

blind—a courageous, honorable man who would enforce the law, regardless of whether he was enforcing it against the Ku Klux Klan or the black power crowd. He was going to do what was right as the good Lord gave him the light to see it, and do his duty under the Constitution.

Mr. President, I stand here as a Democrat. Our country is in trouble—very deep trouble, Mr. President. I hope all Senators will hear this.

We are in trouble on one single issue, law and order. That we cannot argue about.

The people want to be safe on the streets. They want to be safe in their homes. They do not want some brute to deny them their rights, and to take advantage of their wives and children. The people of this country are very much upset and alarmed about mob violence, brutes, rioters, trouble-makers, traitors. Traitors—people who are unworthy of being Americans, who are inside these borders. They are upset about that.

I know something about all this. I never asked anybody to vote for me on this basis, never advertised it, and never made anything of it; but I am proud to have two daughters. One is married, and one is not married. The one who is not married is engaged to a young man fighting with the Green Berets over there in Vietnam right now.

There is no particular distinction in that. But it does bring home one point to my mind. That young man is from Canada. He was an American before he was a Canadian. His family moved to Canada. They are Canadians, and his father is in charge of producing oil for a major oil company in Canada.

That young man came from Canada down here to America, and volunteered to fight in the most hazardous unit you can volunteer to fight in, because, even though he lives in Canada, at heart he is an American, and he is willing to die any day, and volunteer to undertake any task, to fight for this country.

Mr. President, I am somewhat proud of the fact that my daughter attracted a young man like that to propose marriage

to her: A courageous young American living in Canada. He is not one who went to Canada to avoid the draft. He is one who came from Canada to fight for America.

Mr. President, I knew what it was to fight for this country, too. May I say, the first time or two I went into battle, I was very much afraid. But when it came time to invade south France, and I received my orders, I was in the eighth wave to hit that beach.

I approached my flotilla commander and said, "This is not fair."

He said, "What's the matter? You are in the eighth wave, if that is what is bothering you."

I told him, "I ought to be in the first wave. You have men not a bit better than I am who are in that first wave, who were in the first wave at Sicily, the first wave at Salerno, and the first wave at Anzio. That first wave is a very dangerous proposition. They should not be made to be in the first wave again. I am just as good a man as they are, and I want to be in the first wave."

He said, "Are you serious?"

I said, "Yes, I'm serious."

He said, "Just stick around."

In a little while, he brought me back new orders, and I went in in front of the first wave, and was proud to do it.

Mr. President, either you love your country or you do not. Either you are an American or you are not. Either you are patriotic or you are not. You can be one or the other.

Freedom does not come cheap. Daniel Webster stood here on this floor and said the only people who ever keep their freedom are those who love it and are willing to give their lives fighting for it at any time, if need be.

That is how it will be. That is how it should be.

I did not believe in fighting in World War II. I was an idolater of the La Follettes and those who advocated we should not go into World War II. But when the war was on, I volunteered. I wanted no doubt about my patriotism. From my

point of view, I wanted to make it clear that however we got into the war, I would see it through. Please forgive me if I get carried away in discussing other young men in other times who apparently feel differently.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 13, 1968, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 12, 1968:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Ted J. Davis, of Oklahoma, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, vice George L. Mehren, resigned.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

H. Rex Lee, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the term of 7 years from July 1, 1968, vice Lee Loevinger, term expired.

U.S. JUDGE

Edward D. Re, of New York, to be judge of the U.S. Customs Court, vice Lindley G. Beckworth, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 12, 1968:

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Shirley M. Hufstедler, of California, to be U.S. circuit judge, ninth circuit.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATOR

Paul L. Sitton, of Georgia, to be Urban Mass Transportation Administrator.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

STROM THURMOND: NIXON'S CIVIL RIGHTS ADVISER

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1968

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all our colleagues have read numerous versions of how the ticket to carry the banner of the Grand Old Party in this fall's election was put together at Miami Beach. There was one common thread that ran through many of the accounts. And that common thread had STROM THURMOND, the architect of the Nixon southern strategy, in the role of Republican kingmaker.

But STROM THURMOND apparently is more than just a kingmaker. It appears that he also is a chief civil rights adviser of the Republican nominee. Who would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that STROM THURMOND in the year 1968 would wind up advising the nominee of the party of Lincoln. The GOP has indeed gone a long way—backward—since Lincoln.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of our colleagues an article which appeared in a recent edition of the State published in Columbia, S.C. It was datelined Miami Beach—straight from the Republican Convention. The headline over the article read, "Briefing Given to Nixon on Columbia School Fight." Giving the briefing, of course, was none other than STROM THURMOND, whose civil rights record is known to all

of us. The article stated that the Republican nominee "may endorse the 'freedom of choice' approach to school desegregation." One cannot help but wonder whether Mr. Nixon is aware of—or whether he cares about—the recent Supreme Court decision which ruled out, in almost all circumstances, the use of the discredited and misnamed "freedom of choice" technique as a method of desegregating schools. The reason the Court has disallowed "freedom of choice" is that it simply does not work to end the unconstitutional dual school system and protect the rights of Negro children.

The enlightening article in the State also alluded to a deal with Mr. Nixon for "an easing off of civil rights maneuvers" in return for the support of southern delegates at the Miami Beach Conven-

tion. The deal obviously paid off for the Republican nominee.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the South Carolina Republican Party chairman, Harry Dent, is quoted in the article as saying that Mr. Nixon's stand against "regional discrimination" puts the candidate "in a position of opposing the 1965 Voting Rights Act by which literacy requirements for voting in South Carolina and a number of other Southern States, as well as some northern areas, were suspended."

Mr. Speaker, I suspect that the article in the Columbia State may contain some revelations for some of Mr. Nixon's more forward-looking colleagues in the Republican Party, and I urge that all interested Members on both sides of the aisle take a few minutes to read the article which reflects not the "new Nixon" nor the "old Nixon"—just Nixon. Under unanimous consent, I include the article as part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

BRIEFING GIVEN TO NIXON ON COLUMBIA SCHOOL FIGHT

(By Phillip G. Grose, Jr.)

MIAMI BEACH, FLA.—Sen. Strom Thurmond reportedly has carried the school desegregation fight in Columbia to GOP candidate Richard M. Nixon.

The senator got what party chairman Harry Dent called "favorable response" to his presentation of the situation.

MAJOR PLAN

Columbia School District One is scheduled for a major desegregation plan this fall, by which white children will be sent into predominantly Negro schools for the first time.

Dent said that Nixon told Thurmond that he did not favor the busing of school children for desegregation purposes, and that he also felt all sections of the country should be treated alike in civil rights questions. Presumably, Nixon may endorse the "freedom of choice" approach to school desegregation.

SATISFIED

Dent said South Carolinians were satisfied with Nixon's approach to civil rights questions.

Nixon was reportedly asked if he felt any further civil rights legislation is necessary at this time, and the former vice president's answer was reported to be "No".

Reports had circulated freely here during the last few that Nixon may have made a deal with southern delegates for their support in return for an easing off of civil rights maneuvers.

NIXON FAVORS

Thurmond said Thursday that Nixon generally favored the plan whereby federal grants would be channeled through states, rather than being made directly to a smaller political subdivision.

By placing the discretion in the hands of the states, Thurmond said, a number of problems in federal-state relations could be averted.

Thurmond said that vice presidential nominee Spiro T. Agnew of Maryland also favored a similar upgrading of the states' roles in determining the use of funds.

REDUCE INFLUENCE

Thurmond speculated that transferring such authority to the states would reduce the influence of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW).

Dent equated Nixon's stand against regional discrimination as also putting the GOP candidate in a position of opposing the

1965 Voter Rights Act, by which literacy requirements for voting in South Carolina and a number of other southern states, as well as some northern areas, were suspended.

WEIRD POLICY ON RHODESIA

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial entitled "Weird Policy on Rhodesia," published in the Rocky Mount, N.C., Telegram of August 25, 1968.

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

WEIRD POLICY ON RHODESIA

On July 29 President Johnson signed an executive order prohibiting all trade between the U.S. and Rhodesia, and delegating authority to the secretaries of Commerce, Treasury and Transportation to promulgate regulations necessary to put the order into effect with the object of overthrowing the Rhodesian government. One has to look diligently to find any reference to this executive order in the news media, notwithstanding that it represents a very substantial escalation of hostility toward Rhodesia, a friendly, strongly anti-Communist country.

In fact, it brings American hostility toward Rhodesia up to the brink of armed conflict and makes the U.S. a passive accomplice in Che Guevara style terrorist activities across Rhodesia's northern border.

These latest measures are designed to strangle the Rhodesian economy, to extract political results from personal hardships and suffering. It is not really too different from what is happening in Biafra. It is a strange act of policy by a responsible government on behalf of a humane people. It is significant that the people of this country have never endorsed this shameful policy. At no stage in the commitment of presidential action has the U.S. Congress been consulted. There has not even been an equivalent of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

Some members of Congress are concerned. Sen. Harry Byrd of Virginia, spoke thus on August 2:

"The resolution represents the second step in the effort to bring about the collapse of the Rhodesian government. The first step—a partial boycott of the economy of Rhodesia instituted last year—was a failure. The third step, which will be called for should these added measures also fail, is military action.

"The U.S. is in a vulnerable position, its action is unprincipled and wrong. It is unjust. Besides that, we are in the absurd position of demanding sanctions against a nation which is at peace with us, and yet do nothing about seeking economic sanctions against North Vietnam at whose hands this country has suffered more than 193,000 casualties.

"Just 10 months ago I introduced an amendment calling on this government to initiate and support in the United Nations economic sanctions against North Vietnam. The Senate adopted that formal resolution by a vote of 74 to 15. Yet, despite that action the President has done nothing about North Vietnam. But he has intensified the actions of this country against Rhodesia.

"This is a matter to be decided between the countries involved—Great Britain and

Rhodesia. The American government has no business interfering in this matter. That same position has been forcefully stated by former Secretary of State Dean Acheson. Mr. Acheson has labeled the United Nations action against Rhodesia as 'barefaced aggression, unprovoked and unjustified by a single legal or moral principle.

"Hopefully, we will have pressure for a change of policy in this country. We have recently had a change of our ambassador to the United Nations. Mr. George Ball, our former Undersecretary of State now heads our delegation. Mr. Ball has many times expressed his view that our policy towards Rhodesia is self-defeating and misguided."

It should be made a matter of public record that while this country is backing the shameful British policy against little Rhodesia, the British in turn have not only failed to support the United States in its defense of South Vietnam, but have sent British ships into the ports of North Vietnam to provide our enemy with the sinews of war against our troops. The records show British trade with Hanoi has increased 100 per cent over the same period last year.

Again, while this country fully cooperates in the U.N. sanctions against Rhodesia, the U.N. for its part refuses even to consider the question of a boycott of North Vietnam.

This weird policy of President Johnson might make sense to somebody, but we haven't found out yet exactly who it is.

SEX DISCRIMINATION IN PENSION AND RETIREMENT PLANS SHOULD NOT BE PERPETUATED

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, there is now pending before the Senate a House-passed bill—H.R. 2767—that initially came from the House Ways and Means Committee on which I serve. However, the bill as reported by the Senate Finance Committee has been amended, by addition of a new section 2, to perpetuate sex discrimination in pension and retirement plans. That amendment would contravene the basic principle of nondiscrimination adopted by the Congress in title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, prohibiting discrimination in employment on the basis of sex as well as race, color, religion, or national origin. That amendment would overrule a guideline which the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission issued in February 1968 after public hearings and over 2 years of consideration. The amendment would also modify the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, as well as several Executive orders prohibiting sex and age discrimination by Federal Government contractors and subcontractors and on federally assisted construction projects.

This broad and mischievous amendment is based on misinformation and misunderstanding, and is unjustified. I have prepared an analysis of the amendment, which I believe will be useful for the Congress and the public, and I in-

clude my analysis in the RECORD at this point:

SECTION 2 OF H.R. 2767, AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE, TO PERMIT SEX DISCRIMINATION IN PENSION AND RETIREMENT PLANS, IS BASED ON MISINFORMATION AND MISUNDERSTANDING, AND IS UNJUSTIFIABLE—SECTION 2 SHOULD NOT BE ADOPTED

H.R. 2767, as passed by the House of Representatives on March 14, 1967, would amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit tax deductions by farmers for assessments for depreciable property levied by soil or water conservation or drainage districts.

On August 1, 1968, the Senate Finance Committee reported out the bill with numerous amendments. One amendment added section 2, reading as follows (page 4, lines 10-25):

"Sec. 2. The terms or conditions of a pension or retirement plan qualified under section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, or of a retirement practice, which provide for reasonable differentiation in retirement ages between male and female employees, or which provide for or require retirement at reasonable ages, shall not be construed to violate title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, any Executive Order, or any rules or regulations issued under any of the foregoing, except that such terms and conditions shall not excuse the failure or refusal to hire individuals, or the discharging of individuals prior to retirement age, on account of their sex or age. The preceding sentence shall not apply if such terms and conditions are merely a subterfuge to evade the basic purposes of title II of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967."

I. SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Under this amendment, existing and future private retirement and pension plans, and retirement practices, may (a) provide different compulsory and optional retirement ages for men and for women, solely on the basis of their sex, and (b) permit or require retirement "at reasonable ages", regardless of the prohibitions in the following laws and executive orders:

a. Title VII, Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-352; 78 Stat. 241, 253; 42 U.S.C. 2000e).

b. Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (Act of Dec. 15, 1967, Public Law 90-202; 81 Stat. 602).

c. Executive Order 11141, Feb. 13, 1964, prohibiting discrimination based on age by government contractors and subcontractors.

d. Executive Order 11246, Sept. 24, 1965 (30 F.R. 12319), as amended by Executive Order 11375, Oct. 13, 1967 (32 F.R. 14303), prohibiting discrimination based on sex by government contractors and subcontractors and on federally-assisted construction projects.

The stated purpose of this sex-based amendment is to overturn the guideline issued in February 1968 (33 F.R. 3344; 29 C.F.R. 1604.31) by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission which stated that a "difference in optional or compulsory retirement ages based on sex violates Title VII." The Commission has not ruled on whether other sex differences in pensions and retirement plans, such as differences in benefits to survivors, violate Title VII.

It should be noted that the amendment deals with two different subjects: One involves sex differentiation in retirement ages (affecting Title VII and E.O. 11246 and 11375). The second subject involves "retirement at reasonable ages" which does not necessarily involve sex discrimination (af-

fecting the Age Discrimination Act and E.O. 11141).

II. SCOPE OF THIS ANALYSIS

This analysis deals only with the subject of sex discrimination.

III. REASONS STATED IN SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT TO SUBMIT AMENDMENT

The full text of the Senate Finance Committee's reasons for adding section 2 is on pages 6 and 7 of S. Rept. 1497, 90th Cong., and is attached hereto as Appendix A. These reasons are as follows:

1. The report asserts that it is "not uncommon for a pension or retirement plan to differentiate between male and female employees with regard to optional or compulsory retirement ages. . . ." and that such differentiation is provided for in "the retirement practice of many employers."

2. The report points out that although Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not contain a specific exception for differentials in retirement age, there is a provision in the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (sec. 4(f)(2)) which exempts a "bona fide . . . retirement, pension . . . plan" from the prohibition against age discrimination. The report then states: "Nevertheless when Congress originally enacted title VII, the committee believes it is clear that Congress did not intend to prohibit reasonable differences in treatment of male and female employees under retirement or pension plans generally, since differential treatment is accorded men and women under the social security program today. . . . In fact, the congressional view on this matter would appear to be specifically indicated by the retirement differentiation for sex it has provided in the social security program."

3. The report states that the primary purpose of Title VII and the Age Discrimination Act—namely, "the hiring of workers on a nondiscriminatory basis"—would not "be served" by prohibiting sex differentials in retirement age.

IV. THE FOREGOING ARGUMENTS ARE INACCURATE, MISLEADING, AND LARGELY IRRELEVANT

A. Over 95 percent of pension and retirement plans do not have sex differentials in retirement age

It is misleading to state that it is "not uncommon" for a pension or retirement plan to contain differentials based on sex and that the retirement practice of "many employers" provides for differentials in retirement age. The fact is that over 95 percent of all retirement and pension plans under collective bargaining reported pursuant to the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act contain no distinction between men and women workers. Only 5 percent contain sex differentials concerning the age required for either (a) participation in the pension plan, (b) early voluntary retirement, (c) normal voluntary retirement, or (d) involuntary retirement. Of those 5 percent, only a few have sex differentials in all four age requirements. Furthermore, sex as such is almost never the basis for differences in the amount of benefits paid to the retired employee, or in the amount of credited service and earnings necessary to receive such benefits. Incidentally, of the 5 percent of the pension plans which differentiate in retirement age on the basis of sex, those of the Bell Telephone companies, the principal lobbyists for the amendment, affect the most employees.

B. The Social Security Act does not have different retirement ages based on sex

The report's discussion of the Social Security Act is simply erroneous. The Social Security Act does not provide different retirement ages based on sex. The normal retirement age under that Act is 65 for both men and women. In 1956 the Act was

amended to permit women to retire at age 62, with reduced benefits. In 1961, the Act was further amended to permit men also to retire at 62, with reduced benefits. So far as retirement age is concerned, the Social Security Act does not differentiate on the basis of the worker's sex.¹

The report also fails to mention that there is no sex differentiation in retirement ages for men and women employees under the Federal Civil Service Retirement System.

C. Title VII prohibits sex discrimination in retirement age

The clear language of Title VII prohibiting sex discrimination in the "compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment" surely prohibits sex differentials with regard to retirement age. The requirement that an employee retire at a certain age is clearly a "condition" of employment; and the employee's option to retire voluntarily at a certain age is clearly a "privilege" of employment. Therefore, Title VII plainly prohibits sex discrimination with regard to retirement age under pension and retirement plans.

This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that while Title VII contains various exceptions² from the general nondiscrimination requirement, it has no exceptions with regard to retirement age and pension benefits. Furthermore, the fact that such an exception exists in the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, which relates solely to age discrimination, certainly has no bearing on the prohibitions in Title VII, which relate to discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex or national origin. Surely no one could rationally contend that race discrimination is permissible with regard to retirement ages. The same language of Title VII applies to sex discrimination.

D. The legislative history of title VII concerning sex discrimination in pensions and retirement plans does not modify the statutory prohibition against sex discrimination, and does not show a congressional intention to permit sex discrimination beyond that of the Social Security Act, which section 2 of H.R. 2767 would do

Opponents of sex equality in pensions and retirement plans have sometimes cited an ambiguous colloquy between Senator Randolph and then Senator Humphrey to show that Congress intended to permit sex discrimination in pensions and retirement plans. However, that colloquy is quite inadequate, under clearly recognized canons of legislative construction, to rebut the plain statutory prohibition against sex discrimination.

The Randolph-Humphrey colloquy consisted of only six sentences.³ It clearly shows that Senator Randolph was inquiring whether title VII would permit private pension and retirement plans to be compatible with the Social Security system insofar as concerns sex differentials. Senator Humphrey's response plainly indicates that he misunderstood the question. He said: Yes, that point was made unmistakably clear earlier today by the adoption of the Bennett amendment; so there can be no doubt about it." But the Bennett amendment (sec. 703(h) of title VII) did not deal with pension or retirement plans at all. It related only to payment of wages as prescribed by the Equal Pay Act of 1963 which prohibits sex discrimination in wages of employees covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act. The Bennett amendment was simply intended to prevent inconsistent application of title VII and the Equal Pay Act, not to permit sex discrimination in pensions and retirement plans.

¹Footnotes at end of speech.

Furthermore, although the Civil Rights Act of 1964 contains several provisions requiring title VII to be harmonized with other laws,⁴ there is nothing in title VII requiring that its provisions be subject to, or harmonized with, any sex discrimination features of the Social Security Act.

But even if the ambiguous Randolph-Humphrey colloquy were regarded as requiring Title VII to be interpreted in conformity with the sex discriminations permitted under the Social Security law, it would not justify the enactment of section 2 of H.R. 2767. The fact is that the Social Security law for the past seven years has not contained sex differentiations with regard to retirement age. Hence, to adopt section 2 would be squarely inconsistent with the purpose which Senator Randolph expressed in that colloquy.

It should be further noted that although the Senate Finance Committee's report relies on the alleged (but non-existent) sex differentials in retirement age of the Social Security system, the committee amendment to H.R. 2767 is not limited to such differentials as may be in the Social Security Act. It simply provides for "reasonable differentiation in retirement ages between male and female employees" with no reference to the Social Security Act. Since it does not define "reasonable" or what criteria will be used to judge what is "reasonable", that word does not really limit the scope of the amendment.

The amendment is obviously intended to permit a lower compulsory and optional retirement ages for women. Yet actuarial mortality tables demonstrate that sex differentials in retirement ages are not "reasonable" since women as a class tend to live longer than men. When a man retires at 65, he will receive approximately 10 years of social security benefit payments, while a woman who retires at 62 will receive approximately 20 years of such payments. If any sex is entitled to an earlier optional retirement age privilege, it should be the male. Frankly, no sex differential is reasonable for retirement age. What the amendment would permit is simply unwarranted discrimination in retirement age based on sex.

