of what ACLU is all about comes through in a brief review of certain cases it has turned down. It refuses, for example, to defend state right-to-work laws, finding no Constitutional guarantee of a man's right to earn a living without joining a union. Instead, it endorses the closed shop, which makes union membership a mandatory condition of employment. An ACLU policy statement once declared: "No worker should be allowed to participate in the benefits provided by the union without accepting the responsibility of union membership."

A few years ago, however, when it was fighting the blacklisting of the "Hollywood Ten"—screen writers who refused to answer questions of a Congressional committee about alleged Communist Party connections—ACLU declared: "The right to work is a human right . . . a Constitutional right; and the opportunity to earn a living cannot be unjustly withheld from a man without doing violence to the Constitutional guarantees protecting his liberty . . ." Despite its present myopia about the Constitutional right to earn a living, ACLU does believe in a Constitutional right to receive welfare. Poverty, it says, prevents the enjoyment of rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

Take another example. Some merchants in the District of Columbia complained that their civil liberties were violated last spring when their stores were destroyed during the riots here. They asked ACLU to represent them in a suit against the government for failing to provide adequate protection. ACLU declined. It did agree, however, to file an amicus curiae brief on behalf of another group of D.C. shop-owners "supporting the correctness of any decision not to shoot suspected looters and supporting the property owners' right to compensation." Irma Thexton, executive director of the ACLU's Capital Area affiliate, explained that since the community obviously would benefit by any orders not to shoot looters, the community (i.e. the government) should reimburse the merchants.

FAVORS NOISY "PROTEST"

So much for which liberties ACLU ignores. What about the record of causes it has favored? Here's one: ACLU obtained the permit for last fall's huge, violent, wholly unprecedented anti-war demonstration at the Pentagon. According to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, a number of Communists and other known subversives took part in that notorious fracas. In the midst of what Mr. Hoover called a "scandalous display of obscenity and immoral behavior," ACLU was speaking out in behalf of the rights of those who made the display.

A few years earlier, ACLU had made its feelings plain: "Disorder is less to be dreaded than suppression of the right to protest." The organization can be blunter than that. A bill passed by the House of Representatives, making it a federal offense to cross state lines for the purpose of inciting a riot, "represents a typical know-nothing attitude in looking for the mythical scapegoat in response to the enormously complex and grave problems facing our society."

Last June, Washington Director Speiser urged members of Congress to vote against legislation which would keep demonstrators from camping overnight on federal property in the District of Columbia. (It also would require them to post bonds to cover the costs of potential damage resulting from their daytime activities.) The same lobbyist demanded that Congress vote down another bill to prohibit desecration of the American flag. Again, last February, he spoke out against a proposed law which would authorize the Secretary of State to restrict travel of citizens to countries whose military forces are engaged in armed conflict with U.S. forces. Americans who have gone to North Vietnam without U.S. government approval, Mr. Speiser said, "have performed a useful function in contributing to the debate on our involvement. . . ."

The ACLU lobbyist also is opposed to legislative proposals barring employment of Communists in defense plants and authorizing the Secretary of Defense to fire security risks. Further, Mr. Speiser's organization advised teachers not to answer questions from prospective employers about any student's loyalty or patriotism. ACLU's D.C. affiliate wants to "make it unlawful for an employer to ask an applicant whether he has ever been arrested." It even wants to end the practice of distributing copies of arrest records; it would prohibit record-keeping altogether on relatively "minor" infractions of law and "eliminate records of arrests for more serious crimes after a reasonable time—perhaps three years."

Chicago's ACLU branch, by the way, is no less windy. It has criticized infiltration of the city's peace groups as a "real police-state practice which is bound to have an effect on dissent."

ATTACK ON HUAC

One of the primary objectives of the ACLU is to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee. According to HUAC, the

Communist Party coincidentally has an identical goal: back in 1960, the party set up a National Committee to Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee. HUAC responded to the latter event by identifying seven of the National Committee's leaders as Communists. One member, though not named a Communist, is Arthur J. Adkins, who happens to be on the executive board of National Capital Area Civil Liberties Union.

Despite losing a court case to have HUAC declared un-Constitutional, the ACLU continued its fight for abolition. While the Union undoubtedly is entitled to express its views regarding the Committee, some of its tactics surely are open to question. Mr. Speiser, for example, told the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress that he had represented "over 100 people" before HUAC and had never known it to observe House Rule 26(m). (This provides that if a Congressional committee determines certain evidence may incriminate, it may be received in executive session, and requests may be accepted to subpoena additional witnesses.)

HUAC Chairman Edwin E. Willis (D., La.), however, informed the Joint Committee: "The courts of this country, in numerous contempt cases, have had an opportunity to review the Committee's rules of procedure. In no instance have they found them unconstitutional or violative of witnesses' rights." Rep. Willis cited a recent court decision on this point. When Mr. Speiser represented Donna Allen and Dagmar Wilson in appearances before HUAC, he contended that the committee was not observingg Rule 26(m), and advised them not to answer questions. The District Court here subsequently found that HUAC had in fact complied with the rule, and convicted Miss Allen and Miss Wilson for contempt of Congress. On appeal, the conviction was overturned, on a technicality unrelated to the Rule 26(m) dispute.

As for Mr. Speiser's claim that he had represented over 100 persons before the HUAC, Rep. Willis told the Joint Committee: "I have had a careful check made of the record, and it reveals that Mr. Speiser has represented a total of 39 witnesses who have appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities—33 in public session and six in executive session. Therefore, that part of his statement about the number of witnesses he has represented before the committee is less than half true."

NONVIOLENCE?

ACLU people also can be somewhat less than civil. When Arthur Kinoy was representing witnesses before HUAC a couple of years ago, on behalf of ACLU, he disrupted the hearing and was ejected by police. The courts subsequently found him guilty of disorderly conduct. In 1962, the same Mr. Kinoy was a vice president of the National Lawyers Guild, cited by HUAC as a Communist front. He is a law partner of William Kunstler, who in turn is a member of ACLU's board and, among other things, an attorney for Rap Brown, the former head of SNCC, the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee. (Phillip Hirschkop, another of Mr. Brown's lawyers, is on the executive board of the National Capital Area CLU.)

When HUAC held hearings in San Francisco in May 1960, it had even more trouble: specifically, a riot. At the time, Michael Tigar, now a member of the executive board of the National Capital Area CLU, was an officer of "SLATE," a student group at the University of California organizing students for the demonstration. The California Senate Fact-Finding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities reported that SLATE played an important role in stirring up the disorders. According to HUAC, SLATE featured known Communist party members as speakers at meetings which it sponsored on the UC campus.

The California subcommittee declared that Mr. Tigar narrated a propaganda film for Cuba, shown at Berkeley in November 1961. It also named him as one of a three-man committee which made U.S. preparations for the Communist Youth Festival at Helsinki the following year. According to a Washington Post story, "Tigar also was tagged as a student leader at the 1964 Berkeley riots." In that year, too, the California subcommittee found that Mr. Tigar was one of the signers of a call for a student convention in San Francisco, which resulted in the formation of the W.E.B. Du Bois Clubs. And a couple of years later, again according to The Washington Post, Supreme Court Justice William J. Brennan Jr. hired Mr. Tigar as a law clerk—then, following the ensuing public uproar, changed that incredible decision.

In any event, the riot at the HUAC hearings inspired the Communist Party to emphasize "police brutality" as a rallying cry—a brilliant bit of sloganesque which since has attracted the sympathy of innumerable student groups. So concludes no less an authority than FBI Director Hoover. HUAC said the party circulated 20,000 leaflets on California campuses, saying that students were engaged in peacefully defending the most cherished American freedoms (at the HUAC hearings) when, without warning, clubs, blackjacks and fire hoses were turned on them.

According to California's subcommittee, the San Francisco demonstration inspired "another new practice on the campuses of some of our educational institutions . . . the holding of mock trials ridiculing the committee (HUAC) and usually sponsored by the political science departments of the institution together with the ACLU." It mentioned specifically a mock trial held December 2, 1960, before some 600 students at Long Beach State College. "The purpose," it said, ". . . was to ridicule this important Congressional committee and to enlist membership in the college branch of the ACLU as well as to get signatures on a petition circulated by that organization calling for the abolition of HUAC."

The subcommittee also revealed that in October 1960, a UCLA student paper announced that "a Marxist study group had been formed on the campus supported by the ACLU of Southern California . . . That group stated that its fundamental purpose was to provide a medium for the radical movement on the campus and to secure noted speakers for the American radical press.

PHILADELPHIA STORY

ACLU has gotten plenty of mileage out of such tactics. In the January 1968 issue of its official publication, Civil Liberties, the Union gave its version of events in Philadelphia last November. Some 1,500 Negro high school students were "discussing their concerns with the school superintendent." Suddenly, presumably unprovoked, "about 200 uniformed policemen charged, clubbing wildly. Fleeing youths, boys and girls alike, were clubbed from behind or where they fell." The U.S. District Court for Eastern District of Pennsylvania, on reviewing the same events, found otherwise. "An unrestrained group of about 3,500 full-grown, vigorous people," it noted, actually were committing acts of vandalism, hurling missiles, attacking policemen and obstructing traffic.

The court gave details on the arrest of one demonstrator, Albert Hampton. After a policeman told Mr. Hampton not to cross a police line, it seems, Mr. Hampton shouted an obscenity, struck the officer with his fist, spat on him and went through the barricade. About three feet inside the lines he was placed under arrest, "at which time he called to the crowd, 'Riot, riot. Don't let them take me away.' . . . Two officers were required to take Mr. Hampton to the police van because of his struggles. Mr. Hampton conceded that

he had called preliminary meetings and helped to organize the demonstration. . . ."

CLEAR VIOLATIONS

Concluded the court: "Forbearance by the police during a considerable period when the crowd was increasing in size, and tension was mounting, indicates that the police action was not taken in bad faith to 'chill' the exercise of First Amendment rights." The behavior of the demonstrators involved clear violations of criminal law, according to the court. Significantly, the plaintiffs did not claim that the principle of free speech sanctions incitement to riot. "Instead," the court said, "plaintiffs have contended that the Pennsylvania definition of 'inciting to riot' is void for vagueness. Their position is untenable."

During the 1967 riots in Newark, ACLU was even more involved. An Essex County grand jury recently found that the Union, in cooperation with the Newark Legal Services Project, solicited and distributed false affidavits on "police brutality" (Barron's, April 29). ACLU has run into other difficulties in that New Jersey city. Last April, Henry M. diSuvero (then Executive Director of the N.J. chapter of ACLU) was arrested, charged with assaulting a policeman and creating a disturbance. The assault charge has been referred to a grand jury: the other will be heard September 11 in Newark Municipal Court. Mr. diSuvero, incidentally, has become National Director of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, identified as a Communist front by both HUAC and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

REDS' DEFENDER

The record seems clear, in sum, that ACLU likes to defend Communists. Last March 25, Lawrence Speiser admitted to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, "I have had clients who have been members of the Communist Party. . . ." Asked by J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel for the subcommittee, if he recognized the Communist Party as a conspiracy against the U.S. Mr. Speiser replied: "No, Mr. Sourwine. If it were as clear as you make it, then all the members of the Communist Party would be charged and in jail today."

Nevertheless, ACLU continues to speak out loudly in defense of what it regards as its lofty aims. ACLU actions, however, speak louder than words. The record, indeed, speaks for itself.

PARITY FOR AUGUST 1968

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, parity ratio of income for farmers advanced 1 point over the July ratio to 74 percent, and is now back to the same levels that prevailed in January, February, and March. It is 1 point lower than 1 year ago, and 6 points lower than in 1960.

Farm prices went up largely because of an increase in cotton prices, while there were declines in corn, barley, flax, oats, and sorghum. Meat animal prices dipped for poultry, hogs, and lambs.

The following percentages are listed for August 1968:

Cotton	58
Wheat	45
Corn	60
Peanuts	78
Tobacco	79
Butterfat	77

Milk	86
Wool	46
Barley	60
Flax	69
Oats	60
Sorghum	62
Soybeans	74
Beef	81
Chickens	68
Eggs	69
Hogs	77
Lambs	83
Turkeys	64

CURRENT SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, the spring edition of Business Today, a business review published at Princeton University, contains a revealing article by Mr. A. P. Fontaine on current social and economic problems. Mr. Fontaine describes how American private enterprise can help toward enhancing equal employment opportunity and hiring the disadvantaged. I ask unanimous consent that his observations be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

OBSERVATIONS ON SOCIAL UNREST

(By A. P. Fontaine)

For each generation, the tenor of the times creates new opportunities, new challenges and new problems.

For my generation and those that are immediately following, one of the most challenging situations and indeed a most critical problem is the social unrest in our cities.

The very nature of this social unrest and the various means by which it is being manifested is highly complex. And this complexity is a problem in itself.

In view of these facets of social unrest, it is pertinent to ask what business itself can do to improve the well being of our society and, more particularly, to inquire how business can help solve the bewildering array of problems that plague our cities.

It is important to realize that business has already done a great deal, much of it unrecognized by the general public, and it stands ready to assume more responsibility provided there is an understanding of the capabilities and limitations of business in the complex social environment we find ourselves in today.

PRINCIPLES

We at Bendix share beliefs in certain principles with other businesses. For instance, Bendix has long recognized we cannot isolate ourselves from the communities in which we operate.

I believe the greatest public service is performed by individuals who carefully select their causes and work diligently on behalf of them. They do not necessarily have to be told what to do and how to do it by their government or their employer.

Our most effective civic work is being done on the local level by individual employees and groups in response to local needs.

I am vigorously opposed to engaging in civic work if its purpose is mere window dressing. Projects should be planned and involve worthwhile, attainable objectives. I believe individuals and organizations should

get involved first and talk about it later, if at all.

FULFILLING OBLIGATIONS

At Bendix, we try to fulfill our social obligations in the same manner that we conduct our business affairs. Our divisions and our employees are given as much freedom and responsibility as possible to enable them to react effectively to their particular opportunities and problems.

We strongly encourage our employees to get involved in civic work because we believe the broader the base of participation the more that will be accomplished. It is also no secret that employees who take an active interest in the affairs of their community are better adjusted and more well-rounded. They do a better job for us. Realizing all this, we make it a practice to give an employee time off from his work to perform civic tasks when necessary.

SOME ACTIVITIES

Now what can a company, as an entity, do to fulfill its obligations as a good neighbor and a good citizen? I would like to point to some of the activities of our Corporation and a few of our divisions in the area of equal employment opportunity, a matter of great concern to Bendix and one that is perhaps at the root of many of our nation's social problems. The things we are doing are not dramatic, and they are being done by other businesses. They do illustrate the merits of individual action and are affirmative and meaningful.

Bendix employs a full-time equal opportunity coordinator reporting to the vice president of industrial relations. He is responsible for initiating and directing equal employment opportunity programs and working with minority groups. However, his principal objective is to increase minority group employment at all levels and in all divisions of the Corporation. He is supported by an equal opportunity officer at each of our divisions, some of them devoting full-time to this activity. Each division prepares an annual plan for affirmative action and its progress is reported monthly to corporate headquarters.

DIVISIONAL ACTION

One of our divisions is active in the campaign for equal employment opportunity not only in the plant but throughout the large city in which it is located. It has a full-time EEO coordinator reporting to the general manager.

Not only does the division recruit at Negro colleges but it sends interviewers to the ghettos. Free transportation is provided people from the poverty areas to enable them to complete their applications for jobs at the division.

The division helps secure housing for members of minority groups which it recruits.

If a Negro applies for a typist job and is unable to achieve the required 45 words per minute, the division will provide the necessary training to bring the applicant's performance up to the minimum standard.

The drafting classes and lathe training the division offers are primarily intended for members of minority groups.

Negro ministers are invited to the plant to make them aware of the job opportunities available there.

Working with the local Youth Opportunity Program, the division employs a counselor whose mission is to help youths find summer jobs in the community.

Another of our division employs about 10,000 persons in a major metropolitan area. Roughly 1,000 of its employees are members of so-called minority groups.

REACHING ANOTHER

Notices of all employment vacancies are sent to the Urban League. The division has a program called "each one, reach one" in which each new employee who is a member

of a minority group is requested to recommend another member for employment at the division.

This installation sponsors work-study programs at Negro universities and sends recruiters to all Negro high schools in the area. Volunteer, part-time instructors and scientific equipment are sent to Negro schools.

Vocational guidance is offered at all of the area high schools and eligible students are invited to come to the division for paid work experience.

A third Bendix division, located in a medium-sized city in the South, employs 760 persons, 103 of them Negroes. It recently conducted a series of evening job interviews at a high school in the Negro community. Candidates were contacted with the help of Negro leaders and the news media.

Similar activities are taking place at most of our installations in this country and added together they represent an enormous amount of good work. What's more, they have been going on for many years.

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED

What we have been doing is difficult work. We have encountered many problems in the hiring of disadvantaged persons or the so-called hard-core unemployables. Usually these people are lacking in education, technical skills and basic social habits.

Difficulties begin with recruiting—low turnouts and jaded, cynical responses. We find applicants with prison records and people who never finished grade school.

Once hired, these people must be trained or assigned tasks they are capable of performing. Because of our rapidly advancing technology, jobs for low-skilled workers are very scarce indeed, particularly at a scientifically and technically oriented corporation such as Bendix.

ATTITUDES

Attitudes of disadvantaged persons cause problems. Many have never had full-time work before. They may not conform very readily to work habits such as punching time clocks and showing up on Monday mornings. There is also a decided lack of initiative on the part of some because they have been buffeted and degraded on often.

Among other difficulties are resistance to open housing laws which hinder a company's recruitment efforts, industry-union seniority systems that tend to relegate Negroes to menial jobs and the barring of Negroes from any skilled trade unions.

However, a business that is sincere about hiring and keeping disadvantaged persons must be prepared for costly and time-consuming job training, low initial output, poor workmanship and absenteeism.

Integrated solutions to multiple problems are imperative and in this regard industry can provide what may be a powerful tool—systems engineering.

MAJOR OBSTACLES

The major obstacle is to find some profit-oriented mechanism by which the great talents of our system-oriented industry can be brought to bear on the needs of our society. A start in this direction has been made through the model cities program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Bendix system engineers are currently performing preliminary urban transportation studies for HUD.

It is obvious to some but not to all that a corporation's greatest social responsibility is to make a profit. Profits create jobs and enable a business to contribute financially as well as morally to the social movements of the community. Conversely, the absence of profits creates unemployment and retards social improvements.

Profits are subject to the needs of stockholders, customers, employees, the taxing units of government as well as the social requirements of our communities. It is in-

cumbent upon management to balance all of these factors in prudent and realistic fashion. And, of course, a business whose profit is 10 per cent is in a much better position to deal with these factors than one that has only a three per cent profit.

ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

It seems clear to me the federal government will be employing the organizational and technological capabilities of business in the years ahead to help solve some of the pressing problems that plague our cities. Only massive, concerted effort offers any hope of substantial, lasting relief. However, I am confident that individual action on the local level will continue to be the foundation of most community action programs. The freedom of the individual to work out his own destiny has brought us where we are today and I am convinced that society's greatest challenge is providing that freedom to everyone.

TIME FOR REFORM IN THE IRS

HON. JAMES V. SMITH

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, on September 5, 1968, I brought to the attention of the House the need to establish a select committee to investigate charges against the Internal Revenue Service by the Reader's Digest. This information was further substantiated by the following article which appeared in the September 1968 Reader's Digest, entitled "Time for Reform in the IRS." I again urge adoption of my resolution, House Resolution 1295. The evidence is too overwhelming to ignore—the American taxpayers are demanding an investigation, and Congress is obligated to provide them taxation with representation.

The article follows:

TIME FOR REFORM IN THIS IRS

(By John Barron)

(NOTE.—Here, revealed by men who themselves work for the Internal Revenue Service, are examples of the vicious pressures which degrade tax agents and taxpayers alike, too often making a mockery of our faith in justice and fair play.)

Late one night last summer, I received a long-distance call from an Internal Revenue Service officer. "If you really want to understand why taxpayers are getting it in the teeth," he said, "some of us are ready to sit down with you. We've got the documents to show you just what they're making us do to people."

This, it turned out, was the beginning of an unforeseen reaction to a Reader's Digest article describing IRS abuses of honest citizens.¹ Less than 48 hours after publication, I started receiving personal visits, phone calls and letters from IRS employees. I found them almost desperately anxious to make known what is going on today inside the Internal Revenue Service.

Rather in sadness than anger, they offered new evidence of how IRS does damage to innocent lives through misuse of its awesome authority to seize property at will, to levy any claim it pleases—without even talking with the taxpayer to ascertain the facts, or providing any evidence to anybody. More important, they explained *why* all this happens and *why* it will continue until the IRS

¹ See "Tyranny in the Internal Revenue Service," The Reader's Digest, August '67.

system is reformed. In their homes and cars, at airports and on street corners, in hotels, restaurants and employe organization offices across the country, they risked their jobs to talk to me. Some turned over official documents. Yet they did so only in hope that exposure of the bureaucratic virus infecting IRS will make possible its cure.

IRS employs 6300 Revenue Officers in its Collection Division. They have the difficult job of getting money from people who fail to pay taxes assessed against them. But they have nothing to do with examining returns and alleging errors. This is done by the 16,000 Revenue Agents and Tax Technicians assigned to the IRS Audit Division.

Conscientious professionals of IRS realize the absolute necessity of tracking down tax evaders. They also think that the majority of taxpayers are treated fairly. Their great concern is that the present IRS system forces them to run roughshod over a growing number of the innocent while chasing the guilty.

PRESSURE TO BULLY

I began to appreciate how deeply many employes feel after I had a private meeting with 12 Revenue Officers. "IRS doesn't look on people as human beings anymore; they're just numbers, statistics," said an officer with 23 years' experience. He handed me a copy of a local IRS order dated October 1965. It warned: "We will be watching very closely the Revenue Officer who doesn't average at least one levy per week and one seizure per month. . . . Get the dollar. . . ."

I can still see the despair on the face of the 52-year-old Revenue Officer who reported a reprimand just received. While reviewing a case, a supervisor had flung a file folder across the desk at him. "A grade-three clerk could have handled the case better than you did," he shouted. "This man is working. Why didn't you attach his wages?"

"Actually, he owes us only \$19 because he has a refund coming for 1966," the officer explained. "Look, this guy's an old man with a heart condition. He has just found a job as a fry cook after being out two months with an attack. I decided to give him a couple of weeks to get back on his feet. If I had levied on him, he would have lost his job."

"So what?" snapped the boss. "The case would have been closed. If you can't follow our collection policy, fill out a Form 52."²

Across the country other IRS men disclose the same kind of pressures to seize money, get rid of cases, bully people—all in the name of bureaucratic "efficiency" and "productivity." Wrote a spokesman for the American Federation of Government Employees: "We receive much correspondence from IRS personnel who state that they are being forced to participate in the kind of tyranny your article describes."

Nobody has summed up the basic problem better than Vincent L. Connery, president of the 27,000-member National Association of Internal Revenue Employees. A respected Revenue Agent for the past 18 years, Connery is in constant touch with IRS workers across the nation. "IRS management today is trying to run the agency like a factory," he says. "Output is measured by the number of returns audited, deficiencies (underpayments by taxpayers) asserted, cases closed. Pressures to increase output originate in Washington and become progressively more brutal as they are applied down through the ranks. They sap the right of employes to exercise independent judgment. Unfortunately, they often force employes to stick to the mass-production rules regardless of the human consequences."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Yet IRS in Washington publicly pretends that all is well. Last year, Commissioner Sheldon S. Cohen sought to assure Congress that IRS is fair, reasonable and understand-

ing. The agency regards "any seizure of anyone's assets" as "a very serious matter," an action to be undertaken only as a last resort, he said.

At the very moment that Commissioner Cohen was speaking on Capitol Hill, IRS bosses in California were circulating an order warning that "any evidence of a soft approach" toward anyone IRS claims owes taxes "will result in immediate disciplinary action." Another California order, put in force August 3, 1967, instructs: "Levy at once on known sources of income, i.e., wages, bank accounts, etc. Seize assets of taxpayer, car, home, business, etc. Make this your first action. Get taxpayers' attention." The directive concludes that such "efficient work" will be rewarded with "promotions and awards"; that "inefficient work will be severely dealt with by demotions and separation from the Service."

Similarly destructive orders are visited upon IRS auditors. Last February 20 the IRS Group Supervisor in Providence, R.I., warned his agents of an impending inspection by the Regional Commissioner. "You can expect him to be very concerned with the total deficiencies recommended (taxpayer errors alleged) and the number of cases closed by the Audit Division," the supervisor wrote. "Let's make a special effort to close as many cases as possible during the next 30 days."

IRS chiefs cannot be ignorant of such pressure-bred and pressure-breeding orders. In IRS's Washington files there is a closely guarded "FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY" report summarizing findings of nationwide studies of what employes think. This document, first circulated within the agency in June 1966, reveals that more than half of IRS auditors and 65 percent of its Revenue Officers complain that "the quality of their work" is "seriously affected by requirements for production." It continues: "Criticisms of the adverse effects of emphasis on production are problems in every one of the districts included in the survey."

Alarmed, IRS last year organized a special "task force" to make still another study. The very first finding, reported August 1, 1967, stated: "Most Revenue Officers, and many Group Supervisors, feel there is too much emphasis on production and unnecessary pressure to meet statistical goals. They feel many managers go overboard in trying to meet standards and bench marks."

Yet, just nine days later, Commissioner Cohen flatly reassured Congress: "Our revenue agents are under no pressure to produce certain amounts of revenue; there are no quotas. Rather, emphasis is on quality and fairness."

Wherever production pressures are exerted, they have four disastrous effects on employes—and ultimately on taxpayers.

1. *The system can transform employes into automatons by binding them to rigid rules.* A case in California illustrates the sometimes shattering consequences of IRS rigidity.

When the IRS office in Santa Ana opened one June morning in 1966, a pretty housewife walked in. Mrs. Alexander G. Douglas had just received an IRS notice demanding \$674 in back taxes for 1960, and she wanted to know why. "This account was referred to us from Arizona for collection," said a clerk, thumbing through a folder. "If you don't think you owe the money, write us a letter explaining why."

Mrs. Douglas did as told, but IRS didn't even acknowledge her letter. So she wrote an angry protest to the White House, which forwarded it to IRS. Three weeks later, an IRS man telephoned Mrs. Douglas, politely telling her not to worry. The next day, an official letter reassured her that "the matter was mutually resolved."

Then, in October, Mrs. Douglas came home with an armful of groceries to find an IRS card stuck in her front door: "Call at once regarding 1960 tax deficiency, or steps will be taken to enforce collection."

Mrs. Douglas called the designated IRS officer. "I was promised that this had been taken care of," she said. "I don't see why I should pay this money when nobody will tell me why I owe it." The officer told her to pay up or else IRS would "take steps."

It was not an empty threat. Mrs. Douglas' bank called some two weeks later to inform her that the IRS had stripped the family's checking account.

Forced to scrape up cash to cover all outstanding checks and in dread of what IRS might do next, Mrs. Douglas sent another protest to the White House in December. Goaded again, IRS belatedly ascertained what had happened. After her divorce in 1962, Mrs. Douglas' first husband had received a refund on his 1960 taxes—but IRS later decided that it was unjustified. Unable to recover the refund from him, it put Mrs. Douglas on the delinquent list and ordered the money collected from her.

"No further steps to collect from you" will be taken, Assistant IRS Commissioner D. W. Bacon wrote to Mrs. Douglas on February 9, 1967. Nevertheless, she had to spend more than five more months writing letters, consulting a lawyer, making phone calls, before IRS finally gave back the money it had seized. "Every morning when I woke up, I was afraid," she says. "I don't think it's right that the government can do things like this to people."

2. *The IRS system encourages employes to victimize citizens least able and likely to defend themselves.* "The average agent will do anything within his power to avoid getting involved in a case which is likely to cut his dollar per man-day production," declares one agent in the IRS's official attitude study. It is easier to squeeze "production" out of little taxpayers who cannot afford a lawyer or even time off from work to contest an arbitrary IRS claim.

After her husband deserted her in August 1963, Carmen Ramos tried to support herself by working as a maid in McAllen, Texas. Because of ill health, she was able to earn only \$580 in 1964—so little that she did not even have to file a tax return. However, after her absent husband failed to pay the tax due on all of his income, IRS last year summoned Mrs. Ramos. It demanded that she submit a return reporting half of her husband's income and pay taxes on it—even though he had contributed nothing whatsoever to her support.

Outraged, the Hidalgo County Legal Aid Society filed suit against IRS. "Vicious and unconscionable," asserted attorney Joseph L. Nanus, who volunteered to represent Mrs. Ramos in the pending court action. "Here IRS is trying to make this poor woman pay taxes on money she never got and knows nothing about. Talk about civil rights!"

All too often, IRS seeks to increase "production" at the expense of the poor by disallowing their deductions for children. "Dependents are a gold mine for production," an agent explained to me. "All you have to do is send a guy a letter ordering him to prove that he supported his kids. Often he doesn't understand what to do. So we just wait a month, then tell him he owes us an extra 125 bucks or so. What's he going to do, especially if he's poorly educated? We know he'll usually pay. If not, we just take it."

Consider the case of John A. McLeod, a Negro handyman employed by the Southern Bell Telephone Co. in Mobile, Ala. In April 1964, a neighbor tearfully explained to him and his wife that she no longer could care for her fatherless children. The McLeods counted up their modest resources and decided that they could stretch them far enough to give a home to three of the children.

They took them in, and on July 1 the Alabama welfare department approved the adoptions. A year later, however, IRS disallowed the three children as deductions and

²In IRS jargon: submit your resignation.

ordered McLeod to pay \$286.53 in back taxes for 1964. It tried to defend this action on grounds that the children were placed in the home by the mother, "not by an authorized state agency."

McLeod did not comprehend. But he scraped up \$70 for IRS and, when threatened by IRS with seizure of his salary, later borrowed the rest.

A prominent Alabama lawyer was so enraged upon hearing of this case that he filed suit against IRS at his own expense. A Federal District Court last November 22 ruled IRS wrong and ordered McLeod's money returned.

3. *The IRS system tends to erode the integrity of employes.* It is small wonder that pockets of wrongdoing are occasionally uncovered in IRS. The remarkable thing is that the enormous majority of employes remain so honest in the face of policies which emphasize the easy way out.

Pressures to increase production so intimidated four Denver supervisors in 1965 and 1966 that they falsified official reports to make it appear that demands from on high had been met. They were caught, and nobody was harmed except them. But taxpayers sometimes do get hurt when employes are driven to cut ethical corners.

In San Carlos, Calif., corporate executive Richard L. Bradley, his accountant and lawyer reached a carefully negotiated agreement with an IRS agent over a complex business deduction. All were satisfied, and their clear understanding was reflected in writing on an IRS form. But later the agent's supervisor secretly nullified the agreement by rewording it. The clandestine changes established a precedent which made Bradley vulnerable to large IRS claims in later years. Worse, IRS doctored the official form in a way that he was unlikely to notice. Then IRS sent him a copy of the altered form with a statement that it was a duplicate of the original agreement.

When Bradley's lawyer, Harlan K. Veal, discovered the IRS trick, he was appalled. "The new Form 886-A surreptitiously, fraudulently, intentionally and without any notification to the taxpayer left out two key points which appeared on the original," Veal wrote IRS. "The effort to hide this deletion was covered up by not only retying the 886-A but by sending only photocopies thereof so that the delicate deletion would not be apparent. Fortunately, we have on hand the original . . ."

IRS admitted altering the form, but pretended that this was not really important. When Veal threatened to sue and go to the newspapers, IRS decided not to press the additional claims to which the alterations exposed Bradley.

4. *The IRS system robs employes of time, opportunity and incentive to correct mistakes and rectify wrongs.*

Vincent L. Connery, head of the IRS employe organization mentioned earlier, puts it this way: "The employe who goes out of his way to unsnarl an administrative mess is likely to be penalized because the time he spends subtracts from his 'production.' There is no reward for doing a quality job, for correcting somebody's mistake."

But what can begin inside IRS as an uncorrected clerical oversight or honest error in judgment can end in a nightmare for the taxpayer. The experience of Howard F. Mac Neil shows how.

A successful Chicago accountant, Mac Neil had dealt amicably with IRS on thousands of matters. But in 1962 a client, Container Laboratories, Inc., fell more than \$36,000 behind in its taxes and went bankrupt. Thereupon IRS assessed Mac Neil personally for the taxes owed.

At first, he considered this merely a mistake by an individual Revenue Officer. He presented proof that he had no power to pay the corporation's taxes, no control of its affairs. In response, he got an IRS offer to drop the \$36,000 demand if he would agree to a "compromise" payment.

Mac Neil knew that a "compromise" would be cheaper than a court fight. "I could give in," he told his wife, "but, dammit, the evidence is so overwhelming that any court will uphold me. Besides, it's morally wrong to submit to outright extortion." He engaged a lawyer and filed suit in federal court against IRS.

Meanwhile, IRS put liens on all his bank accounts and placarded his house with signs warning: "Keep out. Property of U.S. Government." It also spread the word in Chicago financial circles that Mac Neil was delinquent in his income taxes—something unpardonable for an accountant. Now Mac Neil saw all he had spent his life building start to crumble. His once imposing list of clients dwindled. With income plummeting and debts mounting, Mac Neil moved out of his downtown offices. Gradually, employes left.

Because of a crowded docket, more than two years passed before Mac Neil's case was heard in court. Arguments ended January 7, 1966. The jury deliberated only briefly before returning the verdict: Mac Neil owed the government not one cent, and never had.

Mac Neil had been vindicated. Yet virtually everything he had acquired through a lifetime of hard work was gone. His legal bills amounted to \$14,963.52. "I admit that I am bitter," Mac Neil told me in the modest office he now occupies. "But I'll get back on my feet some way. It's just that it's hard to start all over again when you're 60."

NEEDED: CURBS

For most citizens, payment of taxes is a routine ritual, and most Americans can say that IRS never has treated them unfairly. But this is small consolation to the innocent who have already been unjustly treated by the IRS system.

In the past year, The Reader's Digest has received hundreds of specific complaints about IRS—from ministers, lawyers, janitors, doctors, housewives, policemen, accountants, truck drivers, businessmen—even from soldiers in Vietnam. Congress, too, is hearing from the people. "I seldom go to my district that I don't receive complaints about IRS," reports Rep. Olin E. Teague of Texas. "I am tired of it, and I am going to do something about it."

Sen. Jacob Javits, of New York, states that last fall he was so inundated with complaints about IRS that he had to assign a secretary full-time to handle them. "By treating some taxpayers unfairly while favoring others, IRS is creating a national problem," declares Sen. John J. Williams, of Delaware. "For if Americans ever lose confidence in the fairness of IRS, our whole voluntary tax system will begin to collapse."

Clearly, changes must be made. Congress must curb some of the gigantic powers it has entrusted to IRS. Today, IRS can make the most preposterous claim against anyone, then force him to disprove it. It can seize any citizen's home, car, bank account or paycheck without offering the slightest proof that he actually owes taxes. At the very least, Congress should require IRS to give a judge some evidence before swallowing up property and salaries.

"Vicious" and "evil" declares the AFL-CIO in deploring the practice of attaching workers' wages. "Some employers, rather than accept the annoyance and expense of garnishing wages, simply discharge the workers involved." A concerned Congress last May enacted a law drastically curtailing the right of private creditors to attach earnings. Yet, ironically, IRS in fiscal 1967 tried to seize salaries and property no less than 880,000 times!

In recent months, I have asked IRS about abuses disclosed by its own personnel. As a result, some tax collectors have been called to special conferences and told that a few of the practices I cited are not officially "condoned." An IRS directive released in Los Angeles last May 10 admits that the property of innocent people has been unjustly seized. It advises Revenue Officers henceforth to

stop and listen to the taxpayer who says he does not owe a claim. And in Washington, IRS has ordered the relentless computerized billing and threatening of a citizen halted long enough to establish the facts whenever someone protests.

These reactions—and the confessions of wrongdoing that they imply—are commendable. But at best they represent an attempt to treat a cancer with a bandage. The basic IRS system remains unchanged and, as run today from Washington, guarantees improper actions.

If Commissioner Cohen really wants to reform IRS, he should listen to his own employes, then liberate them down the line from the vicious pressures which degrade taxpayer and tax collector alike. If he listens closely, he will find that his employes are complaining not out of disloyalty to IRS, but out of loyalty to the democratic principles of their country.

OVERREACTION

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial entitled "Overreaction," published in the Washington, D.C., Examiner of recent date.

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

OVERREACTION

Two of American society's most pervasive and powerful institutions are television and the police. Both badly overreacted during the Democratic National Convention in Chicago.

One federal law enforcement officer on the scene admitted that last Wednesday night's club-swinging assault by the Chicago men in blue was the worst case of organized police brutality he had ever seen or heard of.

The Chicago police, simply, went out of control. One Chicago official confesses that not even Mayor Daley could control them at times.

But Mayor Daley, instead of admitting that his Chicago cops have human failings, played his "We can do nothing wrong" attitude right down the line to absurdity.

Granted, there were provocations. The actions of many of the "peace" demonstrators were disgusting. Supposedly they came to Chicago to protest, in the name of the dignity of man, the war in Vietnam. Some were idealists. Too many were filthy-mouthed, well-organized anarchists. Esthetically, morally, and philosophically, they were deficient.

The most pointed criticism, however, should be directed at the television networks (NBC was the worst). The Chicago police would almost be excused for cracking under the pressure of the harassment. Little could be expected from the pigs who lived in the park. But the television newsmen—the smug, dulcet-toned TV newsmen who eat at the best French restaurants—they have a profound responsibility to behave like unbiased professionals. Instead, they tightened up in the gut and cracked, too, spewing forth a steady stream of editorial invective against Mayor Richard Daley, the Chicago police, convention officials, and indirectly against the party's nominee—Hubert H. Humphrey.

It is no secret that the networks were unhappy with the idea of having the convention in Chicago. They were set up in Miami and they wanted to stay there for both conventions.