E. The primary purpose of title VII would be affirmatively served, not hindered, by having no sex discrimination in retirement ages

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was enacted to prevent discrimination based on race, sex, etc. through the entire gamut of the employment relationship. It covers more than the hiring referred to in the Finance Committee's report. It applies to job advertising, to hire, to discrimination "with respect to . . . compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment", and to "discharge". It would be wholly anomalous to prohibit an employer from discriminating in hiring, but to permit discrimination against the employee with regard to insurance coverage, promotions, transfers, on-the-job training, retirement ages, etc. In fact, the statistics in the First and Second Annual Reports of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission show that most charges of discrimination based on race and sex against employers filed under Title VII deal with discriminatory terms and conditions of employment rather than with hire.

When the E.E.O.C., after two years of consideration as well as public hearings held in May 1967, issued its Guidelines of February 1968 interpreting Title VII to preclude sex differentials in retirement age, the E.E.O.C. was furthering, not disregarding, the explicit purpose of the Congress to eliminate discrimination in employment based on sex.

In sum, none of the reasons presented in S. Rept. 1497 can justify the proposed amendment to permit and encourage sex discrimination concerning the retirement ages of men and women employees.

V. ADDITIONAL REASONS FOR REJECTING SECTION 2 OF H.R. 2767

There are, also, additional reasons for rejecting the proposed section 2 amendment to H.R. 2767:

1. The amendment would overrule not only the February 1968 E.E.O.C. Guidelines and the basic purpose and language of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, but also the President's Executive Orders (E.O. 11246, as amended by E.O. 11375) which prohibit sex discrimination by federal government contractors and subcontractors and on Federally-assisted construction projects. In this respect, the Executive Orders match the Congressional intent expressed in the similar prohibition in Title VII.

2. As mentioned above, 95 percent of the retirement and pension plans under collective bargaining agreements in this country, as well as the Federal Civil Service Retirement system, do not contain differentials in retirement age based on sex. Obviously, therefore, the overwhelming majority of public and private employers have concluded that such differentials are unnecessary, and that male and female employees can efficiently be offered the same compulsory and optional retirement age privileges. That, plus the clear Congressional purpose in Title VII to prohibit sex discrimination in the "compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment," plainly require prohibiting, not encouraging and permitting, differentials in retirement age based on sex in the remaining 5 percent of the pension and retirement plans in this country.

3. The elimination of sex differentials in retirement age may displease some women who wish to take advantage of an earlier optional retirement age than is available to their male colleagues. But their concern must be balanced against the fact that the disadvantages of sex differentials in retirement age far outweigh their benefits. The proposed sec. 2 in H.R. 2767 would foster the continuation of discrimination now practiced against women who are able and desire to work beyond the optional retirement age. Experience has also shown that where such earlier options exist, many employers deny promotion to qualified women on the ground that they may be retiring at an earlier age. Many employers also exert pressure on women to retire at the earlier age in order to replace them with younger women or men. The earlier optional retirement age privilege is not an unalloyed benefit to women.

4. We should also consider the source of the argument that sex differentials in optional retirement ages favor women and therefore should not be abandoned. That argument is not supported by the 178,000-member National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, a traditional protector of the rights of the working woman, or by the Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women, or by the National Organization for Women whose goal is "full equality for women in truly equal partnership with men", or by the National Woman's Party which has fought for women's rights since the early 1900's. Among the principal lobbyists for sec. 2 of H.R. 2767 (and its counterpart sec. 6(d) of S. 3465) are the Bell Telephone companies who have long relegated women to the lesser paid jobs in the communications industry, and who fear that the elimination of sex differentials in retirement age may result in earlier retirement for men, or longer service and in-

creased credits for women, and thereby increase the companies' costs.

Furthermore, I find it difficult to understand the reasoning that a system which discriminates in some ways against men rather than against women need not, therefore, be amended. We in the Congress are elected by all the people, men and women, and it ill behooves us to discriminate against either men or women solely on the basis of sex. Indeed, I resent the implication that women should be favored over men on the assumption that women are incapable of withstanding unprotected the rigors of economic life and hence must be especially protected and favored by the law. Whatever validity that concept had five or six decades ago, it has none today. The latest data available from the Labor Department shows that women head 10.6 percent of all families (March 1967), and comprise 36.4 percent of our total labor force 16 years of age and over (July 1968). Women are now certainly entitled to be rid of the "adult children" myth which brands them as incapable of equal participation in our present economy. They are willing to take their chances with equal privileges if society will but grant them equal opportunities.

Moreover, while the direct effect of an earlier retirement age for women primarily discriminates against men, its indirect effect also discriminates against women; namely, the wives and families of male employees who are denied retirement age privileges available to female employees. Discrimination is a seamless web. If we permit it to exist against the interests of one group, it will inevitably work against the interests of the other.

5. The people of this country are becoming increasingly sophisticated politically on the issue of equal rights for women. Congress recognized this in enacting the Equal Pay Act of June 10, 1963 (Public Law 88-38, 77 Stat. 56; 29 U.S.C. 206(d)), prohibiting sex discrimination in wage payments; Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; *supra*: the Social Security Amendments of 1967 (Act of January 2, 1968, Public Law 90-248, 81 Stat. 821, secs. 151 and 157), eliminating some of the sex differentials in that Act; and the Act of November 8, 1967 (Public Law 90-130, 81 Stat. 374), removing sex discrimination in the promotion and retirement of women in the armed services. The President also moved to eliminate sex discrimination when he signed Executive Order 11375 of October 13, 1967, prohibiting discrimination based on sex in the executive branch of the Federal government and by federal government contractors and subcontractors and on Federally-assisted construction projects. Twelve States and the District of Columbia have, since 1961, adopted laws prohibiting sex discrimination in employment, and many more States have been eliminating old laws which discriminated against women.

IV. CONCLUSION

The proposed section 2 of H.R. 2767 would squarely contravene this national policy of ending sex-based discrimination, and therefore should not be adopted.

[Excerpt from Senate Rept. 1497, 90th Cong., second sess., report of Senate Committee on Finance on H.R. 2767 (Aug. 1, 1968), pp. 6 and 7]

APPENDIX "A" TO ANALYSIS BY CONGRESSWOMAN MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

III. DISCRIMINATION ON ACCOUNT OF SEX OR AGE IN RETIREMENT PLANS OR PRACTICES

Reasons for provision.—Under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (the equal employment opportunity title) and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, it is unlawful for certain employers to fail or

Footnotes at end of speech.

refuse to hire, or to discharge, any individual, or to discriminate against any employee, with respect to a number of specified aspects of employment because of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or age. In the case of the discrimination prohibited by the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, a specific exception is provided for the situations where the actions of the employer are necessary to comply with the terms of any bona fide employee benefit plan, such as a retirement or pension plan. No similar specific exemption, however, is provided in the case of title VII of the Civil Rights Act. Nevertheless when Congress originally enacted title VII, the committee believes it is clear that Congress did not intend to prohibit reasonable differences in treatment of male and female employees under retirement or pension plans generally, since differential treatment is accorded men and women under the social security program today.

On February 24, 1968, however, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission issued a regulation regarding pension and retirement plans (29 C.F.R. 1604.31). This regulation provides that it is unlawful for an employer to differentiate between male and female employees with regard to either optional or compulsory retirement ages under pension and retirement plans. The Commission's interpretation on this matter is not consistent with the committee's view of the intent of Congress in enacting title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

It is not uncommon for a pension or retirement plan to differentiate between male and female employees with regard to optional or compulsory retirement ages or to require retirement at specified ages, frequently before attaining age 65. Moreover, the retirement practice of many employers provides for a differentiation in optional or compulsory retirement ages between male and female employees or provides for, or requires, retirement at certain ages. In fact, the congressional view on this matter would appear to be specifically indicated by the retirement differentiation for sex it has provided in the social security program.

Neither the intent of Congress in enacting title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, nor the primary purpose of those acts—the hiring of workers on a nondiscriminatory basis—would be served by making it unlawful for an employer's pension or retirement plan or retirement practice to differentiate between male and female employees with regard to optional or compulsory retirement ages or to provide for optional or compulsory retirement at specified ages. Accordingly, the committee's amendment provides that these types of differentiation or retirement requirements are not to be considered unlawful.

Explanation of provision.—The committee's amendment provides that the terms or conditions of a pension or retirement plan (which is a qualified plan under sec. 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954), or of a retirement practice, are not to be considered as violating title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, any Executive order, or any rules or regulations issued under any of these because such terms or conditions (a) provide for reasonable differentiation in optional or compulsory retirement ages between male and female employees or (b) provide for or require retirement at reasonable ages. This rule is to apply to new and existing pension plans or retirement plans, and to both the establishment and maintenance of these plans. It is important to note that the differentiation in retirement ages and the retirement age requirements which are allowed under the committee's amendment are only those which are reasonable. Moreover,

the rule provided in the committee's amendment is not to excuse the failure or the refusal to hire individuals or the discharging of individuals prior to retirement age on account of either their sex or their age. In addition, the rule provided in the amendment is not to apply if the terms and conditions of the pension or retirement plan or the retirement practice are merely a subterfuge to evade the basic purposes of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967.

FOOTNOTES

¹ However, in computing the amount of reduced monthly benefits for workers retiring before age 65, the Social Security Act averages the man's credits over the number of quarters of covered employment he had after 1950 to the year he would reach 65, whereas a woman's credits are averaged only over the quarters up to the year she reaches 62. Secs. 202(a) and 215(b) (2) and (3), Social Security Act (42 U.S. Code 402(a), 415(b) (2) and (3)). Thus, if a man and woman work under social security for the same number of years, receive the same earnings, and retire at the same age (62, or over) in the same year, the woman would receive a larger monthly check.

² Section 706(f) permits discrimination against members of the Communist Party or Communist-front organizations. Section 706(g) permits discrimination against persons who have not fulfilled the requirements of the national security program, where applicable. Section 706(i) permits discrimination in favor of Indians living on or near an Indian reservation. Section 712 permits discrimination in favor of veterans.

³ The whole colloquy is as follows (110 Cong. Rec. 13663-64):

"Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I wish to ask of the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY, who is the effective manager of the pending bill, a clarifying question on the provisions of Title VII.

"I have in mind that the social security system, in certain respects, treats men and women differently. For example, widows' benefits are paid automatically; but a widower qualifies only if he is disabled or if he was actually supported by his deceased wife. Also, the wife of a retired employee entitled to social security receives an additional old age benefit; but the husband of such an employee does not. These differences in treatment as I recall, are of long standing.

"Am I correct, I ask the Senator from Minnesota, in assuming that similar differences of treatment in industrial benefit plans, including earlier retirement options for women, may continue in operation under this bill, if it becomes law?

"Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, that point was made unmistakably clear earlier today by the adoption of the Bennett amendment; so there can be no doubt about it."

⁴ Section 703(h) (the Bennett Amendment) requires that Title VII be harmonized with the Equal Pay Act of 1963. Sections 708 and 1104 seek to harmonize both Title VII and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 with all state laws which are not inconsistent with the Act.

INVOCATION BY RABBI SEYMOUR
J. COHEN

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Seymour J. Cohen is the spiritual leader of

Anshe Emet Synagogue in Chicago and is one of our city's outstanding religious leaders. He is also president of the Chicago Board of Rabbis.

Recently, he presented a most moving invocation, which I am appending as part of my remarks. I am sure it will strike a responsive cord in the hearts of all Members. The prayer follows:

PRAYER OF RABBI SEYMOUR J. COHEN, SPIRITUAL LEADER OF ANSHE EMET SYNAGOGUE, PRESIDENT, CHICAGO BOARD OF RABBIS

We are assembled in trying times that test the souls of men. Like the prophet of old, we moan that the whole head is sick and the whole heart is faint. To you, O Heavenly Father, we look for guidance and strength. Above the din of Solemn assemblies let us hear Your still small voice summoning us to service. Help us with courage in crisis and hope in place of despair. You have planted hope in the better tomorrow in the hearts of men: You have taught us that the road to holiness is the road of action, strengthen us in our resolve to build a world where young people will no longer hear the call to war. Banish the heat of contention and show us the light of Your peace.

In this age which has witnessed brutal tragedy and violence, where compassion has been sucked out of the souls of some men, strengthen us in our determination to build a just society. May we ever remain sensitive to the anguish of the deprived and the despoiled, the agony of the poor and the forgotten, the cry of those who long to be free.

May we soon see the aspiration of the ages and the dream of modern martyrs fulfilled, when the mountains of bitterness will be leveled and the broad places of tranquillity will be reached.

Restore, we ask of You, the hearts of parents to their children, and the hearts of the young to the old. Help us, O good God, so to act that history may say of this generation. They were truly blessed of the Lord.

ARTHUR ASHE: NEW U.S. OPEN
TENNIS CHAMPION

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the victory of Arthur Ashe in the open tennis tournament at Forest Hills recently restores the United States to the top in tennis.

Arthur Ashe was born in Richmond, Va. His father was a playground policeman, and it was on the playgrounds of the city of Richmond that Arthur Ashe first learned to play tennis.

Virginia is very proud of this champion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Norfolk Virginian Pilot of September 11, 1968, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

CHAMPION

Arthur Ashe's victory in the first U.S. open tennis tournament at Forest Hills is satisfying.

Aesthetically, his win over Tom Okker of The Netherlands in the finals Monday was a beautiful match to watch. Buffs have always known what a splendid sport top-flight tennis is, but it was brought home to millions by the televising of the tournament on two weekends—and especially to those who saw any of the matches on color TV. Mr. Ashe, who scored 26 aces with his big serve, won the final, five-set struggle in convincing fashion; he was clearly in command in the fifth set, winning the deciding game at love. None will question his victory.

Parochially, the achievement of a native son is especially satisfying to Virginians. Mr. Ashe was born in Richmond, where his father is a playground policeman, and grew up there. He first learned to play tennis there—though he made it in competitive ranks as a scholarship student at UCLA, not in Virginia.

Patriotically, Mr. Ashe restored the U.S. to the top of the tennis world. American tennis titles have been on the export market for some time, with Australia carrying off our championships wholesale. But Mr. Ashe and his Davis Cup teammates (especially Clark Graebner, whom he eliminated in the semi-finals) changed that this year. The United States is now the odds-on favorite to bring the Davis Cup home from Down Under later in the year.

Popularly, the Walter Mittys of the tennis world—the weekend players who believe “backhand” is a dirty word—were delighted that the amateurs dominated the first U.S. open tournament. Besides Amateur Ashe's winning, three of the four semi-finalists were amateurs (more or less, in the case of Mr. Okker), and amateurs ousted pros in 17 matches in the men's and women's singles play. The result served to enhance open play's success, and is bound to benefit tennis. Mr. Ashe may regret that he wasn't eligible for the \$14,000 first prize, but he can be comforted by the prospects of big money when he begins to play for pay.

Symbolically, Mr. Ashe is the first Negro ever to win a major men's tennis title. (Althea Gibson scored a breakthrough earlier in women's play.) “Firsts” are significant, but ought not to be over-emphasized. It is only honest to note that tennis is in many places a segregated sport still.

Ultimately, what matters isn't the color of Arthur Ashe's skin, but the fact that he is a champion and a fine one.

RELIEF FOR SUGAR FARMERS

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I arise today to appeal to my fellow Congressmen for understanding, sympathy, and support for my bill, H.R. 19575.

The effect of this measure, which has been carefully drawn in coordination with the Office of Legislative Counsel of the House in consultation with appropriate counsel of the Department of Agriculture, is technically sound.

In addition, it is a “must” piece of legislation if my congressional district, my State, and the State of Florida are to be spared the tremendous economic blow which will be occasioned by the recently announced 20-percent acreage cut on next year's mainland cane sugar crop.

Simply speaking, H.R. 19575, would have the effect of qualifying surplus sugar under the commodity distribution program under section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress. Since certain provisions in the law result in the exclusion of sugar from this program, my bill would make a specific and limited exception to the rule.

This exception would both serve the nutritional requirements of millions of needy citizens and at the same time would reduce the economic impact on thousands of Louisiana and Florida sugar farmers.

As much as 130,000 tons of the carry-over sugar which is now threatening next year's crop with a severe acreage cut could be taken from our warehouses and distributed to the needy.

It is the excess inventory factor which, under the Sugar Act, is the cause of acreage cuts; and by allowing Government disposal of this amount it should have the effect of allowing the Secretary of Agriculture perhaps to cut the cut in half.

It is obvious that reduction of surplus inventories should bring a corresponding reduction in the 20-percent acreage cut announced late last month for the 1969 mainland cane sugar crop, with only those proportionate shares of less than 50 acres being exempted from any cut whatever.

Mr. Speaker, my bill offers a sensible and levelheaded way of correcting serious inequities in our sugar program, without actually amending the Sugar Act itself.

I plead very specifically with those of my colleagues which represent sugar beet States to talk some sense into the sugar beet industry, which already seems to be taking a hardnosed stand against my bill.

Unfortunately, the U.S. Sugar Beet Association and other segments of the sugar industry have strongly opposed all of our plans to give acreage relief to Louisiana and Florida farmers. Now they say there is no reason why they should change their position at this late date.

As my colleagues know, in the Congress, Louisiana and Florida are outnumbered about 15 to 1 by the beet-producing States. In the Senate, for instance, the count is 4 against 46.

Here in the House, the odds are about the same; and the fact that the sugar beet and refining industries have no problems of their own seems to leave them with little or no sympathy for the hardship that a 20-percent cut will bring to Louisiana and Florida farmers.

I trust that many objective Congressmen who represent beet sugar States will therefore give support to my bill which would greatly help the mainland cane area and would be of no harm at all to any other segment of the sugar industry.

Some officials of the other segments of the industry have recommended to the U.S. Department of Agriculture that we should be cut as much as 40 percent. I would like to know what kind of yelling there would be if their salaries were cut 40 percent.

It is obvious to me that H.R. 19575 would provide a sensible compromise in a troubled situation:

First. It is not a direct amendment to the Sugar Act, which all other segments of the sugar industry oppose so violently.

Second. It would fit beautifully into the commodity distribution program since sugar is a high-calorie, easily stored, easily distributed, nonperishable surplus food for the needy families of the Nation.

Third. It would give some much-needed flexibility to a sugar program which, as far as Louisiana and Florida are concerned, has become very much out of balance.

BAN LOG EXPORTS—STOP THE SKYROCKETING COST OF HOUSING

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to learn that the conference committee on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1968 has agreed to prohibit the exportation of softwood lumber logs from federally owned lands for a period of 3 years.

I would like to see this prohibition extended through 1975, and I am today introducing legislation which would do this. My reason for introducing this legislation is the firm conviction that the export of logs has resulted in the people of southern California paying hundreds of millions of additional dollars for the homes they are building or purchasing. This unwarranted inflationary pressure can be avoided by prohibiting further export of softwood lumber.

The export of raw logs from the west coast has skyrocketed lumber and plywood prices for the retailer and homebuilder. One estimate is that recent price increases on raw logs will add \$300 to the price of the average house.

The problem has been growing steadily worse since 1961.

Log exports are the primary factor blamed in the permanent closure of some 47 sawmills and 25 plywood mills in the past 2 years, in western Oregon and western Washington alone.

The export of logs to Japan—long concentrated in that area—now is rapidly spreading into timbered northern California and eastward through Idaho and into western Montana. When the Japanese buy logs, the price of the end product goes up to cover the increase in the price of raw material which their bidding causes.

Throughout the Western forest areas, there have long been fewer logs available than needed to supply existing sawmills and plywood mills. Consequently, everywhere export logs are removed from the local timber supply, mills close down.

This leaves the lumber dealer with less variety of supply sources, less opportunity to bargain for the widest range of material at the most attractive prices.

Contrary to the belief of many people, the wood which is going to Japan is not coming back to the United States in manufactured form. It is going into Japan's boom in housing and light construction.

Consequently, logs which are exported to Japan are lost to the U.S. economy and have no later downward effect on U.S. prices as they would if the material were manufactured in Japan, then shipped back to the United States in competition with American-made lumber.

For some time now, Japan's economy has been expanding at a boom rate—about 10 percent per year—compared with about 4 percent in the United States.

The Japanese have traditionally lived with wood and worked with wood. They enjoy its warmth, its workability.

Japan's housing starts are running at about 1 million per year—compared with 1.4 million in the United States. With 105 million people crammed into an island archipelago the size of California, the country's own forests cannot supply the need.

Japan's forests—seriously overcut during World War II—produce only about 70 percent of the nation's softwood needs now. Although they are among the most intensely cultivated in the world, their ability to supply their own needs probably will become less, rather than greater, as a still larger, more affluent, population increases its demand for softwood construction.

About 95 percent of the west coast exports go to Japan.

Here is how Japanese imports of raw logs from the U.S. west coast have increased in recent years:

Millions of board feet	
1961	355.5
1962	423.9
1963	676.7
1964	752.8
1965	787.9
1966	1,044.9
1967	1,581.0

For the first half of 1968, log exports to Japan were 1,006.5 thousand board feet—indicating the virtual certainty the 1968 final figure will exceed 2 billion.

Has this export volume really affected log prices that much?

Yes; take sales of timber owned by the State of Washington for the first half of 1967: on 242 sales, prices averaged 87 percent above the appraised price. On 40 of those sales, which were bid late in June, prices averaged 233 percent of the appraised price. On these 40 sales, the winning auction figures came to \$8,628,415—compared with appraisals totaling \$3,698,000.

The appraised price is, by definition, the State forest department's own estimate of a fair market price for the logs. This is arrived at by estimating the gross sale price for lumber which the trees will produce, then subtracting all costs of logging, transporting, milling, and selling—plus a margin for profit and risk, usually about 9 percent. Everything that

is left after those costs are taken off is the fair-market or appraised price.

Bidders buying for export to Japan can recover that log cost in the cartel-controlled Japanese market. Mills which cannot recover that price in the American market lose the sales—and eventually close for lack of logs.

Pressure from the mill operators, labor, and affected communities in the West, generally caused a partial restriction on log exports to be imposed last April.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman—who administers the national forests—ruled not more than 350 million board feet of timber from Federal lands in the Douglas-fir region—western Oregon and western Washington—could be exported annually. The rule expires in June 1969.

It does not cover private timber or State of Washington timber in that area. Oregon already has a law restricting export of State-owned timber. The rule also does not cover the other key timber-producing States such as California, Idaho, and Montana.

The rule does not apply to national forest timber already under contract. Since most contracts for Government timber last from 18 months to 3 years, the limit will have expired before present sales do. Thus the supply in the affected Douglas-fir region gains little protection.

However, the restriction did scare—if not panic—Japanese buyers into moving into areas it does not cover. The flurry of applications for rail rates to transport logs to port areas reached as far inland as Montana.

But the greater part of the Japanese change of interest moved southward into California, where the haul to tidewater is shorter. There, the price of white fir, for instance, has jumped in less than 6 months from \$50 per thousand board feet to \$80 per thousand.

Because of their ability to outbid local sawmills for what they want, the Japanese tend to take the higher grade logs, leaving the lower quality material to be manufactured into American homes.

Early in the business, there was tendency for the Japanese to take only certain species—Port Orford cedar and western hemlock being the favorites. Now, however, with their tremendous growth in consumption and in shipping facilities, they are taking all of the species which grow commercially on the west coast—Douglas-fir, white fir, Sitka spruce, western red cedar, and redwood. Additionally, as Japanese buyers have moved inland, they have begun to take some of the pines which are dominant there.

Defenders of export point out, however, higher prices for timber make it economically attractive to thin, replant, destroy competing brush, install better roads, and do other things which make for better forestry in the long range. These practices, they contend, will increase the productivity of the forest land far into the future.

However, the price increase caused by Japanese bidding for logs is expected to raise the Nation's housing bill by \$600 million by 1970. By then, the U.S. housing starts are expected to rise to 2 million—from the 1.4 million level in 1968.

The Western forest simply cannot handle a sudden new Japanese market for wood with housing running above the million-start level, continue to supply its normal U.S. market, and handle the anticipated expansion of U.S. housing needs—all within 2 years or so.

There has been a gradual increase in Japanese import of logs from Siberia. But ports and woods there are closed much of the year by freezing weather, much of the timber is inaccessible, and its quality is dramatically lower than from North America. Generally, it is smaller in size and has more knots. The Soviet Government has bartered with the Japanese—logs for sawmill, plywood, and pulpmill equipment. They have warned the Japanese that when these have been installed, they will insist that the Japanese take finished wood products, rather than raw logs.

Another alternative open to the Japanese is British Columbia—Canada's western-most Province, whose forest is similar to that of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

About 94 percent of the forest in British Columbia is owned by the Provincial government. To keep labor at home, the British Columbia Government will not permit export of any logs except those few which may be found to be surplus to the needs of local mills. British Columbia's Minister of Forests, Hon. Ray Williston, recently remarked, "this Province cannot afford to export jobs."

Thus, while Japan can get much of the wood it needs from British Columbia, it must be manufactured rather than in raw form.

This, the Japanese will not do so long as they are able to get raw logs from the U.S. west coast—and thus capture the labor for its own workmen.

Restrictions on Federal logs from the United States thus would tend to divert the Japanese to Canada for part of its supply—helping keep lumber prices within bounds in the United States, and thereby saving the Nation's homebuyers many millions of dollars.

AGRICULTURE SECRETARY FREEMAN CITES STEPHENS FOR RURAL HOUSING LEADERSHIP

HON. JOHN W. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on August 21, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman came to Georgia to participate in the first Farmers Home Administration loan ceremony for our State under the Housing Act of 1968. This was

the second loan made in the United States under the new act.

It was made in Washington, Wilkes County, Ga., to Mr. and Mrs. Holice W. McAvoy to assist in building a new three-bedroom home for them and their three children.

Washington, Ga., was chosen for this first-loan ceremony because of the wish of the Secretary to recognize the leadership in Farmers Home Administration legislation taken by my Georgia colleague, Congressman ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR., of the 10th District, a member of the Housing Subcommittee.

The new loan procedure is one which provides an interest supplement for low- and moderate-income families in rural America. The design is to encourage homeownership for this income group and to give more incentive for private enterprise to finance this area of housing need. Private capital will build these types of homes and will charge conventional and competitive interest rates, the supplement by the Farmers Home Administration being the difference between 1 percent and what the borrower can afford.

Mr. Freeman was accompanied by S. L. VanLandingham, Regional Director of the Farmers Home Administration, in Atlanta. Harry K. Neal, of Madison, FHA district supervisor, arranged details of the meeting along with T. K. Wilson, Wilkes County local FHA representative. William L. Lanier, Georgia Farm Bureau president, presented Secretary Freeman.

The address of Secretary Freeman on this occasion honoring Congressman STEPHENS is set out below in full for the benefit of the Members of the House:

SPEECH OF SECRETARY FREEMAN

I have come to Georgia today to observe with you the beginning of a new era in rural America.

This occasion marks the beginning of the end of substandard housing in rural America, and points toward the day when even the lowest of the low income rural families can live in decent, adequate homes.

For me—as it must be for many millions of rural people—this is the realization of a dream come true.

This dream was made possible by the passage of the new Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. This unprecedented, landmark legislation culminates nearly eight years of effort by the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations to rid the Nation of the blight of city ghettos and rural slums and put substance and meaning into the promise of "equal opportunity in housing for all Americans."

This moment—this legislation—culminates also, eight years of dedicated effort by your great Congressman, Bob Stephens.

You sent Bob Stephens to Washington the same year I arrived there.

We have worked together since in our common desire to bring a better life to rural Americans.

He quickly established himself as one of the most effective spokesmen in the Congress for rural people. The series of rural housing acts starting with his first term in 1961, are a monument to his efforts and his vision.

And it was the Housing Act of 1961 that represented the first real breakthrough for rural people. This act expanded the first rural housing program enacted back in 1949

to include all rural people—as well as farmers. It also provided special provisions for loans to senior citizens and domestic farm labor.

The next big step—again led by Bob Stephens in the House and by Senator Sparkman of Alabama in the Senate during the 89th Congress—was the passage of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

To show the impact of these new rural housing programs—let me cite some comparative figures.

During the 1950's—under a different Administration—the rural housing program was allowed to wither and then completely die out by 1955. In that year, not a single rural housing loan was made.

By 1960, the last year of that Administration, things had started to perk up and \$40 million was loaned to farm families.

But then, things really started to happen.

In the first full year of operation of the Housing Act of 1961, the Farmers Home Administration loaned more than \$185 million—more than a four-fold increase—and approximately 20,000 rural families were benefiting.

With the enactment of the 1965 Act, we were able to loan nearly a half billion dollars during this past fiscal year—which means the equivalent of some 50,000 new homes for rural families.

Encouraged and heartened as we were with these new and expanded rural housing programs, we were also aware of their limitations.

We could not reach—could not help—the very low income rural people who were most in need of decent housing.

Our experiments with self-help housing programs wherein low income families can save 25 to 30 percent of their housing costs did benefit thousands of rural families. But this program is difficult to administer and it has its limitations.

The answer to our problem of reaching low income people has been largely solved under the new Housing Act.

Hopefully, with this interest supplement payment provision—which could reduce a family's monthly payment to that due if the interest rate were 1 percent, based on family income and size—we shall be able to meet the needs of most rural people under a variety of new housing services. These will include not only low interest loans for new and improved homes, but for nonprofit rental and cooperative housing in rural areas and for expanded self-help housing projects.

This first year under the new Act we expect to provide at least 80,000 housing units in rural areas. As funds, personnel and experience become available, we expect to make increasingly greater annual gains in eliminating the 3 million substandard homes in rural America.

There is no reason why we can't replace such homes in all America within another decade.

One of the major features of this new Housing Act is the provision to provide community planning grants to rural areas.

This is a program that is close to my heart because I am convinced that only through multi-community and multi-county planning can we develop a new Town and Country USA that can offer all the best features of urban and rural life combined and restore to America a healthy balance of rural and urban life.

This new planning program gives us the essential tool to guide the growth of hundreds of small modernized multi-county rural communities already in place all over America.

By working together, six to ten counties grouped around a central city of 10,000 to perhaps 50,000 people can now pool their resources. Local leadership and planning will make Federal help available. The combina-

tion means they can provide educational, health and recreation facilities that would otherwise be beyond their means. Careful planning is basic to this growth and for the securing of Federal assistance. When these facilities are available, new industry is attracted and jobs created. With new industry and new jobs, the tax base is broadened and further community development becomes possible.

These things are all part of a national pattern that is now clearly emerging under these new programs and under local and state initiative and leadership.

We are, in truth, finally developing a national policy to help the disastrous emptying out of people from rural America and to stop the blind rush to self-destruction which now threatens metropolitan America.

To those who say it can't be done, we can't afford it, we can't plan that well, we can't tell people where to live . . . I say, nonsense.

By the standards of the past, creating a viable rural-urban balance seems like a gigantic undertaking. But we are not living in the past. We live now—and most of us will be here tomorrow.

We have no choice—we must restore a national balance or give up our ideals.

We can do the necessary planning.

We can afford it. We are rich enough in resources to do it.

We need not tell people where to live. Poll after public poll clearly demonstrates that if jobs and social advantages are available, more than 56 percent of the American people would prefer to live in Town and Country USA.

I have long had a vision of rural America—a rural America of unlimited economic and social potential—a place where any American can live, if he so chooses, and be assured of a job, good education, good health, good cultural advantages and a good life.

What is that vision? Well, this is the America I see in the years ahead.

I see a countryside dotted with clusters of renewed small cities—new towns—growing rural communities.

I see each cluster with its own jobs, its own industries, and with its own college or university.

I see each with its own medical center, and its own cultural, entertainment, and recreational centers.

I see good farms in these clusters—and an agriculture fully sharing in the national prosperity.

And, standing tall, I see our great cities—intact, but changed—free of smog—free of blight—free of despair—true centers of commerce and culture.

I see the American people living where they choose—at ease with each other and with their environment.

That is my vision of America—a rural-urban America in real balance.

Is it utopian? Maybe. But perhaps it is not far off. Perhaps it is just over the horizon.

PRESIDENT ROBERT E. KENNEDY'S
ADDRESS TO ROTC CADETS

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, students are returning to college campuses all over our land this month. Most of them are returning to campuses, or going to campuses for the first time, in pursuit of

knowledge and a higher education. They seek this education in parlous times. They desperately need all the education they can acquire, to be able to cope with their environment and contribute to our society.

Regrettably, world conditions require that some undertake ROTC training; some may be drafted before their college careers are completed; some may spend much of their college time in dissent of one kind or another.

Many conscientious college students, faculty members, and administrators are approaching this college year with great trepidation. They want to study and teach and learn without disruption. This is their "right." We, as citizens, have an obligation to preserve their "right of assembly" to learn as well as their right of reasonable dissent. Certainly between the "right of assembly" without molestation and the reasonable right of dissent there is adequate room for students to pursue their education.

The address to the corps of cadets by President Robert E. Kennedy of the California State Polytechnic College at San Luis Obispo is an exceptional statement of a related problem and a reasonable approach to a solution which I believe received unusual acceptance by faculty, students, and taxpayers alike, and which could serve as a model for many presidents, administrators, faculty, and students of our universities this fall.

I commend the address of President Robert E. Kennedy to the attention of every Member of Congress in whose district is located an ROTC college, as follows:

As President of Cal Poly I bring you greetings from the entire campus at San Luis Obispo. In the manner of the Services, I salute you, your honored guests, your fifteen-man ROTC staff, and every man standing in the field before me.

I bring special greetings to Colonel Bauer, your commanding officer, who is looking forward to a different tour of duty, called retirement, after a thirty-year commitment to the Army.

The U.S. Government has used the facilities of this state college since 1952 in the production of qualified, educated junior officers for the United States Army. The Military Science Department, an integral part of the educational program of Cal Poly, offers on an elective and voluntary basis classroom and leadership laboratory instruction for students who desire to fulfill their military obligation as commissioned officers. As in any other academic courses, credits accrued for completing ROTC courses are awarded toward college graduation.

In these past sixteen years since the establishment of the program here, 453 men have been commissioned as officers as a result of successfully completing the classroom and laboratory work in ROTC.

These 453 men will be joined by an additional 108 men who will be commissioned June 12 or by the end of the summer quarter. Cal Poly, with an ROTC voluntary enrollment of 525 cadets is the largest voluntary ROTC unit west of the Mississippi River.

The preparation of junior officers is a vital part of the national defense effort. More than 70% of all commissioned officers on active duty in the U.S. Army received their training and commissions through ROTC pro-

grams at colleges and universities throughout the Nation.

One of our sons, Steve, is participating in ROTC training at Claremont Men's College in Pomona. I understand a battle of patience was fought during their Presidential Review just one week ago.

The temperature that day was over 100 degrees. It was mid-day when the unit marched onto the field, side-stepping to avoid marching over six civilian students seated in protest in the center of the parade area. According to one observer that day, this is an account of what took place at Alumni Field, Pomona, last Monday.

Under the shade of oak trees at one end of the field was gathered a group of non-ROTC students, equal in number to the cadets on the field; they were there ostensibly for the purpose of auditing the ROTC class session.

But the conduct of that group that day reflected none of the rules of auditing students. They were quite obviously there for the purpose of harassment and diversion from the field laboratory procedure planned for that time and place as part of the requirements of ROTC training.

The men in helmets and wool uniforms conducted themselves well under the strain of this battle of nerves. To all spectators in the stands, the ROTC men appeared to ignore and overlook the humiliating antics of their so-called fellow students. The ROTC men carried out that day's portion of their classroom commitment with dignity and purpose.

As President of Cal Poly, I have a commitment to uphold the contractual promises of this state college to provide classrooms and lab facilities necessary to the training of junior officers needed for the defense of our Nation. I have the same commitment to see that classes in ROTC are uninterrupted by those who disagree with the purposes of training officers for our military services as I have a commitment to see that there is no interference with any other educational activity of this College. Those who wish to dissent or protest about any activity of this College are welcome to do so, only so long as they do it without interfering with the education of others—without interfering with the freedom of others.

As an individual citizen, I cannot conceive in my mind or my heart a world without law and order. I cannot believe that in our democracy law and order must give way to the irresponsible acts of willful minorities led by individuals whose objectives may not be the improvement of the democratic processes but the substitution of anarchy.

As President of this College, I must act in accord with the rules and regulations established by the Trustees and the State Legislature. I must see that there is no violence, or threat of violence, on this campus which would interfere with normal educational activities. This I have done, and this I will continue to do. Those who wish to protest ROTC classes on this campus will do it in accord with "time, place and manner" that will in no way interrupt this educational program—or they will subject themselves to appropriate discipline.

Those of you on the field today to be commissioned soon will take with you on your tour of duty the best wishes of every loyal American citizen. Though in uniform, you will be working for peace for the world in the most realistic sense that this world seems to know.

On the local level, most people realize that without a police force to protect our citizens, a criminal element in a city would run roughshod over unarmed and frightened citizens. We seem to understand what

might happen without a police force. On the international level, some people seem to get soft-headed. Whether we like it or not, our capability to defend ourselves depends upon our military strength. While we can all pray fervently for peace, we thank God for men willing to volunteer for the Armed Services—our only guarantee against aggression—our only protection against lawlessness and anarchy.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SPEAKS ON PEACE TO B'NAI B'RITH

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson, Tuesday night, addressed the 125th anniversary meeting of the B'nai B'rith, at a banquet attended by thousands here in Washington.

Representatives of that distinguished organization from more than 40 nations heard an eloquent plea for peace and a forceful statement of America's policy throughout the world—a policy of resistance to what the President termed "the dark tide of violence and totalitarian rule," and a policy of constant search for a just peace.

The text of the President's fine address follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO 125TH ANNIVERSARY MEETING OF B'NAI B'RITH

Dr. Wexler, my delightful friend Deputy Prime Minister Allon, Members of the Diplomatic Corps, Members of the Cabinet, Distinguished Members of the Congress, Reverend Clergy, and my fellow Americans:

In time of troubles, I am glad to be with those who have known trouble, and who still treasure the spirit of man.

The proverb says, "A friend loveth at all times and a brother is born for adversity." You have been my friends, and some of you have been like brothers to me.

So in the words of the proverb, we were born for these times.

Adversity is in the air that we breathe. The tanks have rolled again in Europe. The virus of anti-Semitism threatens again to infect nations which should have learned its awful lessons a generation ago.

The road to peace in Southeast Asia is long and hard. The fires of unreasoning hostility tonight burn in the Middle East. Democracy in our own country, Mr. Prime Minister, and elsewhere, seems to be beset by the extremists of the right and the left.

In such a time, it is quite fashionable to despair over our prospects. To some people the events of 1968 prove that there never can be a peaceful accommodation between nations, or between races, or, indeed, between generations.

To others, the solution lies in a radical change of policy. Exactly what is never quite said, except that it just must be radical.

I can assure you my friends that I am not in the least complacent about these events. There have been a great many charges, complaints—columnists and commentators have made observations and laid them at my door during these past five years, as some of you have observed. But I do not think that complacency has ever been among any of them.

But if I am not complacent, neither do I despair. For I believe that the great American

people face the adversities of 1968 far stronger, far wiser, than any people before them, including their fathers and their grandfathers.

Their strength comes from an economy that has provided more jobs, more employment, and more profit than any economy in human history. It comes also from a moral commitment to eliminate racism and injustice, and to eliminate it from the face of this earth that we live on.

Their wisdom comes from the experience of three decades which have taught them that appeasement—appeasement—does not yield peace; that they cannot be secure in this country if there is not security in other countries, if they, in their cowardice of the moment, turn their backs on free men; and they cannot protect themselves behind a wall of affluence from the tumult of a world that is raging with want and disease.

This knowledge, which all Americans have gained at a very heavy cost, is a priceless asset in meeting the adversities of today and, surely, those that lie ahead.

So tonight I want to speak to you as I spoke earlier this afternoon in New Orleans, Louisiana, about the quest for peace—specifically, about conditions in Eastern Europe and the Middle East that really quite threaten the peace, and also what I believe must be done to change those conditions.

The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia just a few days ago has set back the course of peace. It rejects the very idea that better understanding and more human contacts—and a relaxation of tensions—can lead to more peaceful ways of coexistence on this small and yet this very dangerous planet.

We hope—and we shall strive—to make this setback a very temporary one. But I assure you that will not be easy. It will require calm determination on the part of us and on the part of all of our allies. It will also require the considered second thoughts of those who lead the Soviet Union.

These men, who bear with us the terrifying responsibility of an immense military power, must come to realize that the ideals of peaceful men and women just cannot be smashed by force. They must come to understand that peace—peace based on respect for human dignity—offers to all people, including their own people, the only real hope for security in the world.

Some leaders of Eastern Europe have sought to indict those of Jewish faith for spreading ideas of freedom among their people. Well, this is shocking, not only because it is a very thin disguise for anti-Semitism, but because it really suggests that freedom is the cause and the passion of just one people alone.

So tonight let there be no doubt in anyone's mind about who cares for freedom. Mankind itself cares.

We have worked now for more than 20 years not only to protect Western Europe, but to try to promote a peaceful understanding with the countries of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

It was nearly two years ago that I proposed a series of European initiatives. I hoped to achieve better understanding with our allies. I hoped to have more and freer exchanges with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, because only through such improvement of the political atmosphere, as I stated then, could we ever truly hope for peace in Europe, a coming together of Germany and a healing of the deep wounds across the entire face of Europe.

We have taken in this country a series of important steps in that direction. Last June I proposed to the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe a program of balanced and mutual force reductions. We had made somewhat similar proposals to the Soviet Union alone during the very first month that I occupied the Presidency.

Our offer threatens no legitimate interest of any state. It rests on the respect for the equal rights of all states to their territorial integrity and to their political independence.

In the discussions that we have proposed for the reduction of tension in Europe, no topic whatever would be barred from those discussions. These proposals represent the only sound approach to the problems of peace and security in Europe. All of these proposals have been rebuffed for the moment.