The networks were further upset with the

electrical workers' strike and police and convention regulations which curtailed their operations.

And, finally, they were psychotic with rage when newsmen were caught in the brutal charges of the Chicago police.

They found a heavy in Mayor Daley, and with all of the bias at their command, they proceeded to negate the good things that came out of the convention. Indeed, they ignored the convention when it suited their purposes, which was often.

John Chancellor, David Brinkley, Walter Cronkite and others played God—they were very clever and smug about it. On Wednesday night, when Humphrey was nominated—fairly and openly—they flashed back and forth between the convention and the violence at the Conrad Hilton Hotel. While at the convention, they concentrated on Mayor Daley. If Daley wouldn't talk, they stood by and pouted, ignoring what was really important. They behaved as if they had been planning the entire drama with David Dellinger, Tom Hayden, and the other provocateurs. They destroyed the convention as a contribution to the democratic process, which it was.

One had to come away from the convention feeling very sorry for Humphrey. Both he and his running mate, Senator Edmund Muskie, spoke eloquently on Thursday night, but by then, the television networks had done their job too well. Humphrey, who could have easily won the nomination without Daley, was in the middle between the heavy-handed Daley tactics, the pigs in the park, the brutal police, and the childish television correspondents.

The answers, unfortunately, do not come easy. Certainly there should be a federal investigation of the actions of the Chicago police. The anti-war demonstrators should look more carefully at who they associate with. Party officials should retain a fairer, firmer hand on convention proceedings.

The television networks ought to be severely censured. Even in the campaign, too many of the network correspondents sold out to one candidate or another. One newsmen was laughingly referred to as a "whip" in the draft Kennedy movement. And at the convention, they lost what perspective that remained and instead of letting the American people see the convention as it unfolded, they became troublemakers and purveyors of false impressions extraordinary.

The networks executives will predictably and self-righteously claim they were only telling it like it was and, besides, they have the first amendment to protect them.

The sad truth is they performed like cub reporters. And too much is at stake to let it happen again. Let the networks act before the government does, and let the viewer beware. You do not always see the truth.

WILL SPENDING CUTS EVER BE MADE?

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, recent actions by the Johnson administration make it more doubtful than ever that real expenditure reductions will ever be made.

Although spending cuts of \$6 billion were required by Congress in the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968, the President keeps asking exemptions from the act rather than making expenditure reductions.

The latest requests for exemptions are farm price support programs and medic-aid payments. Increases in these programs have been \$1.2 billion. Thus, in the absence of exemptions, overall spending elsewhere would have to be cut \$7.2 billion. Instead the President asks exemptions for these programs to avoid fiscal responsibility.

The latest action is further confirmation of the fact that this administration has no desire to reduce expenditures.

But these actions should not be unexpected. They are merely the latest in a series of maneuvers by the Johnson administration to avoid fiscal responsibility.

The administration bitterly opposed the \$6 billion cut in spending to accompany the 10-percent tax surcharge. It also opposed the rollback in Federal civilian employment to the July 1, 1966, level finally included in the tax bill.

As a matter of fact the Johnson administration added 95,000 extra employees to the public payroll in the 30 days prior to the signing of the tax bill which called for the mandatory reduction in Federal civilian employment.

And now that the reduction in civilian employment is law, the President seeks exemption after exemption to avoid abiding by the provisions of the law.

Thus there is serious doubt that any spending cuts will ever be made. As the Journal of Commerce asks in an editorial on September 10, 1968:

Could it be that the whole \$6 billion spending cut will be nothing but a snare and a delusion and that what will really happen will be that there will be no spending cuts, but merely that projected spending will not go up as much as it might have gone up? If so what happens to that projected big budget deficit reduction? Is that 10 per cent tax increase merely going to finance more spending, as some cynics have insisted all along would be the end result?

Well, I insisted this all along, but I regarded this as a common sense observation, hardly that of a cynic.

The Journal of Commerce editorial follows:

ARE SPENDING CUTS ILLUSORY?

President Johnson's request to Congressional leaders to let him spend \$1 billion over the ceiling Congress had set on government expenditure—which requires a reduction of some \$6 billion in spending—will fortify the view of cynical people that there will be scant chance that the government will reduce expenditures or that it will even want to. There have already been some forced exemptions from the proposed reductions in spending, and there are some outlays under the budget that are specifically exempted.

But it must be assumed that the President will carry out the mandate of Congress and has every intention of doing so. However, the Budget Bureau has pointed out that increases in exempt categories require spending enlarged by \$4.4 billion from the January budget estimates and that the federal outlays for the year which began July 1 are already headed for the \$186 billion originally contemplated. Congress had set the ceiling on all expenditures at \$180.1 billion.

The President has very properly pointed out that mandatory increases in federal payments for Medicaid and farm price supports amount to \$1.2 billion and that as a consequence federal spending must be cut, by him or by Congress, by \$7.2 billion, not by \$6 billion. It illustrates the weakness of our budget and spending system, which starts

programs at a low figure in one year and provides for automatic escalation in future years.

The President can't do anything about those mandatory rises in specific outlays. But he can voluntarily reduce outlays in certain exempt categories, such as defense, although he cannot do anything about another exempt category, interest on the national debt. If he is going to have to live with higher Medicaid or farm price supports, he is going to have to cut more out of other programs so that overall cuts equal \$7.2 billion instead of \$6.1 billion.

The Medicaid increase is said to be due largely to "unforeseen" action by states to get federal matching grants. Why this was unforeseen is a question that should have been asked of the budget estimators. More money for crop supports is, of course, perfectly ridiculous in a year when there are bumper crops which, incidentally, reflect the complete failure of the government's program to reduce acreage so as to produce smaller crops. The reduced acreage was paid for.

At his press conference last week, the President said the secretary of defense was working hard at economizing on the defense budget, that he hoped to cut highway spending by some \$200 million, that some cuts were to be made in space exploration (which is grossly inflated) and that reclamation projects might have to do with \$100 million or so less. Why such a trivial cut in reclamation?

In a recent editorial in Harper's Magazine, John Fischer pointed out that while the Agriculture Department was spending over \$1 billion yearly to bribe farmers to keep cropland out of production (40 million acres), the Department of the Interior, through its Reclamation Bureau, was spending billions to bring new and expensively irrigated land into production.

So far it has brought into production nine million acres. Obviously, says Mr. Fischer, this is insane. We couldn't agree more with such a sentiment. Mr. Fischer has an interesting explanation for the insanity.

Up to recently Senator Carl Hayden, from Arizona, at 91 the most senior man in Congress, the chief beneficiary of reclamation, has been chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee; and no President has dared to offend him. But, adds Mr. Fischer, maybe there is now some hope because Sen. Hayden is retiring. But, adds the Harper's editor, "he is a sweet old gentleman who is anything but a villain and who has served his state well."

For what is happening one cannot, of course, blame the President, who has given his chart and sailing orders, but is up against such Congressionally-imposed obstacles that he will be lucky to accomplish even a part of those mandated spending cuts.

Could it be that the whole \$6 billion spending cut will be nothing but a snare and a delusion and that what will really happen will be that there will be no spending cuts, but merely that projected spending will not go up as much as it might have gone up? If so what happens to that projected big budget reduction? Is that 10 per cent tax increase merely going to finance more spending, as some cynics have insisted all along would be the end result?

WIELDING BIGGER BLUDGEONS

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, the president of the AFL-CIO, George Meany, is leading the attack of organized labor

bosses upon Republican candidates across the Nation. Anyone who doubts that can look at this week's edition of the AFL-CIO News—in particular at the editorial cartoons and editorials—and see a paper that would embarrass Larry O'Brien, the Democratic Party chairman.

One of Mr. Meany's editorial questions, contained in a speech to the machinists convention needs an answer. Mr. Meany says:

What's wrong with power if it is used the way the American labor movement uses its power? . . . If we have too much power, that's okay with me. Let's have more of the same.

The Wall Street Journal of September 9 gives some excellent examples of "what's wrong with labor's power." In an editorial entitled "Welding Bigger Bludgeons" the paper outlines some of the abuses of union power that have been perpetrated on union members when they refused to obey the dictates of union bosses. Compounding the problem is the fact that regulatory agencies—specifically the NLRB, which is supposed to protect the laboring man from abuse by companies and unions alike—exercises practically all its efforts in building up union leadership to the detriment of company, management, worker or consumer.

Consider the case where five engraving employees, who were not on strike, went against union orders not to work overtime and were fined \$1,000 apiece. Both the company and NLRB general counsel thought the fines were unreasonable. But an NLRB trial examiner ruled in favor of the union and the fines have been upheld.

Is this what Mr. Meany finds attractive about labor's use of its power? Is this why he is pushing so hard for the election of his candidates, so he can dictate to the White House, "Let's have some more of the same"?

Mr. President, the time is long overdue for a restoration of balance in the labor-management area. The degree of power that has been allowed to flourish in the past 8 years is unparalleled in American history. Such a concentration of political and economic power in the hands of leaders lacking in concern for either the individual or the Nation must be corrected.

Irresponsible labor leaders have, under the mortgage they hold upon this administration and thus the labor regulatory agencies, strewn our economic pathways with serious hazards and the continued abuse of power menaces the economic health of our country. I suggest that the American people will not lightly regard the demand for bigger bludgeons that Mr. Meany so openly makes, and those candidates who run with such backing may find themselves subject to the same rejection in which honest people cast off threats of blackmail.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Wall Street Journal of September 9, 1968, and the editorial remarks of Mr. George Meany, published in the September 7 edition of the AFL-CIO News, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 9, 1968]

WELDING BIGGER BLUDGEONS

Ever since the Supreme Court last year upheld union-assessed fines against workers who crossed a picket line, labor union fines have been getting bigger. It will be interesting to see how much bigger they will get before Congress steps in to call a halt to this sort of bludgeoning.

Last year's case involved workers disciplined by their union when they defied pickets at the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. They were fined \$20 to \$100. That precedent-setting case, be it noted, had the effect of overturning the language of a section of the Taft-Hartley Act the intent of which—as Senator Taft himself had declared—was to prevent "coercive acts of unions against employees who did not wish to join or did not care to participate in a strike or picket line."

For an example of the new, higher fines, there is the Rocket Freight Lines Co. of Tulsa, Oklahoma. After a short strike, the company and a Teamsters International local agreed on a new contract which was accepted by the local union members and forwarded to the Teamsters' Washington headquarters for approval. After waiting more than three weeks, about half of the company's 70 employees returned to work a few days before approval arrived from Washington. The working employees were fined \$250 each.

On the ground that the fines were unreasonable, the company filed charges against the union, and the NLRB general counsel issued a complaint alleging that the fines were unlawful inasmuch as an agreement had been reached and approved by the local union members. The agency's trial examiner, however, held that the contract was not effective until the Teamsters International approved it. And he declined to rule on the firm's charge that the fines were unreasonable because, he said, the NLRB counsel omitted that charge from his complaint.

Five employees of the General Gravure Service Co. Inc., of Hillside, N.J., fared worse. When the firm's contract with the Lithographers and Photoengravers International Union's local expired, although the union did not strike it announced a ban on overtime work. The firm discharged 14 workers who would not work overtime. To avoid being fired, five other employees chose to work overtime. The union fined them \$1,000 each.

In this instance both the company and the NLRB general counsel filed charges alleging that the fines were unreasonable and hence unlawful. The NLRB trial examiner did not see it that way and upheld the fines.

All this should not surprise the Supreme Court, which in the Allis-Chalmers case opened the door wide to what amounts to legal union intimidation and extortion. Now, who wants to try for \$2,000?

[From AFL-CIO News, Sept. 7, 1968]

WITH NO APOLOGIES

I make no apologies for the fact that labor is strong in this country. I am very, very happy that it is strong. This is what I have lived to see.

What's wrong with power if it is used the way the American labor movement uses its power?

Now, look around for the results of labor's power.

We have the so-called affluent society. There are a lot of people left behind. But look around. There is a high wage economy in this country and it did not come as a gift of the great industrialists and the great captains of industry.

Yes, we have high wages, but only because we wrung them out of them. We used our power to raise wages.

The best customer of American business, the real life blood in this system is the mass purchasing power in the hands of the great mass of people in this country. That is the result of labor's power.

We can look around and look at the children of America. They are better housed, clothed, fed and better educated all over this great nation.

Well, if we have too much power, that's okay with me. Let's have some more of the same.

EDUCATORS CONFERENCE: FINAL REPORT

HON. LLOYD MEEDS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, the second session of the 90th Congress is drawing to a close. I would like to take this opportunity to review some of our accomplishments in the field of education and to give the many constituents in my district a status report on recommendations made last November in the State of Washington's Second Congressional District.

Many of the new legislative enactments generated this year by our Committee on Education and Labor and the General Subcommittee on Education, bear striking similarity to ideas and suggestions espoused at the district-wide conference last November.

The involvement of all of our citizens in solving current problems is important. I think we would all agree that in the field of education it is more important since the composition of the educational process in this country is one that must serve all levels of our body politic. In modern day mass society, individual efforts remain one of our greatest untapped resources.

In an age of anxiety and frustration, the individual citizen in this country may sometimes wonder whether or not he or she counts, whether or not he can bring his talents to bear in helping solve some of the complicated and massive problems facing the United States existing in the latter part of this decade.

I mention this, Mr. Speaker, since the conference which I held in my State of Washington last November drew upon the abilities of distinguished citizens and officials from the Federal, State, and local governments. Participants reviewed the legislative accomplishments of Congress and pointed out new directions that we in Congress should work towards in shaping legislation. As shall be seen, the participants have made a direct contribution to current education legislation; it bears their imprint.

Before I give a final status report on the recommendations made by panelists at this grassroots conference, I would like to list several brief reasons as to the importance of this conference.

When the conference was held last November, the country was experiencing the impact of a vast number of new education laws. They represented, then and now, the commitment we made in the 89th Congress. Many of them, of course,

originated in the House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor and I believe none of the Members need a review of the landmark laws which this committee has forged.

In the field of education, this commitment is without precedent in the history of this country. The new educational programs have done much, in Washington State and elsewhere, in 3 short years.

The purpose of the conference was to evaluate the effects of this Federal assistance to State and local agencies and to get comments and specific suggestions on improvements that can be made in this program. A working day of discussions in three fundamental areas of education was held. Topics included vocational education, elementary and secondary education, and higher education. Reports on each topic and recommendations were submitted to me. Based on these recommendations, in many of the legislative areas in which the Committee on Education and Labor has worked, legislative action has been taken this year to consolidate and strengthen existing laws.

This report today summarizes the status of those recommendations as we near the close of the 90th session of Congress here and as the school year begins in Washington State. For these reasons, I include my final report on the educators conference held in Washington State in the RECORD at this time:

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION CONFERENCE SECTION

One of the more important pieces of legislation coming before the House of Representatives this year was the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. In April, I introduced legislation to expand and upgrade vocational education in this country and an amended version of my original bill, following passage by Committee and the House of Representatives, awaits final action by a House-Senate Conference Committee of which I am proud to be a member.

While this Joint Committee has not yet met, the Senate has passed their version of the Vocational legislation this year and it is clear that significant new directions will be taken when action is completed.

Several recommendations made proved to be quite far-sighted. It was apparent to me that some of the problems on the educators' minds were in line with those regarded as important by the Vocational Education Advisory Council, established by the 1963 Act. The educators' insights and suggestions impressed me greatly. Many of the provisions in my April bill were a direct outgrowth of their recommendations and those of the Advisory Council.

Vocational education has a key role in solving the twin problems of unemployment among the unskilled, and job vacancies in skilled fields. I was, quite frankly, not enthusiastic about the original administration proposal since this nation has neglected the area of vocational education.

This nation needs the skilled manpower and the human resources that will ultimately benefit every level of our economy. It is manpower that can make this nation prosper and grow and these new departures, the very significant new directions in this legislation, will help us supply skilled manpower for this nation's economy. It also will help prepare our young men and women for a productive life.

Recommendations of the November conference and the action taken in these areas are as follows:

First, panelists felt quite strongly that the

needs of vocational education are tremendously diverse, varying by different geographical areas in quality and quantity. It is not possible to have a master plan for vocational education in this country and, of course, all legislation we pass has proper safeguards against Federal control.

The new vocational education legislation will drop the various patchwork programs of Federal assistance which return monies to States, and will give each State a "block grant", so to speak, for vocational education purposes. This consolidation and improvement of vocational education programs is an important component of this legislation. It combines existing vocational legislation, much of it dating back to 1917.

Also, we removed matching requirements. This step originated since there were 23 additional purposes of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and it allows States more flexibility by providing for overall statewide matching. This strikes at the heart of one of the real problems in vocational education, namely that poorer school districts, both urban and rural, are unable to allocate money from their general budget to meet the requirements of matching funds.

Regional purposes are met by another provision of the legislation since each State will be authorized one residential vocational school. Thus, Washington State—and other States—would be guaranteed at least one residential school. Panelists at the November conference had recommended the construction of more residential facilities; it is part of this new legislation.

Two other recommendations were made which have been written into the House bill. The first was the feeling of panelists that more teachers and more experienced manpower was needed for vocational training. The second was that more experimentation and innovative programs, designed to bridge the gap between research and reality, were needed to put new ideas to work.

We moved swiftly on the first recommendation by giving the U.S. Office of Education separate authority under the Education Professions Development Act. A separate authorization will assure our committee members that vocational education would not be bypassed. It is no secret that this field has been somewhat neglected, for whatever reasons. This is our assurance that trained individuals will be provided for vocational education. Experienced vocational educators will be able to spend full time in advance study of their particular fields through a new fellowship program. This provision also provides for exchange programs between different areas of the country, institutes and in-service education for teachers, supervisors and coordinators.

On the second recommendation, we included Title II of the legislation which provides funds to each State for exemplary projects and programs, bringing an innovative luster to the field of vocational education.

One example here of individuals at the local level influencing legislation is that of Mr. Stanley Little of the Boeing Company. His discussion regarding the need to involve private enterprise on a Work Study basis was so impressive as to be deemed a major factor in the cooperative education section of the bill which I introduced.

Our Subcommittee, the full committee on Education and Labor and the House of Representatives have all favorably received these four recommendations which were in line with national trends. Because the recommendations were particularly vital, it was important that they be included in the final House version of the bill. I worked hard to assure their passage. They will go a long way towards helping those young men and women who will not go on to college by providing them with useful job skills.

HIGHER EDUCATION CONFERENCE SECTION

In Washington State, higher education has always played a vigorous role in strengthening our social progress and economic development. This year's Congress has moved forward in this field, too, and the House and the Senate have passed extensive revisions which are contained in the Higher Education Amendments of 1968. Like the Vocational Education bill, the legislation awaits final action by a House-Senate Conference Committee. Many of the recommendations, again made last November at the Educators Conference, are contained in both versions so it is apparent that the final version of this legislation will move to meet the five recommendations made by the Higher Education Conference Section.

First, panelists felt that lead-time for funding of higher educational programs was a necessity. The lead-time provisions included by the House in the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1968 will make Federal programs more workable by giving our colleges and universities a year's advance notice of the funds they can expect to receive.

Secondly, the educators conference recommended that the Guaranteed Student Loan Program be improved to meet student needs and to make the interest rate more attractive to lending agencies. The Higher Education Amendments increase the interest rates slightly, which should give more banks and lending institutions the necessary financial incentive to participate. While this is a substantial improvement, it is still my feeling that student assistance does not respond sufficiently to the needs of middle class America. I shall continue to work for this goal.

Responding to the educators' third recommendations, the House has passed amendments to the Higher Education Facilities Act which will help provide construction funds for building libraries, laboratories, and classrooms to accommodate increased enrollment.

Conference panelists also stressed the need for quick and complete dissemination of information on new Federal programs to all educational institutions so that they might have equal opportunities in applying for Federal funds and so that they might begin programs as soon as possible for the benefit of their students. Educators felt that smaller institutions, lacking the personnel and resources to apply for new programs, often lack too the necessary information to help them in an era when "grantmanship" sometimes favors more affluent institutions.

To facilitate information dissemination, the Senate has included an amendment in the Higher Education Facilities Act which would make it mandatory for the Office of Education to provide and maintain an updated catalogue of all Federal assistance programs in the field of education.

The fifth conference recommendation was that "block packaged" funds should be made available to community service and continuing education programs. While no current legislation responds directly to this recommendation, provision was made in the Higher Education Act of 1968 for reservation of funds for junior colleges to use in whatever ways they think would best promote their schools' goals. As the "special education" needs of our country diminish, more of the block grant concept should be utilized.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION SECTION

This year we considered legislation to increase and expand both vocational education and higher education in this country.

The main provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act were not before the current session of Congress but some of the recommendations made were contained in Public Law 90-247, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967.

The Conference preceded the passage of these amendments and I have earlier reported

that some of the suggestions received the support of the Committee on Education and Labor. These included early funding of Federal education programs, a trend which I have vigorously supported since there is a need for letting school officials know how much funds they are to expect. This provision, contained in the extension of the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, allows our local school districts to plan their programs well in advance. The educators explained that small school districts in particular need more money for planning. Congress has not yet done enough to fill this need, and I will continue my efforts towards that goal.

It might be well to review, at this point, some of the highlights of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which is now in its third year of operation in Washington State.

As most educators know, Title I of this legislation recognized the national need for financial assistance—in school districts all over the country—by areas with high concentrations of children from low income families. Local school districts without Federal control, plan their projects and during Fiscal Year 1967 alone, Washington State was granted slightly over \$10.7 million for Title I programs in 310 school districts all over the state.

In the Second Congressional District, Title I grants provided \$1,209,835 for programs affecting 6,856 children and Snohomish County conducted Title I projects in our local schools for 3,492 students with grants of \$605,095. This money represents a significant effort to upgrade the quality of education in this country and passed during the 89th Congress. It had my strong support then and I believe the impact of this legislation—in all of its titles—has gone towards helping our young children attain a quality education.

Title II provided funds for Library Resources with Washington State receiving nearly \$1.6 million dollars for books and other school library resources and the Second Congressional District receiving an estimated \$195,932, providing audio-visual materials, printed materials, books and periodicals.

Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act provided funds for supplementary Educational Centers and Services and four supplementary educational centers and services were funded, including an exemplary curriculum project in Island County, and additional projects in Monroe, in Shoreline and in Clallam and Snohomish Counties. These projects include outdoor education programs, school guidance programs and training for teachers and administrators in our Congressional District.

Two other components of this legislation have supported research activities and have returned money to our State Department of Public Instruction in Olympia for additional services.

When the 91st Congress convenes, I believe that a review of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act will be necessary to find out if the legislation is having a significant effect on Washington State. In the legislative process, of course, a constant review and evaluation of all legislation is necessary.

That summarizes the status report stemming from the November Educators Conference in Washington State. These very helpful suggestions—and their impact this year on legislation which I sponsored in the House of Representatives—re-affirm my belief that the people of this country can help shape the decisions that make this country strong. With the continued support of members of the educational community such as this, we are helping design Federal programs to meet the real needs of the people at the local level.

I am delighted to offer this report to the people in my Second Congressional District.

SERVICE OF SENATOR GRUENING

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in an editorial published last week, the Salt Lake Tribune took cognizance of the primary election defeat of the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. The fact that the Tribune commented speaks loudly of its valuation of the great service rendered by Senator GRUENING. Its point is that Senator GRUENING's defeat was "more a measure of devotion than disapproval." I think that all Senators feel this way. Our respect for and devotion to our great and dear friend is undiminished. His record speaks eloquently of his achievements. We shall miss his tireless energy and keen insight in the Senate. But we expect him to be in the Nation's Capital to continue our close friendship.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

A VERSATILE LIBERAL IS REWARDED IN DEFEAT

One of the most poignant experiences within the democratic process is the occasional necessity for voters to tell a good man he must step down. Defeat of Sen. Ernest Gruening of Alaska in that state's Democratic primary is such an instance.

A versatile man, an impeccable liberal of long standing and a Vietnam dove whose opposition to American intervention in the affairs of other countries dates to occupation of Nicaragua by U.S. Marines in 1921, Sen. Gruening did more than any other man to bring Alaska to statehood. But at 81 he had become too old to be a full-time senator and Alaska's Democrats were wise to do for him what he apparently could not bring himself to do—retire.

Though his name is closely linked with Alaska in the minds of most people today, Sen. Gruening is a New Yorker, an eastern progressive cast from the classic mold. Trained as a physician he came to politics through journalism and entered government service under Franklin D. Roosevelt.

He received his M.D. degree from Harvard Medical School but during his last year in medical school took a job as reporter on a Boston newspaper and decided to remain in that profession. He edited a number of top metropolitan newspapers before and after World War I, moving from one position to another when he found himself unwilling to conform to dictated editorial policies that offended his liberalism.

In the 1920s he became an authority on, and a defender of Latin America, and his book on Mexico, published in 1928, is still considered an authoritative reference. While serving as editor of the New York Evening Post in 1934 he was named director of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions in the Department of Interior and it was then he met and fell in love with Alaska. He became territorial governor in 1939. Three years after he left the governorship Alaskan voters, in a move to force Congress to act on the Alaskan statehood issue, elected him "senator," and he went to Washington in 1956 as a statehood lobbyist. When statehood was granted in 1958 voters made Ernest Gruening's title official.

His defeat this week by 38-year-old Mike

Gravel has been attributed to his opponent's saturation television campaigning during the final days of the campaign. Perhaps it was. We, however, prefer to think that Alaska's Democrats were doing their grand old man a favor and that his defeat was more a measure of devotion than disapproval.

CONCERN FOR COMMUNISTS MOVES
IN EASTERN EUROPE

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, the people of my district are concerned about the recent moves which have been made by the Communists in Eastern Europe. I am sure that other Members across this Nation have also found that their people are concerned also. I would like to share with the Congress one letter which I received expressing the views of the writer on this problem, as follows:

TALLASSEE, ALA.,
August 22, 1968.

HON. WILLIAM NICHOLS,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: For the past month, especially the past few days, the news has been filled with reports of Russian attempts to subject a liberalized Czechoslovakian Government to iron-fisted Russian domination. During the past few days we have witnessed an invasion of Czech territory by military forces of the East European communist countries. Also, during this time we have been told that this affair is none of the United States business and that we aren't going to interfere.

Why isn't it our business? Twelve years ago the United States refused to become involved in the Hungarian revolt on the grounds that it wasn't our business. The result was a Russian slaughter of the Hungarian people. We were left carrying the moral stigma of doing nothing to aid these people. Now we are being told that the Czech problem is none of our business. Again I would like to ask why it isn't our business. The United Nations is incapable of effective action, so it seems to me that it is very definitely our business.

It seems to me that all of our political leaders raise a hue and cry about halting communist expansion and extending the American concepts of freedom and democracy throughout the world. We claim that we believe in the rights of the individual but every time we have an opportunity to help those seemingly willing to help themselves, our leaders and liberals get strangely quiet. Their inaction speaks volumes in itself. All one can get them to say is that the situation is none of our business. Yet, our Government is willing to send American troops to the far ends of the earth to fight a war for an ally, who, in the words of Senator Robert F. Kennedy, is an ally in name only; a Government without supporters.

We have a chance to extend aid to a nation which has suffered more than its share because of the cowardice and inaction of western "powers". I am referring to the so-called mutual defense pacts which Czechoslovakia signed with Britain and France in the 30's and which they promptly reneged on at the first sign of trouble. We also failed to go to their aid during the coup of 1948 during which the communists seized power.

The Czech's have, at least, been willing to support themselves in a political confrontation with Russia. Their Government has

seemed to be pretty stable and level-headed. What about that of our "ally"?

If the United States remains uncommitted and unwilling to help these people, then the United States has traveled a sorry road indeed, and a bitter harvest will be reaped in the years ahead.

If we can't help people who are willing to help themselves why should we be willing to stand by and see our troops killed "helping" a nation which, again in the words of Senator Kennedy, is unwilling or incapable because of corruptness and incompetence, of being an effective ally in the war against the communists within the borders of its own country?

If it is at all possible I would like for you to insert this letter in the *Congressional Record* as a viewpoint held by at least one citizen and taxpayer.

Thank you very much for your time.

Yours sincerely,

SAMUEL D. YATES.

MILITARY JUSTICE REFORM

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Special Committee on Military Justice of the American Bar Association, under the able leadership of Judge Raymond J. Pettine, recently reported to the House of Delegates of the ABA that it felt congressional action was needed to secure "to all members of the Armed Forces fundamentals of due process in administrative discharges awarded under other than honorable conditions." I am today introducing a bill which incorporates the recommendations of the Pettine committee.

This legislation provides that an administrative discharge under other than honorable conditions may not be issued until the person to be discharged is accorded the following rights: First, the right to be notified in writing of the reasons for his proposed discharge; second, to have a hearing and to present his case before a board of officers having the power to issue process; third, to present witnesses and evidence in his behalf; fourth, to confront and examine witnesses; fifth, to examine documentary and material evidence against him; sixth, to submit statements in his defense; seventh, to be represented by legally qualified counsel; eighth, to have the Government carry the burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence; ninth, to have an appellate review at his timely request by a board of review, such review being solely of record to determine the correctness of law of the matters below; and tenth, the right to waive the above rights in writing only after being afforded an opportunity to consult legally qualified counsel.

Presently, the policies and procedures regarding administrative discharges are governed by a Department of Defense directive, and some safeguards are provided in this directive, but some are not and they are not uniformly granted to all similarly situated. I feel, as the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association felt, that the Congress must act

to guarantee all our military personnel uniformly equal administrative due process by the enactment of this legislation. Moreover, even the present departmental directives in the direction of protecting individual rights could be changed at the whim of an administrator. This has concerned members of the bar, and it concerns me.

Written into my bill are provisions that give reservists and active duty people the same protection as well as officers and enlisted men. I am disturbed that presently a reservist and a person on active duty do not have the same standards of justice applied to them, and neither do officers and enlisted men when it comes to administrative discharges. I see no reason why the same standards should not be applied.

Likewise, I see no reason why the Coast Guard should have separate and different procedures for administrative discharges, and under my bill its procedures would be the same as those in the Army, Navy, and the Air Force.

LETTER TO A CONSTITUENT

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] has written a very interesting letter to his constituents which should be of interest to all Members of this body.

For that reason, under unanimous consent, I include the letter referred to, which is dated September 11, 1968, in the *Record* at this point:

DEAR FRIENDS: Congress has been back at work for a week now. When it will adjourn is anybody's guess. Several important appropriation bills including Defense are still pending. A filibuster is threatened in the Senate over the confirmation of Associate Justice Abe Fortas to be Chief Justice. And all Members are concerned about maintaining order and justice.

The events in Chicago during the Democratic National Convention shocked and grieved all Americans. They also brought into sharp focus for all Americans the fact that our greatest single domestic problem is the restoration of an honorable and just peace on the city streets of America. The first duty of government is to maintain the safety of its citizens so that all of them can seize the opportunity for advancement that a just government must insure.

No American is proud of what has happened in our country in recent months and years. Three national leaders have been assassinated and hundreds of citizens have been innocent victims of unjustified violence in our streets. Let us all resolve that such a climate shall not endure in the land of the free.

America is going through a transition. Many believe that the leadership in our country will change hands in the coming November elections. It would not be proper for me in this Washington Report to make partisan statements about why I would urge all Americans to support my Party, the Republican Party, in this November's election. But it would be proper for me as a member of the minority leadership in the Congress to outline some of the substantive changes

that would take place if my Party takes control of the Congress next January.

The activities of Congress under Democratic leadership is markedly different than it would be under Republican leadership. This is so for the following reason: Although the two great political Parties in our country may view the problems alike, they are committed to different approaches to the solutions of those problems. If, come next January, the House of Representatives is under new management, it would soon become very apparent that the new Congress would concentrate on matters of reorganization, redirection, and innovation.

Reorganization: Here, I am talking about the Congress itself. The reorganization bill passed by the Senate more than 18 months ago has been bottled up in the House by the present majority leadership. The new Congress would shake that bill loose because it is so badly needed. We would also seek to make the Congress more than a bill factory by beefing up its ability to review and improve the operation of existing programs. The neglect of its "oversight" or review responsibilities in the past is one reason Congress itself is partially to blame for the domestic crises we are facing today.

Redirection: One of the great needs is to organize more logically some of the major programs administered by the Executive Branch. Many programs have outlived their original purpose; others actively compound the problems they were designed to relieve; still others are loosely administered and very wasteful. The new Congress would seek to squeeze as much effectiveness as they will yield from the ill-conceived and hastily enacted programs that are on the books until such time as many of them can be consolidated into functional bloc grants, transferred to more proper locations or replaced.

The most hopeful area—and the most promising—is the innovative. Clearly our present array of programs with their reliance on the categorical technique are not working. If we are going to meet the problems of the cities and the depressed rural areas, the problems of welfare, the problems of jobs and crime, the need for better education and housing, and the need for greater opportunities for all Americans, we clearly must strike out in new and different directions. In the minority Party, we think we have developed some exciting new concepts for America.

A new Congress under Republican management would seek to enact such programs as Revenue-Sharing, the Human Investment Act, a Work Incentive Welfare Program, Home Ownership legislation, tax credits for education and for state and local taxes paid, tax incentive programs for the ghetto and depressed rural areas. All of these programs have been the subject of much discussion and many attempts on the part of the minority Party in recent years to enact them into law. If we controlled Congress, they would become top priority items.

Though Congress was in recess during the month of August, the work in Congressional offices did not come to a halt. As a matter of fact, the attention of my office to the business and the problems of constituents continues both in recess and in adjournment. Correspondence, for example, continues to remain heavy year-round. Though it is diminishing now on such issues as Federal Gun Controls, a steady stream of letters on other national issues continues to arrive. Regardless of when Congress finally adjourns, the work of my office in dealing with constituent problems will continue.

Because of the long sessions each year, it is becoming more and more difficult to spend as much time as I would like in personal visits with many of you back home. This makes it necessary to carry on our business of rendering service to constituents largely by mail. Nevertheless, I make a serious effort each year after Congress adjourns to be avail-

able in person to any constituents who might have problems with the Federal Government. My usual procedure is to hold Office Hours in the Courthouses and City Halls of each of the fifteen counties in our District. My intention this year is to hold Office Hours early in October. Watch your local newspaper for announcements of the time and place in your area.

Best regards,

MEL LAIRD.

STRAINING AT A GNAT

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the latest chapter in the saga of the Supreme Court is the subject of an editorial appearing in the September 7 edition of the Peoria Journal Star and I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

STRAINING AT A GNAT

Michael A. Musmanno, a Pennsylvania supreme court justice, is one of the nation's most distinguished jurists.

As a young attorney, he defended Sacco and Vanzetti, in that famous case. As a jurist, he was among those carefully picked to preside at the Nuremberg trials.

He was invited by Israel to observe the Elchmann trial, because of his international reputation. Kennedy appointed him to a commission on international rules of judicial procedure.

But such men are not named to the U.S. Supreme Court.

That is reserved for ex-governors, ex-senators, and political cronies, most of whom never served in a judicial capacity before much less achieved any distinction for jurisprudence.

In short, the sad fact is that the U.S. Supreme Court is not made up of the country's greatest jurists. Indeed, it is remarkable for their absence.

What is equally remarkable is how many of the genuinely great judges of this country have recently taken the unprecedented step of publicly condemning the pack of politicians on the U.S. court of going far out into left field in putting technicalities before justice, and in making just plain hair-brained decisions.

Musmanno has joined that group of colleagues.

He pointed out specifically a heinous crime involving sexual assault and shooting of bound captives. Police traced the rifle used, and obtained a search warrant for the residence concerned.

When they arrived, the owner of the premises (grandmother of the suspect) waved the search warrant aside, telling the officers they didn't need it, that they were welcome.

They found the rifle.

They assembled carefully a mass of evidence, including direct eyewitness identifications.

The man was tried and convicted, unanimously (of course) by a jury.

The Supreme Court of the United States, however, decided to throw out all that evidence on the grounds that instead of accepting the grandmother's invitation, the police should have read the warrant aloud to her when she waved it aside!

Musmanno described this aptly as "straining at a gnat" in order to smack down the police, and "swallowing a camel" when it came to protecting the criminal.

The evidence thus accumulates, with more and more judges of genuine and earned

reputation, as to just how far out the Supreme Court has journeyed in its philosophic meanderings and fantastic prejudices—at a time when the plague of crime is a prairie fire, rampaging unrestrained.

The philosophers still produce the sophistical argument that all these technicalities, applied ruthlessly to the results of police action without regard for justice or public safety, will produce better police results than ever by "forcing a high standard of professionalism."

That is nice philosophy, but in terms of reality it is garbage.

The individual doesn't exist as a policeman or potential policeman who can combine the wisdom of Solomon, the patience of Job, the genius of Sherlock Holmes, an angelic disposition, and the physical capabilities of a Green Bay Packer line-backer to the degree that he could live with both the immense pressures we now place upon police, and the fantastic restrictions we also place upon them at the same time.

To establish such a "impossible dream" as the requirement of police under pain of letting killers run loose throughout the land is a fantastic, unreasonable, and unworkable "rule of law."

A SAILOR WRITES TO HIS CONGRESSMAN

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I received a letter from a young constituent who is just about to complete his basic training in the U.S. Navy. His healthy, well-adjusted attitude toward this military experience is heartening, and I commend it to my colleagues as being more truly representative of the attitudes of the next generation than that which so often makes the news headlines.

The letter follows:

Hon. WILLIAM F. SCOTT,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SCOTT: As I write, the ensign of the United States of America has just been raised and the last notes of our national anthem are resounding in my soul.

The dual sensation of seeing our beautiful flag rippling in the breeze and hearing the music of our anthem, seemingly meant to add definition to every ripple of that flag, is indeed a stirring one to a young man only a few weeks in the service of his country.

In a few short days I shall complete my basic training at the U.S. Naval Training Center in Great Lakes. And although this has been at some moments a most trying experience, for the transition from civilian to military life is a difficult one, it has been, I'm sure, a rewarding experience in the lives of most of us. For though this military obligation we have contracted to fulfill will cost each of us several years of our youth, it is indeed a necessary obligation born of a serious need for the protection of the freedom to choose.