The leaders of the Soviet Union seem to have decided that a movement toward a humane version of communism in a small, friendly country is a threat to their security, despite the fact that the Czechs remain their ally in the Warsaw Pact.

So new military and political risks have now arisen from this aggressive act which demand ever closer cooperation among the Western allies. For our part, I made it unmistakably clear that the use of force, and the threat of force, will not be tolerated in areas of our common responsibility like Berlin, because the use of force generates fears and stimulates passions whose consequences no man can predict or control.

As I said the other day in San Antonio, let no one unleash the dogs of war. Europe has suffered enough—enough in this century.

The Soviet Union tonight can still return to the only road that really can lead to peace and security for us all. That is the road of reducing tension, of enlarging the area of understanding and agreement. It can still change—if not undo—what it has done in Czechoslovakia. It can still act there and can act elsewhere with the prudence and the confidence which characterize the conduct of any great nation—because it is never too late to choose the path of reason.

Every man of sanity will hope that the Soviets will act now before some new turn of events throws the world back to the grim confrontations of Mr. Stalin's time.

Now let me turn to the Middle East. That is an area of deep national interest to the American people, to all of our people, for the safety and the future of small nations are not the concern of one group of citizens alone.

To you tonight, I assure you they concern all Americans.

Our society is illuminated by the spiritual insights of the Hebrew prophets. America and Israel have a common love of human freedom, and they have a common faith in a democratic way of life.

It is quite natural that American Jews should feel particularly involved with Israel's destiny. That small land in the Eastern Mediterranean saw the birth of your faith and your people thousands and thousands of years ago. Down through the centuries, through dispersion and through very grievous trials, your forefathers clung to their Jewish identity and clung to their ties with the land of Israel.

As the prophet Isaiah foretold—"And He shall set up an ensign for the nations, and He shall assemble the outcasts of Israel and gather together the dispersed of Judah from all the four corners of the earth." History knows no more moving example of persistence against the cruelest odds.

But conflict has surrounded the modern state of Israel since its very beginning. It is now more than a year that has passed since the 6-day war between Israel and its neighbors—a tragic and an unnecessary war which we tried in every way we could to prevent. That war was the third round of major hostilities in the Middle East since the United Nations established Israel: just 21 years ago—the third round—and it just must be the last round.

From the day that war broke out, our policy, the policy of this Government, has been to work in every capital, to labor in the United Nations, to convert the armistice ar-

rangements of 1949 into a stable and agreed regime of peace. The time has come for real peace in the area—a peace of justice and reconciliation, not a cease fire, not a temporary truce, not a renewal of the fragile armistice. No day has passed since then without our taking active steps to try to achieve this end.

The atmosphere of fear and mutual suspicion has made communication between the two sides extremely difficult. In this setting, the plans of reasonable men, both Arabs and Israelis—have been frustrated. Despite the patient and perceptive efforts of Ambassador Jarring, little real progress towards peace has been made.

I am convinced that a just and a dignified peace, a peace fair to the rightful interests of both sides, is possible. Without it, the people of the Middle East cannot shape their own destinies, because outsiders are going to exploit their rivalries, and their energies and abilities will be diverted to warfare instead of welfare. That just should not happen.

No nation that has been part of the tragic drama of these past 20 years is totally without blame. Violence and counter-violence have absorbed the energy of all the parties. The process of peace-making cannot be further delayed without danger and without peril. The United Nations Security Council resolution of last November laid down the principles of a just and a lasting peace.

But I would remind the world tonight that that resolution is not self-executing. It created a framework within which men of good will ought to be able to arrive at a reasonable settlement.

For its part, the United States of America has fully supported the efforts of the United Nations representatives, Ambassador Jarring, and we shall continue to do so. But it is the parties themselves who must make the major effort to begin seriously this much needed peace-making process.

One fact is sure: The process of peace-making will not begin until the leaders of the Middle East begin exchanging views on the hard issues through some agreed procedure which could permit active discussions to be pursued. Otherwise, no progress toward peace will be made.

In recent weeks, some progress in this direction has been achieved. So tonight I appeal and I urge the leaders of the Middle East to try to maintain and to accelerate their dialogue. I urge them to put their views out on the table, to begin talking the substance of peace.

Many channels are open. How the talking is done at the outset is not very important tonight. But we just must not lose whatever momentum exists for peace. And, in the end, those who must live together must, in the words of Isaiah, learn to reason together.

The position of the United States rests on the principles of peace that I outlined on June 19, 1967. That statement remains the foundation of American policy.

First, it remains crucial that each nation's right to live be recognized. Arab governments must convince Israel and the world community that they have abandoned the idea of destroying Israel. But equally, Israel must persuade its Arab neighbors and the world community that Israel has not expansionist designs on their territory.

We are not here to judge whose fears are right or whose are wrong. Right or wrong, fear is the first obstacle to any peace-making. Each side must do its share to overcome it. A major step in this direction would be for each party to issue promptly a clear unqualified public assurance that it is now ready to commit itself to recognize the right of each of its neighbors to national life.

Second, the political independence and territorial integrity of all the states in the area must be assured.

We are not the ones to say where other

nations should draw lines between them that will assure each the greatest security. It is clear, however, that a return to the situation of June 4, 1967, will not bring peace. There must be secure, and there must be recognized, borders.

Some such lines must be agreed to by the neighbors involved as part of the transition from armistice to peace.

At the same time, it should be equally clear that boundaries cannot and should not reflect the weight of conquest. Each change must have a reason which each side, in honest negotiation, can accept as a part of a just compromise.

Third, it is more certain than ever that Jerusalem is a critical issue of any peace settlement. No one wishes to see the Holy City again divided by barbed wire and by machine guns. I therefore tonight urge an appeal to the parties to stretch their imaginations so that their interests and all the world's interest in Jerusalem, can be taken fully into account in any final settlement.

Fourth, the number of refugees is still increasing. The June war added some 200,000 refugees to those already displaced by the 1948 war. They face a bleak prospect as the winter approaches. We share a very deep concern for these refugees. Their plight is a symbol in the minds of the Arab peoples. In their eyes, it is a symbol of a wrong that must be made right before 20 years of war can end. And that fact must be dealt with in reaching a condition of peace.

All nations who are able, including Israel and her Arab neighbors, should participate directly and wholeheartedly in a massive program to assure these people a better and a more stable future.

Fifth, maritime rights must be respected. Their violation led to war in 1967. Respect for those rights is not only a legal consequence of peace. It is a symbolic recognition that all nations in the Middle East enjoy equal treatment before the law.

And no enduring peace settlement is possible until the Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran are open to the ships of all nations and their right of passage is effectively guaranteed.

Sixth, the arms race continues. We have exercised restraint while recognizing the legitimate needs of friendly governments. But we have no intention of allowing the balance of forces in the area to ever become an incentive for war.

We continue to hope that our restraint will be matched by the restraint of others, though I must observe that has been lacking since the end of the June war.

We have proposed, and I reiterate again tonight, the urgent need now for an international understanding on arms limitation for this region of the world.

The American interest in the Middle East is definite, is clear. There just must be a just peace in that region, and soon. Time is not on the side of peace.

Now, my friends, I know that these two areas of the world are of very great concern to you as they are to me. Many of you have roots in Europe from which you or your forebears came in order to enrich the quality of the life here in America. Most, if not all of you, have very deep ties with the land and with the people of Israel, as I do, for my Christian faith sprang from yours.

The Bible stories are woven into my childhood memories as the gallant struggle of modern Jews to be free of persecution is also woven into our souls.

I think it is tragic that in our time Eastern Europe and the Middle East have been subjected to military aggression. And I must speak frankly. Military aggression. And that tragedy is just as real in Southeast Asia.

Southeast Asia is a part of the world with which few Americans have any family ties. Most of you have none there. But its freedom is as dear and as cherished and as vital, not

only to America's security, but to the 200 million poor humans who live there and who do not believe in communist conquest any more than you do.

American policy there, as in other parts of the world, has been to resist the dark tide violence and totalitarian rule. We have tried to encourage in all three areas the rule of reason, of forbearance, because we believe that that alone can provide ultimately the conditions of lasting peace.

We have acted in the belief that there is no such thing as harmless aggression—no such thing as harmless aggression anywhere, anytime—that because a nation was small, and thousands of miles away, it did not make its plight any less urgent or any less demanding of American concern.

I want you to know that we seek a world where neighbors are at each other's side and not at each other's throat. We seek no dominion except that of the free, independent human spirit, and we want to help everybody in that quest.

In such a world, the people of Eastern Europe tonight, the people of little Israel, the people of her Arab neighbors, the people of South and North Vietnam, the people of India, Pakistan, Africa and Latin America can live without fear, and so can we.

In a time of adversity, let us all work to secure such a world—secure it bravely and resolutely with compassion for those who are also our brothers on this earth. And, my dear friends, let us work with our heads instead of our passions and our emotions.

Let us work with our sense of justice, instead of our sense of bigotry.

And after 5,000 years or more, I believe most of you here know what I mean.

May it be said of each of us, in the ancient Hebrew words: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that proclaimeth peace, that publishes salvation."

God be with you. Thank you.

CASUAL CHAT

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the interesting columns in the Wynne, Ark., Progress is "Casual Chat," written by the editor of the newspaper, Mr. Bill Courtney. Editor Courtney "tells it like it is." In a recent column, carried in the August 29 issue of the Progress, he comments on the recent happenings at the National Democratic Convention in Chicago. His article follows:

CASUAL CHAT

(By Bill Courtney)

It was dismaying to me Wednesday night, watching the Democratic convention, to see the delegates who preach "law and order" so piously become ready to lynch Mayor Daley of Chicago for providing police protection.

I was sitting in front of the television hoping and hoping that Mayor Daley would simply call off his police who were so unpopular with the convention, and turn that mob of yuppies loose on the delegates. That's what they seem to be advocating.

I defend free speech. I defend a free press. But the right "peaceably to assemble" doesn't mean you can assemble in the middle of a busy street or in somebody's front room, or where somebody else is assembling. Anybody who assembles as those yuppies assembled in Chicago is asking for just what those yuppies got, an assembly in the Chicago jail.

And I have no sympathy whatever for the person who gets his head bloodied for trampling the American flag and hoisting the Viet Cong banner over American soil in a public place. If this is his "free speech", then others have a right of rebuttal, and the Chicago police expressed their opinions, and mine.

WE ARE ALL RESPONSIBLE

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, in these days of riots, civil disobedience, disloyalty, and disrespect for those institutions which are fundamental to our American heritage, it is refreshing to read remarks such as those of Richard B. Williams, of Sturgis, S. Dak., reaffirming his belief in those basic concepts which are the foundation of this Nation's greatness.

Mr. Williams' guest editorial in the Sturgis Tribune follows:

WE ARE ALL RESPONSIBLE

(By Richard B. Williams)

Our nation is not sick. On the contrary it is young, strong, and virile. It has been busy; it has survived turbulent times, it has forged ahead. Like all of us individuals it has made errors, and it has forgotten in the rush to pay attention to some basic items.

For this we are all to blame a little. We have to blame ourselves as American citizens. And we who deal with people in any political subdivision or organization from the home on are not immune. When we once accept our errors and accept our blame, we are then ready to forge ahead with new goals, and a new outlook on life; and this from our own front doorstep to the step of our national Capitol and beyond.

Today we hear such words or statements as "confusion", "no hope", "no future", "everything is in a mess", "we're sick", "God is dead", and many others that could be added. These are negative, and are many times used as excuses for us to avoid reality. Nothing could be further from fact. God is not dead. He is with us always. The Ten Commandments are just as important now as the day they were delivered. Our Constitution is still the greatest document for civil government that was ever penned . . . and our land is still filled with opportunities.

As we open schools this fall, we are reminded of those three great institutions—foundations of a free country—the home, the church, and the school. In all of these, and for all of these our responsibilities weigh heavily. This is as it should be. This is our challenge.

In view of our responsibilities, not only do we need to review within ourselves our love and respect for our country, but we must practice in our institutions and in our daily lives, the real laboratory, these priceless ingredients with which and for which this country was founded.

Then it must follow that we must all work together to see that our philosophies and our institutions work as we would have them work. This job lies on all Americans . . . on each one of us . . . the young and the old. We cannot pass the burden or the blame on others. This calls for effort, for courage, and for sacrifice. It calls for positive attitudes instead of negative attitudes.

It calls for positive performance as opposed to a recessive status . . . decay and subsequent death. It calls for respect for our institutions, for our laws, our fellow citizens, and above all respect for ourselves.

It calls for a burning belief that liberty under law is the only true liberty; that freedom under law is the only true freedom; and that authority and regulation as relegated by the majority to be used for the good of all is the only real authority. For this end we should work shoulder to shoulder to make it work, even if it sometimes takes our own skins off.

We must realize when we shirk our responsibilities a little, we weaken our nation a little. When another succeeds we all succeed a little. When another fails, we all fail a little. Let us keep in mind at all times our grave responsibility to humanity in general and to our Nation, and that responsibility begins at our own door-steps!

JOINT CHIEFS' ADVICE IGNORED TOO LONG

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Aug. 4, 1968]

JOINT CHIEFS' ADVICE IGNORED TOO LONG
(By Vice Adm. Ruthven E. Libby, U.S. Navy, retired)

In their analysis of the probably irreparable damage that the Robert S. McNamara regime inflicted upon the military posture of the United States and its consequent dangerous undermining of our national security, future historians will surely pinpoint as a principal contribution to this achievement the defense secretary's consistent policy with reference to the chiefs of service individually and the Joint Chiefs of Staff collectively.

This policy was aptly described by Gen. Merrill Twining as one of rejecting the advice and counsel of these lifetime career officers "in favor of the snap judgments of a small group of glib, brilliant and superficially informed appointees from civilian life, almost without military background and certainly with none of that feel for war which underlies every sound military judgment. In short, the American Eagle was supplanted by a political bird of passage."

McNamara's departure for the perhaps greener but surely more tranquil pastures of the World Bank has not yet produced any noticeable improvement in this situation—noticeable, that is, to the public eye. This is not surprising because, as previously noted herein, even if Secretary Clark Clifford devoted full time to the process of deflating the gargantuan structure of the office he inherited to anything approaching reasonable and manageable proportions, the process would take years.

One suspects that the percentage of man-hours devoted to demonstrating the indispensability of these various swollen sub-bureaucracies in the Office of the Secretary of Defense is substantial. A systems analysis of these systems would, I dare say, be quite revealing. Furthermore, Secretary Clifford as the appointee of a self-declared lame duck President wields substantially less power than did his predecessor.

In sum, the combination of the irreversibility of many of the steps taken by McNamara and the indestructibility of the burgeoning bureaucracy he created in his office will plague us, in defense matters, for years to come.

Finger-pointing and recriminations serve no purpose at this late date but for the sake of our survival it behooves us to take

a hard look at where we stand and do something about it if we still are granted time.

For almost eight years we have been assiduously seeking accommodation with the U.S.S.R., and in pursuit of the will-o-the-wisp of world peace have engaged in unilateral disarmament on the theory that "parity" in military strength, rather than overwhelming superiority, was the way to secure it. But while dangling before our Washington administration the carrots of nuclear test-ban treaties, nonproliferation treaties and promises to talk about limitations on anti-missile systems, the Russians quietly but effectively have proceeded to build up their offensive and defensive nuclear weaponry; their conventional military strength on land, at sea and in the air; their merchant marine, and their gold reserves to formidable strength, while at the same time sapping our military and economic strength via Vietnam, and attempting to undermine our national morale by a well-planned and shrewdly executed campaign of subversion and insubstitutions within our borders.

None of this should surprise anybody, of course; the Russians are merely doing what they said they would do, even though Washington chooses not to believe them.

The hard statistics in support of the foregoing are undeniable, and in the aggregate almost unbelievable. By way of reviewing our present position, consider just a few items:

In 1961 we possessed a 5-to-1 advantage over the U.S.S.R. in nuclear striking power. This strength has now been cut in half while the Russians were increasing theirs some 300 per cent. If present policies continue, by 1971 the Russians will have a strategic weapon delivery capability of 30,000 to 50,000 megatons, while ours will be reduced to a maximum of about 15,000.

In February of this year, we had a total of 2,345 strategic delivery vehicles (missiles and bombers), and the U.S.S.R. had 2,700. Under present plans we will have 2,121 in 1972, whereas the U.S.S.R. will have 4,230.

Our strategic nuclear-armed bombers have been cut from 2,710 in 1961 to 665 as of now. The U.S.S.R. has had a deployed anti-missile defense system for three years; we have none. Furthermore, most of our defenses against manned bombers have been phased out on the ground that since we have no missile defense, it is useless to defend against bombers.

We have no space weapons and no plans that I am aware of to make any military use of space. The Russians have a 30-megaton orbital bomb that we know about, and probably others that we don't know about.

Because of Defense Department appeasement policies and of our unfortunate image abroad, we have voluntarily closed a number of overseas bases and are in process of losing others by request of the host countries. Contrariwise, the U.S.S.R. is building up a sizable base complex in the Middle East, Africa and the Mediterranean, not to mention its prize possession 90 miles from our shore, Cuba.

The Soviet navy features atomic submarines, missile ships and modern, fast, cruisers and anti-submarine ships. We have nothing comparable to the missile ships and no defense against them.

The Soviet merchant marine, with a noble assist from our own stupidity in matters of maritime trade, is rapidly driving U.S. flag merchant shipping from the seas.

In the face of this evidence, it is little wonder that the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are concerned over our present and prospective military posture. Their recent testimony before the preparedness subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee reflects this justified unease.

The Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, said: "We believe that currently programmed force levels will place United States security interests worldwide at increasing risk."

Air Force Chief of Staff John P. McConnell testified that "our security is being in-

creasingly challenged by the improving strategic forces of the Soviet Union and their associated technological programs."

JCS Chairman Gen. Earle G. Wheeler declares himself apprehensive about U.S. survival if present trends continue.

And so should we all be. It is high time—if it is not everlastingly too late—that the advice of our military authorities be considered.

REMARKS BY HON. ROBERT C. WEAVER, NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION, AUGUST 26, 1968

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, in the last 4 years this Congress and this administration have molded more programs to build housing and restore our urban areas than ever before. The importance of urban areas in the life of our Nation was recognized with the establishment of a Department of Housing and Urban Development. The model cities and rent supplement programs have brought new concepts to the solution of old problems and the passage of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, has given us the tools to wipe out substandard housing in the United States.

It is obvious that we have not yet solved our pressing problems. We have only begun to undo the effects of years of neglect. In an address to the Democratic National Convention, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Robert C. Weaver, the first man to hold this position and the leader who has set the course for this new Department and for America's cities, spoke of the accomplishments of the past 4 years and of the challenge ahead. His words epitomize the dedication of the Democratic Party and its candidates Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE to the task of achieving a decent home and a safe community for all Americans. I would like to share Secretary Weaver's remarks with my colleagues and include them at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY HON. ROBERT C. WEAVER, NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION, AUGUST 26, 1968

Four years ago our platform pledged to make a place in the President's Cabinet for the urban American—a voice for the cities and towns, large and small, in every region—a voice for the 150 million Americans who live in urban centers.

President Kennedy first proposed it, and President Johnson secured its enactment into law.

That I speak to you tonight as the first Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is living, breathing proof that we Democrats keep our promises.

But ours was not just a pledge for another chair in the Cabinet room. It was a pledge to pose a new thrust to create a new strategy, to develop a new concept, to instill a new vigor in all of this Nation's efforts to revitalize the cities and the suburbs.

Many Americans remember the roots of this urban strategy. They remember President Roosevelt's creating the first public housing and FHA home-buyer insurance. They remember President Truman's creating

urban renewal to fight central city decay. They remember President Kennedy's creating the first Federal help for moderate income housing.

And Americans remember that President Johnson and the Democrats of the 89th and 90th Congresses greatly expanded our urban programs. Among the score of innovations were:

Grants for urban mass transportation; rent supplements; model cities; grants for water and sewer facilities.

This unprecedented concern for urban Americans was dramatically culminated by two major legislative victories in 1968.

Only a few months ago, President Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act of 1968 that will give every family a fair chance to find good housing.

On the first of this month, the President signed the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968—a monumental piece of legislation that can translate hope and dreams into good homes and desirable neighborhoods.

In this Act, we dared to say specifically that we can and will help to build and rebuild six million housing units for lower income families—not just some time—but in the next ten years. This is more than has ever been done before. This is ten times more than in the last ten years. And this is enough—at long last—to eradicate the six million wretched dwellings that today oppress 20 million Americans.

In this Act we provide the basis for new dignity and new pride for the poor through a sound homeownership program. In this Act we make it possible to build entirely new communities—communities which will open new vistas of hope and excitement for urban Americans of all income groups.

We have developed new ways to make private industry an active partner in these ventures.

Looking to the future, we have initiated major research programs to determine America's urban needs a decade hence, and to begin planning now to meet those needs.

We are proud of our record. But we will not rest on it or be content with past performance. The Democratic Party has always been, and continues to be, the party able to recognize new conditions, to seek new approaches, to insist upon new ideas; the party ready to accept new challenges.

I need remind no American that our cities and towns face many problems—snarled traffic, polluted air, neglect of central cities, haphazard growth at the urban fringe.

We in the Democratic Party, the party of compassion—understand that these are all problems of people, not only the poor, not only the black, but problems for all of us.

We know that for some of our people despair has triggered rebellion. But we also know why. It is primarily the result of their being mechanized, ostracized and brutalized.

All of us want law and order—no one more than the slum dweller who is the most frequent victim of crime and disorder.

We in the Democratic Party know that social order can only be the product of social justice.

We know that some cry for law and order when what they mean is repression.

We know that others propose bland solutions when what they intend is to do nothing.

But the Democratic Party recognizes that in a democracy, law and order cannot be achieved solely by reliance upon guns and nightsticks.

We are a Nation based on the rule of law and justice.

We must be firm, but our helping hand should offer more than repression. It should offer hope and help for all Americans.

We will not rest—as President Johnson pledged—"until each city is a community where every member feels he belongs, until it is a place where each citizen feels safe on his street, until it is a place where self-respect and dignity are the lot of each man.

"This is what men have always dreamed their cities would be. And this is what we seek to build."

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS, 1968

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, throughout my tenure in the House of Representatives I have sampled, on a periodic basis, the opinions of my constituents on the major issues of the day. The response to my legislative questionnaire has always been gratifying. It was especially so this year. The returns from the four counties which comprise the Fourth Congressional District of New Jersey indicate a high degree of concern in the Paris peace talks; the national crime rate; and racial tensions throughout the country.

In keeping with their expressed concern for the peace talks, my constituents have indicated their belief that expenditures for Vietnam should be reduced, along with those for welfare services, space exploration, and crop supports. On the other hand, the majority feel we should not reduce expenditures for education, highway, and conservation projects. In short, there seems to be a pronounced feeling that we should be tending to first things first—more emphasis on educating our children, tending to our streams and land resources, and much less spending for military adventures abroad.

With respect to the expressed concern about the crime rate, it is important to note that the concern seems to be more on the national scene than on the local level. This might indicate a tendency on the part of some respondents to equate civil disorders, which may or may not involve criminal acts, with what might be termed conventional criminality. In any event, the concern is very real and fully justifies our passage of the Crime Control and Safe Streets Act—Public Law 90-351, section 301 of which substantially enacts H.R. 11835, a bill in which I joined with a number of my colleagues to sponsor on July 27, 1967. In passing, I am pleased to note that New Jersey has quite recently received a Federal grant under the act of \$151,814 to help finance a statewide riot control radio communication system. Creation of such a communications system was recommended by the State and National riot study commissions.

I would also note, Mr. Speaker, that a majority of my constituents expressed concern about the imbalance in the Federal budget. Here, too, the Congress has acted. The Revenue Act of 1968, coupled with cutbacks in expenditures, should restore the desired fiscal balance my constituency seeks. With this preface, I present herewith the actual questionnaire tabulations as expressed in percentages. I am grateful to the faculty of the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton for the assistance I received in the drafting of the questionnaire; and to the following volunteers who worked so hard to tabulate the returns; Carol Berkelhammer, Judith Block, Janice Fleisher, Toni Lichstein, Ann Risdon, Nina Thompson, Jim Ferrucci, Dan Pollitt, and George Steffner.

To facilitate the presentation and in the interest of saving space, the results will not be given in the exact order in which the questions were posed:

1968 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Under present law anyone may purchase firearms by mail. Do you favor or oppose a Federal program to regulate the sale of firearms through the mails?

	[In percent]		
	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All returns.....	81	15	4
Mercer.....	88	10	2
Hunterdon.....	72	23	5
Warren.....	78	20	2
Sussex.....	73	22	5

In your local community, is crime a growing threat to the safety of persons and property?

	[In percent]		
	Yes	No	No opinion
All returns.....	56	38	6
Mercer.....	69	25	6
Hunterdon.....	32	60	8
Warren.....	32	63	5
Sussex.....	30	63	7

Do you favor Federal aid to local police forces?

	[In percent]		
	Yes	No	No opinion
All returns.....	46	34	20
Mercer.....	50	28	22
Hunterdon.....	29	53	18
Warren.....	38	52	10
Sussex.....	37	49	14

The Federal Government is presently spending about 11 billion dollars more than it receives in taxes and other revenues. What should the Federal government do to balance the budget?

[In percent]

	Increase taxes without cutting spending	Cut spending without increasing taxes	Increase taxes and cut spending	Nothing	No opinion
All returns.....	6	57	33	0	4
Mercer.....	11	38	47	0	3
Hunterdon.....	4	57	35	0	4
Warren.....	4	62	34	0	0
Sussex.....	6	57	33	0	4

If there have to be spending cuts, which of the following federal government programs should be reduced?

	Budget (billion dollars) approximate	Percent			
		Reduce	Don't reduce	No opinion	
National defense, excluding Vietnam.....	50	44	44		12
Vietnam.....	30	52	36		11
Veteran benefits.....	7	24	50		16
Space exploration.....	5	69	26		5
Agriculture (farmer's income support).....	4	57	31		11
Highway construction, land and water resources, dams, etc.....	4	33	55		12
Aid to education.....	4	24	63		12
Welfare services.....	3	59	32		9
War on poverty.....	2	47	42		11
Public housing, urban renewal.....	1	43	46		11

Do you favor Federal support, State support, or no support of the following programs dealing with urban problems?

[In percent]

	Federal support	State support	Both support	Neither support	No opinion
Better urban elementary and secondary education.....	22	48	15	8	7
Better urban housing for low and moderate income families.....	28	30	12	20	6
Job training for urban unemployed people.....	33	32	16	15	5
Summer employment for urban teenagers.....	15	45	11	22	6
Tighter control of narcotics and drugs.....	63	10	18	3	5
Better urban mass transit systems.....	31	30	13	17	9
Better control of urban air and water pollution.....	46	24	19	5	6

In your opinion, how important are the following public issues?

[In percent]

	Very important	Moderately important	Not important	No opinion
Vietnam peace talks.....	82	8	8	1
The crime rate.....	85	13	1	1
The need for better schools and colleges.....	48	40	9	3
Narcotics and drug control.....	66	28	3	1
Rising prices and balance of payments.....	67	29	2	2
Government aid to people in poverty.....	39	40	16	5
Racial tension.....	69	24	4	3
Balancing the Federal budget.....	51	24	5	20

MERCER COUNTY

If there have to be spending cuts, which of the following federal government programs should be reduced?

	Budget (billion dollars) approximate	Percent			
		Reduce	Don't reduce	No opinion	
National defense, excluding Vietnam.....	50	50	37		12
Vietnam.....	30	61	30		10
Veteran benefits.....	7	31	52		17
Space exploration.....	5	68	28		4
Agriculture (farmer's income support).....	4	60	28		12
Highway construction, land and water resources, dams, etc.....	4	38	57		10
Aid to education.....	4	22	70		8
Welfare services.....	3	46	46		8
War on poverty.....	2	39	52		10
Public housing, urban renewal.....	1	35	57		8

Do you favor Federal support, State support, or no support of the following programs dealing with urban problems?

[In percent]

	Federal support	State support	Both support	Neither support	No opinion
Better urban elementary and secondary education.....	23	45	19	7	7
Better urban housing for low and moderate income families.....	32	29	16	15	8
Job training for urban unemployed people.....	32	34	17	13	4
Summer employment for urban teenagers.....	14	48	14	18	5
Tighter control of narcotics and drugs.....	63	8	19	4	6
Better urban mass transit systems.....	31	30	14	19	7
Better control of urban air and water pollution.....	44	26	19	5	5

In your opinion, how important are the following public issues?

[In percent]

	Very important	Moderately important	Not important	No opinion
Vietnam peace talks.....	88	5	5	1
The crime rate.....	81	16	1	2
The need for better schools and colleges.....	52	40	6	3
Narcotics and drug control.....	61	32	6	2
Rising prices and balance of payments.....	61	34	2	2
Government aid to people in poverty.....	44	40	12	4
Racial tension.....	70	21	4	4
Balancing the Federal budget.....	41	31	5	23

HUNTERDON COUNTY

If there have to be spending cuts, which of the following Federal Government programs should be reduced?

	Budget (billion dollars) approximate	Percent			
		Reduce	Don't reduce	No opinion	
National defense, excluding Vietnam.....	50	44	42		14
Vietnam.....	30	49	36		15
Veteran benefits.....	7	21	62		17
Space exploration.....	5	63	28		9
Agriculture (farmer's income support).....	4	56	30		14
Highway construction, land and water resources, dams, etc.....	4	28	52		20
Aid to education.....	4	22	63		15
Welfare services.....	3	65	24		11
War on poverty.....	2	50	37		13
Public housing, urban renewal.....	1	46	40		14

Do you favor Federal support, State support, or no support of the following programs dealing with urban problems?

[In percent]

	Federal support	State support	Both support	Neither support	No opinion
Better urban elementary and secondary education.....	21	46	13	12	8
Better urban housing for low- and moderate-income families.....	22	27	9	34	9
Job training for urban unemployed people.....	25	33	14	20	8
Summer employment for urban teenagers.....	10	38	11	33	8
Tighter control of narcotics and drugs.....	60	8	17	9	7
Better urban mass transit systems.....	33	24	13	22	8
Better control of urban air and water pollution.....	44	22	21	5	7

In your opinion, how important are the following public issues?

[In percent]

	Very important	Moderately important	Not important	No opinion
Vietnam peace talks.....	82	12	6	0
The crime rate.....	81	15	4	0
The need for better schools and colleges.....	45	40	15	0
Narcotics and drug control.....	61	30	5	0
Rising prices and balance of payments.....	68	27	5	0
Government aid to people in poverty.....	33	42	24	0
Racial tension.....	66	25	10	0
Balancing the Federal budget.....	56	25	18	0

Do you favor Federal support, State support, or no support of the following programs dealing with urban problems?

WARREN COUNTY

If there have to be spending cuts, which of the following federal government programs should be reduced?

	Budget (billion dollars) approximate	Percent			
		Reduce	Don't reduce	No opinion	
National defense, excluding Vietnam	50	38	48		14
Vietnam	30	48	33		19
Veteran benefits	7	18	62		20
Space exploration	5	66	26		8
Agriculture (farmer's income support)	4	57	32		11
Highway construction, land and water resources, dams, etc.	4	33	52		15
Aid to education	4	24	63		13
Welfare services	3	62	26		12
War on poverty	2	48	36		16
Public housing, urban renewal	1	48	38		14

Do you favor Federal support, State support, or no support of the following programs dealing with urban problems?

[In percent]

	Federal support	State support	Both support	Neither support	No opinion	
Better urban elementary and secondary education	26	47	9	11		7
Better urban housing for low and moderate income families	27	26	5	35		7
Job training for urban unemployed people	34	39	8	15		4
Summer employment for urban teenagers	15	43	6	30		6
Tighter control of narcotics and drugs	66	10	14	4		6
Better urban mass transit systems	30	30	7	26		7
Better control of urban air and water pollution	52	23	16	5		4

In your opinion, how important are the following public issues?

[In percent]

	Very important	Moderately important	Not important	No opinion	
Vietnam peace talks	80	13	5		2
The crime rate	85	14	1		0
The need for better schools and colleges	41	44	9		6
Narcotics and drug control	63	30	4		3
Rising prices and balance of payments	75	20	2		3
Government aid to people in poverty	35	43	17		5
Racial tension	68	28	4		0
Balancing the Federal budget	62	17	4		17

SUSSEX COUNTY

If there have to be spending cuts, which of the following Federal Government programs should be reduced?

	Budget (billion dollars) approximate	Percent			
		Reduce	Don't reduce	No opinion	
National defense, excluding Vietnam	50	37	50		13
Vietnam	30	41	50		9
Veteran benefits	7	24	56		20
Space exploration	5	56	31		13
Agriculture (farmer's income support)	4	56	32		12
Highway construction, land and water resources, dams, etc.	4	34	50		16
Aid to education	4	27	58		15
Welfare services	3	61	31		8
War on poverty	2	49	37		14
Public housing, urban renewal	1	47	40		13

Do you favor Federal support, State support, or no support of the following programs dealing with urban problems?

[In percent]

	Federal support	State support	Both support	Neither support	No opinion	
Better urban elementary and secondary education	21	45	15	13		6
Better urban housing for low- and moderate-income families	20	29	34	12		5
Job training for urban unemployed people	29	33	13	20		5
Summer employment for urban teenagers	14	43	12	26		5
Tighter control of narcotics and drugs	57	18	20	2		3
Better urban mass transit systems	27	38	17	10		8
Better control of urban air and water pollution	45	29	5	18		4

In your opinion, how important are the following public issues?

[In percent]

	Very important	Moderately important	Not important	No opinion	
Vietnam peace talks	74	16	6		4
The crime rate	79	19	0		2
The need for better schools and colleges	50	39	8		3
Narcotics and drug control	70	24	3		3
Rising prices and balance of payments	70	25	3		2
Government aid to people in poverty	36	40	20		4
Racial tension	59	34	6		1
Balancing the Federal budget	63	24	4		9

CONSUMER BEWARE: IT'S NOT REALLY MILK

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the past several months, more and more attention has been focused on the rising production of imitation and filled milk products. Many of these products are packaged so as to give the impression that they are actually whole milk. The housewife may, therefore, be under the impression that she is buying cow's milk, when she may be purchasing a mixture of vegetable oil, and sodium caseinate or soy flour.

The additional factor is that the dairy farmer is deprived of a legitimate market. The present state of the dairy economy shows that American dairymen cannot afford to suffer reduced incomes as a result of cheap imitations.

My bill will require producers and marketers of imitation or filled milk, to so package and display their product that the consumer could not confuse it with

milk. First, the product could not be packaged in a manner resembling genuine milk. Second, it could not be displayed in the dairy departments of stores. Finally, the imitation or filled products could not use the terms "milk" or "cream" on the package label.

The quality of the synthetic milk products being marketed around the country varies a great deal. In a speech delivered to the North Central Milk & Ice Cream Association in Minneapolis it was shown that an artificial milk product had only one-fourth the protein of milk, one-sixth the calcium, and similarly reduced amounts of other vitamins and minerals.

According to the "Dairy Situation," publications of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the chief ingredients in an artificial milk include coconut oil, soy protein isolate, corn syrup solids, sugar, water, emulsifiers, buffers, and stabilizers. One-half gallon of this mix comes out of a counterfeit cow at a cost of 13 cents.

The sales of filled milk have reached proportions of over 10 million pounds per month. In Arizona, filled milk is taking 8.2 percent of the class I market. If imitation milk ever obtained that per-

centage of the national market, American dairy farmers would be deprived of over \$440 million of income.

It is important that the Congress of the United States take action to protect the American consumer and to protect the dairy farmer from the unfair pre-emption of dairy markets.

PAYMENT LIMIT KEY TO FARM PROGRAM REFORM

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe opponents of the bill to extend the Agricultural Act of 1965 have a 50-50 chance to defeat it unless it retains the limitation on payments.

Accordingly, I will attempt to get House Members to reaffirm support for a \$20,000 limitation on the total payments each farmer may get under the bill when a motion is made to send it to conference with the Senate version.

The move will probably come early next week, when Representative W. R. POAGE, chairman of the Agriculture Committee, returns from a trip to Latin America. Last Tuesday the Agriculture Committee authorized him to make the motion to go to conference. The vote was taken as a means of breaking the impasse caused by my repeated objections to go to conference.

I will seek to instruct conferees from the House to insist upon the amendment voted in the House bill on July 31, by 230 to 160.

To me, the House vote in July to impose a limitation on the total amount of Government payments each farmer may receive was an historic event, which must not be permitted to be reversed in the House-Senate conference compromise.

Insistence upon the limitation will be a major step toward the eventual rejection of direct payments in farm programs.

Direct payments have been costly and ineffective, have impaired the management efficiency of farmers, and have caused extensive damage to the private marketplace system through which grains historically have been successfully merchandised. Low market prices, like those today for corn and wheat, are an inherent feature of payment programs.

The establishment of payment limitations, I predict, will quickly lead to a major overhaul of farm programs and the substitution of ones which emphasize higher market prices and the elimination of Government payments.

Because I consider this issue to be so critically important, I have pressed my campaign for payment limitation the past 6 months and in the closing days of the 90th Congress will attempt to utilize every parliamentary device to insist that it be retained if extension of the Agricultural Act of 1965 is enacted.

It may be of interest that passions run to a vital level in some quarters over the payment-limitation issue. On June 21,

shortly after my initial amendment to an appropriation bill to limit payments to \$10,000 was defeated 129 to 79, I received the first of three letters threatening my life.

It was marked "Plainview, Tex.," and signed, "Hale County Farmer."

It warned:

Do not vote against limiting payments in any way or you will get what two other fellows got recently.

Another one postmarked August 3 from Littlefield, Tex., warned:

Change your vote . . . or you will be bombed to hell . . . a party from your district stated they needed a new Representative and they will get it.

It was not signed.

The final letter was postmarked August 4 in Albuquerque, N. Mex. with this message:

Five of you old boys names have been fixed on the unwanted list as was King's, if there is not a four year unlimited program out of this congress, some of you will not be in the next one . . . Bombs do not leave many guts.

It too had no name.

Similar threats went to several other House Members. Reaction at this level has been limited, fortunately, but even a little is too much. The correspondence illustrates a hazard of attempting to reform a program involving lucrative payments.

Two of the major crops covered by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 are wheat and corn. Stated purposes of the act are to bring supply in line with demand, to maintain and stabilize farm income and reduce surplus stocks of these crops. Clearly, the act has been an object failure.

With this in mind, it is interesting to note the 1968 crop estimates for wheat and corn issued by the USDA on Tuesday of this week.

First, the 1968 wheat crop is estimated at 1,596,599,000 bushels—5 percent above the record wheat crop in this country and a whopping 30 percent above the 1962-66 average.

For corn, this year's crop is now estimated at 4,636,456,000 bushels—only 2 percent below the record and 20 percent above the 1962-66 average. With other feed grains added, the crop will be an alltime record.

And now to prices for these crops. On Monday of this week, the cash wheat prices in Kansas City closed at \$1.31 per bushel and cash prices for corn in Chicago closed at \$1.08. Instead of being record highs, these were near record lows for the last 25 years. Prices paid to farmers at their county elevators were even lower. I was informed last weekend in Jacksonville, Ill., that elevators were offering 91 cents for October corn.

As far as the surplus situation is concerned, surpluses have been down some from record highs in the early 1960's. But that has changed. Carryovers of both wheat and corn were higher this June 30 than a year ago and with the huge crops now predicted, surpluses will be even higher next year.

Many will say this is all true, but what would it have been without current programs? That is not the question. The question is, Are these programs meeting

their stated objectives? Not even after spending more than \$2 billion a year on wheat and corn alone has this administration been able to make these unwise supply-management schemes work. This is a national disgrace. Yet you and I are being asked to extend these programs for still another year.

One final item. I see by yesterday morning's paper that the congressional leadership has apparently agreed with the President that the Commodity Credit Corporation, which finances these programs, should be exempted from the spending restraint features of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968. The request for exemption comes as a result of farm program costs now running \$700 million higher than earlier estimates. This exemption should not be made.

The failures of the program and its runaway costs dictate that Congress must act. I urge each of you to join me in opposing any conference report to extend the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 beyond its current expiration scheduled for the end of 1969, which does not include a \$20,000 limitation on individual payments.

FILING RELIEF FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the bill which I introduced today could save \$5 million of our taxes by the Government, and perhaps one-fifth as many man-hours of our citizens in filling out forms.

This bill will exclude a veteran from filing an income questionnaire after he reaches the age of 72, and who has been on the pension rolls for at least 2 years previous to attaining that age.

Looking at this situation realistically, we find very few veterans indeed whose incomes can ever increase after age 72. In fact, not only is their income stolen away by the robbing effects of inflation, but their actual incomes are also decreased by the necessity of using savings funds for the basic needs of life. As much as 25 percent of the pension of a World War I veteran may be used for medical expenses. It hardly makes sense to require these veterans to annually file these reports for increases in income when their incomes are decreasing.

In addition, there is another sad aspect to this situation. As many as 35,000 veterans and their widows can temporarily lose their pension benefits through incorrect completion of the forms. These senior citizens often cannot make the trip to the county seat for assistance from a county service officer, and therefore, are penalized for their errors.

This measure involves no funding, and, as stated earlier, could even save the Federal Government as much as \$5 million in labor and materials costs. I would urge my colleagues to join with me in the support of this commonsense, economical, and practical legislation.

MY STORY: VIETNAM

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James A. Laun, a concerned citizen of Oceanside, Calif., which is part of my district, has recorded his feelings during the time he spent in Vietnam. I believe he has painted a fine word picture of what thousands of our brave American boys are going through, and he feels he had a reason for being there. So that others may share Mr. Laun's presentation, I include it in the Record under Extensions of Remarks. The article follows:

MY STORY: VIETNAM

(By James A. Laun, SP/5, U.S. Army)

It was cold, that night in October, when we, the 3rd Squadron, 17th Air Cavalry, boarded the 727's for the flight to Oakland. It was still hard to believe we were actually going to Vietnam. I was quite tired and hopeful that somehow, someday things would work out.