This I feel very deeply when I realize that in this obligation I alone am the one who must perform, who am ultimately responsible for the defense of my country and freedom everywhere.

Since we are a competitive society, emphasis is placed upon rank, and a man is judged successful by the level of his rank. However much executive talent exists there must always be those to carry out orders to com-

pletion. The stability and security of any organization depends upon the strength of dedication of these men and women. Our Armed Forces certainly have that—in the fullest measure.

Although I am often homesick, and think of what else I might be doing during this period of my life, I have no doubt that this activity is the best use of my strengths at this time. The next four years will be a long time, but I must persevere and do my best, as we all should, at a time when human freedoms are being suppressed, here and abroad.

Perhaps I could continue on this subject for a much longer time, but both of us have pressing schedules (though of different nature). Therefore I shall close, and assure you that I am,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. BREWER.

P.S.—Since you are my representative I hope to be able to come to your office for a few minutes during my leave.

PROGRESS REPORT

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, within the next few days I will be sending to my constituents my sixth progress report of the 90th Congress. I submit it to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

DEAR FRIEND: I spent the Congressional recess meeting thousands of you Nebraskans at the county and state fairs. As we had time to talk, one of the biggest issues to develop was that of the family farm versus agricultural corporations. As one small farmer expressed the problem to me: "Either you get big or you get out." And too many independent farmers are getting out.

Every three and one-half minutes a self-employed person leaves agriculture. We must begin to recognize the relationship between farms going out of business and migration to cities, adding to those burdens. New development of the countryside and policies with which small farmers can live and by which they can profit are priority items for America.

While her family was visiting the Wayne County Fair, I helped Robin Lindsay who wanted to see herself on closed-circuit television.

THE 4-H BEEF STAMP

Unless quick action is taken, 4-Hers, such as those I've seen working so hard at the fairs, could lose the bonus payment they receive for labeled beef.

While in our home state, I learned of a Dept. of Agriculture order to revoke the practice of 4-H beef labeling as of Oct. 1. I immediately sent a telegram to Ag Secretary Freeman asking him to find a way to avoid penalizing the price and pride 4-Hers receive. For those youngsters who receive purple and blue ribbons at the annual Ak-Sar-Ben exhibition in Omaha a special label is stamped on the carcasses. The purchaser pays from \$20 to \$100 extra for this premium beef.

But now the Federal Extension Service under USDA has said that around the country there are too many problems with the stamp and that it is impossible to police the use of the label. Labeling, as practiced in Nebraska, encourages the growth of quality beef. I told Secretary Freeman that if other states are mis-using the label, then he should bring them into line with the careful practices used in our state.

SHRINE PARADE

In Lincoln I joined the thousands of Nebraskans interested in the Shrine Bowl football game for a Saturday morning Shriners Parade.

DENNEY RELEASES RESULTS OF POLL TO HIS DISTRICT

Since my last Progress Report, I have announced the results of the IBM questionnaire to which some 12,000 of you responded this summer. The greatest impression I received from your opinions was that the majority of you do not want to spend more money on government programs except where your personal safety and physical environment are concerned.

The largest number of respondents answered the spending question in the following manner:

	Reduced	Kept at present level	Increased
Foreign aid.....	X	-----	-----
Space program.....	X	-----	-----
War on poverty.....	X	-----	-----
Social security.....	-----	X	-----
Medicare.....	-----	X	-----
Defense.....	-----	X	-----
Education.....	-----	X	-----
Public works and highways.....	-----	X	-----
Crime prevention and control.....	-----	-----	X
Air and water pollution control.....	-----	-----	X

More than 50 per cent of the respondents want police and courts to deal more strictly with civil disorders, and 35 per cent want greater emphasis on curing slum problems to go hand-in-hand with stricter police and court action.

To decrease employment, 61 per cent would favor offering tax benefits to employers who hire and train unskilled workers. Fourteen per cent would favor the government acting as an employer of last resort.

Agriculture subsidy payments should be limited to a maximum of \$10,000 per farm, according to 69 per cent.

It took only one day to tabulate the responses by computer, compared to the many man-hours needed to total the handwritten answers to last year's poll.

STATE VETERANS' HOMES BILL PASSES

A bill containing two features of the first legislation I introduced as a freshman was signed recently by the President. The bill raises the federal share of payments for care in state veterans' homes back to 50 per cent.

No federal increase had been enacted since 1960, and figure showed that nationwide the federal contribution had dropped to 20 per cent before this bill was signed.

I conferred with two other Congressmen interested in the veterans home care payment legislation: Louis Wyman and James Cleveland, both of New Hampshire.

THE POST OFFICE VOTE

Just before Congress recessed, I voted with 344 colleagues in the House to save fourth class post offices and maintain the current level of postal service. In the future, no closing can be made (such as those threatened by Postmaster General Marvin Watson) without notifying the Post Office and Civil Service Committee at least 30 days in advance.

NEW FEDERAL CATALOG PROMISED

The Executive Branch has responded to the pressure of Congress for a comprehensive catalog of federal assistance programs. On July 18, I introduced a bill requiring that such a catalog identify programs, describe their benefits, eligibility, restrictions, costs, mechanics of application and officials to contact. It is generally agreed that the existing catalog which claims to be all-inclusive carries far less than half of all programs.

Now the Bureau of the Budget has announced a book to guide those who are sure

they could get some federal money if they just knew where to look will be ready early in 1969.

A NEW ORDER OF BATTLE FOR AMERICA'S WEALTH

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished Ambassador to India, the Honorable Chester Bowles, has long been a voice of reason and farsighted judgment in the councils of our Government. On a recent visit to the United States, Ambassador Bowles observed the mood of the Nation and found that our most serious problem is not any one of many domestic and international crises but rather it is a failure to come to grips with the fundamental changes that we must make in our institutions and our Government.

Ambassador Bowles set forth his impressions and suggestions in a column that appeared in Saturday's New York Times. His call for a reordering of national priorities is one that I have long urged in this House, and at this point I am inserting the article in the RECORD:

TOPICS: A NEW ORDER OF BATTLE FOR AMERICA'S WEALTH

(By Chester Bowles)

What worries me most after a recent visit to the United States is not racial violence, student protests, urban rot or even our painful dilemma in Vietnam but the failure of many leaders to come to grips with the fundamental adjustments that will be required to cope with these problems.

Although I heard some brave generalized talk about the need to "restructure" American society, I found alarmingly few people who are facing up to the institutional changes that are required to achieve the domestic and foreign objectives that a clear majority of Americans now seem to feel essential. Even among the most articulate and militant leaders of the youth movements, there are comparatively few who have spelled out what must actually be done to produce the new world to which they are so deeply committed.

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC NEEDS

If America is to achieve the new objectives which enlightened members of both political parties are now accepting, it must begin by considering the extent and purpose of its national wealth in a fundamentally different perspective.

We must first balance our gross national income as a whole against the substantial areas of public need and private demand, then establish realistic priorities among these areas. Finally we must use tax and other incentives to see that public and private investments meet these priorities as closely as possible.

LINING UP OUR GOALS

I am not suggesting a new form of "creeping socialism" or a demagogic effort to soak the rich. What I advocate is a hard-headed effort to bring our governmental and private institutions into a more realistic relationship to our new domestic and foreign objectives.

I do not believe we can accomplish these objectives by juggling our established budgets, cutting a little here and adding a little there. What is required are new concepts, even new institutions, that will enable us to

see our national priorities from a fresh perspective.

The immediate starting point must be a fresh, hard look at the distribution of the stupendous income produced each year by American managers, farmers and workers; in other words, a pragmatic re-examination of the purposes for which our national income is now being spent.

A significant step in this direction might be a National Economic Council appointed by the President under legislation provided by Congress. The members of the Council would include distinguished men and women, chosen by the President with the consent of Congress, who would represent a wide spectrum of American life and interests. They would be supported with an expert staff of economists and political and social scientists.

The Council would hold exhaustive public hearings beginning early each year. These hearings would run for several months with maximum television, radio and news coverage. The Council would call a variety of witnesses representing the many claimants on a share of our gross national income—consumer goods producers, national defense authorities, spokesmen for public health, housing and overseas development, and the like.

This Council would be required by law to present to the President by, say, September 1 of each year, a national expenditure budget based on the anticipated gross national income for the coming year and on clear-cut recommendations for the allocation of this income.

Against the background of this exhaustive, well-publicized national self-examination, the President and his advisers would prepare the annual budget for Congress. Although the President would not be required to accept the Council's recommendations, he would inevitably take them into account.

Congress would then consider the Administration's budget as at present and make its decisions regarding appropriations, tax incentives and the like with the knowledge that the public has been substantially involved in the consideration of various alternatives and the establishment of the Council's proposed priorities.

NEW ECONOMIC ORDER

I suggest this procedure simply to underscore the need for new institutional instruments which will help us to escape from our present deeply rooted, seniority ridden pattern of public economic policy-making.

We cannot expect successfully to fight our grave contemporary social problems with an economic "order of battle" which was designed for the nineteenth century. We must be able pragmatically to stimulate and encourage the investment of our national income in those areas where it is most needed.

MINSHALL OPINION POLL

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the September Minshall Opinion Poll, which is being sent to the home of every registered voter in the 23d Congressional District, regardless of political affiliation—Republican, Democrat, or Independent:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 1968.

DEAR FRIENDS: Response to last April's opinion poll was excellent. Subsequent events

in this fast-moving year may have caused you to alter your thinking. New concerns have arisen since last spring. Therefore, I am again requesting your views on today's major issues.

This questionnaire is being mailed to the home of every registered voter in the 23rd District—Democrat, Republican or Independent. If you wish additional copies for other members of your household, please let me know.

With the House of Representatives in almost continuous session, my Congressional duties demand that I be in Washington and I am unable to visit our District as often

as I should like; but I do derive much benefit from having the excellent comments and thinking of those I represent.

As soon as results are tabulated, I shall report them to you in a newsletter and to the news media. I am sure you realize that time and staff limitations make it impossible for me to respond personally to every return, but each will be carefully read and tabulated.

Thank you for taking part in the Minshall Opinion Poll.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
Member of Congress.

MINSHALL OPINION POLL

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. If a satisfactory peace in Vietnam cannot be achieved at the Paris peace talks, which do you favor (check only 1):			
(a) Further intensive peace efforts.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Completely stop all bombing.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Win or get out.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Increase South Vietnam's military responsibility and gradually deescalate U.S. military efforts.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) Immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(f) Increase U.S. military efforts.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. If the Soviets do not completely withdraw from Czechoslovakia, do you think (check only 1):			
(a) Call for immediate withdrawal of all Warsaw Pact troops.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) The United States should respond with economic sanctions against Russia.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) The solution should be left to the United Nations.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. What form of selective service system is preferable (check only 1):			
(a) Present system.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Universal military training for all.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Lottery.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Lottery with limited deferments.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Gun control legislation is awaiting final action. Which one do you favor:			
(a) Registration of all firearms.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Registration only of handguns.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Licensing of all owners of firearms.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) A ban on mail-order sales of all firearms.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) Strong penalties for criminals who use guns in committing crimes.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(f) No additional Federal legislation needed.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. In dealing with civil disorders, do you favor:			
(a) A stricter policy for law and order.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) More money for antipoverty programs.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. What do you think is the principal problem facing the Nation today?			

WILL PEACE COME TO THE CAMPUS?

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the return to college for many thousands of students. There are many who predict renewed unrest and violence on college campuses again this year. The hippies and the yippies have promised widespread college campus demonstrations and riots, starting the week of October 21.

One of the school administrators who showed courage when trouble developed last school term was Dr. Vernon Alden, president of Ohio University at Athens, Ohio.

An article by Dr. Alden, entitled "Will Peace Come to the Campus?" was published in the Parade section of a number of newspapers on Sunday, September 8, 1968. Among other newspapers this article was printed by the Washington Post.

Because of its timeliness I would like to insert the article in the RECORD at this point:

Last spring when Ohio University was surrounded by the worst flood in its 164-year history, a television commentator remarked, "A labor union tried to close Ohio University and failed. Then the students tried and failed. Now God is trying to close the university but President Alden seems to be holding his own."

This wry comment referred to a sequence that began with a threatened strike of maintenance workers. When the strike didn't materialize, some students hoping for an early vacation demonstrated disappointment by marching and throwing rocks through university windows. Their leaders predicted further violence and we were forced to ask that the National Guard go on standby. Then the flood took over but we had already joined the not very exclusive list of colleges and universities wracked by student violence.

Now that a new academic year is about to begin, it's logical that college and university administrators, faculty and students are wondering whether more violence lies ahead. One thing we at Ohio University learned last spring was that threats and disorder solved nothing. They merely froze the different factions within the school. Communications on grievances became more difficult. Force, patterned after that of political revolutions, created rather than solved problems.

A university doesn't have—and until now hasn't needed—the kind of internal discipline that a business or an army must have. Administrators and faculty members are dedicated to freedom of inquiry and expression and they expect some confusion. But when confusion reaches the point of anarchy, when it interferes with the functioning of the university, action must be taken. Persuasion must be the first step. If that fails, the university must be prepared to use force. And it may be necessary that the university deal summarily with students who abuse their school's tolerance to exploit personal power. No institution can live in tumult or under constant threat of disruption.

TODAY'S STUDENTS

While the anarchists and radicals represent only a small proportion of student bodies, it's true that students today are different from those of only ten years ago.

They're brighter, better prepared and more thoroughly involved with the concerns of the world than any previous generation. Since childhood they've watched fast breaking news on TV. They've been reared by parents more permissive than ever before and they've come to expect instant gratification. Today's student is impatient, often demanding, sometimes even arrogant. But I believe that the great majority wish to accomplish change by working within the existing framework and wish to be responsibly involved.

Our student government president, Dave Stivison, has truly demonstrated that kind of responsibility this past summer. Instead of seeking a paying job, he stayed on our campus working with faculty committees and senior administrators. He has made clear to us some of the concerns of the student body. He has presented the student view at many meetings, with the result that several curriculum changes are underway and students have been appointed to membership on most of the university's standing committees. Working through existing channels, Dave Stivison has achieved results.

Scrutinize closely the American college or university and you recognize quickly there's much to be desired in education offered to students. Faculty members are quick to propose reform in government, business or other segments of society but they've been slow to change their own institutions. As our universities become ever larger, the need to reshape academic programs becomes more pressing. Unfortunately, these programs in many schools simply don't challenge bright, well-prepared young people. Too often they come up against bland survey courses, sterile reading assignments, dreary machine-scored examinations. A university experience for many students today consists of reading and memorizing other people's ideas, with little opportunity to develop and express original thoughts, to experiment with new approaches, or to pursue independent self-planned programs to study. There is good reason why many students are impatient, why they're demanding "relevance" in their educational experiences.

And, having seen that the rate of change in a university is painfully slow, students are insisting on participation in decision making. Faculty members and administrators should encourage this. Such involvement can be a vital part of the educational process. By far the greatest value of participation is what the participant himself learns from the action. In a lively, contemporary university the learning potential in everything that happens should be exploited. Universities must be "real life laboratories" for learning.

I'll always remember the intensity of the co-ed who told me after working with deprived children in the Appalachian area: "The theory of sociology courses suddenly came alive when I actually worked with kids who had little concept of how school work could affect their lives. What I learned there helped me discover what courses I need, not just for a degree, but to succeed as a teacher."

ROOM FOR INITIATIVE

At Ohio University we urge students to grow out of the complaint stage and seek to develop their own constructive proposals and programs. Like most university presidents, I'm not impressed by students carrying placards or squatting in the hall outside my office. And I won't respond to threats or bullying. But we are impressed and influenced when a student identifies a problem, considers alternatives, and offers a proposal so logical we can act upon it. This is responsibility, and you learn it by practicing it.

In the years ahead, all educational institutions are bound to change rapidly and significantly. The distinguished university of the future will enable students to make maximum use—on their own initiative—of the

school's resources. It will be a cafeteria where students know what they want and how to get it, not a restaurant where they wait to be served.

One of our June graduates showed the kind of initiative universities should encourage. He had certain capabilities, but also frustrations because he was impatient with the school's pace. He enrolled in nearly double course loads. In addition he studied for other courses on his own time and earned half his credits, not by sitting in a classroom, but by taking comprehensive examinations. This young man completed four years of work in 16 months. A math major, he earned a B average.

Obligations between student and university should be more clearly defined. Certainly both sides have them but they're inadequately spelled out. The university of the future will not tolerate such ambiguity. As an institution of learning, it must stand as a model of participation by all its elements.

More than any other institution in our society, the university should be able to deal justly, equitably and humanely with people and issues. It should be a place where students learn from experience the attitudes, values, skills and ways of relating and dealing with conflicts and tensions that will prepare them to become community builders. Obviously, violence has no place in that picture. The university's ability to shape such community builders may well be judged its greatest contributions to society, and the justification for its continued high-level support.

FOREIGN-AID REDUCTIONS KINDLE GREATER SELF-RELIANCE

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, at the time the House trimmed more than \$1 billion from the annual foreign aid bill, cries of betrayal and inhumanity were raised by many who saw U.S. foreign assistance as the sole support for many lesser developed nations.

It is most interesting to note that the initial reports coming back from many countries whose funds were curtailed this year reveal that the House action has had quite the opposite effect, however.

What many of us have been saying should and would happen if U.S. aid were reduced has, in fact, happened. The most striking example is the Government of India, the largest recipient of our largesse in recent years.

As reported in the New York Times of Sunday, September 6, the leaders of the New Delhi government have actually welcomed the cutback in funds because it forces a long-overdue self-reliance on that country's own initiative, efforts, and resources. Congress can learn a lesson from the effect of our action on the foreign-aid bill; and I include the Times article at this point in the RECORD under unanimous consent:

MANY IN INDIA CALL FOR SELF-RELIANCE AS
AID SUBSTITUTE

(By Joseph Lelyveld)

NEW DELHI, September 5.—Haunted by a sense of loneliness in the world, Indians are starting to talk up the old-fashioned virtue of self-reliance.

To economic planners, self-reliance now means an effort to reduce dependence on foreign aid, the terms of which are held to be onerous and demeaning. It also means a stiffening resistance to new industrial collaborations with foreign corporations. To those who worry about foreign policy and military strategy, it means a deepening preoccupation with the question of whether India should "go nuclear" and build an atom bomb.

The shift in outlook results in large measure from the darkening prospects for aid from the United States and other Western nations. It is not uncommon now for Indian ministers to represent themselves as being glad that the aid climate has turned chilly.

Foreign aid, they contend, undermines the nation's will to help itself.

DISILLUSIONED WITH MOSCOW

Disillusionment with the Soviet Union after its decision to sell arms to Pakistan and its invasion of Czechoslovakia has reinforced this mood. If India had only been less dependent on Moscow, it is being said, she could have spoken out more freely for the Czechoslovak crisis.

In fact, India is closer to a kind of self-reliance than some Indians recognize.

If the United States falls again to renew its grant to the International Development Association, a United Nations affiliate, in the current session of Congress, the cost in foreign exchange of India's debt repayments on old loans in the coming year will nearly equal the new aid she receives.

Since the new aid is restricted to imports from the donor nations and the repayments require foreign exchange, India would be better off, some officials say, if she had no aid agreements at all.

Even if the development association funds come to expected amount of \$200-million, India will be left with less than half the net aid—assistance in excess of debt repayment—that Western aid experts were encouraging her to expect as recently as two years ago.

SELF-RELIANCE INEVITABLE

As one senior financial aide remarked wryly, self-reliance is not only desirable, it "also seems inevitable."

But the Indians are not simply putting a good face on a bad situation. When the time came to draft a new five-year plan this year, the only directive the Cabinet gave the planning commission was to find out how dependence on aid could be reduced.

The commission's first statement of the new plan's aims declared, "A process of development sustained by continuous foreign aid cannot be healthy."

The planners proposed that India reduce the amount of net aid by half in five years.

MASSIVE AID UNACCEPTABLE

In an interview, a member of the commission insisted that massive new aid would be unacceptable, even if it were offered, a view that is not shared by the Finance Ministry.

The planner argued that India's debt of 17.5-billion should not be allowed to grow.

Neither the Government nor the planners appear inclined to take the advice of Westerners who say they should turn to private foreign business concerns to make up for what they are losing in the foreign aid.

The gloomy aid picture appears to have strengthened the hand of politicians who argue that collaboration with private foreign business is invariably compromising. One of the advocates of self-reliance is the Commerce Minister, Dinesh Singh, who is a close adviser of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. He proudly tells visitors to his office that everything in it, including the air conditioners and telephones, is made in India.

One Western aid official tells of what he calls "self-reliance gone wild." The Cabinet has been sitting for eight months now on \$15-million offer from the Tenneco Corpora-

tion, an American oil company, for offshore drilling rights in the Gulf of Cambay, off the coast of Gujarat.

POTENTIAL BELIEVED HIGH

Tenneco believes the potential production could exceed all of India's current production. It proposes to do the exploratory drilling at no cost or risk to India in return for a guarantee of partnerships with the Government in exploitation.

The proposal which the Petroleum Ministry favors, would leave Tenneco with about 20 percent of the profits after taxes.

Company officials have made 22 visits to India without securing a final decision. Officials say the Government would prefer to hire a foreign company to do the drilling and thereby avoid a partnership. But, this would mean spending sums of money not immediately available. Meanwhile, an opportunity to reduce costly oil imports is being neglected, the Western official said.

"In the name of self-reliance," Ashoka Mehta, who recently resigned as Petroleum Minister, remarked despondently, "we are making ourselves more dependent."

The theme of self-reliance has spread into the nuclear field. Any decision to become a nuclear power would require an expenditure of hard currency greater, many economists say, than India could possibly afford.

Nevertheless, the bomb has become a leading topic of conversation of that part of governing élite that calls itself an intelligentsia. Some of those who have returned from studies at such places as Harvard, Stanford and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology have brought back such jargon as "credibility," "nuclear posture," "strike capability" and "scenario."

Most of them would heatedly deny any connection with such chauvinist parties as the Jan Sangh, which has long advocated that India build the bomb.

In part, their preoccupation is an unlooked for result of pressure from Moscow and Washington to renounce nuclear weapons and sign the nonproliferation treaty. No major party now advocates signing the treaty. A recent opinion poll showed that most politically minded Indians appear to want the bomb.

Advocates of the bomb contend that the decline in foreign aid shows that the West really has no permanent stake in India's security and stability. Hence, they ask, how can India count on the big powers to protect them from "nuclear blackmail" by Communist China?

If such "nuclear blackmail" is as unlikely as Westerners sometimes contend, they continue, then why is the United States building an antimissile system as protection against a Chinese attack?

STUDY WIDELY DISCUSSED

Behind these questions is an expectation, startling to foreigners who regard India as a very poor country permanently in need of their philanthropy, that India is on the verge of becoming a major power in Asia.

A recent report by the Government-sponsored Institute of Defense Studies and Analyses made the case for India's ability to afford the bomb by noting that she has the 10th largest gross national product in the world. The report did not point out that with her population of 525 million, India also has one of the lowest per capita incomes in the world.

The study, which has been widely read and discussed, estimated the cost of nuclear weapons and a delivery system that would give the Chinese pause at \$10-billion to \$15-billion—more than the total aid India has received from the United States in 20 years—at least a third of which would have to be in hard currency.

When incredulous Indians or foreigners ask advocates of the bomb how the country could

contemplate this kind of expenditure when tens of millions of Indians are barely subsisting, they are assured that the masses are prepared to make sacrifices.

The institute's study opposed an immediate all-out program to build the bomb, but it argued that the country should "develop its nuclear option" by building up an electronics industry, a stockpile of fissionable material and research facilities.

The evidence is that the Government is doing just that. A nuclear reactor is being built at Kalpakkam, near Madras, on the basis of self-reliance—without foreign help and therefore without any restriction on its ultimate use.

Some economists who argue for self-reliance are dismayed by the tack the planning commission has taken and the infatuation with nuclear gamesmanship. Meaningful self-reliance, they contend, would involve basic social reforms and an emphasis on technology appropriate to India's conditions.

Some senior officials regard the new trend of thinking as inevitable, given the apparent indifference of the developed nations to the fate of such countries as India. But they still indulge the hope that this is only a passing phase.

DICTATORIAL BIG GOVERNMENT

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, we see evidence almost every day of a dictatorial big government interfering in the personal lives of the people; in the operation of business, and local governmental institutions.

Yesterday my office received a letter from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which threatened legal and administrative proceedings against the Union County school system for failure to comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, in not desegregating the public schools.

Mr. Speaker, it would be somewhat difficult to desegregate this school system because of the fact that no person except of Anglo-Saxon descent lives in the county.

Upon being informed that no person of Negro, Mexican, Indian, and so forth descent lived in the county the writer of the letter of intimidation and threat said that apparently a mistake had been made in sending this letter. He said that due to a large volume of such mail being written recently on this subject, that this county was apparently included by mistake.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most serious matter that a governmental agency would send out such a letter without investigating the allegations and facts contained therein.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks I would like to include a copy of the letter from HEW:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,

Washington, D.C., September 9, 1968.

Mrs. KAY UPCHURCH,
Administrative Assistant
Hon. JOHN J. DUNCAN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mrs. UPCHURCH: This is to inform you that the Union County school system has

been notified that the question of its compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has been referred to our Office of General Counsel with the recommendation that administrative proceedings be initiated.

We regret that this step has been necessary, but extensive negotiations by our staff with local school officials have failed to produce an acceptable desegregation plan.

If you have questions about this matter, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD D. WARDEN,

Congressional Liaison Officer, Office for
Civil Rights.

AMENDMENTS TO THE COAL MINE SAFETY ACT

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, safety legislation is an area in which I have long felt a very keen interest. This 90th Congress has considered a great many bills dealing with employee safety, and it remains my hope that before we adjourn this session, some of the safety bills which have been reported by the Education and Labor Committee may join the radiation hazards exposure bill which passed this House in March.

The Johnson-Humphrey administration has put its concern for the safety of workers directly on the line. Knowing that the bills would be controversial, but knowing, too, that lives come before votes, the administration began the year by sending up the occupational safety and health bill. Now, in an area not covered by that broader bill, the administration has proposed, and the able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] has introduced, amendments to the Coal Mine Safety Act.

I am proud of the President for having sent this bill up here, and of my colleague from Pennsylvania for having introduced it. I hope when we adjourn sine die, we can all be proud of the 90th Congress for having taken action in the area of saving human lives.

The administration's bill would improve on the existing Coal Mine Safety Act by making it broader, tougher, and more flexible. Under present law, for example, the jurisdiction of the Federal coal mine inspector is weakest where the danger is greatest—at the working face of the underground mine, where hundreds of miners have been killed—one or two at a time—by the sudden falls of rock and coal. The existing law recognizes the danger of coal dust—but only as an explosion hazard, and not as the insidious menace it is now recognized to be to the miner's lungs. Today, only civil penalties can be invoked against violators of mandatory safety provisions even if the violation is provably willful and criminal. And, rapid as the changes in coal mining technology may be, new safety standards cannot be set forth to cope with new hazards except through the legislative process. The bill now before us would correct such

deficiencies, providing better protection for miners in every State where coal is produced.

How essential is this extended protection? I need only point out that, since 1952—when the existing law was passed—over 5,500 miners have been killed on the job, and that many thousands more have been disabled in accidents that did not have to happen. We have it on the highest authority that coal mining is one of the most dangerous jobs a man can do in this country.

The administration's bill presents us with a challenge and an opportunity to serve the cause of saving human life. I suggest that we make the most of it.

THE ELECTION REFORM ACT OF 1968 AND THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, two of the most important bills to be introduced during this Congress—the Election Reform Act of 1968 and the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967—are pending in the House Rules Committee. The Senate passed similar measures last year. It is my belief that these measures are so important and so needed that every effort possible must be made to bring them to the floor of the House for consideration before final adjournment.

All of us agree that the laws concerning election campaigns and their financing should be revised and updated. The need for this has become even more apparent during the last few years, in light of the Adam Clayton Powell, Senator THOMAS DODD, and Bobby Baker incidents. Studies have shown that current laws in this area actually invite evasion and are filled with loopholes, rather than help the situation. In addition, the laws were not designed to cover the type of campaigns that we must conduct today.

The Election Reform Act of 1968 would completely overhaul the laws pertaining to campaign fundraising and spending in Federal elections, and includes the full range of the Federal election process. It would provide for full disclosure of political contributions and expenditures by candidates and their political committees by requiring periodic reports. A commission would be established to enforce these provisions. I think that we can all agree that this legislation is urgently needed.

Also, because of the tremendously increasing workload of Congress and if we are to give more than a passing glance to the legislation we consider, it is absolutely necessary that the operations of Congress be streamlined and modernized. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967 is a significant step in this direction. It is the result of several years of hard work, beginning in 1965 with the creation of the bipartisan Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. The committee's recommendations were

unanimous, and last year the Senate passed the bill by a substantial margin. Since then it has been tied up in the House Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that both of these bills are needed now, and I urge the leadership to help bring them to the floor of the House for consideration before we adjourn.

CAN I BREATHE THE AIR OF FREEDOM WHEN MY BROTHER WEARS CHAINS?

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, it is sad that today so many people cry about the lack of opportunity and the lack of personal freedom in this Nation of ours, which has more freedom than any other country in the world. It is, therefore, refreshing and exhilarating to read the words and feelings expressed by the type of young American we are so proud of.

Surely there exist millions of young men like Brent Winger or there would not be many places left for peace-loving people. Millions have died in honor, dignity, and even glory, protecting freedom, and have also shared Brent's thoughts and feelings about his purpose in life and his sense of direction for the living.

Brent Winger succinctly and humanly presents his concept of values, and an overwhelming majority of Americans believe these to be both time honored and time tested. Would that every young American shared his dreams and convictions.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I most proudly include the attached letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CAN I BREATHE THE AIR OF FREEDOM WHEN MY BROTHER WEARS CHAINS?

To the Editor:

Being a concerned mother, I recently wrote to my son in Vietnam that I saw no reason for his being there. You see, he had nearly two years of college when he joined up.

I would like to share with everyone our son's answer to my concern. In part, this is what he wrote:

"Dear Parents: I was very unhappy to read that you see no reason for my being here. In fact, I was astonished, confounded, befuddled, even angry. It just isn't the best morale boost for someone who's working 12 to 16 hours a day . . . when you say you don't know why I'm over here.

"Maybe it's so that some kids can grow up with something in their bellies besides grass and weeds; grow up without fear to use their minds and expand their capacities to the extent of the ability their Creator gave them. Maybe it's so that some kids can just grow up, period.

"We are over here for a better reason than our ancestors had in coming to America. They came to a new world so that they could be free. We are in Vietnam so that others may be free. There are no new lands to which one can run for freedom. We either all become free or we all go down together.

"If our leaders sell out the Vietnamese people, they will sell the lives of our future generations and the hopes of the world. Jesus

Christ died on the cross for humanity; and you do not believe that I am man enough to spend a year of drudgery, boredom and dirt in trying to help a country and its people be free. At the same time, my chance of being wounded or dying is less than if I spent the same time driving on a U.S. highway.

"Your excuse is that you are a mother and love your offspring. I can assure you that there are mothers over here and that they feel the same way about their children . . . When I get back, do you believe I will be sorry that I wasted a year in Vietnam? I will only be sorry that I couldn't do more . . .

"When you take humanity and dignity away from one man, you take a part of everyone's. How can I breathe the air of freedom when my brother wears chains? How can we erect monuments to justice and enlightenment when men are oppressed and ignorant? How can we reach for the stars when some men do not live higher than communal animals?

"The poem preceding Hemingway's novel 'For Whom the Bell Tolls,' often has been quoted to prove this point. I can't quote it exactly, but it's something like this: 'No man is an island unto himself; every man is a piece of the continent . . . if a clod be washed away, Europe is the less; any man's death diminishes me, because I am part of mankind; therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.'

"I don't mean to be angry with you or to preach a sermon. I also don't want anyone to think of me as a knight in shining armor or as a crusader; I'm just doing my job. I get disgusted with things here like everyone else. But I do have a reason for being here . . . Your son, Brent."

Thank you for letting me share my son's thoughts about his fellow man.

BRICKHOUSE REPORTS ON DISORDERERS: JACK BRICKHOUSE SPEAKS OUT DURING CUB GAME BROADCAST

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the statement below was made by sportscaster Jack Brickhouse during the live WGN-TV coverage of the Chicago Cubs home game. The following is verbatim transcription of Brickhouse's spontaneous remarks during the telecast:

You know, ladies and gentlemen, I've been thinking . . . uh . . . this has been on my mind for the last couple uh days now, there's been a lot of talk lately about the handling of the Democratic convention, the demonstrations and so forth, and to me who covered many of these conventions the most unfortunate aspect of this whole thing has been the lack of realization by many of just what kind of an opponent the Chicago Police have been up against. . . .

Hope you read the front-page editorial in yesterday's Chicago Tribune, or, the front-page story from this morning's Tribune, the really dramatic account of a brave Chicago Policeman, Robert Pearson, who infiltrated that hard-core Communist inner-circle of the yippies and, at great risk fed inside information to the Chicago Police.

And I hope you heard the report of a brilliant young Chicago Police Department Press information officer, Frank Sullivan who really told it like it was.

Of the many I've covered, I don't think I've ever seen a convention put to the agonizing test that this one was, and, knowing the planned chaos intended by imported Communist leaders who con our young people into joining them under false pretenses knowing of the death threats, the assassinations, of the Kennedy brothers and Martin Luther King being fresh in our minds, the irresponsible television reporting that bears betrayal of the Public Trust, the criticism of well meaning people who really don't know the score. . . .

Add all of them together and I say this country owes Mayor Daley a deep debt of gratitude, and we owe the Chicago Police Department and Superintendent Conlisk, and for that matter, the National Guard, the FBI, the Secret Service and even the Andy Frain ushers, the same debt for protecting us from mania, who not only wanted to ruin a political convention they want to destroy Chicago, they want to destroy the United States of America.

POINT OF NO RETURN?

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a constituent recently sent to me a reprint of a letter to the editor which appeared originally in the Evansville, Ind., Courier.

The writer, Louis Ruthenburg, warns that the United States is following the same socialistic path that has reduced Great Britain to political, economic, and social bankruptcy. He properly asks:

Have we passed the point of no return?

I commend the text of the letter to the attention of my colleagues:

POINT OF NO RETURN?

Jim Bishop's graphic and realistic piece about the sorry status of once great Britain brings to mind Thomas Gray's mournful lines:

"The boast of heraldry, the pomp of power
And all that beauty, all that wealth e'er gave
Await alike the inevitable hour:
The paths of glory lead but to the grave."

Bishop's column should also remind Courier readers that, since early in the century, we, the people of the United States, have followed precisely the same pattern that has reduced Great Britain to political, economic and social bankruptcy.

Before the turn of the century, under such great leaders as Palmerston, Disraeli, and Gladstone, England was blessed with strong, constructive government and became, as Bishop remarks, "greater than Rome." Britons then could boast that "The sun never sets on the British Empire."

During the latter part of the nineteenth century, the Fabian Society, dedicated to converting England to socialism, became active. It embraced and converted British Labor to socialism. The British Liberal Party affiliated with Labor in 1906 and was soon submerged and superseded by the Labor Party.

As the result of that revolutionary political transition, constructive, powerful Britain has degenerated into the present weak, socialistic welfare state. Once proud Britons now must eat the inevitable, bitter fruits of socialism.

Since the turn of the century, our United

States has closely followed the British pattern of degeneration.

After Lord Keynes had popularized the Fabian socialistic philosophy among students and faculty members at Harvard University, a series of socialistic associations of "intellectuals" developed. These culminated in the politically oriented Americans for Democratic Action (A.D.A.). That organization is the counterpart of the English Fabian Society.

Leading spirits in A.D.A. have included Hubert H. Humphrey and Walter Reuther.

Under the Wilson administration the socialistic political and economic trend was accelerated through adoption of the graduated income tax and centralization of bank control in the Federal Reserve System. Karl Marx long since had advocated a graduated income tax and centralized banking as measures desirable for development of socialism.

Roosevelt's "New Deal" surrendered inordinate power to organized labor, just as the English Liberal Party had promoted the interests of British Labor.

Here, as in England, our country has degenerated into a socialistic, welfare state. Among headlines in the same issue of the Courier are these:

"Year's Deficit, 25.4 Billion Largest Since World War II", and "County Welfare Costs Double in Eight Years".

Here, as in England, we are "taxed beyond endurance"; faced with disastrous inflation, increasing crime and rioting, distrust by other nations. We, too, now eat the bitter, inevitable fruits of socialism.

Have we passed the point of no return? Probably, but not inevitably.

CAPTIVE NATIONS' WEEK, 1968, CONFIRMED BY RAPE OF CZECH- OSLOVAKIA

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, this past July, Americans and friends in 17 other countries fittingly conducted the 10th observance of Captive Nations' Week. One of the major themes throughout all the observance was the needed concentration on Soviet Russian colonialism as the real enemy of both the captive nations and the free world. Over the past 10 years this position has been amply substantiated by careful scholarship and historical insight of a few scholars and teachers on the American scene. It is a pity that their voices have not been adequately heard. But where reason and perception fail to prevail, harsh experience inevitably surges forth. The Soviet Russian rape of Czechoslovakia has provided such experience. The question now is whether we can profit by this experience.