Upon arrival, at Oakland, we loaded onto buses for the short ride to the docks of San Francisco. Where the 7th Squadron, our sister unit, was waiting for us to board ship.

With our gear, we walked up the gang plank of the USNS General N.M. Walker, into the dining room, through the ladderwell, down the hallway to compartment 22, our compartment. It was the size of a normal house, and in it went the entire Troop, 108 men. It was home for the next 22 days.

The next day, as we pulled anchor and started out to sea, I heard a band playing "America the Beautiful", so I left my thoughts on my bunk and went topside. I stayed there until we had passed under the Golden Gate Bridge, and the last bit of land we were to see for 15 days, Alcatraz, was out of sight. I was finally on my way to see, for myself, the reason for our being in Vietnam.

Once in International waters the ship began to bob, in the choppy water, like a cork. Those who couldn't cope with it were either hanging over the rail or had their head stuck out a port hole. When the initial effects had subsided most of us would stand by the rail and watch the birds and the Flying Fish skim over the top of the water and wonder what the future held in store for us.

It was a long, hot cruise to the Philippines; We were tired, on edge, and anxious to get there. After 15 days of sickness and boredom, we docked and four hours later we were left off the ship to visit the Naval Base. How wonderful it was to look all around and see nothing but land.

It didn't last long however, and soon we were on our way again. This time it was to Vietnam, where anything can happen.

The following few days were full of confused excitement. We docked at Qui Nohn, where our sister unit offloaded; then Cam Ranh Bay and Vung Tou. It was in Vung Tou we learned we were to be stationed at Di An, with the Big Red One, the First Infantry Division.

We were in Di An for about a month before we went to the field. During that time it became a monotonous cycle of classes, training for combat, and controlling air traffic, with rest only at night.

Then I was asked if I'd like to spend three days at Tan Son Nhut studying the TRN-25, a non-directional homing beacon. "Man, when do I go?"

Upon arrival at Tan Son Nhut two days later, I was put in a wooden hooch, given a bed, a pass to Saigon, and told to report for class at 0900 hr. the next morning.

It wasn't long before I was on the bus to downtown Saigon. It was fun to see the children getting out of school and watch the men and women scurry about on their motorcycles, bicycles, mini-cabs and pedi-cabs through the market plaza and down the streets between business establishments. It was a wonderful feeling to know that this wouldn't have been possible if it weren't for the American Nation.

After a while a wistful feeling came over me. I wanted to be home again, to know and feel forever free again, as I felt that moment in a strange and faraway land. But there is a job to be done.

After completing the classes on the TRN-25, I returned to Di An by air. Once in the air, the majestic beauty of Vietnam hit me. The sight was dark green, checkered by brown irrigation ditches and dotted with a few small villages for an added touch, with clouds for a picture of fantasy. I was awe struck.

Upon arrival at Di An, I learned that I was to leave the following day with part of the Squadron on our first field trip. We were going after Charlie. With this news my heart beat fast, perhaps this was the end of the line.

The morning of our arrival in the field, I was put on a small bunker on top of a hill, given a PRC-25, FM radio, for company, and started giving landing instructions to the aircraft. By late afternoon I had developed a bad headache and a cherry red sunburn. "Where is my relief?" I wondered "That no good for nothing Platoon Sergeant forgot me again!" Finally, after a reminder, he got me relieved.

It was like that for the next 4 days. Eat, Sleep and control traffic.

The third night out the V.C. started to act up. When the smoke cleared the next morning, we found out a South Vietnamese Soldier had been caught between our lines and the V.C., and when he tried to climb our perimeter fence in an attempt to escape from the V.C., the Infantrymen killed him thinking he was the enemy.

That is one of the many unfortunate incidents that happen in a war, for both sides.

After the ordeal was over, and we had returned to Di An, we learned that we were to go on another excursion in 2 days. Only this time I had a glimmer of hope: Charlie didn't get me last time, maybe he won't this time either.

The morning of the 7th of December we moved out, again by convoy. The trip took us through Saigon, West to Cu Chi, Northwest to Tay Ninh and from there to the other side of Mount Nui Ba Den, to Soui Da.

We were told that Nui Ba Den, Mountain of the Black Virgin, was made of marble and that the V.C. had dug into the mountain for protection. And since bombs couldn't penetrate the mountain, we were going to starve them out.

"Oh boy!" I thought "That's all we need is a pack of hunger crazed V.C. around." Suddenly I found myself looking for V.C. as we traveled down the road.

But as it turned out, our assignment was patrolling the border of Cambodia, conducting "Search and Find" missions. We were not to engage with the enemy unless authorized by Brigade.

Upon arrival at our destination I couldn't believe my eyes, out in the middle of nowhere, there was a runway. "So this is Soui Da!"

From that moment on we worked frantically in an effort to provide ourselves with some mortar bunkers for protection against a very probable mortar attack that night. We

worked until midnight that night, but there was no attack.

The next day we erected our tents, unpacked our equipment, built a tower and went to work controlling traffic.

Then the expected happened. The Infantry unit that was there when we arrived was moving out. That left it up to the Squadron to guard our real estate.

From then on the daily routine was off balance. If we worked in the tower during the day, we had guard duty that night, and if we had guard, the next morning was ours to sleep away while our tower buddies worked. Then we worked the tower that night. Occasionally we did get a solid night's sleep, but we were still near exhaustion all the time.

Then, one night while in the tower, a V.C. suicide squad sneaked up to within 10 meters of our perimeter fence. Once there they opened up with their RPG rocket grenades. Before our guards could locate them, they had destroyed one gunship, damaged another and wounded two men. Then a guard fired his M-79 grenade launcher, the grenade hit a V.C. in the neck, it exploded, killing all three V.C.

A few nights later our Northeast perimeter was under sniper fire. It got so bad at one point, that our gunships went up and silenced the enemy with their mini-guns and rockets. I was now growing accustomed to the actualities of war. There was no more fear, just pity.

Three weeks after we arrived in Soui Da our Troop Commander told us we were staying in Soui Da, subsequently we were to dig in. All living quarters were to be installed underground.

The week that followed was hectic and tiring. Myself and one of the fuel handling specialists decided to dig our own two man bunker. Every moment of spare time was spent building it.

It was getting close to Christmas now, everyone was putting out their small Christmas trees, some decorations and Seasons Greetings. Everyone was happy and full of renewed energy.

Christmas day we opened all the presents that had accumulated, and as the day wore on, everyone became lonely. Even the USO show offered little comfort. I prayed to God that someday men would learn to live together in peace.

We finished our bunker soon after Christmas. It wasn't much, just a hole in the ground with a roof covered with sandbags, stacked 4 high. The inside was covered with rubber from the runway, with a cabinet, made of ammo boxes, for our gear, a couple of bunks and some mice for company. On top I erected a five foot Cross. I was beginning to appreciate the things we have at home.

A week later we received orders to destroy all bunkers and move out. We did so, with reluctance, and two days later, January 7, 1968, we pulled out, by convoy, to our next assignment, Tay Ninh.

Tay Ninh was much larger and more secure than Soui Da, but the thought of having to rebuild all over again didn't appeal to us very much. Even so, there wasn't much we could do about it, so we pitched our tents for the night, took a shower and went out for a look at our new home.

Tay Ninh has several advantages over Soui Da. There was a PX, barber shop, post office, a service club, and several bars. However it was a lot hotter and dustier than Soui Da.

The airfield was located between our company area and the Philippines compound. It was a blacktop runway, 4,500 feet long, with all the scattered help pads unique to all Army bases in Vietnam. A real challenge for an Air Traffic Controller.

The next two weeks were spent cleaning our equipment and getting settled in one

place. Then we got the word, Tay Ninh was to be the new home of the 317th Air Cav. For the next six weeks we were building 16' by 32' wooden floors, with skeleton frames for sides, with our tents for a roof. Inside each hooch went 9-12 men with all their gear.

In the meantime, the Viet Cong's Lunar New Year, TET, offensive got into full swing. All the major provincial capitals and cities were under heavy attack.

Commerce was cut off, roads were closed and supplies had to be flown in.

The Vietnamese civilians who worked on base were no longer allowed through the gate and a curfew was enacted in Tay Ninh City.

Martial law was declared in Saigon and other Provincial cities throughout Vietnam.

We were on 24 hour alert. If there was an attack on Tay Ninh, we were to plug up all the weak spots in our defense lines. "Come on Charlie!"

The mess halls were starting to feed "B" rations, and unless the roads were opened soon, they would go to "C" rations. "Come on Charlie, let's get it over with!"

Casualties were high. After the first week the Viet Cong had lost 10 men for every one of ours.

Through the entire offensive, Tay Ninh was attacked three times with 122mm rockets. Each time we were in bed asleep, abruptly awakened with the yell, "Rocket Attack! Rocket Attack!" All of a sudden it became a mad dash for the nearest bunker. We were fighting each other to get through the door, once outside we dared not fall for fear of being trampled in the race for the nearest bunker packed with human sardines.

Casualties and damage had been light. Three aircraft were destroyed, while one rocket went astray and hit the hospital, killing one doctor, his patient and wounding another doctor.

All rockets hit the airfield, except for the eight that hit in the hospital area.

After the sting of the offensive had subsided we left for Di An. And since there were no civilian laundries left open, my first task was to wash some very dirty fatigues in the old ring washer we brought with us from the States. A rarity in Vietnam.

We stayed for two weeks. In that time we packed the remainder of our equipment, tore down the flight operations building and bunkers, everything was going to Tay Ninh.

By the time we finished, most of the roads had been reopened and the mess halls were serving "A" rations again. It was good to eat food again, if you could call it that after our cooks got through with it.

We returned to Tay Ninh by convoy. It was a scorching hot and dusty ride.

The Vietnamese people were traveling along side the road to Saigon, in an effort to get relief from the government. It was a pitiful sight of suffering and poverty, 10 times worse than anything we have.

Everywhere I looked, I saw hunger written on the faces of the people and of the children who hold out their hands for food.

Suddenly, I found myself throwing out my "C" rations, then my PX canned goods, then I hesitated at throwing out my two cans of shrimp. "They need it more than you." I said to myself, and out they went.

I had given my lunch and snacks to the Vietnamese people, who needed it so much more than I, and I still felt guilty.

As I sat back down, tears started to form in my eyes. Then I noticed cans and bags of food flying out of almost every vehicle in the convoy. I smiled with the joy of seeing the goodness of the American Soldier in trying to help an all but defeated people, who have fought and suffered for so long in their struggle for freedom.

With this new born pride in the American Nation and the Vietnamese people, I realized that if a free people should deny help to

those who seek freedom, they don't deserve it themselves.

For God gave us our freedom, why not help the rest of his people who seek freedom also.

I had finally seen for myself the reason for being in Vietnam. I am only too happy to have helped in such a cause.

SECRETARY FREEMAN SPEAKS IN GEORGIA AT 23D MEETING OF SOIL CONSERVATION SOCIETY OF AMERICA

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, when the 23d annual meeting of the Soil Conservation Society of America held its closing banquet at the Coliseum at the University of Georgia in Athens on the evening of August 21, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman was the featured speaker. Cecil Chapman, State conservationist for Georgia and national president of the society, presided.

This was a signal event for Athens, my home in my congressional district, and was testimony to the fact that there is a rapidly spreading understanding that the University's agricultural research potential and its new facilities are second to none in the southeast and in the forefront in the Nation as well.

The well-received and resoundingly applauded address of the Secretary, as set out below, is highly worth the careful scrutiny and attention of the House:

ADDRESS OF ORVILLE FREEMAN

While it is not necessarily so, this may be my valedictory as Secretary of Agriculture before a conservation group such as this.

At least I will treat it as such, because a valedictory is usually a summing up and a look at the future, and I believe we have reached a point in American life where such an assessment is in order.

For almost 200 years, we as a Nation have used the land and its resources to create an abundance of things to satisfy man's physical needs such as the world has never seen.

We have tamed the wilderness, opened the frontier, put two cars in many garages and a television set in every living room in a rush of progress that has left us unsatisfied, uneasy, for in many ways today progress seems to have left us trailing in its wake, out of control, wondering where it will take us next.

The frontier is closed; space is limited; people are bumping into people for the first time in our society. The evidence of our opulence is displayed for all—rich and poor—on television, in the newspapers and magazines and on the radio. But our ability to enjoy this opulence is eroding. The second car goes no faster through the traffic jam than the first; the half-hour gained by the shorter work day is wiped out by the hour's commuting to the job and back; the poor, who see this opulence and cannot share it, march across our TV screens and we are troubled.

And we are finding that we have been changing the natural environment at a rate faster than nature can handle it, and we are getting a feedback from nature in the form of smogged-up air; polluted rivers, silted harbors, algae-covered lakes, eroding soil.

We are discovering, in short, that in the pell mell drive of progress we have achieved an unprecedented quantity of life with little, if any, thought to the quality of life.

Our cities are not only centers of culture and commerce but of congestion and strife. The countryside is a haven of quiet, but too often the quiet of decay, the peace of decline.

Students revolt, minorities riot, the poor march on Washington. It is an uncomfortable time. But with all its discord, despite its troubles, this is also a stirring time in which to live—a challenging time. It offers to this generation a unique opportunity to shape the future of the Nation by shaping the future of the land. I want to talk about that for a few minutes today.

Thanks to technology and to its progress, we as a Nation have, for the first time, the resources—and the time—to literally remake the face of the Nation in terms of the best use of all of its land for all of its people—to remake it in terms of quality of life, not quantity of life.

This is the great challenge and the great opportunity of our time.

There is no longer a valid reason why human beings should be stacked at the rate of more than 122,000 per square mile in Harlem;

There is no valid reason why 43 out of every 100 country boys reaching working age must go elsewhere to find jobs;

There is no valid reason why millions of Americans must spend much of their lives standing in line, waiting in traffic, while millions of others watch the grass grow in the cracks of Main Street.

There is no reason for people to spill out haphazardly over the land—ugly strip cities stringing along the highways; subdivisions leaping frog ring upon ring, leveling hills, felling trees silting up streams in senseless, uncoordinated, wasteful expansion.

And there is absolutely no sense at all in the kind of thinking that says this trend to impacted cities and depopulated countryside must continue, that it can't be halted.

I contend that all this can be halted—and even reversed. I contend that we can plan for and achieve a geographic distribution of opportunity in this land that will give every American the chance to choose where he will live and work, that will put quality of life within the reach of us all.

I didn't say it will be easy. It will require a total National commitment by people and by governments at all levels to develop a basic National policy of conservation and use of resources and space for people; of local, area, regional and National planning—and action—for people.

But it can be done, and it must be done, because we are expecting at least 100 million more Americans to be living on this land by the year 2000—three hundred million of us, three people standing in a little more than 30 years where two stand today. That means three people in the school, on the highway, at the clinic, by the seashore, at the lake, on the street.

This Nation has been blessed with space for these people; there is room, and to spare—if we use it.

It is obvious that we are not using it now, not when 70 percent of us are elbowing through life on a little less than 2 percent of the land, not when the boarded up store is a commonplace for the 30 percent of us who live on the remaining 98 percent of the land.

But gloomy as this picture sounds, there is real cause for hope, and it stems largely from the countryside, where I can report from first-hand exposure that more and more of us are waking up to the consequences of lopsided growth, that steps are being taken in growing numbers of communities to redress rural-urban imbalance, to stop impacting the cities and to repopulate the countryside.

Local people are acting to restore jobs and opportunity that will keep their young people at home and attract others, acting to slow the migration that sent 22 million rural persons to the cities from 1940 to 1960 and that still continues.

And I am proud of what the Department of Agriculture is doing to further this cause of rural-urban balance, of providing for people a choice of where they want to live their lives.

I like to think that the Department has elevated the human equation in the care and use of resources, an equation that says environment, wherever it is, must nurture the spirit as well as house the body, that conservation means the balanced use of resources that truly husbands and conserves them.

We had lifted our conservation sights from the farmlands of America to resource management, resource development for all the people, to the total relationship between man and the world around him.

This broadened horizon is perhaps exemplified best by our Resource Conservation and Development projects, authorized by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962.

Forty-one of these projects exist today, covering more than 112 million acres. They are regionwide, bootstrap operations in which people in several counties pool their talents and their resources to develop the whole area for all the people.

We help—but local people and local initiative determine how effective that help is. The 750 project measures completed by July 1 are providing 11,000 jobs and have increased annual gross income for the people they serve by more than \$120 million.

I got a particular thrill from visiting one of these projects last year—the Lincoln Hills RC&D project in Southern Indiana, the first in the Nation. Last week I was equally impressed when I toured the West Central RC&D project in my own home state of Minnesota.

The thrill came because I could measure what had been done in the four years since I had been there at the inception of each in 1963.

At Lincoln Hills I saw a new high school in Perry County, new modern medical and dental facilities in Crawford County; two new bridges across the Ohio River; new and expanded wood products, metal, ceramics and other industries.

And I helped dedicate a lake where there had been no lake four years before—a lake that already was providing fun for three small boys who were busy fishing as I was speaking, and a lake that was planned to be the focal point of a growing tourist business.

One old-timer summed it up as we walked from the lakeshore after the ceremony.

"This project probably won't help me much," he said, "but it will help keep our young people, so I'm all for it."

This is where we've got to key our development from now on—people, and all the people, city and country alike.

One way we have focused on people in the USDA is the formation of what we call Technical Action Panels in all 3,000 rural counties and in all the 50 states. Every county in the United States has at least 4 programs carried out by professional personnel, involving the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Soil Conservation Service, Farmers Home Administration and Extension Service.

The Technical Action Panels comprise the senior USDA field officials and representatives of other government agencies, too, including State and local. Their assignment is community development—to help bring about a comprehensive development plan and then to

pinpoint the programs that can best help to solve people or resource problems. TAPs make every effort to provide technical and planning help as needed, as well as some of the resources to carry the plans forward.

We have assembled in USDA a considerable array of programs designed to help communities and individuals to move themselves into the mainstream of the economy, and by our outreach program we have enlisted the aid of other government agencies that heretofore had not been putting a fair share of their funds and effort into rural America.

I will not try to list them all, but will only say that they range from a loan to enable a boxed-in farmer to start a part-time welding business to the multi-county Resource Conservation and Development projects I mentioned a moment ago. And today, unlike 8 years ago, the target is not just to make a particular service in a particular agency available, but to join them all together under local leadership to build balanced communities.

And people are using these programs. Opportunity is being restored in hundreds of communities in the countryside. Figures show it.

Non-Metropolitan America's share of the nonfarm job growth rose from 20 percent in 1962 to 27 percent in 1966.

During the Sixties, the rate of increase in employment in Town and Country America has been double the rate of the Fifties.

Some 30 states now have designated multi-county planning districts for development; multi-state planning is advancing in several parts of the Nation.

Just today, I broke ground for two new homes, one in Triana, Alabama and the other in Washington, Georgia, the first to be financed under the new Farmers Home Administration housing program authorized by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. Not only does this landmark legislation mark a long stride toward decent housing in rural as well as urban America, it also includes matching funds for comprehensive multi-county planning, the foundation of balanced community development.

And, most important, the migration from the countryside to the cities has slowed from a net average of more than a million a year in the Forties and fifties to less than 500,000 a year in the first five years of the Sixties.

There is progress in the countryside, and growing momentum, but measured against the task, it is only a beginning.

To build of this Nation the Community of Tomorrow worthy of the American ideal of human dignity, of opportunity for all, will require a nationwide effort in the barn-raising spirit of another era.

It will require local initiative, state initiative, Federal initiative and private initiative—all working toward the same goal—the development of communities, big and little, urban and rural—not to make them bigger, but to make them better.

It will require people who care, people who understand that discrimination, poverty, congestion, pollution, discord in the life in any corner of the land, make life in the rest of the land that much less.

It will require a spirit of intergovernmental cooperation, an end to contention between units and levels of government. We have probably wasted more political energy in this country over the issues of state's rights, local rights and the Federal role than any other. And in this, a Presidential election year, we hear the voice of demagoguery in shrill cry once again around the country, seeking to set one part of government against another. The people can only lose from such

a course, for we have reached the time in this society when the issue has changed from one of rights to one of responsibilities. Demagoguery only wastes time, wastes motion and slows progress.

Under our constitution, the Federal, State, and local governments are interrelated parts of a single governmental system. As our population grows toward 300 million and beyond, and as our society progresses, the need for government to provide both more and better services grows in almost equal proportion.

Of necessity—because local units could not or would not do it—the Federal government in recent years has assumed an increasing share of the total responsibility, but we are fast reaching the point of diminishing returns.

The times call for a coordinated division of labor, recognizing what each level of government can do best within a national plan for a national goal.

Political boundaries must cease to be barriers to progress. The people in towns and counties that can't now provide good schools, or hospitals, or other services must understand that they have no chance for a life of genuine quality unless they band together in multi-county planning to pool the resources of the whole area for the good of all its parts.