In any case, the truths disseminated by the farseeing supporters of Captive Nations' Week will continue to haunt those who have feared to heed them. As the reports on the 10th observance continue to flow in, it should be quite instructive to note what was said and done, particularly now in the light of the Czechoslovak experience. The following examples are noteworthy: proclamations by Gov. Claude R. Kirk, Jr., of Florida, Mayor Stephen P. Clark of Miami, and Mayor Chuck Hall of Dade

County, Fla.; the first issuance anywhere of a Captive Nations' Week stamp by the Republic of Korea; an editorial and report on the week in Svoboda; a statement by Senator ROMAN HRUSKA in the August 3 issue of HUMAN EVENTS; testimony by the National Captive Nations Week chairmen before the Republican platform committee; an article in the San Diego Union of July 16; a Japanese statement in the WACL Bulletin of August 1968, as well as one by Mr. Ky Chery-Kang on the Russian invasion:

PROCLAMATION: STATE OF FLORIDA EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, TALLAHASSEE

Whereas, the United States has become a great nation due to its ability through the democratic process, to achieve an harmonious union of its people despite the diversity of racial, religious and ethnic backgrounds, and

Whereas, this harmonious unity of our free society has led the people of the United States to have a warm understanding for the aspirations and interdependency of the people and nations of the world, and

Whereas, the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of peaceful co-existence between nations and raises a barrier to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other people, and

Whereas, these captive nations look to the United States for leadership in bringing about their liberation and restoration of their religious freedom, and

Whereas, it is vital to our nation's security that the desires of these captive people be kept alive as a deterrent to war and a means of obtaining a lasting peace, and

Whereas, it is proper that we clearly show these people through an appropriate ceremony that we share their aspirations.

Now, therefore, I, Claude R. Kirk, Jr., by virtue of the authority vested in me as Governor of the State of Florida do hereby proclaim July 14-20, 1968, Captive Nations Week in the State of Florida.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Florida to be affixed at Tallahassee, the Capital, this 18 day of July, A.D., 1968.

CLAUDE R. KIRK,
Governor.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK IN MIAMI, 1968

(A proclamation by the mayor of the city of Miami, Fla.)

Whereas the greatness of our nation is, in large part, attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve harmonious unity of its people, and

Whereas in contrast to the freedoms which the citizens of our country enjoy, the people of more than 25 countries throughout the world have been subjected to Communistic tyranny, and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States of America as the citadel of human freedom and a beacon lighting the way to their own liberation, and

Whereas the United States Congress has designated the third week in July as Captive Nations Week,

Now, therefore, I, Stephen P. Clark, Mayor of the City of Miami, Florida, do hereby proclaim the week beginning July 14, 1968, as Captive Nations Week in Miami.

In observance thereof I call upon the people of Miami to join in offering prayers and dedicating their efforts toward the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples throughout the world.

In witness whereof I hereunto set my hand and cause the seal of the City of Miami, Florida, to be affixed.

Done in the office of the Mayor of the City of Miami, Florida, this, the — day of — in the year of Our Lord, Nineteen Hundred and Sixty-Eight.

STEPHEN P. CLARK,
Mayor.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK IN METROPOLITAN DADE COUNTY, 1968

(A proclamation by the mayor of Metropolitan Dade County, Fla.)

Whereas: The oppressive tactics of international Communism and other forms of tyranny are holding in a state of enslavement and terror many nations, including Cuba, just a few miles from our continental shores, and

Whereas: Persecuted and oppressed individuals throughout the world traditionally have looked to the United States as a symbol of Democracy, depending on this country to lend its influence in liberating those who are oppressed, and

Whereas: The Congress of the United States has designated the third week in July of each year as Captive Nations Week, in order that submerged nations everywhere may be reminded of this country's sympathy, thus sustaining their hopes for ultimate freedom.

Now, therefore: Be it resolved that I, Chuck Hall, Mayor of Metropolitan Dade County, Florida, do hereby proclaim the week beginning July 14, 1968, as Captive Nations Week in Metropolitan Dade County.

In observance thereof: I urge the people of Greater Miami to participate wherever possible in events arranged in observance of this special week and to join with others in offering prayers for the liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples throughout the world.

THE KOREA ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE, Seoul, Korea, July 28, 1968.

DEAR SIR/MADAM: From July 15 through 21, we have observed the Captive Nations Week on a nation-wide scale that marks the sixth event observed in Korea. On this occasion, our League held the nation-wide rallies and performed the touring lectures.

In the citizen's Rally held in Seoul and other main provincial cities on July 16, we aroused our voice to urge the liberation of the peoples subjugated under the Communist tyranny and a resolution was passed to send messages to our fellow countrymen in the northern part of Korea and to the free peoples of the world. We also exposed and condemned in the Rally the falsehood and atrocity of Communism and strongly urged to all the peoples of the world under the Communist tyranny to break off the chains of slavery and stand firmly on the sacred fight for the freedom and independence.

We urge all the member units of the WACL to be united in the fight for the liberation of the subjugated peoples till the moment the freedom attained and prosperity assured. We believe firmly God will bless us in our gallant struggle with loving care and guidance.

Finally we are pleased to inform you that our Government, in response to our effort to publicize on the Captive Nations Week, issued the postage stamp to commemorate the movement for the liberation of the captive nations under the Communist tyranny as clearly indicated on the stamp. We shall be very much pleased if a few pieces of the stamp enclosed are received by you as a small but beautiful gift on this precious occasion.

Sincerely yours,

LEE EUNG JOON,
Chairman.

POSTAGE STAMP TO COMMEMORATE THE MOVE- MENT FOR LIBERATION OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS UNDER THE COMMUNIST TYRANNY

The world peace and freedom of mankind are being threatened by the constant inva-

sions of the inhumane Communist imperialism ever since the World War II. The people of many nations were deprived of their freedom and are groaning under the Communist tyranny, including our fellow country-men in the north.

In an effort to mop up such poisonous Communist force from the earth and lend spiritual support and sympathetic concern to these freedom-loving peoples who are struggling for survival and freedom under the brutal Communist rule and at the same time to further inspire the free people with the unswerving thought of anti-communism by exposing to the world the atrocious acts of the Communist and miserable life imposed on the people by their dictatorship, the congress of the United States decided to set the period of the 3rd week every July as the "Captive Nation's Week," and the week dedicated to the movement for liberation of the captive nations under the Communist tyranny, in 1959. All free nations of the world are called upon to come forth together with their active measures to promote further the anti-communism among their people and their contribution of whatever the possible helps to the cause of these freedom-fighting captive nations during the period.

Communism is the common enemy to all free peoples.

As for Korean people who are facing the north Korean puppet regime and their ever increasing aggressive acts, this occasion should be made another moment to strengthen further their moral armament and renew their determination to liberate their fellow country-men from the bloody Communist hands in the north and to achieve eventually the longing desire for the national unification.

[From the Ukrainian Weekly, July 13, 1968]
CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1968

July 14-20 has been designated as Captive Nations Week of 1968.

This is the tenth observance of a week set aside to remind us that the captive nations—the peoples themselves as against the totalitarian Red states and their Communist Party apparatus—are still very much captive.

Captive Nations Week traditionally symbolizes for billions of captive peoples the firm dedication of America to their freedom and independence.

More than any event, it shows that the right things about America stand out most when contrasted with the combination of political oppression and rampant economic poverty that exists in the Red Empire, particularly the Soviet Union.

In the U.S. House of Representatives, an hour has been scheduled on July 17 to pay special attention to the captive nations and their enslavement by Communist Russia. Similar participation is anticipated in the Senate.

The National Captive Nations Committee Chairman, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, has appealed to all members of the U.S. Congress to participate in this year's Captive Nations Week observance. He has also recommended that the congressmen urge the creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations to "dispel the dangerous myths engulfing our country and . . . calling for an unprecedented review of U.S. policy toward the USSR, an empire with which some Americans are apparently seeking a partnership."

We, the citizens of America, can back up these actions by our whole-hearted participation in local observances of Captive Nations Week—in anti-communist manifestations such as those taking place in New York and Pittsburgh during the next few days. A voice, raised in behalf of our enslaved kingmen in Ukraine, should be particularly strong on this occasion and at this time in history.

Our strong support of Captive Nations Week will serve to inspire citizens through-

out the nation to rededicate themselves to the principles of the American Revolution and the ideal of freedom for all peoples.

[From the Ukrainian Weekly, July 20, 1968]
ANTI-COMMUNIST RALLY IN NEW YORK BEGINS
CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

NEW YORK.—A lively anti-Communist rally in Central Park marked the start of Captive Nations Week here on July 14.

Several hundred Ukrainians were among almost 1,000 persons attending the rally after a mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral.

Congressman Lester Wolff (D-Nassau County), one of several speakers at the rally, noted that people everywhere look upon America as a "bastion of freedom."

He called on the Soviet Union and its Chinese underlings not to silence the voices of protesters but to listen to the demands for human rights.

Speakers included Judge Matthew Troy, head of the Captive Nations Week Committee, and Dr. Ivan Docheff.

The "Verkhovyntsi" dance group of New York took part in the concert portion of the program along with Estonian and Azerbaijan performers.

Representatives of close to 20 captive nations, many of them in national costume, marched from the Plaza fountain on Central Park South to St. Patrick's Cathedral and afterwards from the Cathedral to the bandshell in Central Park. Over 500 persons took part in the mass and the parade.

Demonstrators carried signs bearing slogans such as "Freedom for all subjugated nations," "Human rights for all nations" and "Moscow—enemy of the free world."

The Ukrainian group, the largest contingent, included Ukrainian veterans, members of the Organization of Four Freedoms of Ukraine and Soyuz Ukrainok, and some 100 SUMA members, some of whom had come by bus from the SUMA camp at Ellenville, N.Y.

Others in the Ukrainian delegation were Roman Huhlewych, Ivan Bazarko, Lev Futala, Dr. Alexander Sokolyshyn, K. Wasylyk, UNA Supreme Vice-President Mary Dushnyck, UCCA publications editor Dr. Walter Dushnyck and Michael Spontak, head of the Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations in the U.S.A.

Interviews with Mr. Spontak and Dr. and Mrs. Dushnyck were conducted by representatives of The New York Times, the New York Daily News, WCBS-TV and WNEW-TV, which were among the many communications media covering the day's events.

[From Human Events, Aug. 3, 1968]
CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

(By Senator ROMAN HRUSKA)

The observation of Captive Nations Week recognizes the yearnings of the captives. We must give them our support, for their aspirations are rightful. We are talking about 100 million people. Our accommodations and concessions are not going to improve their position unless a quid pro quo is received.

The events of the past year have not brought true freedom and independence to any of the captive nations. Millions of people in the Communist-dominated countries continue to be enslaved by their Soviet masters. They are still shackled under the tyranny and oppression which they have known for so many years. Their individual liberties and fundamental rights as human beings are still being denied. And the United Nations Charter which proclaims the principle of "equal rights and self-determination of peoples" continues to be flaunted.

We also know that the spirit of these oppressed peoples has not been broken. They have not given up their hopes for freedom. An expression of the deep desire of man for

freedom can be seen in Czechoslovakia, and the new government has apparently responded to some extent. The aspirations of the youth of Poland, however, were smothered with repression and retaliation.

In order to preserve this spirit and keep alive this spark of resistance, these people of the captive nations must know that they have not been abandoned. They must have the reassurance of the free world that they have not been written off as a lost cause. To this end, Captive Nations Week has made a vital contribution. It serves as an excellent means of focusing the world's attention on the plight of these people and give the American people an opportunity to manifest their concern.

A NEW REPUBLICAN POLICY OF DYNAMIC
INDEPENDENCE

(Testimony of Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of Georgetown University, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, and chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, before the Republican platform committee, Miami Beach, July 30, 1968)

Mr. Chairman and Distinguished Members, the time has come for the Republican Party to chart a new course in our foreign affairs. This course must be primarily founded on an expansive knowledge of the Soviet Union, courage to utilize such knowledge, and a national will to uphold a single standard of morality and principle in our dealings with the really prime enemy of our country. What we have been witnessing in this decade is the very negation of these criteria and, behind the Grand Illusion of Peace, a steady deterioration of the American posture in the world at large. The present course, paved by mythical preconceptions, a protracted obscurantism, and thus fear regarding the main contender for world domination, will inevitably lead to more wars, wasteful American sacrifices, and a further eclipse of American power.

A new Republican policy of dynamic independence—one that will dynamicize the right things that have made this Nation the greatest in the modern world—would prevent further wars, restore the badly mauled American image and, for human freedom and justice, maximize the uses of the only real power worth talking about, American power itself. More than anything else, this truly innovative policy would prepare us as fitting heirs to celebrate with clear consciences and pure spirit the 200th Anniversary of the American Revolution and our Declaration of Independence, only eight years away.

Concentrating on the basic factors and causes in the world struggle, not the secondary and tertiary ones that Moscow steers us into, this policy is justified both, negatively, by the failures of the present Administration and, positively, by needs for our security, peace, and victory in this cumulative struggle. The Administration's failures, which constitute serious points of indictment, are as follows:

(1) It has pursued a confetti diplomacy in regard to the main enemy, which can be accurately depicted as the international dimension of the credibility gap. The whole train of paper-making—the Test Ban treaty, Consular Convention, Outer Space treaty, the Non-Proliferation one, and even the Moscow-New York flight run—are so much confetti on the scale of fundamental problems, serving to hoodwink our people as to the harsh realities in the Red Empire and the real threats to our security. The Consular treaty, as written, doesn't even make semantic sense. These superficialities tend, in the myopic tradition of the Roosevelt Administration over two decades ago, to convey an implicit partnership between Independent America and Imperio-Colonialist Moscow.

None of these treaties is of any concrete net advantage to us, and each is of nothing-to-lose-much-to-gain advantage to Moscow. The confetti helps to enshroud the real enemy of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism and its communist weapons which are dramatically at work today in Czechoslovakia.

(2) In its covering appeasement of Moscow, the Administration has systematically downgraded the captive nations, the peoples themselves, in favor of a self-defeating "bridges of understanding" policy conducting to the entrenchment of Red totalitarian regimes. One need only read President Johnson's Captive Nations Week proclamations to notice the detachment of the Secretary of State's signature and, in the 1968 one, the American people aren't even invited to participate in the annual observance, where heretofore they were.

(3) The Administration has frustrated along a broad spectrum any consideration in favor of the independence of the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union, which make up a majority of the population. With its double-standard morality, it has cast aside this key concept of the captive non-Russian nations in the USSR—the key to ending Moscow's indirect aggressions in Vietnam, the Korean area, the Middle East, through Havana in Latin America and, indeed, in our own country—for a working partnership with the world's worst imperialist system in false pursuit of "non-confrontation and world peace."

(4) With no comprehension of the chief psycho-political warfare being waged against us, it has insularly blocked the passage of the Freedom Academy bill which would equip Americans and others to cope with this form of revolutionary warfare. This despite the fact that a majority of the House Rules Committee is in favor of it.

(5) Although a new generation of Americans has emerged with little or no understanding of how the Red Empire has developed, the Administration has also resisted the creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. Here, too, in what is supposed to be "the democratic process," a substantial majority in the Rules Committee sees the urgent need of such a committee.

(6) The ineptitude of the Administration has also been reflected by its virtual silence in this International Human Rights Year concerning the deprived rights of peoples in the USSR and elsewhere in the Red Empire; its pressures for liberalized East-West trade, repeating the errors of the 30's; and its ineffectual uses of the VOA, the U.N. and other media in the interests of world freedom, particularly during this Czechoslovak crisis.

The needs for our security, peace and victory in this cumulative struggle can in fundamental part be satisfied by adopting the following as planks in the Republican Party Platform:

(1) the declaration of a new Republican policy of dynamic independence, applicable on the basis of a one-standard morality to all areas of the world, particularly the USSR;

(2) the promise to conduct for the first time in our history a full-scale review of U.S. policy toward the USSR (Mr. Fulbright has been challenged on this and fears it);

(3) specific support for the passage of the Freedom Academy bill, even to prepare for political warfare on our own terrain;

(4) also specific support for the creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations (Let us uphold the democratic process); and

(5) in clear repudiation of the Democratic Administration's policy of silence and self-paralysis, a courageous reaffirmation of the Party's established stand toward all of the captive nations including 17 million North Vietnamese:

"In the spirit of dynamic independence,

Republicans reaffirm their traditional commitment to a course leading to the genuine freedom and independence of the Communist-dominated nations of Eastern Europe, Asia and Latin America, including the peoples of Poland, Hungary, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Albania, Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Armenia, Ukraine, Yugoslavia and its Serbian, Croatian and Slovene peoples, Cuba, mainland China, North Vietnam, and many others."

"In this International Human Rights Year, we condemn the persecution of Russian, Ukrainian and other non-Russian intellectuals in the USSR and of minorities, such as the Jews, within Communist borders."

Ladies and gentlemen, as I have quoted in my current book *The Vulnerable Russians*, "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing." Silence, myopia, and fear are of the species of nothing which we can ill afford.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union July 16, 1968]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK IS MADE MEANINGLESS
(By Dumitru Danilepol)

The 10th Captive Nations Week is being observed this week, but one wonders why.

In 1959 a joint resolution in Congress proclaimed the third week in July Captive Nations Week, "until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all captive nations in the world."

The first presidential proclamation signed by President Eisenhower made it clear which these nations were.

It spoke of "many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism."

It appealed to Americans "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of the captive nations."

The Russians were furious. Their vehement protests indicated they were hurt and hurt badly by the action.

But that was 10 years ago. Since 1961, the Kennedy-Johnson resolutions have been so watered down that they can apply to any country.

President Johnson, in his proclamations, does not even mention the Soviet Union or communism.

This attitude, of course, reflects the President's policy of detente with the Communist leaders.

Just how far we have drifted since 1959 is demonstrated in a recent review of U.S. foreign policy by Eugene Rostow, under secretary of state for political affairs.

"We were and are opposed to communism, and concerned about its spread," he said. But since 1945 "the idea of using the threat of force, or our atomic monopoly to press the Soviet fulfillment of its agreements at Yalta and Potsdam was literally unthinkable.

"We did, of course, resist Communist efforts to extend what Churchill first called the Iron Curtain," Rostow said. "But we did not attempt to intervene on the other side of that line—either in East Germany in 1953 or Hungary in 1956 . . . we have no design against the political system which exists in North Vietnam."

It may be pertinent to recall that Vice President Richard Nixon advocated American help to the Hungarian Freedom Fighters in 1956.

In the last year much has been made of "liberalization" in Czechoslovakia and of "an independent attitude" in Rumania. Each small gain in a Communist state is something to cheer about, but these are still captive nations in which basic human rights are denied to all people.

[From the WACL Bulletin, August 1968]

A WORD ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

(By Dr. Juitsu Kitaoka, APACL and WACL Japan Chapter)

We are happy to note a step forward taken this year for the liberation of captive nations. On the other hand, we cannot but feel indignation over the Soviet persecution and suppression of writers and other intellectuals in the Ukraine. The whole world must cry protest to this.

We regret, too, that the United States, the leader of the free world, has shown lukewarm timidity in resisting the aggression of North Vietnam and the Vietcong. This fact is quite clear: if the USA gives up South Vietnam or recognizes Red China, as some of her statesmen advocate, not only will the captive nations be further oppressed but also the present free nations of Asia will be enslaved and reduced into captive nations by Communist aggression.

We, therefore, strongly urge the USA and all other free nations to unite in supporting the liberation movement of the subjugated nations and in defending the free peoples against the Communists' direct and indirect aggression.

STATEMENT ISSUED BY MR. KU CHENG-KANG,
COUNCIL CHAIRMAN OF THE WORLD ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE, ON SOVIET INVASION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

1. The armed invasion against Czechoslovakia by Soviet Russia and her satellite nations of East Germany, Poland, Hungary and Bulgaria fully reflects the fact that the internal divisive movement and the crisis of a split within the Communist empire have developed to such an extent that Soviet Russia had to run the risk of facing unpredictable consequences, by resorting to armed suppressions. With the collapse and disintegration of the Communist empire approaching, Soviet Russia had no alternative but to use this last resort to save a rapidly deteriorating situation. We are convinced that history will prove that Soviet Russia's invasion against Czechoslovakia signifies the downfall and disintegration of Communism.

2. Soviet Russia's open invasion against Czechoslovakia shattered the lies of the so-called "internationalism" and "peaceful co-existence." Since Soviet Russia found it incompatible to get along even with a member of the Communist Bloc like Czechoslovakia, how can the free world expect her to abandon her design of communizing the world. In the past, international appeasers had thought that a "bridge" could be established with Soviet Russia and the Chinese Communists in culture and trade in order to improve the relations between the Communist empire and the free world. Such an illusion has been crushed by the iron heels of the invading Soviet troops. Peoples in the world can, through the outrageous Soviet actions, understand that the basic nature of Communism remains unchanged. This is true of the Soviet regime, and especially true of the puppet Chinese Communist regime.

3. Soviet invasion against Czechoslovakia has told the world, efforts of peoples behind the Iron Curtain in seeking freedom must not lack the support of external forces. The hesitant and timid attitude of the free world at the time of the Czech crisis was tantamount to encouraging Soviet Russia to use brutal force against Czechoslovakia in the end. Peoples throughout the world ought to learn this lesson and not to entertain any thought of pacification or appeasement with either Soviet Russia or the Chinese Communists.

4. In the face of outrageous Soviet armed invasion against Czechoslovakia, all righteous and peace-loving peoples in the entire world should be united and, through various means, take all possible actions to support the Czech people in their struggles against tyranny.

In upholding justice and peace in the world, the United Nations, in particular, should pass resolutions condemning Soviet Russia as the aggressor, adopt effective sanctions against Soviet Russia's outrageous actions which have undermined the charter of the United Nations, and force Soviet Russia to withdraw her forces in order to restore the territorial integrity of Czechoslovakia and the complete freedom of her people.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON REITERATES HIS PLAN FOR WORLD PEACE TO THE 50TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION AT NEW ORLEANS, LA.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was again my pleasure to be in attendance at the American Legion Convention in New Orleans, La., when President Lyndon B. Johnson addressed the delegates on Tuesday, September 10. I believe that the President was more forceful than ever in the presentation of his speech in which he once more outlined the position of his administration and our country in the role of a world leader and our quest for a lasting peace.

The President's speech follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE 50TH ANNUAL AMERICAN LEGION NATIONAL CONVENTION, NEW ORLEANS, LA., SEPTEMBER 10, 1968

Mr. Chairman, Commander Galbraith, Senator Ellender, Congressman Teague, distinguished members of the American Legion and Ladies Auxiliary, my fellow Americans:

I am deeply touched and very grateful for your thoughtfulness and for the presentation of this award, on behalf of the men who have demonstrated their love of country.

Today, I have come here to your convention to speak with you in a keynote talk about world peace—about your President's efforts to achieve it—the progress we have made—as well as the tasks that lie ahead.

It was 50 years ago this very month that the eyes of the world were turned on the efforts of the American doughboys to reach a railroad running across France, which happened to be the main supply line, at that time, of the German Army.

I remember then, as a 10-year-old boy, how we followed the news of the Meuse-Argonne offensive in that fall of the year 1918.

Some of you in this room no doubt fought through that battle.

Some of you were there, two months later, when the first world war in history was brought to an end.

Now we know how brief the illusion of peace was, on that Armistice Day a half century ago. In the course of five stormy decades, we have learned how carefully peace must be built in a complex and dangerous world—as well as how well peace must be guarded.

World War I had been ignited by a very small flame in the Balkans. That was our first lesson. Others followed in rapid profusion:

We saw depressions leap continents. We saw democracy weakened and break under their weight.

We witnessed the rise of dictators and watched aggressors stalk across borders.

We fought through the Second World War which came in the wake of their bootmarks—and before the dust of war had

really settled, we saw the rise of a new aggression.

We beheld the dawn of the nuclear age. We saw the birth of new nations, and the death of old colonialism.

And from a dozen different parts of the globe, we heard the long pent-up cry for food and land and a new day of hope and dignity.

These are the conditions and developments of our turbulent times. Around them, America has constructed a policy to try to promote peace in the world.

That policy did not begin in my Administration. That has been our policy for more than 20 years in the making. It was shaped in a bipartisan spirit, by Republicans and Democrats.

It has been followed by four different American Presidents.

I have built upon it. I have strengthened it when I could. I have modified it where I needed to, to meet the changing demands of the changing years. But we have always held to four essential imperatives.

The first imperative—constant from President Truman's day to mine, is this: The United States of America must remain the strongest nation in all the world.

I have tried to take steps, even small ones, that would move us toward more normal relations with the Soviet Union and other Communist countries.

We shall continue that progress in every honorable way that is open to us. World safety demands that the two greatest powers on earth reduce—if they possibly can—the tensions that have held mankind in mortal bondage for more than a generation.

But I have always, also, been deeply aware—and I have constantly and steadily warned—that many dangerous and unresolved problems face us.

Some, however, concluded that changes of such magnitude were taking place in the Communist world that we could relax our vigilance, trusting that the Communists wanted the same kind of world that we Americans wanted.

Today, the events in Eastern Europe make it clear—and make it clear with the force of steel—that we are still a long way—a long way—from the peaceful world that we Americans all wish to see.

The message out of Czechoslovakia is plain: The independence of nations and the liberty of men are today still under challenge. The free parts of the world will survive only if they are capable of maintaining their strength and capable of maintaining and building their unity.

Peace remains our objective. But we shall never achieve it by wishful thinking, nor by disunity, nor by weakness.

The second imperative of our policy for peace is that we must meet our commitments and keep our promises to use our strength in the face of common danger to oppose aggression.

Self-interest has always been—and must always be—at the root of every action which commits the lives of American men.

When we entered the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO, we did so because the threat of a Communist takeover of Europe was real, and because we knew that America's security was linked to the security of Western Europe.

If its human and material resources in Europe were to fall into hostile hands, then the balance of world power would be against America. We would have to become a bristling defensive fortress here at home, organized against an enormous, dangerous threat. We would have to live under conditions that are drastically different from any conditions that we have ever known.

So that is why America helped formulate, organize and joined the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. And that is why we are a strong part of that organization today.

When we fought to keep aggression from swallowing up South Korea, it was President Harry S. Truman who defined the self-interest that impelled our stand. Unchallenged aggression, President Truman said, "would mean a third world war, just as similar incidents had brought on the second world war."

When President Eisenhower sent troops into Lebanon, it was to keep a situation from developing which could trigger in the Middle East, and then could draw us in.

When President Eisenhower committed us to the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, and he submitted it to our United States Senate during the Eisenhower Administration, it was voted and ratified there by a vote of 82 to 1. It was because President Eisenhower saw Southeast Asia as the key to political equilibrium in the Orient, vitally affecting America's future.

When President Kennedy brought in additional troops to Berlin in 1961, it was because America's self-interest demanded that we stand behind our pledge and our commitment to keep West Berlin free.

When President Kennedy put our forces on alert during the Cuban missile crisis the following year, it was because Soviet missiles in the Western Hemisphere jeopardized American security.

When the first American soldiers went into South Vietnam in the early 1960's, it was because this Nation saw that if the Communist aggression there succeeded, the entire region of Southeast Asia would be in mortal danger, and the threat of world war would be more ominous.

We have heard many voices raised in opposition to this stand. Indeed, I have sought some of these voices out. For, as your President, I assure you in these long days and nights for more than five years now, we have searched every avenue of thought and opinion on this issue that so troubles all of our people today.

But after investigating carefully every possible course of action, I always come back to that warning of President Harry S. Truman about how unchallenged aggression could lead to another world war.

Inevitably, I always come back to that judgment of General Dwight D. Eisenhower, who said that if South Vietnam were captured by the Communists, "The freedom of 12 million people would be lost immediately, and that of 150 million others in adjacent lands would be seriously endangered. The loss of South Vietnam," President Eisenhower said, "would set in motion a crumbling progress that could, as it progressed, have grave consequences for us and for freedom."

I always come back to these words, not of President Truman or President Eisenhower, but the late, beloved John Fitzgerald Kennedy, when he said: "For us to withdraw from the effort in Vietnam would mean a collapse not only of South Vietnam, but Southeast Asia. So we are going to stay there."

The judgments of these three former Presidents, as mine has been, were formed in positions of the gravest responsibility. After seeing, hearing, reading and studying all the evidence, their judgments were formed and were unshakeable. The American Constitution obliges the President to make his judgment, as Commander in Chief, according to what he believes is in the best interest of all the American people.

And I have believed—as these three Presidents believed who went before me—that a Communist military takeover in South Vietnam would lead to developments that could imperil the security of the American people for generations to come.

I know very well the cost of our commitment. Every day and every night I mourn every man who has been lost or who has been wounded.

But a President, a President worthy of this title, if he is true to his trust, must think not only in terms of those who have fallen. He must think in terms of the casualties that might have been—or the dead who might be.

How many American lives would eventually have been lost if our forces had not stood in Europe in the late 1940's to block the aggression that threatened, at that time, to sweep the English Channel?

More than 34,000 American men fell in Korea, and hundreds of thousands more bear the wounds of Korean battle. But how many more doughboys would have died if the aggressor had not been stopped there, and the war had spread to other parts of the world?

If we had not drawn the line against aggression in Vietnam, in keeping with the treaty that we signed, the SEATO obligations, and if the erosion of freedom had begun that President Eisenhower told you about when I quoted him a moment ago—some American President—some President—some day would have to draw the line somewhere else. And I ask you, at how much greater a cost? How many millions of young Americans would be lost in the larger war that would surely and inevitably come?

These are the sobering questions that no President and no Commander in Chief can escape.

From the very first, our objective in Vietnam has been to prevent the aggressor from taking that land by force.

We Americans have sought no advantage—except the advantage of peace. We have tried to fight a limited war—not to destroy an enemy, not to win a military victory, but to try in every way we knew how, as best we could, to protect our friends, remain true to our obligations, and win a peace in that part of the world.

We believed that to be very much in America's national interest then, and we believe it to be in America's national interest now.

On the night of March 31st, in a television address to this Nation, we launched a major new effort for peace. That was the latest of many.

We had already had eight bombing pauses. But on that night we announced that we would withdraw 90 percent of the population of Vietnam, almost 80 percent of the territory, from the area that our men were permitted to bomb.

As a result of that effort, our negotiating team would be willing to meet with the representatives of North Vietnam. The enemy suggested that we meet in Cambodia, and then he suggested that we meet in Poland. Against great odds and against the advice of some of our more eager people, we finally agreed not to meet in either of those places, but to meet in Paris. The wisdom of that decision, I think, is clear to almost any of you today.

We continue now to hope that something productive is going to come out of those meetings.

All we have heard so far is a demand that we do something else without their having responded to our first bombing restrictions.

Now let me make it as clear as I possibly can why we are still bombing and will continue to bomb the panhandle of North Vietnam—why re-establishing the DMZ, I think, is so critical to peace in Vietnam.

In the area just below the DMZ, we and our allies have some four divisions of men and the necessary people to support them, involving more than 60,000 Americans and one division of South Vietnamese. Just behind them in the rest of I Corps are an additional 164,000 American and Allied fighting men.

Those close to the DMZ are subjected daily to artillery fire and the direct movement of enemy forces across that DMZ against them. All those men in I Corps are constantly subjected to a massive flow of supplies and infiltrators, and rocket fire, through the pan-

handle to the northern part of the battlefield.

These are just hard, inescapable facts that a Commander in Chief must face up to and confront.

So what are our choices?

First, we could invade North Vietnam with our men. We could overrun their military positions. We could throttle the supply routes in North Vietnam itself. This we do not wish to do, although it should be clear that the North Vietnamese do wish to invade South Vietnam, and they are doing so—although they don't want to admit it.

Second, we could withdraw our forces. We could retreat and surrender on the installment plan, as some have suggested, by taking our men from below the DMZ, and turn over the I Corps area, that part of South Vietnam, to the North Vietnamese. This, I assure you, we shall not do.

If we cannot take our men in, and we are not going to take our men out, it appears to me, third, that the best thing we can do is to bring our planes to bear in the panhandle across the line against the artillery, the trucks and the rocket launchers that are being fired on our men, and to bring it to bear against the enemy trucks, the enemy troops, and the enemy supplies that are coming through. Every secondary explosion—and there were thousands there last month—means that that powder and that steel doesn't have to be brought back from South Vietnam by some American soldier in his body if it is stopped in North Vietnam.

We are today exacting a very substantial price from the enemy. It requires patience of all of us. But we are limiting his capacity to bring weight against our forces and our allies. There is not the slightest doubt that if we should stop the bombing in the panhandle, the military capacity of the enemy to hurt our forces would greatly increase, and our casualties would skyrocket.

Just a few days ago, I went to the field with a cable and asked the commander of our troops in South Vietnam, one of the ablest commanders ever to wear a uniform, General Abrams, to give me his viewpoint on what would happen if I should order him to carry out the suggestion that had been made by some of our enemies abroad and some of our friends at home to stop the bombing.

His reply was simply this: If you should require me to stop the bombing of North Vietnam, you would permit the enemy to increase his capability several fold in 10 days, and if he did, I would be forced to withdraw our men from that area because they could no longer stand their ground.

I am not going to issue any order like that.

General Abrams, and not a single field commander we have, has made that recommendation to me. I am not a prophet or a speculator, but I do prophesy that some of these men who recommend it now would not do so if they were there on the DMZ, and could see there what our men face every day and face every night.

Therefore, the Commander in Chief has insisted that the bombing will not stop until we are confident that it will not lead to an increase in American casualties. That is why we have placed such emphasis on re-establishing the DMZ.

We yearn for the day when the violence subsides. We yearn for the day when our men can come home. No man can predict when that day will come, because we are there to bring honorable, stable peace to Southeast Asia, and no less will justify the sacrifices that our men have died for.

But President Thieu of Vietnam stated his intention at Honolulu—"to continue to assume all the responsibility that the scale of the forces of South Vietnam and their equipment will permit, while preparing the Vietnamese nation and armed forces for the important and decisive role that will be

theirs in the coming stages of the struggle." Every report I receive from Saigon reports that the gallant, determined people of South Vietnam are acting in accordance with that statement.

The third imperative of our program to promote peace in the world, like the other two I have stated, is our effort to assist other countries to improve their economies. A man's home, however grand it is, is not secure if it stands on a street of crumbling slums, where people are hungry and in despair.

Whatever that man does to build up his neighborhood is an investment in his own security. This is the principle which has been the base of our programs. It is here that the quiet work has progressed. This is slow work and stubborn work. But from South Korea to Turkey—from Taiwan to Iran—from Pakistan to Tunisia—there are many success stories in which Americans can share the great pride of accomplishment.

Let me tell you, briefly, what has been happening in just one area in our Hemisphere, in Latin America, in the last few years. With our help, a great struggle has been taking place to overcome hunger and ignorance. These are the victories:

The average per capita growth has more than doubled.

Forty-three million acres of land have been distributed to almost 400,000 families.

Food production has increased 14 percent, and manufacturing production has gone up 23 percent.

There are 340,000 new schools, and 7 million more children getting an education today.

Infant mortality has dropped 14 percent. The growth of confidence, the birth of hope, have changed history around the globe. And this is the kind of change which helps us to build peace.

We have always hoped and believed that as our friends and allies grew in strength, our burden would grow less lonely. We have been moving over the last few years toward a long-term position in which the United States would be able to assume its responsibility in enterprises of common concern, but our partners would be able to assume theirs.

This progress, too, is often hard to see. But it is there. In Asia, six Pacific Allies are fighting beside us in South Vietnam. By far, the greatest burden in that struggle—contrary to what is often said—is carried not by these allies, but carried by the South Vietnamese themselves. Since the beginning of the current offensive in mid-August of this year, they have suffered almost 50 percent more casualties than we Americans have suffered.

By the end of this year, the South Vietnamese will have 1,000,000 men under arms—1,000,000. 993,000, to be exact; 7,000 short of a million. That is out of a nation of 17 million. We have there 550,000, not a million, out of a nation of 200 million. But they have one million men under arms out of a nation of 17 million, and they don't control all of that 17 million.

The equivalent figure, in terms of population, if we had as high a percentage of our people at the front as they have, instead of having 500,000, we would have 12 million.

So this is a rather remarkable effort by a hardpressed, small nation that is fighting and dying for liberty that you don't always hear very much about.

The contribution of our NATO partners offers another example of partnership. U.S. forces are one-eighth of the ground forces in NATO Europe. But they are a critical element in the balance, because they—and their nuclear weapons that are there with them—supply the shield which enables our allies to provide increasingly for the defense of Western Europe.

We have a right to expect Europe to do

more—and we might as well say that plainly and frankly. We have a right to expect them to do more in their own defense.

The world of free men and independent nations is weakened by European isolationism and disunity—as it was once weakened by an isolationist America that it took President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill a long time to wake up.

We must look to the further enlargement of Europe's assumption of responsibility of their own in the future. In monetary affairs, in trade negotiations, in emergency food problems—across Asia and Europe and Latin America—the shift to partnership effort has already, I assure you, been substantial. Our relative burdens, as the years go by, become lighter.

I believe the day will soon come—which we have been building toward for 20 years—when some American President will be able to say to the American people that the United States is assuming its fair share of responsibility for promoting peace and progress in the world, but the United States is assuming no more and no less than its fair share.

While we can reduce our responsibilities, we must all be cautious enough never to allow anyone to persuade us to neglect them. In the 1960's I warn you there just must be no return to the isolationism of the 1930's that brought on World War II.

I warn you that the voice of isolationism is becoming strident once again in some of the places that we heard this same isolationist voice a generation ago. Some of it is in Congress. Some of it is on the campuses. Some of it is on the farms. Some of it is on the streets.

We say, "Why should we be bothered with the problems across the sea?" We might say we don't need to be bothered with smallpox in the next block, but the facts of life are if it is in the next block, we have to watch it and help stamp it out before it gets to our house.

The fourth imperative for peace is that we use our influence, however we can, to keep trouble from erupting into an all-out war—or to keep wars themselves from spreading. Through the United Nations, through the Organization of American States, and sometimes, but rarely, alone, we have already helped to dampen the fires of many potential conflicts in the last 10 years.

America shouldered arms half a century ago, "to make the world safe for democracy." Later it became quite fashionable to deride that slogan. For it seemed to belong to a simpler time, a time that was uncomplicated by a shrinking globe, and the new face of aggression, and the restlessness of emerging nations.

But I wonder today, looking back, if the derision did not come too soon. Democracy has had its times of frustration, it is true. Democracy has even had its times of failure. We know it is the best—but we also know it is the most difficult—way for men to organize their own affairs.