The central city has got to involve the suburbs in its planning and its problems; each is dependent on the other. They share an economic base and interdependent transportation. You can't have a good life in one and not the other.

This whole society, linked as it is by high-speed transportation and instant communications, is interdependent; it is a truly National society. Like it or not, the problems of one of us are the problems of all, and nowhere is this more evident than in our rural-urban imbalance.

At one extreme, we have the cities, so congested with people that the cities are, as one mayor put it, "running as fast as we can to stay as close behind as possible" to the problems of serving those people.

At the other extreme, we have rural areas where the economic base is so weak that the people remaining are deprived of services and opportunity and are pushed toward the already impacted cities in search of those services and that opportunity.

There was a time when it made sense—it was necessary—to locate cities near sources of transportation and power, but cities need no longer to be tied to the railroad, waterfall, or seaport.

Permit me to quote from a recent statement by John Gardner, former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and now Chairman of the Urban Coalition.

"Within the past 20 years," he said, "the urge on the part of large numbers of people to pile into the cities has become wholly anachronistic.

"For 10,000 years, people had excellent reason to crowd themselves into the cities. Only there could they find the richness and variety of stimulation that make for creativity. Only there could they find the massed resources and economies of scale that make possible the greatest enterprises.

"Today, thanks to advances in communications, transportation and the arts of organization, we can provide these conditions in any point on the map that strikes our fancy."

Any point on the map. The implications there for the American future are breathtaking. It opens a new frontier, vaster and more complex than the wilderness of 200 years ago—and more challenging: The frontier of balanced growth for quality of life, of the purposeful, proper use of the land and

with it the space of America for the people of America.

We can—and we know it—conquer this new frontier. We can make room for a growing population in this vast continent, room for economic growth, room for ample recreation facilities, for highways, airports, clean cities, fine towns, prosperous farms—all the needs of people.

We can do it if we build on the beginning we have made, if we harness the momentum in the countryside and the growing awareness in the cities within a National framework under a National commitment—a commitment to join together to build Communities of Tomorrow that will offer a choice of where to live in dignity and where to work in dignity to 300 million Americans of the year 2000 and to those who come after them.

And no one will have a more important role on this frontier than the soil conservationist, the man who cared for the land when few others did, who conserved the resource that many others would have squandered.

Your knowledge, your skills, your advice, your personal leadership, will be needed as never before if we are to develop, protect and gear the land and water resources of the United States for balanced growth in terms of all the people.

The weight of your expertise can raise local eyes from the city limits, past the county line and across the state border to the geography of a Nation, and the people of a Nation.

For this, in the end, is where the destinies of the smallest town, the remotest farm, and the biggest city lie—in one Nation, one people.

You will be amply repaid for your part in building the Communities of Tomorrow when future Americans say of you: "They loved the land and the clear running stream. They appreciated the value of the forest and the field. They showed us how to fashion from quantity a quality that kept a growing Nation strong."

WASHINGTON STATE DOCTORS SERVE AS AMA VOLUNTEER PHYSICIANS FOR VIETNAM

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the AMA Volunteer Physicians for Vietnam is one of the most important programs administered by the American Medical Association and financed by the Agency for International Development. This program sends every month 12 to 16 U.S. doctors to Vietnam, where they complete a tour assignment of at least 60 days in provincial hospitals in 22 locations, supplementing drastically inadequate resident medical staffs.

These skilled American physicians, a number of them specialists, take time off from their own practices at home to serve in Vietnam on an unpaid volunteer basis, receiving only a subsistence allowance and travel expenses under the terms of their contracts. They care for the Vietnamese civilian population—war casualties, refugees, and other nonmilitary victims of disease, accident, and illnesses of all kinds.

After their tours are completed, some of these doctors return to Vietnam for a second or a third voluntary assignment. All have served with distinction.

More than 500 doctors from 49 States, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone and seven overseas areas have participated in this program, Mr. Speaker, and I commend all these men for their service to their country. Listing all those who have participated would constitute a

lengthy rollcall, indeed, but I enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of those physicians from the State of Washington who have given so freely of their time and talents to this worthwhile program. They are: Louis E. Braile, Seattle; Jack G. Henneman, Seattle; William N. Pope, Seattle; Herman L. Schiess, Seattle; Richard V. Tinker, Seattle; Edward C. Calta, Renton; Wayne Zimmerman, Tacoma; Robert E. Lane, Tacoma; Anthony R. Galgano, Port Angeles; Harry Frewing, Vancouver; Philip A. Fritel, Vancouver; C. Richard Goodhope, Edmonds; Fred H. Gloeckner, Buckley; Edwin F. Liebold, Forks; Richard B. Link, American Lake; Robert C. Maher, Spokane; Barbara A. Kenyon, Buckley; William A. Johnson, Longview.

FINAL TABULATIONS OF CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, I periodically send to the citizens of my district questionnaires on important issues before the Nation.

Recently I announced the first tabulations of the results of the last such questionnaire for the counties of the Third District of Indiana, including all counties to both the old and the new district.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in the RECORD the final and official tabulations from this survey:

NEW 3D DISTRICT OF INDIANA—FINAL RESULTS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAs' OPINION SURVEY
[3d District totals for Elkhart, Kosciusko, Marshall, and St. Joseph Counties, 13,022 total responses]

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided or no response
Do you favor—			
1. Legislation prohibiting mail-order gun sales and requiring registration of guns?	51.0	36.9	12.1
2. A negotiated settlement of the Vietnam war?	64.9	18.0	17.1
3. Remaining in Vietnam until a complete military victory has been achieved?	25.6	50.5	23.9
4. Lowering the retirement age for social security benefits below 65?	42.3	43.1	14.6
5. Lowering the voting age to 18?	34.8	52.0	13.2
6. Electing the President of the United States by popular vote instead of through the present electoral college system?	79.1	8.4	12.5
7. Legislation to provide jobs in private industry or needed public service for unemployed persons?	43.5	34.9	21.6
8. Limiting the amount an individual farmer or farm corporation can receive in Federal subsidies to \$10,000 a year?	73.7	5.8	20.5
9. Reducing substantially the 27½ percent income tax depletion allowance permitted oil and natural gas producers?	55.8	12.2	32.0

BREAKDOWN BY COUNTY OF OPINION SURVEY FINAL RESULTS

[In percent]

Questions (as numbered above)	Elkhart (3,187 responses)			Kosciusko (1,381 responses)			Marshall (987 responses)			St. Joseph (7,467 responses)		
	Yes	No	Undecided or no response	Yes	No	Undecided or no response	Yes	No	Undecided or no response	Yes	No	Undecided or no response
1. Gun control	49.7	38.0	12.4	44.2	44.6	11.2	45.5	42.2	12.3	53.5	34.3	12.2
2. Vietnam negotiated settlement	64.5	17.8	17.7	59.3	24.5	16.0	62.3	19.4	18.3	66.5	16.7	16.8
3. Vietnam military victory	25.0	50.6	24.4	31.1	46.1	22.8	26.8	49.8	23.4	24.8	51.4	23.7
4. Social security before 65	34.8	49.8	15.4	34.1	53.8	12.1	37.7	51.3	11.1	47.6	37.2	15.2
5. Vote at 18	34.6	52.5	12.9	35.0	52.9	12.1	34.4	54.4	11.3	34.9	51.3	13.9
6. Popular vote for President	77.9	8.9	13.2	81.0	7.8	11.2	80.0	9.0	11.0	79.2	8.1	12.7
7. Providing jobs	42.9	34.5	22.6	39.9	39.7	20.4	40.6	38.5	20.9	44.7	33.8	21.5
8. Farm subsidies	73.7	5.6	20.6	80.0	6.9	13.1	79.6	5.9	14.5	71.7	5.8	22.5
9. Oil depletion	55.8	11.0	33.2	59.7	12.6	27.7	52.1	15.4	32.5	55.6	12.2	32.3

OLD 3d DISTRICT OF INDIANA—FINAL RESULTS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAs' OPINION SURVEY

[Totals for LaPorte, Marshall, St. Joseph, and Starke Counties, 11,638 total responses]

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided or no response
Do you favor—			
1. Legislation prohibiting mail-order gun sales and requiring registration of guns?	52.0	35.3	12.7
2. A negotiated settlement of the Vietnam war?	65.4	17.5	17.1
3. Remaining in Vietnam until a complete military victory has been achieved?	25.4	50.8	23.8
4. Lowering the retirement age for social security benefits below 65?	46.6	39.0	14.4
5. Lowering the voting age to 18?	35.2	51.7	13.1
6. Electing the President of the United States by popular vote instead of through the present electoral college system?	78.9	8.7	12.4
7. Legislation to provide jobs in private industry or needed public service for unemployed persons?	44.1	35.0	20.9
8. Limiting the amount an individual farmer or farm corporation can receive in Federal subsidies to \$10,000 a year?	73.0	6.6	20.4
9. Reducing substantially the 27½ percent income tax depletion allowance permitted oil and natural gas producers?	54.8	13.0	32.2

BREAKDOWN BY COUNTY OF OPINION SURVEY FINAL RESULTS

[In percent]

Questions (as numbered above)	Laporte (2,758 responses)			Marshall (987 responses)			St. Joseph (7,467 responses)			Starke (426 responses)		
	Yes	No	Undecided or no response	Yes	No	Undecided or no response	Yes	No	Undecided or no response	Yes	No	Undecided or no response
1. Gun control	54.9	33.8	11.2	45.5	42.2	12.3	53.5	34.3	12.2	41.7	44.8	13.5
2. Vietnam negotiated settlement	64.1	18.7	17.3	62.3	19.4	18.3	66.5	16.7	16.8	62.1	19.0	19.0
3. Vietnam military victory	25.7	50.0	24.3	26.8	49.8	23.4	24.8	51.4	23.7	28.8	48.3	22.9
4. Social security before 65	46.1	40.2	13.6	37.7	51.3	11.1	47.6	37.2	15.2	53.1	34.3	12.7
5. Vote at 18	36.2	51.8	11.9	34.4	54.4	11.3	34.9	51.3	13.9	37.3	51.6	11.1
6. Popular vote for President	77.6	9.7	12.7	80.0	9.0	11.0	79.2	8.1	12.7	79.6	10.8	9.7
7. Providing jobs	43.3	37.2	19.4	40.6	38.5	20.9	44.7	33.8	21.5	45.3	35.4	19.3
8. Farm subsidies	73.7	6.4	19.9	79.6	5.9	14.5	71.7	5.8	22.5	75.6	10.1	14.3
9. Oil depletion	54.4	14.1	31.6	52.1	15.4	32.5	55.6	12.2	32.3	51.4	16.0	32.6

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN V. TUNNEY ON THE CONGRESSIONAL INTERN PROGRAM

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, the youth of today are seeking action, participation and involvement in the problems which are presently confronting our society. More than any other time in our history our young people are attempting en masse to cure the terrible social ills which infect our social fiber and plague our moral consciences. However, few avenues, if any, are presently available through which our young people can participate in a constructive manner; few avenues are open to the youth of today through which they can make meaningful contributions to the improvements of our Nation and its Federal government.

For many years, I have felt that one of the best ways a young man or woman could constructively contribute to the growth and betterment of the Federal Government is through the congressional summer intern program. From its inception, the summer intern program has attempted to bring to Washington for the summer months some of the most talented and able-minded college students. Students from a variety of cities and campuses have flocked to Washington to learn about and participate in the workings of the Federal Government. For those fortunate few who have availed themselves of this great opportunity, the learning and experience they have acquired in the operations of the government have been extremely worthwhile.

In my own congressional office, for example, I have personally witnessed the

great benefits of the summer intern program. For the last few summers, I have brought to Washington a number of talented students from California who have wanted to contribute and learn about the Federal Government. My experience with them has been mutually rewarding and sincerely gratifying. I sincerely feel that the few short months which these students worked in my office will be returned to the Federal Government in the years to come in the way of better understanding and knowledgeable leadership.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to help prepare for the leadership of tomorrow by investing in congressional programs of today. I can think of no finer program which teaches our talented young people more about the Federal Government than the congressional intern program. We should make it as easy as possible for interested young men and women to come to Washington for a firsthand experience of the Nation's Capitol in action. A first step in this direction would be for the Congress to reinstate the funding for next summer's intern program. The fiscal responsibility for funding interns should not be the burden of individual Congressmen, but should be assumed by the U.S. Congress. Such action would indicate to our young people that the Federal Government sincerely cares and wants them in Washington.

Furthermore, I feel this action would serve as a lasting tribute to my friend, the late Senator from New York, Robert F. Kennedy, who dedicated most of his life to the ideals and aspirations of our Nation's youth. Mr. Kennedy had this to say about the youth of today and their role vis-a-vis the Federal Government:

We may find some of their ideas impractical, some of their views overdrawn. Still, there is no question of their energy, of their ability, above all of their honest commitment to a better and more decent world for

all of us. It is for us now to make the effort, to take their causes as our causes, and to enlist them in our own, to lend to their vision and daring the insight and wisdom of our experience.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time to give serious consideration to Senator Kennedy's words and commence to do everything we can to enlist young people into our Government. They need our experience and we their youth, vigor, and vision. We can sustain with them a mutually beneficial contract which will attempt to bridge the generation gap and provide for responsible and insightful leadership of tomorrow. I implore the Congress to act. Let us provide for those talented young men and women who want to sincerely learn and contribute to the workings of the Federal Government. Let us reinstate the funds for the summer intern program so that we may seriously act to alleviate the prophetic lament of Tennyson:

Ah, what shall I be at fifty,
Should nature keep me alive,
If I find the world so bitter
When I am but twenty-five?

PILLOW, PA., CELEBRATES ITS 150TH BIRTHDAY

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, during our August recess, the town of Pillow, Dauphin County, Pa., celebrated its 150th birthday. This week-long observance by this Pennsylvania Dutch village of 1,965 people was climaxed with a huge town meeting on Sunday, August 18, in a small tree-bowered grove set amidst

two of the town's five churches. Among the features of this meeting was a recital of the town's historic background.

The community was originally settled by the Schneiders and was understandably called Schneidershtettle. Later the name was changed to Uniontown, was incorporated in 1864, and within the past several years the name was changed finally to Pillow, to agree with the U.S. Post Office name, and in honor of Admiral Pillow, after whom it was presumably named.

The town's history was read in a most interesting fashion by one of its honored natives, Mrs. Anna Bohner. The historic document was the product of the pen of Mr. Raymond Wiest, a longtime resident and high school principal. Mr. Wiest told me in later conversation that in the 39 years of teaching in the Pennsylvania school system, he never had a single day's absence from his teaching duties, for any reason whatsoever—a fine example of Pennsylvania Dutch dedication and devotion to his chosen profession.

My day spent in Pillow with the present and returning residents of this village was most enjoyable and rewarding. The observance of its history was a vivid reminder of the rich heritage we as Americans have acquired as the result of the undying spirit and determination of our pioneer forefathers. Such inspiring motivation is today the hallmark of small town America, and it was a privilege for me to have had the opportunity to meet and talk with the residents of this community on such an important occasion.

BE A BOY SCOUT

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, "Scouting rounds a guy out" is certainly an appropriate theme for the Boy Scouts of America.

One of the greatest experiences in a boy's lifetime can be fulfilled by his joining a Scout unit. Where else can a young man meet with boys his own age and share ideas and beliefs, thus becoming involved in what we are placed on this earth for: companionship and service to our fellow man. And, of course, the benefit that is derived from outdoor activities and other organized events is unparalleled.

An editorial appeared in the Johnson City Press-Chronicle on Wednesday, September 11, 1968, which I would like to share with the readers of the RECORD, as follows:

BE A BOY SCOUT

Your boy going to be a Scout when he is old enough?

Why, of course.

Nearly all parents want their boys to be Scouts, and nearly all boys want to be Scouts.

But sometimes, for one reason or another, the boy and the Scout unit don't get together. And lots of fellows miss out on a great experience.

With this in mind, leaders of the Sequoyah Council of the Boy Scouts of America are making their fall membership drive—the 1968 roundup—a concerted effort to recruit boys into 50 Scout units of Daniel Boone District.

For the last couple of years, Boy Scouts of America has featured the theme "Scouting rounds a guy out." Certainly, the experience and the excitement of outdoor activities help build boys into men who are physically, mentally, and morally fit.

Scouting is a partner with 15 religious and community organizations in this area which actually "own" the Cub packs, Scout troops, and Explorer posts, and Scouting is recognized universally as a vital educational force in the lives of thousands of boys.

Special emphasis currently is being placed on Scouting in congested urban areas, sparsely populated rural areas, and fast-expanding residential areas—wherever boys live—and our nation stands to benefit as more and more boys are enlisted.

Now is a good time for boys, 8 through 17, who are not Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, or Explorers to get in on this active, virile, he-man program.

STATEMENTS ON TROOP REDUCTIONS IN VIETNAM

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, during the 1964 election, the then Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara issued politically attractive public statements regarding possible troop reductions in Vietnam. These statements, which raised hopes that American troops would be brought home from Vietnam within a short time, proved groundless.

It is regrettable that now 4 years later, Vice President HUMPHREY has again raised what proved to be false election-year hopes regarding plans to bring American troops home from Vietnam.

Yesterday the Vice President in New Orleans called for a moratorium on what he called political doubletalk. However, according to no less authorities than President Johnson and Secretary of Defense Clifford, Mr. HUMPHREY himself engaged in somewhat irresponsible doubletalk concerning the transfer of the 27th Marine Regiment from Vietnam.

First the Vice President claimed that the administration planned to bring a Marine division home as part of a general Vietnam troop reduction. Then Mr. HUMPHREY amended his statement to claim that only a regiment was to be withdrawn. The Secretary of Defense himself straightened the record by declaring that the removal of the 27th Regiment was only a rotation of units and not a troop reduction.

The feelings of thousands of families with sons and relatives in Vietnam require that Vice President HUMPHREY should in the future resist the temptations of a political year by checking out his facts before making loose and unreliable claims regarding bringing our American fighting men back home.

OBSCENITY ISSUE AND FORTAS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, among the many unfair and intemperate attacks that have been made on Mr. Justice Fortas in recent weeks, none is more inexcusable than the effort to portray him as "soft" on obscenity.

As was pointed out yesterday by Joseph O'Meara, dean emeritus, Notre Dame Law School, in an excellent letter to the Washington Post, if Justice Fortas is guilty of the charge, then so is every other member of the Supreme Court.

I hope that Dean O'Meara's letter will be carefully studied by all who are concerned with the immediate issue of Justice Fortas' confirmation and with the broader question of whether this country will continue to have an independent judiciary. The letter follows:

OBSCENITY ISSUE AND FORTAS

A few United States Senators seem determined to block the confirmation of Mr. Justice Fortas's nomination as Chief Justice of the United States because of his votes in two recent obscenity cases. To attack Mr. Justice Fortas because of those votes is unfair, misleading and dangerous.

First, it is unfair because it attempts to measure a sitting Justice's judicial fitness on the basis of the scanty evidence of his recorded vote in cases decided without written opinion, two cases only.

I take it to be a general rule that no active Justice should be called to account in the Senate for his votes in particular cases. But, passing that, it seems to me clearly wrong to impugn Mr. Justice Fortas for his votes in the two cases in question. The Senatorial opposition has focused on the Court's reversals of convictions in *Schackman v. California*, decided *per curiam* on June 12, 1967, and in *Jacobs v. New York*, which was dismissed as moot on the same day. In neither of these cases did the Court issue a written opinion explaining its reasoning, and in neither of the cases did Mr. Justice Fortas issue a separate statement of his own views. I am quite unable, therefore, to see how one can single out Mr. Justice Fortas's actions in these cases from those of his colleagues, or extract from his votes very much about his position on the complex obscenity issue.

This conclusion is reinforced by an examination of the issues presented to the Court in those two cases. Each was unique. The briefs to the Court state that *Schackman* involved a "peep-show" of a filmed burlesque performance not unlike those presented fairly widely in burlesque houses throughout the country. *Jacobs*, on the other hand, involved a nearly private screening of what we are told was a seriously intended, if unconventional, underground art film, and the showing was not advertised in any way to the public at large. In addition, in *Schackman*, there was presented the question of unlawful police seizure of the film prior to any lawful determination that it was in fact obscene under the local statute. For my part, I am unable to see that these cases tell us much about Mr. Justice Fortas's particular views.

Secondly, the attack on Mr. Justice Fortas's votes in these two cases is misleading because it overlooks his total record in the

field. From the time of the landmark *Roth* decision in 1957 until Mr. Justice Fortas was appointed to the Court in 1965, the Court had never squarely sustained a finding of obscenity. However, in the October 1965 Term, Mr. Justice Fortas voted with the majority to sustain the obscenity convictions of Ralph Ginzburg and Edward Mishkin. He did not issue an opinion in either case. The Court's opinions, however, spell out a new theory and they broke the impasse which had developed over the obscenity issue in the years before his appointment. The Court held that the manner in which a defendant merchandised allegedly obscene material could be taken into account in determining whether those materials were "obscene."