Today, vast reaches of this world have become safe for democracy. There is something deep in the human spirit which, in the end, demands government as a result of the consent of those governed.

Democracy is showing the strength which prophets 30 years ago did not believe it could show. We are not evangelizing democracy around the world. We are content to let every people choose their own path for development. But we are working to promote peace. And as it happens, peace is the only environment in which democracy can actually grow and thrive.

In conclusion, I would remind every loyal son of the Legion, the men who have worn the uniform of this country and have carried old glory to every corner of the world, and brought her back without a stain on it: I would warn you, peace lovers, those men who love peace more than you love man, but are

willing to defend freedom with your own life, that the ingredients of peace are these: strength, conviction, principle, compassion, constancy, patience, and, above all, my fellow Legionnaires, courage.

Treaties—treaties—yes, we have hundreds of them. Meaningful treaties are not hammered out by cowards who are afraid to stand up for what is right when the going is tough, or afraid to die for freedom when they are required to do so.

This afternoon I appeal to you to support your country, to support your fighting men, to support peace by maintaining strength in this country; by refusing, always, to bow to the demands of the moment; by refusing, always, to sacrifice principle and the things we hold dear; by standing as firm at home as you expect your sons to stand abroad, and ask yourself if you are doing it.

If you do this, then I think history will say that we caught up with the promise of Pershing's doughboys. I can think of no finer judgment to be made on you, or on me, or on our times, or on the America that we all love. Thank you very much.

JACK ANTOKAL: AN AMERICAN IDEAL

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday I participated in a memorial ceremony honoring the memory of the late Jack Antokal, of Saddle Rock, N.Y.

While Jack Antokal was a close and valued personal friend of mine, I speak of him at this time because of his fulfillment of an American ideal of service and devotion to the public good.

Mr. Antokal, who passed away recently at an all too early age, was the mayor of Saddle Rock and an active leader in a wide variety of community affairs. He was the kind of man who cared enough about his neighbors to devote his time and energies to the public good.

His services were always available on a purely voluntary basis for a wide variety of public projects, especially the development and government of the village of Saddle Rock. It is through the efforts of men such as Jack Antokal that our Nation has grown strong and enduring.

The tribute paid to this public man on Sunday was highlighted by the appearance of all the local elected officials. This turnout for a ceremony honoring his memory is the best indication of the high esteem in which we all held Jack Antokal.

His wife, Muriel, and his two lovely daughters may forever be proud of Jack's work in his lifetime. The memorial dedicated in his honor by the village of Saddle Rock will serve as a tangible reminder of the intangible, yet most high regard, with which Jack was held.

As long as our Nation can produce men with the public spirit and devotion of Jack Antokal, and the others like him in all parts of the country, then I remain confident of our great future.

Jack Antokal did fulfill an American ideal and the achievements he realized will never be lost.

COAL MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT OF 1968

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, coal mining is about as dangerous a job as a man can have in this country today. We have a Federal law that is supposed to protect miners from the extraordinary hazards they encounter. Yet Government figures reveal many lamentable gaps in this protection.

Witness that at least one out of every 10 of our active coal miners, and one out of every five surviving retired miners, suffers from a serious respiratory disease. There is no doubt that coal dust is the leading cause, but the law does not mention lung disease as a mining hazard.

Witness that more than 80 percent of the nearly 6,000 underground coal mines in our country have, on some occasion, been found in violation of at least one of the inadequate Federal safety standards now in existence. The penalties provided by law are inadequate to bring them into line.

Witness that current Federal safety standards are hardly effective at all in their application to the working face of a coal mine, where nearly half the fatal accidents take place.

Witness that Federal coal mine inspectors have no authority at surface mines, which account for nearly 40 percent of our total domestic coal production.

In light of these and other equally deplorable facts, President Johnson has urged this Congress to pass a new Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act which would remedy the intolerable flaws in the protection we afford our coal miners—flaws that have led to more than a dozen deaths in the Appalachian coal regions during just the past few months.

The 144,000 coal miners in the United States deserve better protection than they are getting. So do their families, whose bread they win each day in work that is hard and hazardous at best.

But, even if we set aside all humane considerations, a compelling case for passage of this bill can be made on economic grounds.

Last year alone, injuries and disabilities suffered by coal miners cost more than 1.8 million man-days of productive work and many millions of dollars in workmen's compensation payments. The victims' loss of earning power brought economic hardship to their families and their communities. The loss of skilled labor impeded the business of mining coal for our industries and utilities.

The lack of adequate safeguards for those who provide us with essential supplies of fuel makes as little sense to the economist as it does to the humanitarian.

No matter how this situation is viewed, the conclusion is inescapable: It is high time for Congress to close these gaps in our laws.

The very distinguished and able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT]

has introduced the 1968 amendments to the Coal Mine Safety Act, and I think the coal miners of this country and their families owe him a debt of gratitude for having done so.

CONGRESSMAN McCARTHY PRAISES
THE LATE STANLEY J. KEYSA

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, western New York lost one of its most distinguished leaders August 31 when Stanley J. Keysa died after an illness of 2 days.

I attended his funeral on Wednesday, September 4. St. Mary's Church in Lancaster was filled by many relatives, friends, and admirers.

Stanley Keysa was the supervisor of the town of Lancaster for 22 years. A Democrat and lifelong resident of the Lancaster area, Stan Keysa began his public career in 1940 as a peace justice and was elevated to the supervisor's seat in 1946.

He was returned 10 times as the executive head of Erie County's sixth most populous town. He was the dean of the former 54-member Erie County Board of Supervisors and served as its minority leader from September 1964, through 1966.

His contributions to the town of Lancaster were countless. He paved the way for water and sewer district extensions, Scajaquada Creek drainage improvements, recreation and park site acquisitions, town hall renovation, and a large scale tree-planting program for which he will be blessed by many future generations.

His dedication to his town's continuing growth and development prompted him to turn down the candidacy for election to Erie County's new legislature. Instead he chose to continue as Lancaster town supervisor.

In addition to his distinguished public service, Supervisor Keysa was a devout member of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church in Lancaster. He was a member of its Holy Name and Nocturnal Adoration Societies and served on the parish council. His other memberships included the Erie County, New York State and American Bar Associations, Advocates Club, Moose, Elks, and Orioles lodges of Lancaster, Lancaster-Depew Aerie of Eagles, Red Men, Polish Depew Club, Polish Falcons, Blackstone Club, Democratic Lawyers Club, and Father John Schaus Council 4652, Knights of Columbus.

Born in the village of Depew, he was graduated from Depew High School and the University of Buffalo Schools of Pharmacy and Law. He also attended St. Bonaventure University in Olean.

A devoted family man, Supervisor Keysa is survived by his wife, the former Louise Siemon; three sons, 1st Lt. Stanley Jay Keysa, Jr., Fort Eustice, Va.; James S. and Thomas P.; a daughter, Miss Mary L. Keysa, all at home; his

mother, Mrs. Helen S. Morrow of Lancaster; a brother, Joseph F. of San Francisco; a sister, Mrs. Helen S. Regan of Washington, D.C.; a half-brother, Edward Morrow, and a half-sister, Mrs. Lucia Quackenbush, both of Buffalo.

Mr. Speaker, I account Stan Keysa's death as a great personal loss. My wife and I were extremely fond of Supervisor Keysa and his entire family. To me he embodied all the finest qualities a public officeholder should possess. He was a man of great warmth and yet of great dignity. His integrity was absolutely unquestioned. He was intelligent and never lost his youthful idealism. He was devoted to the people who elected him. While a tall man, he possessed stature in many other ways. He was a man of whom it truly could be said that people looked up to. Unfortunately, the world possesses too few Stanley Keysas.

Let us hope that his example will inspire other young men to follow his lead and his example for indeed he was a model of excellence.

Under his leadership, the Lancaster town government developed into a very model of honest, forward-looking and progressive local government.

MESKILL HAILS GOP JOB-TRAINING PROPOSALS

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, the House is to be commended for extending and improving the manpower development and training program. This has proven to be one of the most useful and effective programs ever devised for training young men to qualify for work in modern industry.

I am proud of the contributions made by the Republican Party over the years to the basic form of the program and to improvements made in it on the basis of operating experience.

I would like to take this opportunity to urge support for the Republican-sponsored Human Investment Act of which I am a cosponsor. This would be a great help to industry, especially smaller companies in smaller communities in training poor youths to work at good jobs.

In each case, these programs are designed to harness the tremendous resources of private industry and to emphasize the worth of every individual.

Since the first enactment of the manpower development and training program, steady improvements have been made. We realize that more than just jobs is involved. It is just as frustrating and wasteful to put a man in a job for which he is not trained as it is to train him for a job which does not exist.

The new MDTA legislation reflects this realization. More funds are provided for training of the specialized staff which is needed to get the most from the program.

From the inception of this program, Republicans have shown a deep com-

prehension of the practical problems involved in the massive effort to upgrade and improve the poor. Our Human Investment Act reflects our concern and deserves the support of thoughtful citizens.

COURAGEOUS AND TIMELY RESCUE
SAVES A DEAR FRIEND

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, very few of us ever stand on death's doorstep and live to tell about it. This has been a sad year through the loss of several Members in this House.

One close friend and colleague has walked that narrow line last month. RICHARD L. ROUBEUSH of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District is now recuperating from injuries suffered in a plane crash in Riverview Hospital in Noblesville, Ind.

I am sure he would be the last one to talk of his own personal courage following the crash of an airplane in Georgia last month. But his own courage is apparent from a newsletter he has sent to his constituents. His words speak of a group of young college students who rescued him, his wife, and companions but if you read them closely those words point out the courage of a man whose thoughts are not for himself but for those who are close to him.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share this newsletter with my colleagues and I know that you join with me in wishing our friend and colleague, RICHARD ROUBEUSH, a quick return to our Chambers:

ANGEL ON OUR WINGTIP

LA GRANGE, Ga.—The newsletter this week originates from my hospital bed in southern Georgia.

Our small plane crashed in the hilly Georgia pine country during a return trip to Indiana from the Republican National Convention in Miami.

Flying has become routine, but I have always been uneasy in an airplane. My work in Congress, however, has required a great amount of travel by plane.

Often during the past eight years on my scores of air trips between Washington and Indianapolis, I have thought about the possibility of a crash.

I'm sure this occurs to other people who must travel frequently by plane.

It was an incredible experience. We were having difficulty finding our fueling destination at Pine Mountain. There was ground haze and air turbulence, and the landing strip was difficult to see in the heavily wooded hills.

As we were making our approach the plane suddenly seemed to "drop" and nosed toward the trees.

I will never forget the sight of those tree tops rushing up at us. When I shut my eyes I can still see those trees hurtling toward our plane.

Then we hit the trees. The impact at air speed was terrific. The only way I can describe it would be like crashing a car head-on into a brick wall.

I was still conscious when we hit the ground. Sitting next to the door, I tried to force it open with my shoulder, but it was jammed.

I saw flames licking back along the fuselage.

Despite the pain in my left leg and arm, I realized that if we didn't get out we would be burned to death.

But, the door wouldn't budge. About that time I saw a big, muscular young man running toward the plane.

He wrenched the door open and I fell out through the opening. The young man and his companions dragged me away from the flames and then got all of the passengers out before the cabin burned up within minutes.

It was 18 miles to the nearest hospital over bumpy roads and we were placed in the back of a pick-up truck for the trip.

We will remember that journey for awhile, but we made it safely to the hospital at La Grange.

There must have been an angel on our wingtip that day over Georgia because we all survived—including my dear wife, Marge; our good friends and neighbors, Ken and Velma Biddle; their daughter, Mary Frances, and the Biddle's foreign guest, Mrs. Yolanda Bajo from Brazil, who was coming to Indiana for a visit.

We learned later that the nine young men who saved us from the burning plane were college students from Florida working on a construction job at a new golf course next to the airport we were trying to reach.

They later paid us a visit at the hospital. They had seen our plane crash into the trees, catch fire, and plummet into a pine thicket at the edge of a fairway. They were 350 yards away, but raced to the plane quick enough to save us.

We owe our lives to these young men who risked their lives by entering a burning plane which might have exploded. Even after we were all out, one of them plunged back into the cabin and made a search to be sure no one was left.

Sudden injury and death are ever-present in our modern-day life, but so are the old virtues of courage, selflessness and bravery.

I am looking forward to returning back home to Indiana as soon as possible and the doctor promises me that I can travel to Noblesville around Labor Day.

EDGE OF BITTERNESS SHOULD BE "MELTED"

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see the editorial entitled "Edge of Bitterness Should Be 'Melted,'" which appeared in the Bristol Herald Courier on Friday, September 6, 1968.

I feel that our law-enforcement officers are to be commended for their outstanding efforts in striving to maintain law and order. They continually go beyond the call of duty to defend us, and we are so often inclined to take their great contribution for granted.

I have often said that the greatest danger in America today is the flagrant violation of law and order. This violence—this burning, this looting, this rioting, this murdering—must come to a halt.

I would like to share this editorial with the readers of the RECORD, as follows:

EDGE OF BITTERNESS SHOULD BE "MELTED"

The policeman is only a man, but whether he likes it or not, he is also a symbol.

As the agent of society, charged with the frontline duty of preserving the law and order without which no society can exist, he is for many Negroes and other minority group members the only representative of "the establishment" they have much contact with.

Justly or unjustly, he is to them the visible symbol of all those complicated forces and attitudes that have kept the Negro from equal participation in society at large. And to the policeman, the Negro, justly or unjustly, too often appears as the visible symbol of that which society at large must be protected against.

According to two University of Denver scientists, who made a study of police-minority group hostility under a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity, the best hope of ending this mutual hostility lies in upgrading the lives of the minority so that their basic attitudes undergo a change that will bring them closer to the mainstream of American life.

But while the burden of solving the problem does not fall on the police alone but requires a fundamental commitment and unflinching effort by all Americans, "if policemen themselves can demonstrate a capacity for sympathy, understanding and impartiality," say the professors, "they may begin to melt the edge of minority bitterness toward majority society."

Representing the majority community as they do, the police are in a unique position to change the attitudes of the minority for the better. To do that requires that they practice tolerance, understanding and respect for all citizens of whatever station.

It would also help if we would stop considering the cop on the beat the lowest and least important man on the force and begin paying him what he is worth, or what he ought to be worth.

There must be understanding and respect and an appreciation of the requirements of an ordered society from the other side as well. To engender this understanding on the part of the minority requires that they be given hope—hope based on convincing evidence that real progress is being made toward the day when they are full-fledged members of society.

The policeman's lot is not an easy one, and never was this truer than in our time. To "melt the edge" of the bitterness that could tear America apart is a large order, but if he can do it—and only he can do it—the man in blue will have made an indispensable contribution to the building of the kind of society all of us want.

THE AVC COMMENTS ON VETERANS AFFAIRS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in its convention in South Fallsburg, N.Y., on June 28-30, the American Veterans Committee adopted a platform that expresses the well-reasoned liberal thinking of this progressive veterans' group. At this time I would like to commend the AVC for its excellent work in encouraging fair and responsible treatment of veterans and insert the veterans and Armed Forces affairs section of their platform in the RECORD:

VETERANS AND ARMED FORCES AFFAIRS

The American Veterans Committee has constantly reiterated, since its founding, its fundamental belief that rehabilitation and integration of veterans into the community is the proper scope and purpose of a veterans program. The achievement of economic security for veterans through sound economic planning for all citizens rather than through special grants or favors to veterans is basic AVC policy.

1. COMPENSATION

For many years, AVC has pointed out the need for a thorough review and reappraisal of this Nation's policies on veterans as follows:

1. We oppose bonuses and general pensions as being class legislation and unrelated to the real needs of individual veterans and tending to set veterans apart from their fellow citizens.

In the matter of benefits, two basic standards should be applied.

a) For death or disability incurred in military service: Are the benefits sufficient to provide a decent standard of living for the veteran, his family or survivors?

b) For all veterans: Are the benefits so designed as to enable a readjustment from military service to civilian life with a minimum economic loss?

Since benefits are a Federal responsibility, uniform standards of administration and compensation should be applied nationally without regard to race, creed, color, sex, or national origin.

2. DRAFT

AVC recognizes the necessity for the United States to maintain adequate military forces in present world circumstances. It also recognizes the citizen's obligation to military service and recognizes a selective service system as an appropriate mode of raising military manpower. We object, however, to the inequalities of the draft system as presently administered, especially the deferment of students, the lack of uniform guidelines and the lack of fair representation of the citizenry, especially for minority groups, on the draft boards.

3. RESERVE PROGRAMS

The world we live in, with its emphasis on speed of operation and technical superiority, demands standing Armed Forces of sufficient size, training and equipment and organization to be effective immediately for defense and counter attack. It is apparent that the Regular Armed Forces must remain our first line of defense. They must be of sufficient size and mobility for deployment anywhere on the globe within a minimum of time so that we may continue to provide, when necessary, those forces needed for collective security under our international obligation in peripheral conflicts occurring in the strategic localities of the world.

AVC believes that any reserve program, present and future, which does not completely revoke segregation in the Armed Forces is incompatible with democratic ideals and frustrates the moral fiber of our society. It is essential for the future security of this nation that our manpower resources be used for the defense of our way of life without regard to regional prejudices.

AVC maintains that insofar as national defense is concerned, the National Guard is a military anachronism. It should be eliminated from the Federal military structure. In the meantime, we believe that federal funds not be allocated for the National Guard of any State where said National Guard still permits a policy of segregation of units or where a state refuses to integrate its National Guard because of color or national origin.

We believe that reservists should not suffer loss of job rights and privileges and em-

ployment opportunities because of their participation in reserve training.

AVC is opposed to any policy whereby the Armed Forces award discharges other than honorable to reserve personnel based upon the political or other activities in which these individuals may participate following separation from active service under the draft.

We believe that the conditions of discharge should be based solely upon the military activity and efficiency of the reservists.

4. BENEFIT DOLLAR

AVC believes that provision should be made to maintain automatically the purchasing power of the benefit dollar and upward adjustments be made annually in accordance with the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Price Index.

5. CIVIL SERVICE

AVC believes that veterans point preference in the civil service be limited to the initial appointment only, and that no person should receive a position unless fully qualified to perform the duties involved.

We oppose the principle of granting absolute preference to veterans in state and local civil service.

6. G.I. BILL

AVC applauds the passage of a permanent G.I. Bill of Rights as a responsible means of enabling servicemen and women to return to civilian life with facility and ease at the end of their service and become useful and productive members of their communities.

However, we urge the Congress to adjust the benefits more in line with the World War II and Korean G.I. Bills and the current cost of living so that the programs may be used by veterans without the financial stress they now entail. The G.I. Bill of Right should be administered in such manner as to guarantee the absence of discrimination.

7. VA HOSPITALIZATION

AVC urges that treatment of non-service-connected disabilities in VA hospitals be continued on a space-available basis, but that such treatment be charged at the full cost, if a patient has the means to pay for such service; certificates that a veteran is unable to pay should be investigated thoroughly to determine the true ability to meet the cost of hospitalization. Further that terms of coverage of all prepaid medical associations, plans and companies be amended by action of the legislatures, supervisory bodies or membership, so as to provide payment to VA hospitals for non-service-connected treatment on the same basis as payment to private voluntary and public hospitals.

8. UNIFICATION

AVC notes with satisfaction that the process of unification of the Armed Forces has been making progress. AVC commends the actions, hitherto taken in this regard and urges that the Department of Defense continue these efforts vigorously.

9. DISCRIMINATION—FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC

We maintain that no assignment of any military personnel should be made whether within the United States or overseas, for consideration on grounds of color, religion, ancestry or national origin.

Our goal is to insure that no member or employee of the Armed Forces, and no dependents of such persons shall be subjected to discriminatory treatment, on or off base within the United States or outside the United States, on the grounds of color, religion, ancestry or national origin, and that the power, including the economic power, of the United States be consciously used to further this objective.

10. INFORMATION SERVICE

We owe the men of our armed services the best possible training to equip them for the

rigors of modern combat under the most adverse conditions of weather, terrain, supply and enemy action. We further believe that an orientation program be instituted in order to acquaint the prospective draftee, at the time of registration, with the rights, privileges, benefits and special training he and his family will be entitled to if and when he is inducted into the Armed Services.

11. JURISDICTION OVER EX-SERVICEMEN AND CIVILIANS ACCOMPANYING THE ARMED FORCES OVERSEAS

We believe that the ex-servicemen, military dependents, and civilians accompanying the armed forces abroad should not escape punishment for serious offenses committed while in such status, but should be tried before civilian courts. By serious offenses we mean crimes of the same degree of seriousness as felonies at common law.

12. AWARDS AND BENEFITS

All laws of the United States pertaining to the granting of military medals or decorations, military disability retirement or compensation, dependents and survivors benefits, veterans benefits (including benefits to dependents or survivors), or other special benefits to military personnel or their dependents on the basis of wartime service of such military personnel shall apply in like manner to service performed in such areas and during such periods as proclaimed by the President where combat or combat conditions exist and the United States forces to which such person is attached are either engaged in the combat, engaged in military operations designed to carry out any treaty or other international obligation of the United States.

13. EXPEDITIOUS NATURALIZATION OF SERVICE PERSONNEL AND DEPENDENTS

AVC believes that any man who assumes the risks and responsibilities of entry into the Armed Forces, whether in wartime or time of peace, should be entitled to citizenship.

AVC therefore urges the enactment of legislation which provides in substance that:

Any person regardless of age who is serving, served, or hereafter serves honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States may be naturalized, irrespective of how he entered the United States. No period of residence within the United States shall be required; no residence within the jurisdiction of the naturalization court; the petitioner shall not be required to speak the English language, sign his petition in his own handwriting, or meet any educational tests; no fee shall be charged or collected for making, filing or docketing the petition for naturalization, or for final hearing thereon, or for the certificate of naturalization, if issued.

Since some aliens who enter the Armed Services are sent overseas before the naturalization processing can be completed, even though no prior period of residence may be required, AVC urges that, following the precedent set in former Section 702 of the Nationality Act of 1940, provision be made for such a person to be naturalized while outside the United States.

AVC further urges the Amendment of Section 319(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act which shortens the residence requirement for aliens married to citizens from 5 to 3 years be deemed met even if the spouse dies while in active service or from service causes or because of the absence of the spouse from the United States or the state by reason of military service.

RESOLUTION—REPORT OF U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON VETERANS BENEFITS

AVC's view has always been that military service is an obligation of citizenship. It should not automatically entitle all ex-servicemen to a lifetime of governmental largesse.

AVC regrets that upon examination of the Report of the U.S. Veterans Commission on the Veterans Benefits System it is compelled to reject it—despite some few worthwhile points—because it basically reiterates the position of the professional veterans that the simple act of service in the armed forces is sufficient to endow veterans with a permanent position as a privileged class in the nation.

AVC recognizes and supports the justifiable claims of aid and rehabilitation on the part of those veterans whose service-connected disabilities have placed them at a disadvantage.

Veterans without service-connected disabilities should, upon demobilization, be eligible for benefits under a broad G.I. Bill of Rights. In deference to their lost time, interruption of education and careers and their special contribution to their nation's welfare, these veterans should receive rehabilitation benefits that would reduce their sacrifices to a minimum and enable them to resume their places in society as quickly as possible.

AVC notes with disfavor that the Commission's report seeks to increase the scope of benefits for all veterans and considers this philosophy as decidedly detrimental to the total citizenry. If a privileged social class of veterans is not to be superimposed upon our nation, the needs of those veterans who may have special problems should be integrated with those civilians with like problems and handled by the new programs designed for all citizens which are being developed and implemented.

Because of the very strong reservations which AVC holds in regard to the tone and recommendations of the Commission's report, it strongly urges that said report not be implemented. Instead, AVC calls for the setting up of a permanent "Board of Review of Veterans Affairs." This Board should not be made up of people supporting the existing system and should not repeat the mistakes which have characterized earlier efforts in this area; for this reason it should be composed of people dedicated to the broad public interest, responsible for reporting only to the President and charged with a continuing searching evaluation.

THE REWARDS OF PIRACY, CHAPTER III, OR: HOW THE FOGGY THINKERS AT FOGGY BOTTOM CAN FOG UP AN ISSUE

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the State Department would have us believe that the \$5.3 million World Bank loan for building up the Ecuadorean fishing industry will somehow redound to the benefit of U.S. entrepreneurs.

Hints that U.S. canners and shipbuilders will share Ecuador's undeserved prosperity are found midway through the remarkable briefing paper intended by the Department to justify the loan.

The paper, reproduced on page 26258 of the RECORD for yesterday, September 10, points out that "U.S. firms will be free to submit bids" on the 12 seiners Ecuador will build with the loan.

I, for one, wonder just how many of these contracts U.S. yards are going to win against the cutrate competition of shipbuilders in Japan and other countries with minimal labor costs.

I also wonder what assurances the State Department can give to support the implication that U.S.-owned canneries will get a piece of the processing action generated by the new Ecuadorean boats.

If anything, I suspect that the effects of Ecuador's new capability on our own canning industry will be strictly negative. In all likelihood additional processing plants will be required by Ecuador. But whether they are built with Ecuadorean, United States, or other foreign capital, the net result will be the same: some loss of jobs for U.S. cannery workers simply because the Ecuadoreans will be taking fish and diverting business that otherwise would have gone to the United States.

This raises another point, which the State Department failed to touch on at all in the briefing paper: What about our own fishermen, who for years have been giving way in an unequal struggle with heavily subsidized foreign competition?

Most obviously, they will be hurt. Besides coping with the Ecuadorian gunboats, our crews will now be confronted, on the high seas, by a jazzed-up Ecuadorian tuna fleet, underwritten to a large extent by their own U.S. Government. And, of course, the loan also provides for the training of personnel to operate the 90-foot seiners with which Ecuador hopes to sweep the southern seas of yellowfin tuna.

Our own fishermen, understandably, wish they had it so good.

But they are also realists, and they know from experience that our State Department, in its zeal to accommodate the Ecuadorians of this world, is apt to overlook their interests.

And as Ecuador reaps more and more of the yellowfin harvest, the unit costs to our fleet can be expected to rise. Ultimately, increased costs forced by Ecuadorian competition would have to be borne by the U.S. consumer, a thought that does not seem to have occurred to the State Department.

As the World Bank has noted, the \$5.3 million loan will enable Ecuador to more than double its tuna catch.

In fact, the loan covers just about everything except processing plants. If they are needed, and the necessary investment money is lacking, maybe the State Department's own Agency for International Development could arrange financing to take care of that problem.

Mr. Speaker, our friends in the tuna fleet have become accustomed to fishing in troubled waters. But I believe this is the first time they have been scuttled by their own Government.

THE "PUEBLO"—HOW LONG,
MR. PRESIDENT?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 233d day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON TALKS
STRAIGHT TO THE LEGION

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States delivered a splendid address yesterday in an appearance before the American Legion National Convention in New Orleans.

President Johnson is talking straight to the American people on the critically important issue of Vietnam and he was given a standing ovation by the Legionnaires, who understand better than many groups the nature of the struggle for freedom and appreciate straight talk from the Commander in Chief.

I believe both the American people and the Members of the Congress will find the text of the President's speech both informative and inspiring.

The complete text follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE 50TH ANNUAL AMERICAN LEGION NATIONAL CONVENTION, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. Chairman, Commander Galbraith, Senator Ellender, Congressman Teague, distinguished members of the American Legion and Ladies Auxiliary, my fellow Americans:

I am deeply touched and very grateful for your thoughtfulness and for the presentation of this award, on behalf of the men who have demonstrated their love of country.

Today, I have come here to your convention to speak to you in a keynote talk about world peace—about your President's efforts to achieve it—the progress we have made—as well as the tasks that lie ahead.

It was 50 years ago, this very month that the eyes of the world were turned on the efforts of the American doughboys to reach a railroad running across France, which happened to be the main supply line, at that time, of the German Army.

I remember then, as a 10-year-old boy, how we followed the news of the Meuse-Argonne offensive in that fall of the year 1918.

Some of you in this room no doubt fought through the battle.

Some of you were there, two months later, when the first world war in history was brought to an end.

Now we know how brief the illusion of peace was, on that Armistice Day a half-century ago. In the course of five stormy decades, we have learned how carefully peace must be built in a complex and dangerous world—as well as how well peace must be guarded.

World War I had been ignited by a very small flame in the Balkans. That was our first lesson. Others followed in rapid profusion:

We saw depressions leap continents. We saw democracy weakened and break under their weight.

We witnessed the rise of dictators and watched aggressors stalk across borders.

We fought through the Second World War which came in the wake of their bootmarks—and before the dust of war had really settled, we saw the rise of a new aggression.

We beheld the dawn of the nuclear age. We saw the birth of new nations, and the death of old colonialism.

And from a dozen different parts of the globe, we heard the long pent-up cry for food and land and a new day of hope and dignity.

These are the conditions and developments of our turbulent times. Around them,

America has constructed a policy to try to promote peace in the world.

That policy did not begin in my Administration. That has been our policy for more than 20 years in the making. It was shaped in a bipartisan spirit, by Republicans and Democrats.

It has been followed by four different American Presidents.

I have built upon it. I have strengthened it when I could. I have modified it where I needed to, to meet the changing demands of the changing years. But we have always held to four essential imperatives.

The first imperative—constant from President Truman's day to mine, is this: The United States of America must remain the strongest nation in all the world.

I have tried to take steps, even small ones, that would move us toward more normal relations with the Soviet Union and other Communist countries.

We shall continue that progress in every honorable way that is open to us. World safety demands that the two greatest powers on earth reduce—if they possibly can—the tensions that have held mankind in mortal bondage for more than a generation.

But I have always, also, been deeply aware—and I have constantly and steadily warned—that many dangerous and unresolved problems face us.

Some, however, concluded that changes of such magnitude were taking place in the Communist world that we could relax our vigilance, trusting that the Communists wanted the same kind of world that we Americans wanted.

Today, the events in Eastern Europe make it clear—and make it clear with the force of steel—that we are still a long way—a long way—from the peaceful world that we Americans all wish to see.

The message out of Czechoslovakia is plain: The independence of nations and the liberty of men are today still under challenge. The free parts of the world will survive only if they are capable of maintaining their strength and capable of maintaining and building their unity.

Peace remains our objective. But we shall never achieve it by wishful thinking, nor by disunity, nor by weakness.

The second imperative of our policy for peace is that we must meet our commitments and keep our promises to use our strength in the face of common danger to oppose aggression.

Self-interest has always been—and must always be—at the root of every action which commits the lives of American men.

When we entered the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO, we did so because the threat of a Communist takeover of Europe was real, and because we knew that America's security was linked to the security of Western Europe.

If its human and material resources in Europe were to fall into hostile hands, then the balance of world power would be against America. We would have to become a bristling defensive fortress here at home, organized against an enormous, dangerous threat. We would have to live under conditions that are drastically different from any conditions that we have ever known.

So that is why America helped formulate, organize and joined the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. And that is why we are a strong part of that organization today.

When we fought to keep aggression from swallowing up South Korea, it was President Harry S. Truman who defined the self-interest that impelled our stand. Unchallenged aggression, President Truman said, "would mean a third world war, just as similar incidents had brought on the second world war."

When President Eisenhower sent troops into Lebanon, it was to keep a situation from developing which could trigger in the Middle East, and then could draw us in.

When President Eisenhower committed us to the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, and he submitted it to our United States Senate during the Eisenhower Administration, it was voted and ratified there by a vote of 82 to 1. It was because President Eisenhower saw Southeast Asia as the key to political equilibrium in the Orient, vitally affecting America's future.

When President Kennedy brought in additional troops to Berlin in 1961, it was because America's self-interest demanded that we stand behind our pledge and our commitment to keep West Berlin free.

When President Kennedy put our forces on alert during the Cuban missile crisis the following year, it was because Soviet missiles in the Western Hemisphere jeopardized American security.

When the first American soldiers went into South Vietnam in the early 1960's, it was because this Nation saw that if the Communist aggression there succeeded, the entire region of Southeast Asia would be in mortal danger, and the threat of world war would be more ominous.

We have heard many voices raised in opposition to this stand. Indeed, I have sought some of these voices out. For, as your President, I assure you in these long days and nights for more than five years now, we have searched every avenue of thought and opinion on this issue that so troubles all of our people today.

But after investigating carefully every possible course of action, I always come back to that warning of President Harry S. Truman about how unchallenged aggression could lead to another world war.

Inevitably, I always come back to that judgment of General Dwight D. Eisenhower, who said that if South Vietnam were captured by the Communists, "The freedom of 12 million people would be lost immediately, and that of 150 million others in adjacent lands would be seriously endangered. The loss of South Vietnam," President Eisenhower said, "would set in motion a crumbling progress that could, as it progressed, have grave consequences for us and for freedom."

I always come back to these words, not of President Truman or President Eisenhower, but the late, beloved John Fitzgerald Kennedy, when he said: "For us to withdraw from the effort in Vietnam would mean a collapse not only of South Vietnam, but Southeast Asia. So we are going to stay there."

The judgments of these three former Presidents, as mine has been, were formed in positions of the gravest responsibility. After seeing, hearing, reading and studying all the evidence, their judgments were formed and were unshakable. The American Constitution obliges the President to make his judgment, as Commander in Chief, according to what he believes is in the best interest of all the American people.

And I have believed—as these three Presidents believed who went before me—that a Communist military takeover in South Vietnam would lead to developments that could imperil the security of the American people for generations to come.

I know very well the cost of our commitment. Every day and every night I mourn every man who has been lost or who has been wounded.

But a President, a President worthy of this title, if he is true to his trust, must think not only in terms of those who have fallen. He must think in terms of the casualties that might have been—or the dead who might be.

How many American lives would eventually have been lost if our forces had not stood in Europe in the late 1940's to block the aggression that threatened, at that time, to sweep the English Channel?

More than 34,000 American men fell in Korea, and hundreds of thousands more bear the wounds of Korean battle. But how many

more doughboys would have died if the aggressor had not been stopped there, and the war had spread to other parts of the world?

If we had not drawn the line against aggression in Vietnam, in keeping with the treaty that we signed, the SEATO obligations, and if the erosion of freedom had begun that President Eisenhower told you about when I quoted him a moment ago—some American President—some President—some day would have to draw the line somewhere else. And I ask you, at how much greater a cost? How many millions of young Americans would be lost in the larger war that would surely and inevitably come?

These are the sobering questions that no President and no Commander in Chief can escape.

From the very first, our objective in Vietnam has been to prevent the aggressor from taking that land by force.

We Americans have sought no advantage—except the advantage of peace. We have tried to fight a limited war—not to destroy an enemy, not to win a military victory, but to try in every way we knew how, as best we could, to protect our friends, remain true to our obligations, and win a peace in that part of the world.

We believed that to be very much in America's national interest then, and we believe it to be in America's national interest now.

On the night of March 31st, in a television address to this Nation, we launched a major new effort for peace. That was the latest of many.

We had already had eight bombing pauses. But on that night we announced that we would withdraw 90 percent of the population of Vietnam, almost 80 percent of the territory, from the area that our men were permitted to bomb.

As a result of that effort, our negotiating team would be willing to meet with the representatives of North Vietnam. The enemy suggested that we meet in Cambodia, and then he suggested that we meet in Poland. Against great odds and against the advice of some of our more eager people, we finally agreed not to meet in either of those places, but to meet in Paris. The wisdom of that decision, I think, is clear to almost any of you today.

We continue now to hope that something productive is going to come out of those meetings.

All we have heard so far is a demand that we do something else without their having responded to our first bombing restrictions.

Now let me make it as clear as I possibly can why we are still bombing and will continue to bomb the panhandle of North Vietnam—why re-establishing the DMZ, I think, is so critical to peace in Vietnam.

In the area just below the DMZ, we and our allies have some four divisions of men and the necessary people to support them, involving more than 60,000 Americans and one division of South Vietnamese. Just behind them in the rest of I Corps are an additional 164,000 American and Allied fighting men.

Those close to the DMZ are subjected daily to artillery fire and the direct movements of enemy forces across that DMZ against them. All those men in I Corps are constantly subjected to a massive flow of supplies and infiltrators, and rocket fire, through the panhandle to the northern part of the battlefield.

These are just hard, inescapable facts that a Commander in Chief must face up to and confront.

So what are our choices?

First, we could invade North Vietnam with our men. We could overrun their military positions. We could throttle the supply routes in North Vietnam itself. This we do not wish to do, although it should be clear that the North Vietnamese do wish to invade South Vietnam, and they are doing so—although they don't want to admit it.

Second, we could withdraw our forces. We could retreat and surrender on the installment plan, as some have suggested, by taking our men from below the DMZ, and turn over the I Corps area, that part of South Vietnam, to the North Vietnamese. This, I assure you, we shall not do.

If we cannot take our men in, and we are not going to take our men out, it appears to me, third, that the best thing we can do is to bring our planes to bear in the panhandle across the line against the artillery, the trucks and the rocket launchers that are being fired on our men, and to bring it to bear against the enemy trucks, the enemy troops, and the enemy supplies that are coming through. Every secondary explosion—and there were thousands there last month—means that that powder and that steel doesn't have to be brought back from South Vietnam by some American soldier in his body if it is stopped in North Vietnam.

We are today exacting a very substantial price from the enemy. It requires patience of all of us. But we are limiting his capacity to bring weight against our forces and our allies. There is not the slightest doubt that if we should stop the bombing in the panhandle, the military capacity of the enemy to hurt our forces would greatly increase, and our casualties would skyrocket.

Just a few days ago, I went to the field with a cable and asked the commander of our troops in South Vietnam, one of the ablest commanders ever to wear a uniform, General Abrams, to give me his viewpoint on what would happen if I should order him to carry out the suggestion that had been made by some of our enemies abroad and some of our friends at home to stop the bombing.

His reply was simply this: If you should require me to stop the bombing of North Vietnam, you would permit the enemy to increase his capability several fold in 10 days, and if he did, I would be forced to withdraw our men from that area because they could no longer stand their ground.

I am not going to issue any order like that.

General Abrams, and not a single field commander we have, has made that recommendation to me. I am not a prophet or a speculator, but I do prophesy that some of these men who recommend it now would not do so if they were there on the DMZ, and could see there what our men face every day and face every night.

Therefore, the Commander in Chief has insisted that the bombing will not stop until we are confident that it will not lead to an increase in American casualties. That is why we have placed such emphasis on re-establishing the DMZ.

We yearn for the day when the violence subsides. We yearn for the day when our men can come home. No man can predict when that day will come, because we are there to bring an honorable, stable peace to Southeast Asia, and no less will justify the sacrifices that our men have died for.

But President Thieu of Vietnam stated his intention at Honolulu—"to continue to assume all the responsibility that the scale of the forces of South Vietnam and their equipment will permit, while preparing the Vietnamese nation and armed forces for the important and decisive role that will be theirs in the coming stages of the struggle." Every report I receive from Saigon reports that the gallant, determined people of South Vietnam are acting in accordance with that statement.

The third imperative of our program to promote peace in the world, like the other two I have stated, is our effort to assist other countries to improve their economies. A man's home, however grand it is, is not secure if it stands on a street of crumbling slums, where people are hungry and in despair.

Whatever that man does to build up his neighborhood is an investment in his own security. This is the principle which has

been the base of our programs. It is here that the quiet work has progressed. This is slow work and stubborn work. But from South Korea to Turkey—from Taiwan to Iran—from Pakistan to Tunisia—there are many success stories in which Americans can share the great pride of accomplishment.

Let me tell you, briefly, what has been happening in just one area in our Hemisphere, in Latin America, in the last few years. With our help, a great struggle has been taking place to overcome hunger and ignorance. These are the victories:

The average per capita growth has more than doubled.

Forty-three million acres of land have been distributed to almost 400,000 families.

Food production has increased 14 percent, and manufacturing production has gone up 23 percent.

There are 340,000 new schools, and 7 million more children getting an education today.

Infant mortality has dropped 14 percent.

The growth of confidence, the birth of hope, have changed history around the globe. And this is the kind of change which helps us to build peace.

We have always hoped and believed that as our friends and allies grew in strength, our burden would grow less lonely. We have been moving over the last few years toward a long-term position in which the United States would be able to assume its responsibility in enterprises of common concern, but our partners would be able to assume theirs.

This progress, too, is often hard to see. But it is there. In Asia, six Pacific Allies are fighting beside us in South Vietnam. By far, the greatest burden in that struggle—contrary to what is often said—is carried not by these allies, but carried by the South Vietnamese themselves. Since the beginning of the current offensive in mid-August of this year, they have suffered almost 50 percent more casualties than we Americans have suffered.

By the end of this year, the South Vietnamese will have 1,000,000 men under arms—1,000,000. 993,000, to be exact; 7,000 short of a million. That is out of a nation of 17 million. We have there 550,000, not a million, out of a nation of 200 million. But they have one million men under arms out of a nation of 17 million, and they don't control all of that 17 million.

The equivalent figure, in terms of population, if we had as high a percentage of our people at the front as they have, instead of having 500,000, we would have 12 million.

So this is a rather remarkable effort by a hard-pressed, small nation that is fighting and dying for liberty that you don't always hear very much about.

The contribution of our NATO partners offers another example of partnership. U.S. forces are one-eighth of the ground forces in NATO Europe. But they are a critical element in the balance, because they—and their nuclear weapons that are there with them—supply the shield which enables our allies to provide increasingly for the defense of Western Europe.

We have a right to expect Europe to do more—and we might as well say that plainly and frankly. We have a right to expect them to do more in their own defense.

The world of free men and independent nations is weakened by European isolationism and disunity—as it was once weakened by an isolationist America that it took President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill a long time to wake up.

We must look to the further enlargement of Europe's assumption of responsibility of their own in the future. In monetary affairs, in trade negotiations, in emergency food problems—across Asia and Europe and Latin America—the shift to partnership effort has already, I assure you, been substantial. Our relative burdens, as the years go by, become lighter.

I believe the day will soon come—which we have been building toward for 20 years—when some American President will be able to say to the American people that the United States is assuming its fair share of responsibility for promoting peace and progress in the world, but the United States is assuming no more and no less than its fair share.

While we can reduce our responsibilities, we must all be cautious enough never to allow anyone to persuade us to neglect them. In the 1960's, I warn you there just must be no return to the isolationism of the 1930's that brought on World War II.

I warn you that the voice of isolationism is becoming strident once again in some of the places that we heard this same isolationist voice a generation ago. Some of it is in Congress. Some of it is on the campuses. Some of it is on the farms. Some of it is on the streets.

We say, "Why should we be bothered with the problems across the sea?" We might say we don't need to be bothered with smallpox in the next block, but the facts of life are, if it is in the next block, we have to watch it and help stamp it out before it gets to our house.

The fourth imperative for peace is that we use our influence, however we can, to keep trouble from erupting into an all-out war—or to keep wars themselves from spreading. Through the United Nations, through the Organization of American States, and sometimes, but rarely, alone, we have already helped to dampen the fires of many potential conflicts in the last 10 years.

America shouldered arms half a century ago, "to make the world safe for democracy." Later it became quite fashionable to deride that slogan. For it seemed to belong to a simpler time, a time that was uncomplicated by a shrinkng globe, and the new face of aggression, and the restlessness of emerging nations.

But I wonder today, looking back, if the derision did not come too soon. Democracy has had its times of frustration, it is true. Democracy has even had its times of failure. We know it is the best—but we also know it is the most difficult—way for men to organize their own affairs.

Today, vast reaches of this world have become safe for democracy. There is something deep in the human spirit which, in the end, demands government as a result of the consent of those governed.

Democracy is showing the strength which prophets 30 years ago did not believe it could show. We are not evangelizing democracy around the world. We are content to let every people choose their own path for development. But we are working to promote peace. And as it happens, peace is the only environment in which democracy can actually grow and thrive.

In conclusion, I would remind every loyal son of the Legion, the men who have worn the uniform of this country and have carried old glory to every corner of the world, and brought her back without a stain on it: I would warn you, peace lovers, those men who love peace more than you love men, but are willing to defend freedom with your own life, that the ingredients of peace are these: strength, conviction, principle, compassion, constancy, patience, and, above all, my fellow Legionnaires, courage.

Treaties—treaties—yes, we have hundreds of them. Meaningful treaties are not hammered out by cowards who are afraid to stand up for what is right when the going is tough, or afraid to die for freedom when they are required to do so.

This afternoon I appeal to you to support your country, to support your fighting men, to support peace by maintaining strength in this country; by refusing, always, to bow to the demands of the moment; by refusing, always, to sacrifice principle and the things we

hold dear; by standing as firm at home as you expect your sons to stand abroad, and ask yourself if you are doing it.

If you do this, then I think history will say that we caught up with the promise of Pershing's doughboys. I can think of no finer judgment to be made on you, or on me, or on our time, or on the America that we all love.

Thank you very much.

PENNSYLVANIA OFFICER SHOT IN VIETNAM

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

MR. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I include the following article taken from the Philadelphia, Pa., Evening Bulletin in the RECORD:

PENNSYLVANIA OFFICER SHOT IN BATTLE, FIGHTS 5 HOURS

(By Paul F. Levy)

SAIGON.—Alpha Company, with 58 men and nine armored personnel carriers, moved slowly down the quiet street on the outskirts of Saigon.

"We know the Viet Cong are in there," 1st Lt. Merrill Sharpe, 22, of Windber, Pa., explained as he moved alongside the lead vehicle.

"The question is where?"

Forty seconds later, Alpha Company found out.

The Viet Cong, well fortified in a factory and a dozen buildings at the end of the street, opened up with B-40 rockets, AK-47 machine guns and rocket grenades.

SHARPE IS HIT

Fragments from the first round caught Sharpe in the chest, dropping him to the ground.

A B-40 rocket, capable of puncturing 11-inches of steel, stopped an armored vehicle in its tracks in the middle of the street.

Several more men from Alpha Company were wounded as the street developed into a fierce battleground. Such scenes around Saigon have been common since the Viet Cong offensive began during the weekend.

Sharpe, a little guy with red hair and glasses who recently graduated from Pennsylvania State University and hopes to go back soon for a master's degree in English, pulled himself into the shadow of the lead vehicle and began directing the attack. Blood stained his flak jacket.

HE REFUSES TO LEAVE

For five hours yesterday, while the battle ebbed and flowed along the unnamed street in a shantytown less than a mile south of Saigon, Sharpe refused to be evacuated.

Finally, pulling himself inside the armored vehicle, Sharpe ordered the eight personnel carriers that hadn't been hit to pull back to the end of the street.

Once outside the range of fire, he pulled himself to the top of the carrier, plotted map coordinates and called for air strikes and artillery fire on the Viet Cong position.

Alpha Company wounded, including the two platoon leaders, who were second in command to Sharpe, were evacuated. But Sharpe still refused to go.

AIR STRIKES, ARTILLERY

Propping himself up against a hatch cover on the armored vehicle, he calmly directed the air strikes: First the helicopter gunships with their guns that fire 6,000-rounds a minute, then jet fighter bombers, and finally the artillery.

Then the company moved back down the street, cleaning out the Viet Cong from each house along the way. Now there was only scattered enemy fire.

After five hours, the battle was over. And Sharpe finally agreed to go to a hospital.

SILVER STAR CEREMONY

Tomorrow, in a bedside ceremony at a hospital near Tan San Nhut air base, he will be given the Silver Star—the nation's third highest tribute.

"But it is only an interim medal," Col. Eric Antila, of Sante Fe, N.M., explained. "I'm putting him in for the Distinguished Service Cross."

This is the second highest award. The highest is the Medal of Honor.

"If anyone deserves it, he does," Antila said. Yesterday, as Alpha Company, an armored unit attached to the 9th Infantry Division rested in an open field less than a mile from the battle scene, Sharpe was the only topic of conversation.

"When you listened to him over the radio," Antila recalled, "I didn't even believe he was wounded."

"But that was typical."

PENN STATE TRAINING

A quiet, thoughtful soldier, Sharpe had taken reserve officer's training at Penn State, then shipped out for Vietnam shortly after graduation.

For the past six months, he has been commander of Alpha Company.

"But he wanted to know more about the war than that," Col. Antila said.

"He was due to be relieved as C.O. (commanding officer) after six months in the field and I asked him what he wanted to be."

"He said he'd like to be S-5 (the civil affairs officer who works with the local people and the pacification program). It's a job we can't normally give away."

"He said he knew enough about the fighting side of the war, and now he wanted to know about the other side."

The "other side," however, would have to wait a few days.

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, along with the widespread demand for change in our national political convention system, there is also a great deal of concern for the abolition of the electoral college. Both of these steps are provided for in legislation sponsored by myself and others which is pending before the Committee on the Judiciary. An editorial which appeared on September 5 in the *Eccentric*, a newspaper published in Birmingham, Mich., a community in my congressional district, made a substantial contribution to the current debate on this matter. Under leave granted, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

A NEW WAY

The two national political conventions just concluded bear witness to the fact that our nation has outgrown its present method of electing its chief executive officer.

Apparently our forefathers, who wrote the Constitution, mistrusted the judgment of the electorate. They created a so-called electoral college to elect the president and provided that each state legislature should de-

cide how the presidential electors should be elected.

Nowhere in the Constitution can one find any indication of a desire on the part of these men that the people of the United States should select their own leaders, yet this is supposed to be a democracy.

The way it works today, not only are the people in most states not considered on who they want as their party's nominee, but the power in both political conventions rests in the hands of the losers of that party.

For example, in the Republican Convention the Southern delegates were instrumental in selecting the party's choice, although the south normally would not give its votes in November to the Republican nominee.

In the Democratic convention, the Michigan delegation gave most of its votes to Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey. But since state representation to each of the conventions is primarily based on the number of federal senators and representatives the state has, and since there are more federal Republican Senate and House members, in Michigan the majority of delegates were not representing the winners of their party.

There are many problems in changing the system, but these problems should not be used as an excuse for not changing.

If we are to have one-man, one-vote for our federal House or state legislature and even our county board of supervisors, the people should have the right to select their president.

It will take time to make the change. If action is not taken now, while the subject is deeply impressed upon our minds, it can be put off—and four years from now we will still be in the same boat.

The only democratic way to select a president is to have each party's choice voted upon by direct vote of the electorate.

This would eliminate any sleight-of-hand situation where a majority of voters in each state can give all the state's electoral votes to one man. Party hacks would not be able to select at a convention ruled by overzealous policemen a party nominee who never presented himself to the voters for their approval.

We are not trying to be overly dramatic. The winners of both conventions were not the people the polls showed to be the most popular men in their parties as far as the voters of the nation were concerned.

The direction that our chief of state takes will not be the direction that the majority of people want it to be until the majority of people are allowed to pick a captain.

OUR DEDICATED FIREFIGHTERS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in many parts of our country, including my congressional district, the important responsibility of firefighting is discharged by civic-minded volunteers imbued with a great sense of duty.

These men spend countless hours away from their families, take great personal risk, and commit themselves to a demanding yet vital job. They do this without pay; and they often do this without the public recognition they greatly deserve.

Recently, the *Oyster Bay Guardian*, an excellent weekly newspaper published in my district, printed an editorial entitled "The Forgotten Fireman." This editorial

pays appropriate tribute to the volunteer firemen in the community.

I believe this tribute should be extended to all the volunteer firefighters in all parts of the country. These men are constantly earning our appreciation, and I want to say a deep and lasting "Thank you" to all the volunteer firefighters in this Nation.

Because of the high regard I hold for these gentlemen, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the editorial from the *Oyster Bay Guardian* in the RECORD at this point:

THE FORGOTTEN FIREFMEN

From Bayville and Locust Valley to Oyster Bay and East Norwich to Syosset there are fire departments, all of them volunteer. As such, each man serves without pay, giving not only many hours each week, but also risking omnipresent danger to himself to protect our lives and property. We think it takes a very special kind of community-minded person to give so much and get so little in return.

We tend to take our fire departments for granted, and when we do mention them, it is often in disparaging terms that have been made stereotyped by lesser departments in other areas. But as more and more of us, in those terrible moments that we believe will never come, panic as we envision a fire in one room engulfing the whole house and then suddenly awoken to find only that room damaged and the rest of the house intact because of our firemen's efficiency, as more and more of us are allowed to live because of the speed with which a fire department ambulance driver gets up in the middle of the night and dashes us to the hospital, we begin to have kinder thoughts.

The entire area is blessed with competent, well-practiced departments. We have a friend in another state who sank his entire life savings into a new business, and when it caught fire several years later, the firemen arrived, disorganized and not versed enough in modern techniques to put out the particular type of fire. Every cent of his investment was lost.

But we have departments that practice several nights a week, departments that time again have proven that they were among the best in the state. Take a look at the years' worth of trophies at any of the firehouses—a tribute to their continued excellence. And the next time you're near a firehouse when the ominous whistle blows, stop for a minute—and that's about all you'll need—and observe how long it takes for the first firemen to arrive and put their trucks on the road.

A number of departments are engaged in fund-raising drives right now—they deserve all the financial support we can give them. But let's make it on a year-long basis, for the money doesn't go into anybody's political pockets, and the impact is felt within the community itself with even better facilities and equipment to serve us. Let's thank them now, and hope we never have to thank them after.

DEFINITELY UN-AMERICAN

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, deficit spending has almost become a way of life for most of the governments in this country. The Federal Government is always in the red, and there are few States, counties, cities, or towns that do not have to borrow money to operate.

Therefore, it is refreshing and encouraging to see one government that does not operate this way. One such city is Tallassee, Ala., which happens to be in my district. Mayor Lloyd Tippett has just been reelected there, and I am sure it was largely due to his financial philosophy. I would like at this point to insert an article from the September 9 edition of the Birmingham News which outlines the progress Tallassee has made without borrowing money and without raising taxes:

DEFINITELY UN-AMERICAN

(By Thomas F. Hill)

TALLASSEE.—If the House Un-American Activities Committee wanted to become active and do some probing, it could well start right here. . . .

For Tallassee Mayor Lloyd Tippett is making many statements these days that are definitely "un-American" as far as finances and municipal operation are concerned.

Tippett believes in keeping in the black. This simply isn't done these days. And the mayor doesn't believe in city taxes!

Definitely un-American!

Furthermore, he feels that his town should operate within its budget, pay cash for what it needs and give the citizens good, honest and efficient government.

This simply isn't being done these days.

Except in Tallassee.

Tippett, who also is violating the old political law that a good law-enforcement officer cannot make a good vote-getter, recently was re-elected to another term. Before serving his first term, he was police chief—and a good one, too.

Mayor Tippett isn't staying within his budget just by not doing anything. In fact, his administration shows many accomplishments.

During his administration, the city spent about \$200,000 for street, alley and sidewalk paving.

It appropriated \$55,000 for a youth and recreation program, which will result in a modern recreation center being erected.

It appropriated about \$75,000 for schools and made improvements at the airport.

In addition, the city paid off \$136, 030.88 in bonds and warrants it inherited.

Federal grants for a new sewage system have been obtained, and the mayor says that based on present revenues, the city will be able to pay its share of the cost without additional taxes.

Tallassee has no ad valorem tax, and has the cheapest sewer and garbage rates of almost any city in Alabama at \$1 per month each.

The city has purchased new equipment, hired additional policemen and completed projects.

"I have never bought a dime's worth of anything for the city on credit since I have been mayor," Tippett said. "And I never will. . . ."

This is your case, congressional committee. Get busy!

A NOBLE SOUL: GEORGE V. KENNEALLY

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that we note the passing of George V. Kenneally, the father of pro football in New England. George Kenneally was active in every

phase of this great American sport, from player to owner and coach. He started his career playing football for Boston Latin School. In 4 years at St. Bonaventure College he won 16 letters. During the twenties he played pro ball for Buffalo in the National Football League, Pottsville, Pa., and with the Cardinals.

In 1929, he and some friends bought a National Football League franchise; 1929 was not a good year for any business investment, but it began a great and lively interest in the Boston area for the rough game that was even rougher when George Kenneally played than it is today.

George played for that first team, the Boston Bulldogs—he also played for the Boston Shamrocks and the Boston Yanks. He played for the Philadelphia Eagles and was, in the words of Swede Nelson, "a truly great football player."

For the past 11 years, George Kenneally was head coach at Revere High School. He was also the line coach at Brandeis University.

Besides his great love for the sport and his great ability to participate in every level of the bruising, wonderful game, George Kenneally understood how much sports could do for youngsters. Every community he ever lived in was better for his having been there. He was loved by everyone, athletes, fans, and people who think pigskin is only for gloves.

He cared about people and they knew it. He was active in Boston politics, and "Gigi" Kenneally was as good an organizer off the field as he was on the field.

He was a great family man who brought his children up in a tradition of public service and love of life. My good friend, State Senator George V. Kenneally, Jr., is testimony to that fact.

Tim Horgan of the Boston Herald-Traveler, in an article on Wednesday, September 4, described George Kenneally as he was—a great athlete, a dedicated player and coach, and a wonderful man. I would like to share this excellent article with my colleagues:

A NOBLE SOUL: KENNEALLY HAD GREAT GRID CAREER

(By Tim Horgan)

When he was 37 years old he decided to quit playing and become the end coach of the Philadelphia Eagles. The reason, he told a friend, was because the Eagles had signed three of the best college ends in the country, three genuine All-Americans.

"I'd better quit before I'm fired," said George V. "Gigi" Kenneally, who'd been captain of the Eagles for five years.

The Eagles opened their season that year against the Giants, so Kenneally's friend went to New York and stopped by the dressing room before the game. There was Gigi, suiting up.

"What are you doing, Gidge?" asked the friend.

"I'm starting at left end," said Kenneally. "But what happened to your three All-Americans?"

"The Eagles decided I was better than the three of them," said Gigi, "so they cut the bums last night."

"He was a truly great football player," said Swede Nelson when he learned that his pal George Kenneally of Dorchester, out of South Boston, had died suddenly Tuesday at the age of 67.

"And a charming and funny man," added

Gerry Hern, the former Boston sports columnist now with Blue Cross-Blue Shield.

Kenneally's charm, wit and talent enabled him to meet all the people who made pro football the bonanza it is today—Jim Thorpe, Red Grange, Vince Lombardi, Jimmy Conzelman, Art Rooney, Bert Bell, Ernie Nevers, George Halas. . . . You name him and Gigi had played for, with or against him.

Or, maybe the guy had played for Kenneally. Gigi is the man who introduced pro football to Boston. He founded the city's first pro club, the Bulldogs, and while he certainly had the right idea, unfortunately he picked the wrong year. It was 1929, and when the stock market crashed, so did the Bulldogs.

Many citizens looked upon this as the one bright spot in the Depression, because pro football was not the darling of society in those days. One of the teams Kenneally had played for during his 16 years in the pros, for example, was the Pottsville, Pa. Maroons of the early NFL. Pottsville is coal mining country and on game day the miners would wash out their working clothes, unscrew the lamps from their caps and go out to be entertained. They wanted nothing fancy. Just plain mayhem.

Adding to the bloodshed was the fact the players bet on the games. "A man from each team would meet when the trains got in," Kenneally loved to recount, "and they'd bet each player's salary against another's. They'd bet the payrolls. Not every game, but quite a few of them were winner-take-all."

Kenneally, incidentally, was paid \$150 to \$200 per game, which isn't much today. But it looked very big to Gigi after the Bulldogs folded, so in 1930 the former entrepreneur suited up and played end for the Chicago Cardinals, opposite the immortal Ernie Nevers.

Kenneally didn't stop trying to bring pro football to Boston, however. In the early 1930's he formed another club, the Shamrocks, Joe McKenney of the Boston School Dept. recalls coaching a college all-star team that beat the Shamrocks by the margin of a conversion kick by young Vic Fusia of Manhattan College and now of UMass.

Kenneally promoted the first night football game at Fenway Park, and an indoor game in the Garden, which sold out. "A very imaginative guy," says Foxy Flumere, who coached with Gigi at Brandeis later on. "He was 25 years ahead of his time in everything he did."

But, Kenneally never caught up with the pro football boom. In 1939 he became head coach at Revere High and turned out teams so good that one of them once played Massillon, Ohio, the No. 1 football school in the country.

Gerry Hern recalls that Revere lost the game only after an official nullified a touchdown with an outrageously bad call. But after the defeat Kenneally told his squad, "Forget it, boys. We're going home tonight but that official has to live with these people the rest of his life. I don't blame him for making the call."

"A tough guy," said Swede Nelson of Gigi Kenneally, "and a noble soul."

WHAT'S WITH MR. WILLIAM F. BUCKLEY, JR.

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., who views everything from the right but perversely and invariably sees everything wrong, published a column entitled "What's With Mr. Fortas?" On this particular day Mr. Buckley, whose middle

years are graced with youthful exuberance, was exercised about a Supreme Court decision holding by a 5-to-4 vote with Mr. Justice Abe Fortas in the majority that a certain movie entitled "O-12" was not pornographic.

Mr. Buckley's elliptical prose pays no mind to the simple declarative sentence so that his thoughts are frequently obscured by his vagrant verbiage. However, as best as I can make it, "O-12" is a movie commonly shown at stag parties.

In any event, Bill Buckley did see the film under circumstances described by him as "under the impeccable auspices of the chief of the vice squad of Los Angeles." After viewing the film, Mr. Buckley whipped out his criteria for pornography determined that the film was "manifestly without redeeming social importance" and promptly decreed the film pornographic.

What particularly disturbs Mr. Buckley is that the Supreme Court decision makes "O-12" free again to flaunt her pudenda—at 25 cents for 3 minutes." By the same token, however, Mr. Buckley feels free to flaunt his pudenda regularly at 10 cents a throw for 2 minutes of viewing time. Yet I never considered that circumstance a cause for suppression of Mr. Buckley's column as an obscenity. Nor did I ever consider that Mr. Buckley would expose himself as a voyeur of such intensity that he would voyage the full breadth of our Nation just to take a peek.

Initially I thought that Mr. Buckley's column would be the last and definitive word on the subject of "O-12." However, I have since learned that the Senate Judiciary Committee is showing an inordinate interest in that film. Apparently, some members of the committee have already seen it as often as others have seen "Man of La Manche." In fact, those among the committee members who have seen it insist that it be viewed by the entire committee membership.

On the other hand, I see nothing inspiring about the august membership of the Senate Judiciary Committee cluck-clucking while being titillated by "O-12." It is high time, I submit, that the Senate Judiciary Committee stop looking at dirty pictures and report favorably the nomination of Abe Fortas as Chief Justice.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND
NOW HAS TO TELL UNITED
STATES HOW TO MANAGE ITS
ECONOMY

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, economic mismanagement of the U.S. economy by the present administration has grown so bad that the International Monetary Fund—IMF—now feels compelled to tell the United States how to manage its economy.

In its annual report issued this past weekend the IMF has warned the United States not to ease monetary restraint lest

the dollar outflow increase and the balance of payments go into worse deficit. As the IMF put it:

Elimination of the deficit must now become a primary objective of economic policy in the interest of the U.S. itself and of the international monetary system.

More specifically, the IMF said it was necessary for the U.S. economy to hold real gross national product growth below 4 percent in order to "relieve upward pressures on costs and prices and to dampen imports." Moreover, monetary restraint must be continued in order not to erode the hoped for economic stability from the tax increase spending cuts bill passed earlier this year by Congress.

Although the report stated that the administration's controls over investment and lending overseas should eventually be removed, it stressed the need for firm monetary restraint to avoid negating the attempt of these restrictions to slow down the outflow of capital from the United States.

Part of the reasons for the IMF's concern has to be the balance-of-payments figures for the second quarter of 1968. Although the figure announced by Secretary of the Treasury Fowler was a seeming improvement over the first quarter—a deficit of \$156 million versus \$663 million in the first quarter—the real deficit for the second quarter was around \$900 million. The \$156 million figure for the second quarter conceals the fact that \$500 million of Treasury securities were sold to Canada and about \$250 million were sold to West Germany. These funds are counted as capital inflows—which they are—and are not counted as increases in liabilities—which they should be. Thus the second quarter had an even higher balance-of-payments deficit than the first. The Financial Times of London reported this juggling of figures by Mr. Fowler as "the U.S. balance-of-payments improvement that never was."

The glaring point that just cries out in the IMF report is the fact that the IMF felt constrained to tell the United States to put its economic house in order. For years the fount of wisdom for developing countries on how to manage their economies, the United States is now getting its advice back from an international body composed of many of these countries. It is sad to observe that the acknowledged leader of the Western World does not know how to manage its economy. It is only to be hoped the United States will heed the IMF advice.

Following are three articles. The Wall Street Journal and Washington Post of September 9, 1968, have articles reporting on the IMF annual report and the National Review of September 10, 1968, has a short article showing how Treasury bookkeeping procedures make the balance-of-payments figures for the second quarter look better than they really are.

The articles follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 9, 1968]
RESERVE BOARD URGED BY IMF TO CONTINUE RESTRAINTS ON CREDIT—WORLD AGENCY INDICATES THE UNITED STATES HASN'T PUSHED HARD ENOUGH TO END ITS PAYMENT DEFICIT

WASHINGTON.—The International Monetary Fund strongly suggested that the Fed-

eral Reserve Board shouldn't ease up rapidly on credit lest it worsen the dollar outflow again.

In its annual report, the 109-nation IMF indicated concern that the U.S. hasn't yet put enough push behind its goal of wiping out its balance-of-payments deficit; such a deficit occurs when foreigners acquire more dollars than they return in all transactions. "Elimination of the deficit must now become a primary objective of economic policy," the IMF said, "in the interest of the U.S. itself and of the international monetary system."

In the same skittish vein, the IMF tacitly conceded that the world monetary system is still in some danger. While praising the U.S. for its tax increase and Britain for its austerity measures, the IMF declared that "the restoration of enduring confidence and stability in the international monetary system depends primarily on the early and progressive improvement" in the balance of payments of both countries.

Considering the long stalemate before the U.S. tax increase was enacted in late June, the report said, it is "necessary" for the U.S. economy to be held "well below" its 4%-a-year potential increase in "real" or physical output of goods and services. The restraint, the IMF said, is needed to "relieve upward pressures on costs and prices and to dampen imports."

During this period of "economic adjustment," the international agency asserted, "It is essential that the U.S. authorities should maintain a sufficient degree of monetary restraint to provide firm support to the programs of control over outflows of U.S. capital"; these programs include the mandatory controls over corporate investment in foreign subsidiaries and the Federal Reserve's voluntary limits on bank lending to foreigners.

Along with its unusually blunt prescription for the Federal Reserve's monetary policies, the IMF called on European countries with payments surpluses to continue their more expansionary domestic policies in order to maintain "a satisfactory growth of world trade." Johnson Administration officials have also been encouraging faster expansion by Europe in hopes of permitting greater U.S. exports, but they've been expressing hope that the Federal Reserve will offset some of the restraint of the tax increase by more actively easing monetary policy.

The IMF, which basically makes three-to-five year loans of foreign currencies to tide members over temporary payments deficits, also hinted that the "paper gold" plan currently being ratified by members may have to be put into use in order to resume progress toward less-restricted trade and capital movements. The plan would create "Special Drawing Rights," which members could hold in reserves and use much as they currently use reserves of dollars, pounds and gold.

The gold reserves of all governments at the end of March, at \$37.8 billion, were "lower than at any time in more than a decade," the IMF said. And it noted that much of the apparent increase in total reserves of gold and convertible currencies merely represented "swaps" in which two countries temporarily bolster their reserves by holding each other's funds. As of March 31, the IMF reported, the U.S. held \$2.2 billion of British pounds and \$250 million of Canadian dollars.

The IMF said that at its annual meeting starting Sept. 30 in Washington it will consider distributing to certain members close to \$37.5 million of its \$55.7 million income from the fiscal year ended April 30. The distribution would be intended to partly compensate countries whose currencies have been heavily used by the IMF in loans to others; the formula involved would mainly benefit Western European members, and wouldn't provide anything for the U.S.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 9, 1968]

IMF'S REPORT WARNS UNITED STATES AGAINST EASY MONEY POLICY

(By Hobart Rowen)

The International Monetary Fund last night warned the United States not to slide into an easy money posture, just because the long-delayed fiscal-restraining package is now on the books.

Moreover, suggested the international agency, elimination of the balance-of-payments deficit "must now become a primary objective of economic policy, in the interest of the United States itself and of the international monetary system."

This Dutch Uncle advice was contained in the IMF's 23d annual report. It stressed that "perseverance" on the part of the United States and Great Britain in reducing their payments deficits is critical in restoring "confidence and stability."

DILUTION FEARED

The IMF's warning on U.S. domestic monetary policy coincides with the view of many observers here who fear that monetary ease may dilute the deflationary impact of the tax-and-expenditure package passed earlier in the summer.

On the other hand, the Johnson Administration and the Federal Reserve Board itself have been concerned about economic "overkill," and the Fed recently slipped its bellwether discount rate down by 1/4 percentage point.

But the IMF observed that in the U.S., it is necessary "to restrain demand expansion so as to bring the growth of real GNP well below the capacity rate of 4 per cent, and thus relieve upward pressures on costs and prices and to dampen imports."

"During this period of economic adjustment, it is essential that the U.S. authorities should maintain a sufficient degree of monetary restraint to provide firm support to the programs of control over outflows of U.S. capital."

EVENTUAL EASING SEEN

Eventually, the report said, the capital controls put into effect last Jan. 1 should be removed.

The report also predicted "a constructive role" for the new Special Drawing Rights system, which will ultimately supplement existing reserves of gold and certain currencies.

It pointed out that reduction of the U.S. and U.K. payments deficits would have, as a counterpart, a reduction of reserves in Europe and elsewhere. This factor, the report noted, adds to the importance of the SIRs, which will contribute to the total level of available reserves.

A statistical summary showed that from January through June, 1968, drawings on the fund exceeded \$3.3 billion, a larger total than any full year in the Fund's history.

The near-chaos in the world's financial markets that preceded and followed British devaluation in November 1967 created unusual patterns in world reserve holdings, which at the end of March, 1968 showed an aggregate rise of \$2.0 billion. But gold holdings of \$37.8 billion were the lowest in a decade.

[From the National Review, Sept. 10, 1968]

Treasury Secretary Fowler reported on August 16 that the U.S. international deficit dropped to \$156 million in the second calendar quarter of this year. He failed to mention that in that quarter the U.S. peddled \$500 million of nonmarketable Treasury securities to Canada and about \$250 million of similar debt instruments to West Germany. Thanks to arbitrary accounting at the Treasury, sales of such bonds are not recorded as increases in liabilities although the funds received are indeed credited on the in-

flow side of the balance-of-payments books. Thus, instead of the slight improvement that Mr. Fowler crowed about, the U.S. deficit actually went up from \$682 million in the first quarter to \$900 million in the second quarter. That's why the London Financial Times reported Mr. Fowler's announcement as "the U.S. balance of payments improvement that never was."

WILL YOUR VOTE BE COUNTED?

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, as the coming presidential election commands more and more of our attention, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a timely article in Nation's Business of July 1968, entitled "Will Your Vote Be Counted This Year?" The article brings into focus many of the corruptions in our voting system today and suggests various ways to eliminate fraud at the polls.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will acknowledge the existence of such corruptions in voting, and that they will discuss these with local officials before the November elections.

Mr. Speaker, I have found that some of the statistics relating to the fraudulent voting are appalling. To cite from the article:

As an example, the Honest Ballot Association figured four million fraudulent or invalid votes were cast in the 1964 elections, about 5.5 percent of the total. Many races that year were decided by a narrower margin than five per cent.

This degree of fraud, Mr. Speaker, cannot and must not be tolerated if our governmental system is to function properly.

Mr. Speaker, because I believe many insights will be gained by my colleagues into the dishonest aspects of voting, I am placing in the RECORD at this point the article entitled "Will Your Vote Be Counted This Year?" The article follows:

WILL YOUR VOTE BE COUNTED THIS YEAR?

An estimated 118 million people will be eligible to vote in the November Presidential election. But many who will cast a ballot, won't have their votes counted.

Will you be among the disenfranchised? Carelessness or outright fraud could steal your vote.

While voting machines, permanent registration and public indignation have largely eliminated wholesale fraud at the ballot box, if you think every vote is counted, listen to George J. Abrams, chief investigator for The Honest Ballot Association of New York City, who predicts:

"Anywhere from three to three and a half million votes will be lost through election irregularities in November."

And if the brawling election days of Hinky Dink Kenna, Bathhouse Coughlin and Hell-Cat Maggie are today mere memory, the need to protect the sanctity of the ballot box is still as great as ever.

As an example, The Honest Ballot Association figured four million fraudulent or invalid votes were cast in the 1964 elections, about 5.5 per cent of the total. Many races that year were decided by a narrower margin than five per cent.

Hundreds of businessmen, as well as count-

less civic groups and women's organizations, are gearing up to combat public apathy to election procedures, described by one official as the "vote chisler's greatest ally."

A number of procedures could invalidate your ballot if you're not on guard. If you want to be sure every vote is counted—yours included—there are a number of things you can do.

"All election irregularities are not fraud," says Mr. Abrams. "There is a lot of carelessness. But there are also a lot of practices going on that shouldn't."

"Voting machines have done much to reduce the number of votes that won't get counted. But I have come to the conclusion, reluctantly, that we need a national election law to make uniform rules and regulations."

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 does provide stringent penalties for some forms of fraud in federal elections, including a maximum fine of \$10,000 or five years in prison or both for giving false information in order to register or vote.

But in many instances, proof of intent is hard to come by.

DAYS OF FRAUD

The heyday of widespread vote fraud in the nation spanned the period from the Civil War to well into the Twentieth Century, when big city bosses and machines flourished.

It was the time of notorious practices: "Tombstone voting," and padded registration lists.

Myriad, often conflicting, state election laws are one reason why many voters reach election day before they find they can't cast a ballot.

Residence requirements vary. So do registration regulations. Precinct boundaries are often unknown to the average citizen.

Both major political parties have strongly backed the need for public vigilance to insure honest elections. And in many cities across the nation, voluntary groups have long been active.

In Philadelphia, the "Committee of Seventy," a group of business and professional men started in 1904, again will recruit nearly 1,000 citizens to serve as poll watchers at this election, along with 50 attorneys who will be in radio contact with a "complaint center" to make on-the-spot investigations.

"If the attorney finds the complaint warranted, he immediately turns it over to the district attorney or federal district attorney," says Executive Director Bob Cooper.

In Chicago, the Joint Civic Committee has had as many as 4,000 poll watchers assigned on election day.

The League of Women Voters, the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, the women's division of the Republican National Committee have all been active in warning about shady practices at the polls.

"The best way to insure an honest count is to study your state's election laws, then protest vigorously if you see the slightest violation," says Rep. William Cramer (R-Fla.) one of the sponsors of the clean elections section of the voting rights law. "If a federal election is involved, complain to the FBI, the U.S. district attorney or the Attorney General of the United States."

Franklin J. Lunding, Jr., a young attorney who is executive director of Operation Eagle Eye in Chicago, estimates this Republican-created poll-watching organization will have 6,000 to 8,000 persons involved in the November election, including some 150 attorneys in radio-equipped cars for quick, on-the-spot investigations.

Another group concerned with the same problem in Chicago is the Honest Election Foundation which has taken over this function of the Joint Civic Committee.

BUSINESS COMMUNITY HELPS

"I'm proud of the way the business community has reacted in trying to eliminate

the black eye given Chicago in the 1960 Presidential election," says Charles F. Hood, public affairs consultant to the chairman of the board of Standard Oil of Indiana, and an organizer and former director of Operation Eagle Eye.

The organization grew out of a small meeting of businessmen with Republican leaders after the 1960 election, Mr. Hood says. There were accusations of wholesale election irregularities in Cook County in the Kennedy-Nixon race.

It has been active since the 1962 elections and some 150 companies are involved in recruiting poll watchers on a voluntary, bipartisan basis for election day.

Eagle Eye filed a federal court suit after the 1966 general election, alleging election judges stuffed the ballot box in Precinct Forty-seven of the Twenty-fourth Ward, with every Democratic candidate receiving 300 votes and every Republican candidate, three. Dismissed in district court, the suit is now on appeal.

Election irregularity charges involving "ghost voters" have popped up in Indiana's Lake County (Gary) area and in other towns in the Hoosier State.

The *South Bend Tribune* on Nov. 1, 1962, ran an eight column headline: "Ghost voter list bared."

"In a single South Bend precinct, 280 persons are registered to vote from vacant lots and abandoned buildings," the story said, quoting a survey of voter registration lists made by Gerald L. Murphy and other supporters of a G.O.P. Congressional candidate.

The same story quoted Ideal Baldoni, the St. Joseph County Democratic chairman, as accusing Republicans of "slander . . . lies . . . half-truths and now ghost stories."

Testifying in behalf of a proposed new state election law, Larry S. Landis told the Indiana House of Representatives Elections Committee last year of a survey he had made in Terre Haute, Ind., while a senior student at Wabash College.

"In Terre Haute," he testified, "it was found that of 5,032 persons registered in 11 precincts, 587 did not live at the addresses given as the place of residence. After the election, a follow-up found that 91 of these persons voted in the 1966 general election."

He said this figure represented about three per cent of the total vote in the 11 precincts and that three of the 91 who supposedly voted were dead at the time of his original survey.

"While this does not mean wholesale fraud is taking place in Terre Haute," he told the House Committee, "it should give us pause . . . and proves the present registration method needs to be altered and updated."

Of the nation's estimated 175,000 voting precincts, some 40 per cent will still be using paper ballots in November, and it is the paper ballot that made possible the legendary tricks of such as Hinky Dink Kenna.

Kenna and Bathhouse Coughlin, so-called because he operated out of a Turkish bathhouse, are characters out of Chicago's brawling past who specialized in illegal balloting.

They flourished in the era of politicians like Boss Buckley of San Francisco, who gained a measure of fame with his pronouncement: "The game of politics is not a branch of Sunday school business."

Hell-Cat Maggie figured in New York City politics. Wearing artificial fingernails, she would lead a mob of members from her Battle Row Ladies Social & Athletic Club in a wild foray to a polling place, chasing away the faint-hearted, who never returned to vote.

WITH AND WITHOUT WHISKERS

The legendary Big Tim Sullivan of Tammany Hall was an expert in election stealing. His strategy:

"Vote 'em with whiskers on, then it's to the barber for sideburns and a mustache.

Vote 'em again, then back to the barber and leave only the mustache. Hell, man, if you need another vote, shave off the mustache and it's a baby's face he'll have. You get four votes for each man this way."

Violence was common in the reign of Boss Tom Pendergast of Kansas City. Election day, March 27, 1934, became known as "Black Tuesday." There were four murders, 11 critical injuries and more than 200 cases of assault.

In the Fifties, in sentencing Louis W. Nathan, a 71-year-old precinct captain to a five-year prison sentence for election violations, United States District Judge Julius J. Hoffman of Chicago commented:

"Tampering with election procedures in one precinct, especially by individuals bold enough to operate under assumed names, fosters the supposition that such fraud not only exists in other areas, but even is an accepted fact of American political life."

The most common election irregularities today involve interpretation of election laws; illegal assistance to the aged, illiterate or handicapped; registration violations and, in some instances, voting machine procedures. Confusion over interpretation was well illustrated in the election in Texas in 1960. Under the law, to vote for a candidate on a paper ballot, a line had to be drawn through the names of all other candidates for the office.

Hundreds marked their ballots only with the traditional "x" to signify the candidate of their choice. This made their votes null and void. But the law also gave the election official on the spot discretionary authority. In some precincts, officials allowed these ballots to be counted. In others, they were tossed out.

WHAT TO WATCH FOR

If as a businessman—or interested citizen—you are concerned with eliminating the last margin of error that any vote might not be counted, here are some practices you should be aware of on election day:

Chain-balloting—cited as a common method of election trickery, this requires getting an official ballot (easy to acquire, especially in states with liberal absentee ballot laws) which is pre-marked. A "bought" voter then deposits the pre-marked ballot, palms the ballot he obtains before entering the voting booth, marks it and gives it to another "bought" voter to repeat the scheme over and over.

Padded registration lists—those which include names of persons who have died or moved away, are another common complaint. Not as common, but it has happened, is for a registered voter to find his name has been "lost" from the official list.

Illegal assistance—An unscrupulous election official influences the naive by advising him how to vote.

Spooling ballots—It's easy for a vote thief to nullify a ballot by marking it with graphite concealed under a fingernail or a "short pencil" held in the palm of the hand or by tearing it.

Disqualification—Election judges frequently vary in what they consider grounds for voiding ballots.

Jammed voting machines—Accidents do happen. But they can be made to happen, too.

Fast count—Where totals are read by scheming precinct officials to recorders at a rate too fast to be heard.

There are a number of steps various groups and officials recommend that you take to make sure there is no careless or fraudulent count at your precinct.

To avoid padded voter lists, make a complete an accurate canvass six and three months in advance of an election, listing all voting age residents.

Make sure precinct leaders keep their lists constantly updated on deaths and departures, so vote thieves can't bring in impersonators.

Both parties should have alert poll watchers. Additional poll watchers can be placed outside the polls, armed with cameras to record any suspicious activity.

Report irregularities at once to the chief of police, press and your party county chairman.

Work to get your slate voting law tightened if it is ambiguous on ballot disqualifications.

Challenge all suspicious activities if you are a poll watcher.

Make sure officials of all parties inspect voting machines before they are locked at the warehouse prior to shipment to precinct polling places.

Make sure officials of all parties voting have complete up-to-date lists of eligible voters at every precinct.

Make sure a voting machine mechanic is on hand.

Be active. Don't depend upon someone else to do all the work.

This last piece of advice is probably the most important. An old-time politico, talking about election irregularities, says:

"The public is lax as ———. If you want to stop fraud at the ballot box, find out what voting is all about and then turn out in herds. What the ——— could anybody do then?"

AEROSPACE TEST FACILITIES ARE PREREQUISITES TO PROGRESS

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, one of America's most capable military leaders is Gen. James Ferguson, who heads the Air Force Systems Command. This important command is responsible for the advancement of aerospace technology, its adaptation to operational aerospace systems, and the acquisition of qualitatively superior aerospace components and materiel required for the accomplishment of the Air Force mission. Within the AFSC sphere of activity are research, development, procurement, and production functions.

In the August 24 issue of "Armed Forces Journal," General Ferguson sounds a warning which deserves careful and mature consideration. He warns that the Russians have moved ahead of the United States in terms of the newness of their aerospace test facilities, in terms of the number of newer facilities, and in terms of their ability to exceed U.S. performance limits. This is indeed a sobering statement.

I submit his article for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

AEROSPACE TEST FACILITIES: PREREQUISITES TO PROGRESS

(By Gen. James Ferguson)

Understandably, many people believe that today's weapon systems spring from the heads of their designers fully armed, much as Athena emerged from Zeus's brow. Too few people understand the vital need for aerospace test facilities in connection with development of these new weapon systems.

There is simple logic behind this need. The pressing requirement for ever more capable weapons and the rapid pace of technologies have demanded in recent years that our systems become progressively more sophisticated and more complex. In turn, this invariably results in higher system hardware costs. However, it is cheaper to build several

multi-purpose test facilities to accommodate systems models than it is to replace the number of vehicles which would otherwise be damaged or destroyed during actual operation because of avoidable design or material deficiencies.

Today, five to ten years normally elapse between initial design and first operational system capability. In this interval, many test activities take place; design and performance verification, parameter optimization, environmental testing, intra-system compatibility testing and troubleshooting. The result is that full scale production starts (eventually) with a design that has a high probability of being near optimum from the beginning of production. Paper can be modified much faster and cheaper than hardware.

Proof of the success of the test facility concept is most evident when one recalls aircraft production during WWII. Planes were designed, built and flight tested with practically no regard to pre-production testing. As a result, many lives were lost and aircraft destroyed before operational status was achieved.

It wouldn't have taken many WWII bombers, at \$370,000 per copy, to have built an adequate test facility for this plane—probably many less than were destroyed because of the lack of such a facility.

This is not to imply that new weapon system designs are initially faulty. Not at all. They are literally the best designs money can buy at the time they are contracted for. However, each new system at least approaches, if it is not beyond, the limit of the current state of engineering knowledge. None has even been built before; therefore, these designs must be verified in advance in test facilities if we are to arrive at near optimum design.

To appreciate the functional role of the test facility, let's see how it has worked with one of our newest logistic systems—the gigantic C-5 cargo aircraft.

In September 1965, the Lockheed-Georgia Company began development of the C-5. Target date for first flight was June 1968 (which was met on time, as things turned out).

In November 1965, only two months after contract award, wind tunnel testing of scale models started at the Air Force Systems Command's Arnold Engineering Development Center (AEDC), in South-Central Tennessee.

One of the three C-5 test models was a "semi-span" model at 1/18th scale. Included were the left wing with its two engines, and half the fuselage. This model was wired up with over a thousand pressure sensors distributed around the surface and leading to remote recording devices. To create a realistic airflow the engine pods were equipped with small gas turbine engines powered by an external nitrogen source (at a cost, incidentally, of \$10,000 each). The results of wind-tunnel testing of these models suggested significant improvements in the configuration of the exterior surfaces—small design changes which could easily be engineered into the production airplane at that stage of development.

The cumulative effect of all the individual minor changes was striking. Some 37 "drag counts" were eliminated. This means, in effect, that the performance of the C-5 had been augmented, by paper design changes alone, so that over \$10-million by operating costs could be saved for a 52-aircraft fleet over a ten-year period.

This example implies that our new system designs are far from inadequate, incomplete, or unoptimized. Although, the original designs are the best money can buy and are the best possible short of test optimization, the constraints operating against designers these days are formidable. New systems are complex and sophisticated. So many variables and parameters are involved in their configurations that performance predictions can

barely scratch the surface of performance possibilities. We want to operate new systems. In ranges of environments and operating conditions that defy complete analyses by the most powerful computers now in existence.

It is greatly to the credit of both Lockheed and AEDC that a productive test program was conceived and realized in timely fashion on the C-5 system. It is also a credit to these who "sold" large facilities in the past. If we had waited until contract award in 1965 to acquire the test facilities, they would not have been available in time.

Aerospace test facilities are not merely limited to the use of wind tunnels for design optimization. Test facilities are used whenever a precise quantitative indication of probable system or component performance is required.

Facilities simulate real life conditions which may exist now or in the future. For example, if vehicle speed is the parameter to be simulated, one can either move the vehicle through the air or move the air past the vehicle. For the former, there are the sled tracks, the most capable of which is the seven-mile, Mach 6 track at the Air Force Missile Development Center at Holloman AFB, N.M. For the latter, we can fasten the vehicle to a support in one of a number of wind tunnels around the country, including those at Arnold. The air can be heated, cooled, dried, or moistened as necessary to simulate different operating conditions of speed, altitude, and engine power.

To simulate environmental conditions for testing full scale satellites and space vehicles from launch to altitudes of 300 miles, Arnold has constructed an environmental chamber with an inside test area 35 feet in diameter and 65 feet high. To create the pressure transients associated with ascent, rapid pumpdown is provided. For simulation of space vacuum and cold temperatures, the chamber is evacuated and the interior walls cryogenically cooled. To simulate the heat input and radiation from the sun, special high-intensity lamps are provided, which approximate the correct energy levels.

Other systems such as re-entry vehicles require the simulation of great speed in a near vacuum. This can be done by gaseous discharges in instrumented "hot-shot" tunnels. At Arnold, a huge energy storage coil is used to discharge over a million amperes at 20,000 volts into stored nitrogen gas for ten milli-seconds. The temperature and pressure of the nitrogen is raised to 6,750° F and 40,000 pounds per square inch. This blows the nitrogen through a diaphragm along the tunnel, over the model and into a vacuum tank, creating those conditions encountered by bodies re-entering the atmosphere. Although the body is exposed to this environment for only 1/10 of a second, much useful data are produced.

When rocket engines are tested in simulated space environments, the high energy exhaust gases must be vented to outside air. As engines have increased in size, venting problems, due to extreme heat, have become very severe. In 1966 Arnold solved this problem while testing NASA's Saturn S-IV stage, J-2 engine. The engine is now tested in a special 200-foot tall test cell where gases are cooled by spraying water along their entire vent path—half a million gallons per minute!

Not all the work conducted in test facilities is confined to research and development. An untold amount of money has been saved over the years by establishing fixes on operational systems by the use of the systems test models. A good example of this occurred with the Atlas missile.

During several launch attempts, the missiles malfunctioned and were destroyed. Motion pictures of the launches showed that the base structure above the three rocket engine nozzles had burned through, allowing fuel to escape and burn catastrophically.

To arrive at a solution, a number of models were tested at Arnold under conditions similar to those that were believed to exist at the time the real Atlas malfunctioned.

Photography revealed a significant phenomenon: a suction effect during firing caused the burning exhaust to be drawn up between the nozzles and to impinge on the missile's base. This apparently caused the burn-through and the resultant fuel leakage.

A minor modification on first the test model and then the real missiles saved the remaining Atlas inventory from a similar fate. It was estimated that the cost of just one "saved" Atlas paid for both the test facility and its use-cost.

An example of a quick-fix affecting human lives, involved the Apollo capsule. When experience showed that nonpredicted re-entry profiles could occur, simulation work was inaugurated at Arnold. It was found that uneven ablation of the re-entry body's surface could happen under certain conditions, resulting in a markedly changed re-entry path. Armed with this knowledge, NASA has taken steps to avoid this. The fix has eliminated a serious obstacle to the Apollo program.

The Arnold Engineering Development Center has been highlighted here because it is perhaps the most versatile and prolific test complex in the free world. During the normal working day tests may range: in speed, from zero to over 20,000 miles per hour; in altitudes, from sea level to over 1000 statute miles; in pressures, from near absolute vacuum to more than 450,000 pounds per square inch; in temperatures, from near absolute zero to more than 12,000°F; in rocket engine sizes, from five pounds to 430,000 pounds of thrust; and in model sizes from 1/180 scale to the mammoth, full scale Saturn S-IV B stage.

Aerospace test facilities are not limited to homogeneous environments localized in self-contained units such as wind tunnels. Some take up large sections of real estate and airspace. These are the instrumented ranges, where simulation involves the use of full-scale (or at least large) models under controlled conditions.

The Eglin Gulf Test Range in the Air Proving Center, at Eglin AFB, Fla., is in this category, as are the Air Force Eastern and Western Test Ranges at Patrick AFB, Fla. and Vandenberg AFB, Calif., respectively, and the Air Force Flight Test Center at Edwards AFB, Calif.

Such ranges are replete with radars, telemetry, radios, motion picture cameras, and computerized control centers. They are unusually concerned with keeping track of the location and speed of vehicles at precise times.

An interesting test program uses the Army's White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico. The Air Force launches sub-scale test vehicles from Green River, Utah, into the White Sands Range as part of DoD's Advanced Ballistic Re-Entry System (ABRES) development program. The use of small-scale models gives useful test results without the need for full-scale ICBM launcher.

Full scale tests under the ABRES program are conducted by the 6595th Aerospace Test Wing at Vandenberg AFB, on California's Pacific Coast. Experimental re-entry vehicles are launched aboard Atlas boosters down the Western Test Range to a well-instrumented Pacific target area.

The White Sands Missile Range also supports the Air Force Missile Development Center's Central Inertial Guidance Test Facility (CIGTF). The CIGTF has been designated as the Department of Defense agency for performing "standard" verification testing of all inertial navigation equipment prior to procurement. Its tracking radars provide continuous aircraft position information to better than 100 feet for comparison purposes.

Can a new weapon system raise and lower its landing gear at -65°F?—or at +165°F in

heavy rain? A climatic hangar at Eglin AFB stimulates extreme cold and extreme humidity at sea level. In the climatic hangar the real system is always used, not a model. This is satisfactory because the deficiencies—and fixes—usually do not involve major system design changes.

One peculiarity of test facilities is that they must be more advanced technologically than the systems they are meant to test. To test systems for tomorrow's inventory as well as components, materials, and devices for the day after tomorrow's systems, test facilities must be "better" than anything normally considered "state of the art."

In the 1940s, for example, a Mach 3 wind tunnel was proposed—this at a time before the sound barrier was breached at Mach 1. A Mach 3 tunnel, built in the 1950s, tested Mach 3 supersonic vehicle models of systems proposed for use in the 1960s. We are now in the 1960s and require a Mach 10-20 tunnel for systems of the 1970s—and beyond.

Not only must facilities be ahead of systems in performance capability, but they must also be at least an order of magnitude better in precision. If, in a certain operating environment, a particular aerodynamic surface is supposed to deflect a certain number of inches plus or minus one thousandth of an inch, then the test apparatus must be able to measure with a precision approaching plus or minus one ten-thousandth of an inch.

Designing and developing such "far-out" facilities is a challenge which occupies some of the best engineering minds in the country. Keeping test facilities "ahead of the game" requires both imagination and an aggressive research and development program. Development of advanced test facilities is probably a harder job than development of advanced weapon systems. The eccentricities of the Mach 20 regime, for instance, must be explored first by the facility designers before systems or components for actual Mach 20 use can be examined.

Fortunately, the Air Force enjoys good company in its interest in advanced simulation technology. The facilities operated by its sister services, other governmental agencies (particularly NASA), and by industry are extensive and capable. There is mutual cooperation in the use of these facilities.

We in the Air Force are able to test systems in facilities not our own and we open our facilities to many operating agencies. During the last few years at the Arnold Engineering Development Center there have been tests on systems or components belonging to the Army, Navy, NASA, FAA, AEC, the Communications Satellite Corp., the U.S. Weather Bureau, and the National Cancer Institute of the Public Health Service.

The main reason we test in each other's facilities is that every facility is different, with unique capabilities. Some suit a given type of testing better than others. In the Air Force, we can boast of the largest and most capable assembly of aerospace test facilities in the Free World.

Since many of our Air Force facilities were designed in the 40s and built in the 50s to test the systems of the 60s, the question arises as to whether they suffice for testing systems of the 70s and components or techniques for systems of the 80s. Can we now test as we should? Even more important, will we be able tomorrow to test as we must? This is important because facilities are fixed plant items which must be developed, designed, and successfully entered into the Military Construction Program for the appropriate fiscal year. Facility lead time is long, so we must be thinking about new facilities for the 1970s right now.

It is certainly time for vigorous planning in this regard. In a number of ways, current test facilities are becoming obsolete. That impending obsolescence can be categorized in two ways: performance values and new operational modes.

Concerning performance limitations, let us look at the testing of large, high-thrust turbojet engines required for the C-5 and the supersonic transport (SST). Such engines can be expected to be used more and more in the future. The test facility for large jet engines must be able to probe all the design limits as well as to verify that the engines will operate as prescribed in the normal cruise regime or in many abnormal situations.

So much for theory. In actual cases, new engines are getting bigger and more powerful all the time. It is becoming difficult, sometimes impossible, to operate an engine in a test cell throughout its operational envelope.

Take the TF-39 engine for the C-5 airplane. It is a high-thrust engine employing the high-bypass feature. This means that it has a fan which acts as a gigantic internal propeller, creating an airflow that is enormous, particularly at lower altitudes. No test cell exists in the free world large enough to test the TF-39 through its entire operational envelope. Below 5,000 feet (rising to 11,000 feet at higher airspeeds) the most capable cells (at AEDC) cannot generate the required flow of air.

The cell actually used at Arnold was built in the 1950s for testing ramjet engines. With modifications it has been able to support the C-5 engine, but not completely. The Air Force modified a B-52 bomber by installing one TF-39 in place of two ordinary B-52 engines. The expense of performing such a modification, added to the cost of diverting a B-52 and operating it for test only, would have gone some way toward buying a facility large enough for the TF-39 engine.

Almost our entire "stable" of facilities today is reaching the outer limits of performance capability when used to test our technologically newer systems.

There is also the problem of new operational modes. As time passes, ways of doing things in aerospace change.

Let us look at one example: When most currently operational facilities were designed, little attention was paid to testing in preparation for putting man into space for extended periods. Short periods, yes, but there is a new class of conceptual systems for which time in orbit reaches a month or a number of months.

There is a considerable amount of testing already being done in this regard. In addition to NASA's work in the area, the Air Force Systems Command's Aerospace Medical Division is in the forefront of environmental testing for purposes of man in space. How does prolonged isolation or prolonged inactivity affect humans? Which cabin atmosphere is best? How will weightlessness affect the cardiovascular system? How will cabin atmosphere contamination be assimilated. All these questions are being answered by the use of bio-astronautical test facilities. We are in reasonably good shape in these newer test modes, but obsolescence comes fast in current days of progress.

One new operational mode not yet accommodated adequately is VTOL—vertical takeoff and landing. The term is usually applied to an airplane which can cruise like a normal airplane of its type (fighter, bomber, transport) but which can slow to a hover posture and then land and takeoff vertically.

Insofar as VTOL craft act like ordinary airplanes, they can be simulated by models and tested easily in today's facilities. When it comes to the transition regime (from vertical into horizontal flight or vice-versa) we are in trouble. Many wind tunnel features are required simultaneously to do the job right.

VTOL testing requires a large tunnel cross-section to minimize boundary effects (remember; part of the airflow by the vehicle is vertically oriented). Also needed is a moving ground plane to simulate movement forward during transition, and an exhaust

scavenger because the engines should be real lift engines for realistic testing.

Right now there is no wind tunnel with all the VTOL-required features. The alternative is to build real systems and to test by flying. This is realistic but very expensive and always imprecise and inadequate. In a tunnel the model can be made to perform in maneuvers that any self-respecting test pilot would abhor in a real airplane.

There is a sort of eternal truth that might be expressed: "By their test facilities shall ye know them."

We have seen how much care will be necessary in the United States to avoid obsolescence. The important corollary question is, how are things in the Soviet Union?

The answer, simply, is that Soviet aerospace test facilities are generally newer than ours; there are more of the newer kinds; many U.S. performance limits are exceeded by Soviet facilities, and the Soviet Union is putting money and people into improving its facility status.

It is easy to fall into a trap in comparing U.S. with Soviet facilities. Both are excellent. The important consideration is, how will we both stand in five years? In ten? If we are not careful we will find ourselves still sitting on the laurels of the 1950's while the Soviets create a facilities complex worthy of the 1970's. The result could easily be a shortened Soviet system lead time with an output of capable, fully-tested, debugged systems.

The United States is still in good shape to act in time to stay ahead in aerospace test facilities. What is needed is a national approach to new facilities, so that all agency requirements are covered with no unnecessary duplication. The Air Force Systems Command is supporting the Aeronautics Panel of the Aeronautics and Astronautics Coordinating Board in developing such an approach. Hopefully, the output will be a national aerospace test facilities plan for the 1970's.

Such a plan must be created because test facilities are truly prerequisites to progress.

OPERATION SHAKEDOWN

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Nation's Business, in its September issue, has detailed the fears of many businessmen who are being threatened by extortion. The article, "Operation Shakedown," shows that this severe problem ranges across the country but is usually centered within the slum areas of our major cities.

It is tragic comment on the many attempts to promote not only observance of the law and rights private property but on the many attempts to solve pressing slum problems on the person-to-person level.

There is no question that more harm is done to the slum dweller, Negro or white, by alienating and driving out merchants, than there is money gained through these illegal pressures. A few rebels in the community have created what may be the greatest pocket of fear in a nation where the paramount concern is law and order. This is the pocket of small and medium sized merchants who are literally under the gun.

Some of this problem can be corrected by strict laws and constant enforcement. Much of it must be thwarted by close

association, within the problem areas, by merchant and resident.

The seriousness of the situation is graphically detailed in this article that I insert into the RECORD at this point:

OPERATION SHAKEDOWN

In New York, a delicatessen owner was pistol-whipped because he refused to buy a \$50 picture of Dr. Martin Luther King to put in his window.

In Chicago, a Southside barbershop was set afire because the owner refused to put up bond money for a neighborhood punk.

In Detroit, a small independent grocer was told to sell his store—"or else."

"Gimme or you burn tonight, baby!" That's the language of the ghetto. But its chilling message is being heard in business districts all over America today.

In small towns, in big towns, the message is the same. Neither businessmen, who are the victims, nor police who are trying to protect them, will tell the whole story. Fear has put the lid on.

It is a new kind of fear for America, the land of brotherhood. It's fear generated from the outbreak of racial strife. Fear of the black strong-armed hoodlum who orders the local merchant to pay up "or else."

A nationwide survey by Nation's Business editors found that apprehension, anxiety and fear run deep in the commercial community of the country.

"Scare Whitey . . . and you've got it made."

And, scared he is.

It reaches a peak for the white merchant in a ghetto area.

He fears being burned out, fears bodily harm, fears a bomb in the car, fears for the wife and kids.

He fears that the courts are too lenient, and he fears he can't get insured again.

Even outside the ghetto sections, businessmen are anxious, Negro as well as white.

"I think the most pressing problem, not only with the businessman, with the employee, with everybody, is that everybody I hear about is scared.

"This isn't the America we know and not the America we want to leave to our children."

This statement, on the condition that his name and type of business not be used by Nation's Business, was made by a jittery Washington merchant whose small shop is within a few blocks of the White House.

Shakedowns were so prevalent in the nation's capital, Congress several months ago sped through a new extortion law for the District.

The menacing presence of violence makes many a merchant an ideal target for shake-down artists. Obviously all sorts of extortion still exist as they have for centuries. But the extortionist who trades on racial violence today is typically a black hoodlum who is selling a picture of Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, a hastily scrawled blotting of "Soul Brother" or the simple sign, "Friend." Respectable Negroes and supporters of civil rights causes are resentful and hurt by the shakedown activities. Sometimes the shakedown is blunt. Sometimes it is subtle.

Listen to the experiences of one big city store owner.

HOW THEY WORK

"We received threats and we also received requests," he told Nation's Business.

"I was standing in the doorway of my store one day and these two Negro males walked up to the door and said, 'Are you the manager?'"

"I said, 'Yes,' and the darker-skinned one says:

"Well, would you like to buy some protection?"

"I said, 'What kind of protection do I need?'"

"He said, 'The plywood could be kicked in and your store could burn.'"

The owner was braver than some. He immediately called the police and the shake-down artists left.

This was not the only instance.

"Two Negroes, one female and one male, came in and wanted me to give a donation to SNCC, the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, and I said I felt I shouldn't give a donation to an organization that I felt destroyed my store."

"They left in a huff," the merchant said.

"Another time," he said, "a youngster came around selling pictures of Martin Luther King at \$1.25 a picture, 10 for \$10, and would I be interested. I said, 'No, we don't sell any picture in the store,' and he said, 'Well, I think it would be a good idea if you bought them.'"

When the merchant again declined, the youth fondled a brown manila folder and fled the store, shouting obscenities as he left.

On still another occasion a young girl demanded a donation for a local project.

When the merchant, unique in his bravado, again refused, she declared:

"This ——— place is going to burn, too."

NEEDED: PROTECTION

Sen. Robert Byrd of West Virginia has extracted "confidential" testimony from dozens of frightened merchants. Here are samples of what worries them, revealed to Nation's Business:

Mr. A: "Lack of police protection, and the lack and utter disrespect for law and order."

Mr. B: "I think the most pressing problem, not only with the businessman, (but) with the employee, (is) I am scared and everybody is scared. We have a country of fear."

Mr. C: "I find if I had to go to work now, mentally I just can't do it. I am not up to it."

Mr. D: "The most serious thing is we can not get help. The next most serious problem is fear."

Mr. E: "Protection, it is the main thing we need today. Any businessman needs protection against the hoodlums on the street."

Mr. F: "My immediate problem at this moment would be the need for protection . . . so that I can operate my business and give the necessary feeling of security to all of my employees."

Mrs. G: "The fact that I have no protection, no police protection, no protection at all. I feel no security in my business."

Mrs. H: "You have no protection here. If they [the police] tried to protect you, they are not given backing from anyone."

Mr. I: "The police seem to be handcuffed."

Mr. J: "The hoodlums in the streets . . . come into the stores and demand merchandise without money. They come in in groups using threatening language, very abusive language, such as, 'I'll bust your mouth.'"

Mr. K: "I feel that the government has failed in its obligations to its citizens."

Mr. L: "The most important problem we have right now is the problem of controlling the youths who harass our business."

All, under prodding, conceded that they had received threats to sell out, pay extortion—or "burn baby, burn."

They said they received phone calls from "all kinds of groups" including the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), Congress on Racial Equality (CORE), the NAACP and other organizations.

"I am a member of the NAACP," a white store owner told Nation's Business. "I had to be—or else."

"What do you mean by that?" he was asked.

"Well, to be in good with them. I am in the neighborhood and they expect everyone in the neighborhood to belong."

This merchant also claims he pays for "protection."

Dudley Williams, executive secretary of the NAACP's Washington branch, declared,

"We just don't go around intimidating people to join the NAACP. Membership is a voluntary thing."

He added that there have been reports that gangs have been "literally frightening to death" merchants but emphasized that the reported shakedown attempts were in no way connected with the NAACP.

CORE's community relations director, Kermit J. Scott, told Nation's Business: "We don't solicit in that fashion and we certainly aren't shaking down anybody. I recommend that any businessman approached in that manner contact me and CORE will check out the solicitor at our expense."

Efforts to contact SNCC officials were unsuccessful.

Even threats and the cost of protection money don't scare the die-hard merchants away.

CHICAGO'S BLACKSTONE RANGERS

The Blackstone Rangers gang provides a classic case.

Reports of an expanded extortion racket against small merchants by members of the Blackstone Rangers first came to the attention of Chicago police a day after the April 6 and 7 riots in the wake of the assassination of Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King.

Police said they learned that the protection racket was organized by top gang leaders who used the disorders to charge higher fees and recruit additional merchants.

Frightened businessmen reportedly paid up to \$100 for a hastily lettered sign from the gang warning looters that the premises were protected by the gang's "top 21," its ruling echelon.

The placards in the store windows read: Do Not touch—Black P. Stones—Jeff." According to police sources, the name Jeff apparently refers to Jeffrey Fort, 20, a leader of the Rangers. P is for power and "Stones" is shortened name for the gang.

One policeman, assigned to the Grand Crossing district, a hotbed of the extortion racket, said that he saw a check in the amount of \$50 which had been written by a merchant and made payable to the Blackstone Rangers.

The merchant reportedly told the policeman that the merchants don't complain to police for fear of having their shops burned out. A grand jury action to get panicky merchants to testify on the record about extortionists is now contemplated by Chicago officials.

Leaders of two Southside businessmen's organizations reported that they know a number of merchants who were solicited for protection money after the riots.

Marshall Stern, president of the Woodlawn Businessmen's Association, says the merchants told him that the extortionists identified themselves as members of the Blackstone Rangers.

"I believe it was whatever the traffic would bear," he replied, when asked about the size of the payoff.

Two new developments have solidified earlier police reports of the extortion racket among gangs in Chicago.

Police recently charged Allen Randolph, 19, with extorting \$25 from Ira Cohn, owner of a clothing store in the Southside Negro community. Mr. Cohn told police he gave the money, in marked bills, to young Randolph after a man, identified as George Walker, told Cohn to "kick in" toward making bail money for David Barksdale, leader of the notorious Disciples. Barksdale, however, was not in jail.

When young Randolph walked into Mr. Cohn's store and reportedly asked for the "package" for Mr. Walker, he was arrested by detectives.

On the same day, Perry Green, owner of a Southside Chicago barbershop, signed a complaint against a man known as George Walker, who told him Barksdale was in jail and that he was expected to kick in for bail. Mr. Green refused.

His business was almost burned down two nights later when someone placed a flaming gasoline can at his front door.

Sen. John L. McClellan's permanent investigations subcommittee held hearings on the activities of the Blackstone Rangers gang and their support by the federal anti-poverty office this summer. During the hearings the subcommittee received hundreds of letters from businessmen from all over the country complaining about shakedowns.

NEGRO MERCHANTS SUFFER, TOO

Certainly white merchants are not the sole target of extortionists and burners. Some black merchants have also suffered.

The owner of a burned-out, three-store appliance chain corroborated the letters with this typical story. He told Nation's Business: "These two Negroes walked into my store and ordered \$7 or \$8 of merchandise and put it in the bag—and you know that expression—they started out with the bag. I tried to stop them and I never heard such obscenity in my life.

"If you get the police on these kids, they get so mean it makes it worse yet."

A fund-raising program initiated last winter by one of the most respected of the civil rights organizations stirred concern in at least one small southern city.

Letters and personal visits to businessmen solicited contributions to a local branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The letters to businessmen complained that "neglect and indifference are the basic factors which contribute to the years of suppression and oppression suffered by the minority groups of this country."

The letters proposed the funding of a "Community Service Center to assist minority groups in finding solutions to problems due to unemployment, illness, housing, old age, basic education, food and clothing." Contributions of \$100 per businessman were suggested.

When the local Kiwanis Club was solicited, discussion by members brought out that a number of business leaders had contributed their \$100. The treasurer of the club explained that there was no money in the club budget for such contributions and that the stated needs already were being met by public and private agencies.

During the discussion, one businessman who owns a lumberyard said he had already contributed. When asked why, he replied, "Have you ever seen a lumberyard burn?"

Soon after the Kiwanis meeting, and his recommendation that the club reject the solicitation, the treasurer got a personal letter from the NAACP branch urging a contribution. He was the only banking official in town to receive such a letter.

He was particularly irritated at this implied pressure because his bank already makes special low-interest, long-term mortgage loans to Negroes in the area.

His resentment and concern was multiplied among businessmen elsewhere in the city.

Though the NAACP may well have intended no coercion or pressure in its fund-raising, in these troubled times many of the local businessmen read into it an implied threat.

In Detroit, Edward Deeb, executive director of the Association of Food Dealers of Greater Detroit, told Nation's Business:

"I receive many calls from merchants in the inner city area telling of harassments and threats. Some of them say they are warned that if they don't sell out, they'll be burned down. In some cases, they are trying to force the owners to sell and even give names of people who are ready to move in and buy them out."

"And," he added, "they usually quote a price ridiculously low."

Another brand of harassment faced Washington's Statler-Hilton Hotel last June as

the nation's capital braced for the Poor People's Campaign. The Rev. A. D. King, brother of the slain civil rights leader, was miffed at the Statler's refusal to serve him in its dressy steak house because he was clad in jeans and a tee shirt. Mr. King tore off to nearby Resurrection City and returned with a busload of disheveled Poor People campaigners, minutes before the restaurant was about to close for the night.

They demanded to be served. Hotel officials reopened the restaurant and served 92 steaks. The bill for food and drinks came to \$500. Mr. King argued over the bill, declaring that he would only pay \$200.

Hotel officials called the police. District Safety Director Patrick Murphy personally showed up along with Justice Department officials. These top-level officials reportedly advised the hotel management to take the \$200 and avoid triggering a crisis.

Rochester, N.Y., businessmen are feeling different forms of pressure exerted in the name of more employment for Negroes. This is happening despite the fact some businessmen at their own expense are training young Negroes for jobs.

For example, groups of 25 or 30 will enter a restaurant at the peak serving hour and order an inexpensive item. They eat slowly and tie up the tables. When they pay the check they all pay in pennies.

In several Rochester department stores similar groups will invade the shoe department and start ordering pair after pair of shoes. Legitimate customers must wait. This goes on for an hour or more without a purchase being made.

Still another form of pressure involves the churches in a kind of secondary boycott to force them to hire more Negro employees.

Many Detroit businessmen have been called upon to fill out questionnaires indicating how many Negroes they employ. One questionnaire form has this message:

"... church institutions will evaluate their suppliers on their policy and practice of equal employment opportunity and will favor those suppliers which practice equal employment opportunity."

IN LOS ANGELES

Officials in Los Angeles say there is now no organized drive by black militants to extort money from white and Negro merchants for protection against property damage and injury during flare-ups of racial violence. But, like other reluctant authorities, they concede that there have been "isolated" cases of attempts by Negroes to cash in on the violence. Lt. George H. Yocham, of the Los Angeles Police Intelligence Unit, calls them "opportunists trying to make a couple of quick bucks."

"There is no pattern to this activity. After the Watts riot in 1965, we had a couple of guys make one quick tour through the area, soliciting merchants whose businesses were still intact.

"They offered protection for these people in case of future disturbances. Some of the merchants paid \$20 or \$50 to these guys. Some asked to consider the offer. Some called police.

"The extortionists never came back. They had no intention of burning down stores. They were just taking advantage of an existing situation."

Los Angeles was noted for its calmness in the wake of Dr. King's death, thanks to an intensive "keep cool" campaign by Negroes and whites. Still, there were instances of Negroes threatening to burn down stores because of individual disputes with merchants over trivialities—refusal to cash a check or sell liquor to intoxicated customers, according to Lt. Yocham.

Other Los Angeles officials, however, believe there is an extortion tie behind telephone calls made by some Negro organizations to merchants for donations to honor the memory of Dr. King. The appeals were made on the premise that "something must be done

to put a halt to property destruction during racial troubles."

In New York City, a shopkeeper told Nation's Business, they have a grisly slogan involving uncooperative merchants:

"Only burn one a day to keep the troops away."

ON STATE TAXATION OF NATIONAL BANKS

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, at its recent term, the U.S. Supreme Court held that, under section 41 of the National Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 548), a State may not impose a sales or use tax on the sale of taxable personal property to a national bank for its own use. In order to protect State and local revenue resources, I have introduced H.R. 19031, which amends section 41 of the National Bank Act so that they would be subject to nondiscriminatory State and local sales and use taxes to the same extent as other commercial enterprises.

I have written to Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, urging favorable action by the committee on H.R. 19031. In my letter to Chairman PATMAN, I set forth the consequences of the Supreme Court decision on revenues for the State of New York and the city of New York. I especially commend this letter to all our colleagues, because the revenues of other States and localities will be similarly affected.

The text of my letter to Chairman PATMAN follows:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, at its recent term, the United States Supreme Court, in *Agricultural Bank v. Tax Commission* (36 L. W. 4686), held that under Section 41 of the National Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 548), a State may not impose a sales or use tax on the sale of taxable personal property to a National Bank for its own use.

In order to avoid the serious consequences of this decision upon State and local revenues, I have introduced the bill referred to above, which amends Section 41 of the National Bank Act so that National Banks would be subject to nondiscriminatory State and local sales and use taxes to the same extent as other commercial enterprises.

The serious consequences of this Supreme Court decision are clearly demonstrable. For example, we have been informed by Hon. Arthur Levitt, Comptroller of the State of New York, that the annual loss in State and local sales and use tax revenue from exempting National and State Banks on such purchases would be in the neighborhood of \$5 million. About two-fifths of this loss would be attributable to the exemption of National banks and about three-fifths to the exemption of State banks. In addition to the annual loss of revenue, Comptroller Levitt estimates that National and State banks will be entitled to refunds of some \$8 to \$12 million on past purchases.

The exemption of State banks from sales and use taxes is a direct consequence of the Supreme Court decision exempting National banks from such taxes. This follows from Article 16, Section 4, of the New York State Constitution, which provides as follows:

"Where the state has power to tax corporations under the laws of the United States there shall be no discrimination in the rates

and method of taxation between such corporations and other corporations exercising similar functions and engaged in similar business within the state."

We have further been informed by Hon. Mario A. Procaccino, Comptroller of the City of New York, that the City's share of the State revenue loss will amount to \$1,750,000. In addition, the City may be obliged to refund substantial amounts of City taxes collected from National and State banks for years antedating State collection of sales and use taxes.

Moreover, like ripples in a stream, the Supreme Court decision has consequences beyond sales and use taxes. Comptroller Procaccino has informed us that the City of New York has received claims for refunds on the annual municipal vault charge and from a National Bank on the City's Commercial Rent Tax. Total annual loss of municipal revenues from exemption of National and State banks as a result of their exemption from vault charges and the Commercial Rent Tax, or the total amount of refunds to which the city would be obligated, have not been estimated.

Other State and Local governments are faced with similar problems of revenue losses and refunds. There can be no justification for exempting National Banks from non-discriminatory State and Local taxes and thereby shifting the burdens of State and Local government costs on individuals and other business and commercial enterprises.

H.R. 19031 is designed to rectify this inequity. I respectfully request that you bring this bill to the attention of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency and trust that the Committee will clear the way for House action on my proposal. Enactment of this bill is essential to prevent erosion of State and local revenue resources.

Sincerely,

BERTRAM L. PODELL,
Member of Congress.

CO-OPS AND THE DEVELOPING WORLD

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a brief statement regarding the work being done by U.S. cooperatives in partnership with the Agency for International Development to help the people in the developing countries to improve their agricultural and food production and to raise their living standards.

These self-help achievements are of particular interest to me because they show that we can further the aims of title IX of the Foreign Assistance Act and because Minnesota leads the Nation in the number of cooperatives and in cooperative membership. Among the several thousand cooperatives are large regional associations serving many States, including two farmer-owned associations—Land O' Lakes Creameries and Farmers Union Central Exchange—that are listed among the 500 largest U.S. corporations.

I would add parenthetically that Vice President HUMPHREY, as a Senator from Minnesota, gave leadership to encouraging the use of these valuable tools of democratic development by AID, in an amendment to our Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, which provides in part:

It is declared to be the policy of the United States . . . to encourage the development and use of cooperatives, credit unions and savings and loan associations. . . .

In the 7 years since, cooperatives have contributed money, manpower, and technical assistance to AID's efforts to develop people-owned enterprises overseas.

I insert in the RECORD, at the end of my remarks, the excellent statements made by Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman and AID Administrator William S. Gaud, and a news article titled "U.S. Co-op Know-How Moves Overseas," prepared by the U.S. Agriculture Department in connection with its support of Cooperative Month in the United States next October:

STATEMENT OF ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Cooperatives are bright spots of hope on our rural landscape.

Within them new farm and community leadership is born. From them radiate challenging opportunities for rural workers. Around them grow added business for rural communities. And inside them develops increased income for farmers and other rural families.

Cooperatives are training centers for the quality of leadership we must have today. They help rural people build confidence in their abilities to do things on their own. They provide a stimulus to thinking and learning about the broader world we live in.

As productive rural industries, cooperatives hold needed talent in our rural communities because of income they provide members and salaries for the several hundred thousand jobs they open up. This is vital if we are to maintain a rural-urban balance.

Because they are locally owned, cooperatives' money does not flow out from the home community. Instead it moves back into the hands of many members and employees. In turn they move it on to home town businesses.

The cooperative business itself puts money into the community. It builds plants, has offices, buys supplies and services, pays taxes, and spends for other community needs.

Cooperatives are bright spots in rural areas because they wholeheartedly represent farmers and other rural people as they seek fair returns for their labor and investments.

Without cooperatives to bargain and do business for them, farmers would be far worse off today. Without the added heft cooperatives bring, the family farmer would be in far worse position to compete with the ever larger enterprises he confronts.

Thus, in thousands of our rural communities, cooperatives are a very real force for human and economic progress.

And the promise and fulfillment of rural cooperatives as rural community builders—the focus for Co-op Month 1968—points the way for those in urban communities with common needs, hopes and purposes.

These rural-owned cooperatives transform the weakness of a few into the strength of many.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM S. GAUD, ADMINISTRATOR, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

For the past seven years the Agency for International Development has been engaged in a unique partnership with U.S. cooperatives in building and strengthening cooperative institutions in developing countries. Together, we have worked in 53 countries on a variety of development programs ranging from small rural credit unions in Peru to a \$120 million cooperative fertilizer plant in India.

In 12 Latin American countries, 2,500 credit unions have been established serving

700,000 members with over \$52 million saved by the members.

In Uganda 60 percent of the production of cotton and coffee is now processed and marketed through farmer cooperatives.

In Ecuador 2,800 farm families are being provided with light and power through their own rural electric cooperatives.

In Panama, 1,000 farm families are improving their housing and living conditions and achieving the security of home ownership through the self-help cooperative housing program.

In other developing countries cooperative programs are well under way in agricultural production and marketing, savings and loans, housing, insurance and banking.

On this 7th anniversary of our partnership, we in A.I.D. commend the U.S. cooperatives for their contribution toward building a better world community.

U.S. CO-OP KNOW-HOW MOVES OVERSEAS

Farmer cooperatives with over \$1 billion in assets and \$15.6 billion in annual business are in partnership with the U.S. Government to help boost farm production and farm income in overseas countries.

They're taking know-how and manpower to the grassroots. They're now showing people in a score of developing countries how to set up and run their own businesses.

Many other types of cooperatives as well as farmer organizations have had a unique partnership with the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) for seven years. Together with A.I.D., they have been in 53 countries to help build and strengthen cooperative institutions.

Their activities have ranged from rural training centers and credit unions, handicraft and cottage industries, to the multimillion dollar agricultural credit and marketing programs. Now a group is topping it off with a \$120 million fertilizer cooperative to be owned by farmers in India.

These cooperative business ventures open up new horizons and new challenges for U.S. cooperatives. Most organizations can draw on their own experiences as small, local farmers' enterprises in the depression years of the 1930's.

Their growth since illustrates their value to farmers who depend on them to market their commodities and furnish them with farm supplies. Five of them, Agway Inc., Syracuse, N.Y., Cotton Producers Association, Atlanta, Ga., Farmland Industries, Kansas City, Mo., Farmers Union Central Exchange, South St. Paul, Minn., and Land O'Lakes Creameries Inc., Minneapolis, Minn., are among the 500 largest U.S. corporations.

Exclusive of the technical assistance and manpower contributions of U.S. cooperatives, the U.S. Government invested \$8.5 million last year in cooperative development overseas. Measured by results, however, it reveals the low cost and efficiency of cooperative programs. Over 400 technicians were on the job.

Results of Assistance.—In partnership with U.S. cooperatives, A.I.D. has had a sustained record of cooperative assistance. Here are some examples of results of this work:

In India, U.S. cooperative assistance has set up pilot oilseed crushing cooperatives, with more under construction. When some firms declined to sell the new "miracle" seeds, U.S. cooperative technicians helped Indian farmers set up their own distribution system, special seed plots. This expanded both production and distribution of "miracle" seeds. Results were so successful that many firms other than cooperatives are now selling seed.

In the meantime a group of regional U.S. cooperatives have pledged \$1 million and their know-how, and organized Cooperative Fertilizers International to help the Indian cooperatives build a \$119 million nitrogen fertilizer plant. The project, which involves

A.I.D., the Indian Government, a privately financed loan of over \$50 million, and the Indian cooperatives now awaits the go-ahead of the Indian Government.

It is the largest international business transaction that cooperatives have yet undertaken. It could be a pace-setter for other ventures. Present plans call for building the cooperative at the port city of Kandla, in the Gulf of Kutch in northwest India. Construction is expected to begin in 1969, with completion targeted for 1971.

In 12 Latin American countries 2,500 credit unions have 700,000 families many from among the poorest in the slums. They have saved nearly \$60 million and get credit at reasonable interest rates through these organizations.

Rural electric cooperatives "light the way and give power and new life" to whole communities in Ecuador, Nicaragua, Colombia, Costa Rica, and even Vietnam.

In Uganda, a half-million farmers move 60 percent of the country's coffee and cotton crops through cooperatives. The U.S. is also helping them organize cooperatives for dairy and livestock and minor crops.

Farmers from Peru, Chile, Bolivia, and Venezuela, as well as young cooperative leaders from Africa have been brought to the U.S. Here they live with farm families and learn about family farming under special cooperative supervision.

In a half-dozen countries in Latin America and Africa, fishermen are making bigger catches and consumers are getting better fish because cooperatives have improved fishing, grading, storage and distribution.

In nine Latin American countries, a half-million families have put \$185 million in their savings and loan associations. This has made 21,000 home improvements and 62,000 new dwellings possible.

Self-help cooperative housing programs, some of them rural, are improving homes or putting up new ones in Panama, Colombia, Honduras, and Chile.

In Brazil a multitude of cooperative projects, some with the help of A.I.D., and others by private groups, are starting multipurpose centers in the poorest communities in the Northeast, providing loans for new housing and grub-staking homesteaders through PL 480 commodities distributed cooperatively.

Under an A.I.D. agreement, Farmer Cooperative Service (FCS, USDA, has 3 employees working with Brazilian Government and cooperatives. They have helped establish a new training center for cooperatives at Campinas, have provided other training, and given direct assistance to emerging cooperatives. FCS is doing similar training and educational work in Colombia and Paraguay.

Many other countries—Thailand, Nepal, the Philippines, Korea, Pakistan, India—have cooperative-type programs in agricultural production and marketing, training and education, housing, credit, insurance and banking.

In addition to A.I.D.'s program, the Peace Corps, frequently working with U.S. cooperative groups, has helped start many hundreds of farmers' associations and cooperatives.

In recent years the voluntary relief agencies have also been making a vigorous effort at establishing permanent people-owned enterprises.

U.S. cooperatives are not alone in the field. From Europe come the Scandinavian groups, Swiss, German, French and English cooperative technicians. Israel, the Philippines, Korea, India are able to furnish capable specialists.

Need Increasing for Co-op Help.—The need for cooperatives overseas is greater now than ever before. The new demand for people's enterprises rests in part on the demand of farmers. A breakthrough in the revolution in the world agriculture finally seems to have

taken place. Record crops are being produced in a growing number of developing countries.

To maintain the Green Revolution, the world's farmers must have more than just words of encouragement to sustain high production.

There must be heavy inputs of fertilizers—which can be produced and distributed cooperatively, there must be storage and marketing facilities to assure reasonable and stable prices—which can be done effectively cooperatively, there must be improved farm supplies and machinery, and insecticides and chemicals to protect crops and harvests from insects and rodents.

Over and above this, there must be sustained technical help to train local farm experts and extension workers to reproduce or develop new strains of "miracle" seeds.

And farmers need help, not only to cope with the problems that accompany necessary new techniques, but with the economics of marketing. Here again, the simplest and most direct approach is through cooperatives, which involve the whole community.

By the measure of what is needed, the actual achievements are admittedly minuscule, but they point the way. A quarter of a century has made a tremendous difference in the size, importance and net worth of U.S. cooperatives, but the developing countries cannot wait that long.

These are some of the reasons why A.I.D. is taking a second look at the potential resources of U.S. cooperatives to involve people in useful enterprises and open up the private sector to new development.

CONGRESSMAN JOHN A. BLATNIK; OTHERS KNOW OF HIS INFLUENCE—A SOLID RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding editors and publishers in Minnesota is Veda Ponikvar, of the Chisholm Free Press. One of her recent editorials reflects some of the accomplishments of Minnesota's dean of the delegation, Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK. This well-written editorial deserves the attention of all of us.

[From the Chisholm (Minn.) Free Press, Aug. 5, 1968]

OTHERS KNOW OF HIS INFLUENCE—A SOLID RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT

Recently, a man from Wisconsin, now retired, travelled three thousand miles in an encirclement of the east and midwest states; then came to Chisholm for two purposes. He wanted to visit the Minnesota Museum of Mining; and he wanted to visit with the town folks and the area citizens about a statesman.

A TOURIST VISITS WITH CITIZENS

This tourist and visitor does not vote in our state, but he was a virtual reservoir of factual statistics and information regarding Chisholm's Congressman Blatnik. In visiting with the citizenry, he spoke in glowing terms of this senior legislator and nationally acclaimed government leader and law maker. He came as a voluntary, good will ambassador, because he had heard in the hinterland that some people thought Congressman Blatnik "hadn't done anything."

MAY BE SPEAKER OF HOUSE

Next Tuesday, September 10, the voters of the Eighth Congressional District will have

an opportunity to voice their approval; re-emphasize their faith in a fellow citizen who has dedicated 27 years of continuous service to building and strengthening this area and this nation.

The Eighth district, and especially the Iron Range, can look with justifiable pride on a leader who is strongly being considered for the position of Speaker of the House. The title has prestige and honor, but aside from that, it will only mean longer, harder, more gruelling hours of work and knowledge of parliamentary procedures. These qualities the Congressman has in rich reserve. His vision and determination to help all creeds, all tongues, all facets of our society, reveal the human kindness and understanding of a man who knows the pangs of poverty, the heartache of war; the responsibilities of an educator; the hopes and fears of the unemployed; the burdens of taxation; the dreams of peace, understanding, and an abundant life for all.

RECORD OF MERIT

What is his record? It is one of solid achievement; solid as iron ore of the Mesabi Range; strengthened with the sinews of human endeavor. There will always be those who will question the wisdom of the passage of the Taconite Amendment, but no one can deny that year round employment is not better than the four and six month stints and the compensation rolls. As the State Senator in 1941, Congressman Blatnik was the original author of the Minnesota Taconite Tax Law. With Professor Ed Davis, he tackled the challenge of making iron ore available on a long term basis. This revolutionary, technological breakthrough in the processing of iron ore in the Forties has blossomed into nearly One Half Billion Dollar investment and thousands of jobs for Minnesotans. Allied industries have developed into satellite production payrolls that spell better communities, new industrial parks, and a new dimension of brain power and social and cultural enrichment.

RIBBONS STRETCH FAR AND WIDE

The 20 year record in Congress stretches like a galaxy across this state and nation. When others were afraid to speak, he pioneered the investigations into the harm of cigarette smoking. He was co-author and leader in the sleeping dream of the St. Lawrence Seaway. His perseverance resulted in the passage of the bill and the sea lanes of the world were opened to our port of Duluth. Federal aid highway funds in the Eighth district alone total \$145 Million. He not only has helped to blueprint and bring into the reality the world's largest network of highways, but he has insisted that all of the safety measures and precautions be implemented. His efforts and his acumen have given to the Range the Hibbing four-lane beltline; the Chisholm-Hibbing Pillsbury scenic and four-lane ribbon; the Eveleth-Duluth construction; the Eveleth-Virginia four lane beltline; the Duluth-Two Harbors four lane; and the Grand Portage-Grand Marais North Shore Highway. The Eighth Congressional District has the longest completed continuous stretch of Interstate Highway in the entire state of Minnesota.

EVERY COMMUNITY BENEFITED

The Congressman was the original House co-author of the Area Redevelopment Administration bill that has completed 150 projects in 35 communities at an investment of \$7,700,000. He is the author of the Accelerated Public Works Program that completed 175 projects in 38 communities, and in the Eighth District provided more than 3,000 new jobs. Every community across the Iron Range benefited, with Chisholm gaining a modern new water system.

WISDOM LEGISLATION

The Economic Development Act was another "wisdom" piece of legislation that

gave 22 of our communities benefits totaling over \$13 million. A \$210,000 grant to Chisholm made possible a new sewer system and a similar story is repeated in city after city.

THE REAL LANDMARKS

His forward work in the areas of Water Pollution, Job Training, Medicare, Senior Citizen Housing, Urban Renewal, Education, OEO, Agriculture, REA, are the real landmarks of his devotion and concern for his people.

RESPECTED AND ESTEEMED

Few men in Congress have earned the respect and esteem that is commanded from people of both political parties by this Iron Ranger whose snow-shoe league feet cover thousands of miles to help the Indian, the miner, the small businessman, the school teacher, the student, the aged, the sick, the handicapped and retarded . . . and whose voice is listened to by men of government, labor, industry . . . and a retired senior citizen who came from Wisconsin to just remind us about "our outstanding citizen and statesman."

NOT ALL ARE IN REVOLT

HON. JAMES V. SMITH

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, with September comes the opening of colleges and universities and many of us are concerned with the possibilities of new student riots on campus.

It is unfortunate that the young people who want nothing more than to be left alone to pursue their studies are unable to find this desired quiet and peace on some campuses.

As for the others, those who disturb classes with their rebellion, I wish each might read an editorial which appeared in the Sunday Oklahoman of Oklahoma City, Okla., on September 8.

In order that my colleagues may benefit from this fine article, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

RED EXPLOITATION OF STUDENTS

This autumn's influx of returning college students occasions published forebodings concerning a possible recurrence of campus violence on a scale greater than last year's.

The campus radicals represent only a minority of the nation's millions of college students. But the minority's ability to accomplish mischief altogether disproportionate to its numbers was demonstrated only recently at Chicago.

Director J. Edgar Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation discusses the subject in the September issue of the FBI Bulletin. He says the extremists "openly avow that their aim is to overthrow the existing order." He says they profess to want a dialog under the guise of academic freedom "when actually what they seek is a confrontation with established authority to provoke disorder."

He cites the Students for a Democratic Society as the organization providing the "main thrust of the New Left movement," and says many of its members and some of its national leaders "openly profess their faith in Communist concepts and their determination to 'restructure' our society." He quotes a spokesman for the New Left as having said that if perhaps 25 universities could be linked to the movement, it would be too much for the police "and we would get what we demand."

Incredible in the light of the undisguised conspiratorial nature of the violence sweeping the campuses is the present lachrymose soul-searching about the causes for the "revolt of the young people."

It ought to be recognized in the first place that most of the nation's young people aren't in revolt and want nothing more than to be left alone to pursue their studies. Those who do become involved in violence certainly ought to know by now that they are carrying water for the Communists, and their continued membership in such radical organizations as the Students for a Democratic Society attests their readiness to be considered fellow travelers.

The Communist origin of much of the trouble on the campuses antedates even the Berkeley commotions of 1964 and 1965. A California legislative committee reported in June, 1965, that laxness on the part of then President Clark Kerr of the University of California had "let a minority of Communist leaders" take command of the student uprisings there.

Communist master-minding of the recent disorders at Chicago was disclosed six months ago in testimony Hoover gave to a House appropriations subcommittee. The individuals pulling the strings in many of these instances aren't students at all, but middle-aged revolutionaries, some of whom are avowed Communists.

The purpose of these revolutionaries is to provoke violent confrontations with established authority. Singularly myopic in the circumstances are the suggestions that a greater readiness by the authorities to "negotiate" grievances would avoid violence.

What the justice department ought to be explaining is why these middle-aged revolutionaries are being allowed to roam the country, fomenting violence and causing impressionable young people to knock heads with the authorities. Congress recently enacted a law making it a federal offense to cross state lines for purposes of inciting riots. Why isn't this law being enforced?

JEWISH COMMUNITY RELATIONS COUNCIL OF GREATER PHILADELPHIA

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, for 3 years now, agricultural workers have been engaged in a bitter strike against table grape growers in California.

Unfortunately, that battle has been reminiscent of labor organizations battles of the early decades of the 20th century, before Congress took a hand in the situation and made it a matter of law that workers had the right to organize and employers had the obligation to negotiate with the employee organizations.

But in the 33 years that have passed since the original passage of the Wagner Act by the 73d Congress farm laborers who were exempted from that act as a matter of expediency have remained exempt from the National Labor Relations Act.

To a degree, the Congress must assume its responsibility to failure to act on legislation to include the farmworkers—in certain cases—as employees under the terms of the NIRA.

Presently, the House has pending before it H.R. 16014, which was reported

out by the Committee on Education and Labor. The principal effects of H.R. 16014 would be, in the committee's own words:

1. The question of whether the farm employer would have to bargain with a union would be determined not by a test of raw economic strength and pressure but by a democratic vote of his employees.

2. Both the employer and the union would be prohibited from engaging in "unfair labor practices."

H.R. 16014, as proposed, would affect about 30,000 farms in the Nation roughly nine-tenths of 1 percent of all of the Nations 3.2 million farms.

Exempted from H.R. 16014 would be all farms which did not employ 12 or more persons during the previous year and whose labor costs for the previous year were less than \$10,000.

It is obvious to me as it must be to most people that there will never be an amicable settlement to the dispute in the grape fields of California until Congress makes it mandatory under law that growers recognize the freely chosen organizations of the agricultural workers.

I urge that the House give speedy action to this problem. It does not involve a single expenditure of the Government. It merely emancipates a modern serfdom which should not exist in a free nation.

Many people of good will have interested themselves in this problem. As an example, I offer to my colleagues a resolution passed recently by the Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Philadelphia, composed of elected representatives of hundreds of organizations in my home city:

JEWISH COMMUNITY RELATIONS COUNCIL OF GREATER PHILADELPHIA—STATEMENT ON THE STRIKE OF MEXICAN-AMERICAN FARM WORKERS AGAINST CALIFORNIA GROWERS OF TABLE GRAPES, ADOPTED BY JCRC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, AUGUST 30, 1968

As an agency struggling for 30 years for equal opportunity, equal rights, equal justice for all groups, the Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Philadelphia cannot fail to respond to the repressive measures being taken against Mexican-Americans in the United Farm Workers Organization Committee as they seek to exercise their rights by peaceful and non-violent methods.

We view this struggle as part of the larger problem of poverty amidst affluence in America. Migratory and seasonal farm workers constitute a very substantial proportion of poverty stricken Americans.

Denied the legal right under the National Labor Relations Act to bargain collectively, Mexican-American farm workers have been carrying on a historic and courageous struggle for 3 years against the grape-growing corporations in California for the right to organize and bargain collectively with their employers.

Led by one of their own, Cesar Chavez, an advocate of non-violent resistance, they have won recognition of the United Farm Workers Organization Committee as the sole bargaining agent for its workers from the grape growers for the wine industry.

But the California growers of table grapes have rejected all overtures at settlement or even negotiation. Instead, they have used illegal Mexican nationals as strikebreakers; various forms of intimidation including violence; political pressures and other means of harassment to maintain the helpless position of the migrant farm workers.

In the face of these powerful forces and in absence of legal guarantees, Mexican-American Farm workers believe that their only effective weapon is the conscience of

America manifested in selective buying of California table grapes.

Their call for selective buying of California table grapes has received increasing support from religious groups, unions and political figures throughout the United States including Philadelphia, which is the fourth largest distribution center of table grapes in the country.

The JCRC pledges to join with others in an intensive campaign of interpretation on the need for wide-spread public support of the goals sought by these workers and urges its constituent organizations and their membership to join in this campaign.

The JCRC affirms the position taken by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights and the Kerner Commission Report in calling upon the United States Congress to take the long overdue legislative action to afford to agricultural workers the right to organize and bargain collectively guaranteed to all other American workers, by including them in the scope of the National Labor Relations Act.

The JCRC calls upon the Attorney General of the United States and the Secretary of Labor of the United States requesting that they undertake immediate investigation and appropriate measures to insure unimpaired exercise by the farm workers of their constitutional rights and to affect adequate police protection to prevent further acts of violence against them.

FACING THE FACTS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, when the subject of the national security of our country comes up, one can generally depend on most veterans organizations to be knowledgeable and alert. No exception is the American Legion which is holding its national convention this week in New Orleans, La. Its national commander, William E. Galbraith, discussed the Vietnam situation at a press conference last Friday, and like most veterans his recommendations were hard hitting and to the point. The worldwide threat of communism was not brushed under the rug as has been the case with other national figures in recent times.

On the same day the Americanism Committee of the Legion heard an address by the general counsel of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Chester D. Smith, whose 31 years in intelligence work for the executive branch before joining the committee well qualified him to speak on various aspects of internal security problems in the United States. He identified Negro extremist groups such as RAM, the Black Panther Party and SNCC as "nothing but black klans" who were perverting the true civil rights movement.

Mr. Smith, whose vast experience in the intelligence community brought him in intimate contact with every aspect of internal security, stressed the price that we must be willing to pay to continue to live in freedom:

The bill is high, but pay it we must. The alternative is a debtor's prison—enslavement of our country and its ideals.

It is not surprising then the Legion's resolutions passed yearly at their annual convention reflect a genuine concern and a hardheaded realism toward the top-priority problems which face our Nation.

I submit two news accounts of the convention appearing in the New Orleans States-Item of September 6 and the Times-Picayune of September 7 for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Orleans States-Item, Sept. 6, 1968]

MAJOR THREAT CITED—LEGION FOCUSES ON SUBVERSIVES

(By James Hearty)

As thousands of Legionnaires continued to swarm into the city today for the biggest convention ever held here, one thing became apparent.

Whatever their targets will be later on in the gigantic spectacle, the target for today is subversion, a topic which got a thorough going-over in two pre-convention addresses.

One speaker said it's time now, even though the Vietnam war is an undeclared one, for Congress to start relaxing the type of evidence needed to convict spies who would sell us out to Russian and Chinese Communists.

Another described the alarming price Americans are paying for Communist subversion, aggression and espionage.

Addressing the Americanism Committee of the Legion at the Roosevelt was a 59-year-old career spy-hunter, who during World War II led a counter-intelligence task force of more than 1,000 men.

Chester D. Smith, Washington, D.C., general counsel for the House Un-American Activities Committee, addressed the loyalty group, while Martin L. Schneider, president of the North Virginia Savings and Loan Association, spoke before the National Public Relations Committee of the Legion.

Other speakers today included George W. Healy Jr., executive editor of The Times-Picayune and New Orleans States-Item, before the public relations group, and James V. Day, Washington, commissioner of the Federal Maritime Commission, chairman of the Legion's Task Force for the Future Committee, and C. C. Horton, Gulf Shores, Ala., chairman of the National Legislation Committee.

Sitting in at the Americanism committee session as a committee member was the Rev. John J. Howard, Hampton, Va., "where it all begins." Father Howard explained he meant Hampton is "the oldest English-speaking settlement in the United States."

Smith's spy-hunters, he recalled today, uncovered more than 26,000 cases of subversion against the United States, documented them and turned them over to the Justice Department.

Today, however, he said he wondered whether our legal system "is sufficient to protect our free society." He said while the war is undeclared, "all around us are people, who, through clandestine acts, are aiding the Communist Party of the U.S.A."

Smith, who stepped in as a speaker today in place of Rep. Edwin Willis, of Louisiana, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, cited the riots in Watts, Newark and New York as the work of that party and the Progressive Labor Party, which is backed by Red China.

RAM, the Revolutionary Action Movement, Smith said in his speech, "is headed by Robert Williams, a fugitive from justice who fled to Cuba and then to Peking, where he lived until recently."

He was befriended by both Castro and Mao Tse-tung. "From these Communist countries he broadcast and mailed to the United States call after call for Negroes to launch a revo-

lution, fought on urban guerrilla warfare lines, to bring this country to its knees."

Smith said that Williams is now in Tanzania, the new African nation largely under the influence of Peking, reportedly on his way back to the United States.

The speaker said that the cases of RAM conspirators pinpoint "two major problems we face in America today." One is civil rights—equality for Negroes and other minorities. The other is Communist and black racist revolutionary warfare.

"Each one is a very serious problem; each one feeds on the other to some degree, and each one demands vigorous corrective action in the interest of our national security. . . ."

"Actions by groups committed to our destruction—the New Left, the Communist Party U.S.A., the Soviet military and industrial espionage forces and others, underline the absolute necessity of costly intelligence operations of our country," Schneider said.

The bill is high, he added, "but pay it we must. The alternative is a debtor's prison—enslavement of our country and its ideals."

He asked, "What is the price of liberty? How much collateral must we be prepared to pledge for the survival of freedom? I think it was said for us in the final sentence of the Declaration of Independence:

"... our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor."

Day said a new comprehensive program for the future of the nearly three-million-member Legion will be presented at next year's convention in Atlanta.

He said his group has been working on it for a year, is continuing to do so with the help of many distinguished consultants.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Time-Picayune, Sept. 7, 1968]

LEGION LEADER URGES VICTORY—SOUTH VIETNAM COALITION REGIME CALLED UNSUITABLE

(By Bill Abbott)

The national commander of the American Legion Friday afternoon called for American military victory in Vietnam and declared unsuitable formation of a coalition government between Communists and South Vietnamese.

William E. Galbraith addressed a press conference at the Roosevelt Hotel in conjunction with the opening of the massive 50th annual American Legion Convention.

Galbraith said that American troops in Vietnam are the best this country ever produced and that "given more arm room," they are capable of victory.

He said that he opposed any decrease in the bombing of North Vietnam as risking lives of the 500,000 United States troops now stationed in the south.

FOUR STEPS URGED

Galbraith stated that his organization recommended four steps in the past to aid South Vietnamese and support U.S. troops.

These are increased bombing of areas of North Vietnam now shipping supplies into the south, additional attacks on the port of Haiphong, additional concern with the Cambodian border where North Vietnamese and Viet Cong guerrillas have sought refuge, and increased control of the U.S. war effort by military leaders.

Concerning peace talks now being conducted in Paris, Galbraith cautioned that during Korean War peace negotiations 13,000 American soldiers were lost in combat.

Galbraith said that he opposes formation of any coalition government with the North Vietnamese or the Viet Cong because the people of Vietnam sought U.S. military help and indicated a desire for independence in their presidential elections.

He said that, in forming a coalition government, the United States would have to tell parents of 25,000 American soldiers who were killed that their sons died in vain.

Going beyond Vietnam, Galbraith said the U.S. must maintain its troop commitments in Europe. He said that the security of the country depends not only on the safety of U.S. boundaries, but also on a fight against Communists throughout the world.

SUPPORTS LAW

In domestic affairs, Galbraith said that law and order is definitely the number one issue. He said that the country should allow political dissidence but only "provided it falls within the framework of abiding by the law." "All men want to improve themselves," Galbraith said, "but we want people to do this lawfully and not by stepping on the rights of others."

Questioned about gun controls, Galbraith said that the American Legion always opposed registration of firearms by the federal government, but modified its stand to allow control by local officials. Galbraith added that the American Legion can possibly endorse government limitation of persons receiving firearms through the mail.

Galbraith, at the press conference, also discussed the work of the American Legion "Task Force for the Future," a group which analyzes "current patterns of American life to determine whether the Legion's goals and programs are conforming to this pattern."

The task force, Galbraith said, will look ahead to the year 2019 and will recommend new ways the Legion's more than 2,600,000 members can make significant contributions to their country.

The first specific problem that will be dealt with, Galbraith said, will be a movement from rural areas to cities. He cited this at the core of problems of law and order, and said individual posts through social involvement of its members, can do much to improve urban conditions.

Earlier Friday, special committees of the American Legion met and heard speeches by experts concerning particular areas of Legion interest.

Chester D. Smith, general counsel for the U.S. House Un-American Activities Committee, addressed the Americanism Committee, while George W. Healy Jr., executive editor of The Times-Picayune and New Orleans States-Item, addressed the National Public Relations Committee.

Other speakers included Martin L. Schneider, president of the Northern Virginia Savings and Loan Association, addressing the Public Relations Committee; James V. Day, commissioner of the Federal Maritime Commission and chairman of the Legion's Task Force for the Future Committee; and C. C. Horton, Gulf Shores, Ala., chairman of the National Legislation Committee.

HITS FIFTH COLUMN

Smith, in his featured Americanism address, branded as "fifth column" Communist organizations, Students for a Democratic Society, the Progressive Labor Party, the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs and the Negro Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM).

He identified Negro extremist groups such as RAM, the Black Panther Party, and the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee as "nothing but black Klans," and accused them of perverting the true civil rights movement.

Smith said that the "two major problems we face in America today" are civil rights—equality for Negroes and other minorities; and Communist black racist revolutionary warfare.

Calling for careful distinction between civil rights and black revolutionary groups by Americanism committeemen, Smith said:

"Real Americanism of the type you men have demonstrated does not condone or call for hate, prejudice, discrimination or violence. On the contrary, it calls for respect for law and for all fellow citizens. It calls for vigorous action in promoting true civil rights—equal opportunity for all in all

areas, and equality of all people before the law, no matter what their race, creed, nationality, or color of skin."

Smith described the House Un-American Activities Committee as "just one of a number of government agencies with a security function."

As other security agencies he named the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Central Intelligence Agency, the U.S. Information Service, the Voice of America, divisions of state and local police departments and the intelligence units of the armed services.

He said that although all these agencies are "doing what they can to preserve and strengthen this country and frustrate and defeat the plans of its enemies," they alone cannot fully protect the nation.

BELIEF IS NEEDED

The most vital security element, Smith said, is an "unswerving belief in the principles of freedom and independence" among the American people. "These qualities are developed, or inhibited, by a nation's overall culture, the sum of all that its citizens are taught in their homes, educational institutions, and churches, through newspapers, radio, television, moving pictures, and similar communications media."

Smith criticized some religious and civil rights leaders for detrimentally opposing U.S. foreign policy to such an extent that no government agency can repair the damage done.

In closing, Smith called for more attention to the cultural elements of security as the best way of working for the preservation of American freedom.

THE REAL CHICAGO

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the national media and the press of our large metropolitan centers have been literally flooded with accounts of what took place at the unhappy Democratic Convention in Chicago last month. With that in mind, I thought it might be of interest to read some opinions from the grassroots such as an editorial from the Peoria Journal Star of September 6 which discusses events at the Democratic Convention but, more importantly, the editorial points out very clearly the contrast in Chicago a few days after the convention when the Republican presidential candidate, Mr. Nixon, came to that city to kick off his campaign.

Hundreds of thousands of people turned out for a joyous, spirited, friendly reception and except perhaps for a few toes that may have been trampled on in the crowd, not a single injury of any consequence was reported. This demonstration portrayed the true face and spirit of Chicago, and I submit that editorial for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REAL CHICAGO

When the hell-raising hippies—bankrolled and bused in all the way from New York and California—left town, Chicago ceased to be anything resembling the "police state" the TV visitors were hysterically proclaiming it to be.

The real spirit of the city went on spec-

tacular display when Richard Nixon came to town—just days after all the action and horror talk by New York based hotshots.

Nixon is no friend of Mayor Daley. Far from it.

But he didn't come to town to smash the laws, abuse the police, and wreck things.

Hundreds of thousands of normal citizens lined the streets, responding as needed to good-natured police.

The people turned out in hundreds of thousands and we got a chance to see who they really are—instead of the mangy crowd in Grant Park a week previous. The crowd of silly kids, thrill seekers, and vicious, calculating American Viet Cong had screamed "We are the people!" the week before. They had to scream it, because that was as near as they could come to make it seem real and back up their claim to "own" the park, and "own" the streets!

After they got hit in the head, the leaders and organizers of the American Viet Cong rushed onto TV under the welcoming wing of Hugh Downs to proclaim that they had no interest in the Democratic convention, that it was "irrelevant" to them, and they only wanted a place to make some "free" speeches.

Good old Hugh cooed appropriately, and tutted appropriately.

He wasn't curious about the strange coincidence that they decided to up and spend several thousand dollars transplanting themselves to Chicago for one week, and it just happened to be the week of the convention!

He wasn't curious about the odd practice of marching from hotel to hotel where delegations were lodged to howl "Peace, Now!" (by day, and at night the most extreme obscenities aimed at Humphrey).

He wasn't curious about previous announcements made and published that they were going to Chicago to "turn the city upside down," or scream in threats made on their portable loudspeaker systems to the crowds in the park about the obscene things they were going to do with the convention and to Hubert Humphrey.

He wasn't curious that they made their mass move on the Conrad Hilton hotel which was convention headquarters, and candidate headquarters.

What a set of coincidences? Concerning a convention and a candidacy in which they weren't interested. Irrelevant, indeed!

However, the plain fact is, no matter how confused they may be back in New York, that Nixon's visit days later shows the entire Midwest that Chicago is a very open town, indeed, and that the only brief time when it seemed a mess was when it was invaded by a mess of New York rabble-rousers on the streets and a bunch of New York broadcasters who proved to be pretty good rabble-rousers themselves on the TV.

When those few went back home, the real Chicago came back to life.

Meanwhile, as they refuse Mayor Daley his request to lay out the full facts of what happened in detail during the convention, claiming they had given "fair coverage," NBC proceeds to pack its "Today" show and its "Tonight" show ALSO with vicious and one-sided abuse directed against Mayor Daley, Chicago, and the Chicago police.

(They followed this with a "token" visit from Bill Buckley and then cut him off short when they finally got around to the same subject and he had made one quick point.)

It doesn't matter.

Chicago gave its own answer this week, with hundreds of thousands of people pouring into the same strife-torn streets, to greet a presidential candidate who passed among them safely and without fear.

The people who came to wreck a convention from inside it and outside it had gone home.

C. L. DANCEY.