More recently, and again with the support of Mr. Justice Fortas, the Court dealt with "variable concepts of obscenity," holding that the First Amendment does not preclude legislation to protect children from materials which might not be "obscene" if purveyed to adults. In his separate opinion in that case, *Ginzberg v. New York*, decided April 22, 1968, Mr. Justice Fortas stated:

"The State's police power may, within very broad limits, protect the parents and their children from public aggression of panders and pushers. This is defensible on the theory that they cannot protect themselves from such assaults."

To attack Mr. Justice Fortas on the basis of his votes in two *per curiam* decisions (*Schackman* and *Jacobs*) therefore, is to distort the record. His vote in the first *Ginzburg* case, and his opinion in the more recent *Ginzberg* case, to the extent that one can isolate his views from those of the other Justices, reflect a developing sensitivity to the complexities of the problem, a realistic appreciation of the significance of the way challenged films and books are marketed, and a concern with the peddling of obscenity to the young. One need not agree or disagree with the Court or with Mr. Justice Fortas. I for one do not agree. I have argued that the burden of deciding obscenity cases should be shifted to local juries and away from appellate courts. But surely one can see, from Mr. Justice Fortas' record since his appointment, a commendable, judicious temperament wholly undeserving of the kind of attack which has been launched against him in the Senate.

Finally, to attack Mr. Justice Fortas on the basis of two *per curiam* decisions is dangerous, because it threatens not only this specific judicial appointment, but involves fundamental constitutional considerations as well. At stake in these cases is the sensitive balance to be struck between a society's interest in protecting itself from smut, and its deep need to preserve and enhance freedom of artistic and literary expression. The Constitution places the responsibility for determining where that thin line is to be drawn on the nine Justices of the Supreme Court. It should remain there.

Moreover, if Mr. Justice Fortas is to be punished for his votes in the two obscenity cases above mentioned, consistency would require that a majority of the Court be impeached.

The time is long past when the Senate should be allowed to express its judgment whether, on the basis of Mr. Justice Fortas's entire career, it consents to his appointment as a fit Chief Justice of the United States. That judgment ought not to be frustrated or obscured by a fixation on votes in two recent obscenity cases, both decided without opinion.

I am authorized to state that the following Deans, namely, Reverend Robert F. Drinan, S.J., Boston College Law School; Charles E. Ares, University of Arizona College of Law; Louis H. Pollak, Yale Law School; John W. Wade, Vanderbilt University School of Law, join in the views expressed in this let-

ter, with the single exception of my personal opinion that obscenity, like negligence, is a jury question.

JOSEPH O'MEARA,
Dean Emeritus, Notre Dame Law School.
NOTRE DAME, IND.

GROWING IMPORTS MENACE U.S. GLOBAL TRADE STANCE

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, in the weeks preceding the recent congressional recess, the House Ways and Means Committee conducted hearings on legislative proposals designed to protect various American industries from destruction by excessive imports of products from low-cost labor countries.

When I addressed that committee on June 26 concerning the alarming increase in shoe and leather imports, I pointed out that footwear imports represented only 1.2 percent as a percentage of U.S. production in 1955; but if the present trend of shoe imports continues, that percentage of U.S. production could equal 35 percent in 1968, and possibly 50 percent in 1969. This, I said, would almost certainly wreck the U.S. shoe manufacturing industry within the next few years.

The rising footwear import trend is continuing, as Lloyd M. ("Mike") Hampton, Washington editor of *Leather and Shoes* magazine, stresses in his editorial of August 31, 1968. Noting that Congress would be returning from its recess this month, Mr. Hampton concluded his commentary:

"It is broadly hoped in both private and legislative quarters that the House Ways and Means Committee will be able to consider before the year's end the international orderly marketing and fair trade measures presently on its desk. Passage of such legislation is badly needed if something is to be done in time to save a number of U.S. industries from the permanent crippling effects of cheap labor-produced foreign imports.

I sincerely hope that the Ways and Means Committee and the Congress will heed this and other urgent appeals for relief for our beleaguered American industries before it is too late. Among the bills before the committee, Mr. Speaker, are some which my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, Representative JAMES A. BURKE, and I have introduced. Of special concern to the shoe and leather industries, I wish to point out, are H.R. 13616, to provide for orderly trade in leather footwear and which was recently strongly endorsed by the Massachusetts Governor's Advisory Committee for the Shoe and Leather and Allied Industries, and H.R. 87 and 88, the Orderly Marketing Act proposals. It is our hope that the objectives of those measures will be incorporated in such legislation as may be recommended by the Ways and Means Committee and enacted by the Congress.

The inspiration for "Mike" Hampton's editorial, to which I have referred, was a

statement by Secretary of Commerce C. R. Smith on August 20. Because I believe his observations are of interest to all who are concerned about the rising import problem, I shall quote Mr. Hampton's editorial in its entirety, as follows:

[From *Leather and Shoes*, Aug. 31, 1968]

A FACING UP? GROWING IMPORTS MENACE U.S.
GLOBAL TRADE STANCE
(By Lloyd M. Hampton)

During a recent out-of-town speech, Secretary of Commerce C. R. Smith made a number of remarks which would appear to lend a degree of support to what many import-inundated U.S. industries have been voicing for some time. Unrestricted imports, such beleaguered industries complain, constitute not only a grave threat to basic domestic manufacturing sectors as footwear, leather goods, steel, and textile, but hit dangerously at our over-all world trade posture, as well.

To say, as Smith did last week (August 20) in Los Angeles before the Western Electronic Show and Convention, that "The U.S. world trade position needs improving," was to somewhat underestimate the matter. "Recent figures," to quote the Secretary, "have been dreary, and there are no really clear signs that we have turned the corner, that we can soon expect a return to a favorable trade balance of the dimension we once assumed would long be the rule."

This obviously pessimistic forecast by Smith caught some by surprise, coming as it did from a usually optimistic Administration which is patently dedicated to a brand of free trade seen by many inside and out of Government as bordering on the "extreme." But the statement didn't end there. It grew more noteworthy. The Secretary went on to allow that we have two problems, both related: first, "exports have been rising at a very nominal rate"; second, "imports also have been rising at a very phenomenal rate."

For instance, statistics for the first 6 months of this year shows an increase in exports of 5.3 percent over the same period in 1967, to an annual rate of slightly under \$33 billion. But imports climbed 20.9 percent over the same period, to an annual rate just over \$32 billion. In other words, our trade balance for the period was, as a result, "barely positive" at a rate of \$600 million in the 1968 Jan.-June period. In the same 6 months last year our trade surplus contributed to our over-all balance of payments at a rate exceeding \$4 billion!

According to the Commerce chief, there are some who predict that the trends will be brighter in the last half of 1968, "but," he hastened to advise his West Coast audience that "there are no figures on trends now available which can give us assurance."

Nonagricultural products, which includes shoes, are seen by Government sources as the driving force behind the import expansion. On a seasonally adjusted basis, these imports outdistanced the Jan.-June 1967 value by 23 percent and accounted for most of the upward spiral in total U.S. imports.

Imports of footwear soared by almost 50 percent in the first 6 months of this year . . . from \$126 million in value in Jan.-June 1967 to \$187 million in 1968. Half of this gain is said by Commerce to reflect greater deliveries of Italian shoes which are popular in the U.S. "because of their distinctive styling and attractive prices." Spanish footwear imports were also up sharply this year.

If the Administration's over-liberal world traders seem at last to concede—however small—that there does in reality exist a serious imports threat to a broad range of this Nation's industries, it took a Congressman to spell it out in more direct terms.

In a statement to the Democratic Platform Committee, Rep. John S. Monagan, D-Conn., and a free trade advocate himself, called for among other things an "intelligent" trade-tariff policy.

Monagan urged his party's platform writers to initiate a close review of international trade and tariff policy. While affirming his own support of the principles of free trade, he unhesitatingly underlined that "when that trade mounts to the point where it reaches 30 or 40 or 50 percent of the domestic market, it poses a dangerous challenge to the existence of jobs and the maintenance of the economic activity of our Nation."

Interestingly enough and coexistent with Monagan's statement, latest figures show that leather and vinyl footwear imports during the first 6 months of this year equaled 29.3 percent of U.S. production while canvas and rubber-soled footwear imports amounted to 29.8 percent of our output.

Simply put, this Nation has a giant-size trade problem on its hands. The Administration knows there's no running away from it. Centering around the flood of imports allowed to come ashore here, what is now regarded as a problem is seen as rapidly escalating into a general U.S. trade crisis unless effective, remedial, legislative steps are quickly forthcoming.

As a means to balance our over-all trade picture, the Government is pushing a long-term export expansion program. This is a fine thing. But of what merit is such a plan to those particular domestic industries already import-damaged, and, who quite realistically see very little if indeed any possibility for export growth, shoes and leather products included? For these two industries and their workers along with a growing list of others, something more helpful must be offered other than the myth of overseas markets which abound in both seen and hidden roadblocks to our exports.

The Congress will return from recess in early September. It is broadly hoped in both private and legislative quarters that the House Ways and Means Committee will be able to consider before the year's end the international orderly marketing and other fair trade measures presently on its desk. Passage of such legislation is badly needed if something is to be done in time to save a number of U.S. industries from the permanent crippling effects to cheap labor-produced foreign imports.

GUN CONTROL

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have received a telegram from Mr. Walter T. Shannon, president, International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissions, objecting to the Attorney General's proposal to register all firearms and license all firearm owners. So that my colleagues may be aware of the association's position, I insert the text of the telegram at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TUCSON, ARIZ.,
September 12, 1968.

HON. JOHN DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners representing 50 State wildlife conservation agencies is

deeply disturbed about Attorney General Ramsey Clark's statement yesterday to U.S. Senate re firearms legislation proposal to register all firearms and license all gun owners. We strongly believe that such legislation would not accomplish the objective and, furthermore, would cost the taxpayers millions of dollars. We respectfully request that you help defeat such legislation.

WALTER T. SHANNON,
President, International Association of
Game, Fish and Conservation Com-
mission.

HOW TO PREVENT RIOTS?

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, seasoned newspapermen throughout the Nation have had the opportunity to assess the journalistic ability and impartiality of the electronic newscasters as never before. The telecasts of the National Democratic Convention in Chicago—and the adjacent mob-incited police actions—have come under the critical comment of many of these newsmen.

One such is editor Marvin Caldwell of the Marianna, Ark., Courier Index. In an editorial carried in the September 5 issue of the Courier Index, Mr. Caldwell comments on the telecasts and on the plea of one such electronic commentator for a "better way to handle demonstrators."

The editorial follows:

HOW TO PREVENT RIOTS?

The ABC news commentator was appalled by the violence. Never, in all his days as a reporter, had he seen anything to match the brutality displayed by the Chicago Police Department. "This nation has got to find a better way to handle demonstrators if it is to survive," he piously declared.

We are inclined to agree with William Buckley, Jr., who followed a few minutes later. He asked the commentator to kindly suggest a better way so that both parties could put it into their platform. The rest of the country is waiting too. Commentators (and editorial writers) quite frequently, are willing to criticize, condemn and complain, but are often hesitant to make any concrete suggestions for a change.

There can be little doubt that the Chicago police were over-enthusiastic in their control of this so-called demonstration but then, they had some good reasons to swing a big stick. They have been (maligned) by the press, insulted by hoodlums and handcuffed by the federal courts. There is little wonder that they took a little of it out on these so-called "peaceful demonstrators" who, according to the TV commentators are somehow above the law.

The commentators kept talking about "freedom to assemble" and they were right—but only half right. Certainly, this is a privilege of Americans. But they failed to remember the old axiom that "your freedom ends where my nose begins." These people were plainly breaking the law and infringing on the rights of others. They were blocking major streets in Chicago and creating a major disturbance that threatened the rights and property of countless thousands more than their own pitiful number.

Still, the bleeding hearts cry "police brutality" and cry for some other solution to the problem. Alright; what is the answer? Mob rule? Anarchy? Dictatorship?

Unfortunately (or perhaps fortunately) we don't have any answer except that law and order must prevail if our democratic society is to endure. The Chicago police may have overstepped the bounds of good judgment but the basic precept of their action is still sound and until some of the liberals come up with a better idea, it is still the only way to preserve freedom for all.

AMERICAN SEA POWER: WHERE ARE WE GOING?

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, more than 2 years ago, I spoke on the subject "American Sea Power: Where Are We Going?" In that address, I pointed to the probable grave implications of the shocking deemphasis in our national maritime efforts, particularly in view of the rapid growth in sea power by our principal cold war competitor, Soviet Russia.

This year, at its 66th annual convention held in Honolulu, Hawaii, the distinguished Navy League of the United States issued a similar warning in its Declaration of Objectives and Resolutions, in the words of Mr. Charles F. Duchain, national president of the Navy League, where were set forth in the foreword to this statement of policy:

Relating, as they do, directly to the National needs for a quantum increase in maritime strength and posture, these resolutions warrant careful consideration by the general public and policy makers within the government.

I, therefore, invite the attention of all my colleagues in the House to the following editorial, which appeared in the San Francisco Examiner of July 12, 1968, concerning the authoritative warnings of the Navy League of the United States with respect to the ever-deepening crisis in American sea power:

SEA WEAKNESS

Important recognition of the deplorable state of the American merchant marine has come from the influential Navy League.

At its recent convention in Honolulu the league declared, "A progressive and competitive posture for a modern U.S. merchant marine is necessary to the total sea power requirements of the United States."

That is an accurate statement. It sets up a realistic goal that unfortunately we are nowhere near attaining. The United States has fewer privately-owned merchant ships today than it did in 1936.

The league went on "Kremlin policy makers have turned to the sea and in so doing have adopted a fundamental maritime policy to challenge American oceanic preeminence."

True enough. Soviet warships are bow to bow with our Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean and growing numbers of Soviet merchantmen drop anchor in world-wide ports.

"Lack of a long range adequate ship building program has resulted in block obsolescence of the U.S. fleet and left the merchant marine in a deplorable condition," said the league.

These are authoritative warnings based on nomenclature fact. They should be heeded.

THE CONTINUING DIALOG ON THE DRAFT

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, although it is unrealistic to expect any further consideration on the needs to update our present system of military manpower procurement in this session of the Congress, it is my hope that a new Congress can begin immediately in January at a time when they will not be under the gun to meet a deadline prescribed by the imminent expiration of the old law. This will allow the orderly and thoughtful study that is necessary to bring about the needed revisions in our draft laws, and will avoid the unnecessary last minute rush which characterized the proceedings of this 90th Congress and resulted in the poorly studied extension of the Selective Service Act which was passed.

It is encouraging to note that the young people of this country will not let this issue drop. They are concerned with the underlying merits, and are not satisfied with perfunctory extensions of the old law. The Forensic Quarterly, volume 42, May 1968, is devoted to the subject of compulsory service systems for the purpose of promoting student debates. It was my privilege to prepare for their use an article on the potential of an all volunteer military, which I am inserting at this point in the RECORD:

THE DRAFT: UNJUST AND UNNECESSARY¹(By Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS²)

THE SPECTRUM OF VALUES TO BE CONSIDERED

The defense of a nation's values by military force presents difficult choices for any society. For the American people, born under the aegis of individual liberty and maximum freedom from arbitrary governmental interference in the lives of independent men, such choices are especially hazardous. For an inappropriate system of national defense may threaten those very ideals our society exists to preserve. Thus, a discussion of manpower procurement policies for the military carries us into a consideration of the very basic values which our form of government was established to protect. It is important that this be foremost in the minds of those who discuss the question of the draft and its alternatives.

In addition to the question of justice and individual freedom, military manpower procurement policy raises questions of economics and strategic preparedness. Our modern technological society has produced a new concept of warfare for which old ideas of manpower procurement, and former views of the skills necessary for military preparedness and civilian economic strength, are no longer adequate. No longer do the principles of mass warfare conducted by massive armies across wide expanses of ground with primitive weapons hold true. The modern soldier

is a specialist, a technician of war a "knight on horse-back" who rides to battle in tanks, helicopters, and armored personnel carriers, and is equipped with a bewildering array of sophisticated weapons and implements of war. War which was once the sport of royalty, is now a conflict between civilizations, and the entire economy and productive capacity of nations are part of the field of conflict.

Therefore, this discussion of a voluntary system of military manpower procurement is intended to be in the context of these basic ethical, economic, and strategic considerations.

THE ETHICS OF A VOLUNTEER ARMY

The arithmetic of ethics. There are approximately two million men now reaching draft age each year. At present our armed forces require the services of slightly more than one-third of them. This percentage is most likely to decrease as the population reaching draft age each year increases, and with the hoped-for cessation of military hostilities in Asia. With these basic figures the ethical question is immediately thrown into relief. The military does not need approximately two-thirds of draft age men. What is the fairest way of selecting that minority it does need?

The present system, based as it is upon compulsion, is inherently inequitable and inconsistent with the ideals of a free society. The method currently employed under the selective service law of cutting out the unneeded two-thirds is through a leaky system of deferments and exemptions which generally favors the physically limited, fathers, farmers, clergymen, reservists, and scholars—provided their subject of study is continually within a shifting area of priorities dictated by the government. Those young men who do not fit into one of these and a few other categories make up that directly-compelled one-third. It is also fair to say that many of the remaining two-thirds feel the indirect compulsion of government when they choose their future careers and activities with a wary eye on selective service draft deferment categories.

Today's obstacles to choice. To compound the inequity very little effort is made by the Selective Service System to afford the would-be draftee an "eyes-open" choice. Bruce Chapman, in his recent book *Wrong Man in Uniform*, describes the draft registrant's selection opportunities in the following terms:

"Young men born since World War II . . . meet the draft in a Kafka-esque experience of bewilderment and frustration that most older adults do not understand. There are nowadays some sixty optional programs through which one can fulfill his military obligation, with a strange maze of attendant procedures and processes; and there are countless ways of not serving at all. Despite such complexities, no counseling is made available to young men as a matter of course and even if one seeks out his draft board, the information supplied by the busy and businesslike clerk is likely to be skeletal. It is surprising that nearly all young men even know that they must go to their draft board to register at age 18, yet the law deals firmly indeed with him who does not. "Those registrants whose infractions of the law are not deliberate," reads a report by the Director of Selective Service, "usually are not brought to trial, but they are subject to accelerated induction into the Armed Forces and they occupy the highest position in the sequence of selection for induction."

"When a man does register he is given a tiny flyer whose chief function is to list the eighteen different categories of Selective Service classification—without explaining what they are and how one gets assigned to them. One is told that any appeal of classification must be entered to the local board in writing no more than ten days after notification, but one is not told under what cir-

cumstances an appeal should be made or what to put in the appeal. The terse flyer's parting shot is the hardly reassuring advice that "Classifications are subject to change by the local board at any time," and that "Failure to comply with an order from your local board may make you subject to fine or imprisonment."

"Even a bright and determined young man—usually the one with bright and determined parents—might have a hard time compiling all the information relevant to his rights, obligations and choices. Yet at no single time does the Government or the educational system automatically provide the full facts of the draft and military service to youngsters who face it."

Contrast this briefly with what would be the required procurement procedure for a voluntary career army. The basic premise upon which procurement rests is that a modern technological army is seeking skills and not bodies. Therefore manpower procurement procedure need not be essentially different from civilian jobs offered by the government or the private sector. Skills in demand must be paid the going rate, and additional benefits such as greatly improved living conditions, better schools for servicemen's families, and an upgrading of the concept of military service in the eyes of the community, would be part of the inducement package. There must be a multitude of reforms in military life.

Professionals or mercenaries? Increase in pay, even along with other necessary reforms, to induce voluntarily the necessary number of enlistments has brought about the charge that a volunteer career army would be an army of "mercenaries" and this is philosophically or morally undesirable to many Americans. Although I feel that the charge of "mercenaries" is a distortion of both the term mercenary and the concept of a volunteer army, it is important to discuss the various ethical questions at the base of this objection.

To students familiar with American history, the term "mercenary" brings to mind the German Hessians hired by the British to fight the rebellious American colonists. After all, the Americans won the Revolutionary War, and could it be that part of this may be due to the underlying unreliability of the mercenary Hessians, who had no interest in the cause for which they were fighting? Certainly, and this concept of the word mercenary accurately carries with it a justified fear of unreliability in battle.

However, there are two different concepts contained in the word "mercenary." The first is that of a soldier hiring for service in an army not of his own country, like the Hessians in the American revolution. The second is acting merely for pay or monetary reward. The first definition is used to denigrate the value of a volunteer army by its opponents, although only the second definition even comes close to describing accurately the concept, and this isn't very close. A voluntary career army is one in which citizens of the same country are hired into that country's armed services. The derogatory import of the term mercenary is then manifestly unfair.

Any change of unreliability of one who serves in his own country's army for a salary commensurate to what he could be earning in a civilian occupation is difficult to sustain. Indeed, some of those who have yelled the loudest that "they would not want to be defended by an army of mercenaries" are themselves mercenaries in the sense that they serve for pay or make their living at their work. The career director of the Selective Service System, General Lewis B. Hershey, is then a mercenary even though he winces at the thought of being defended by them. It is also true in this sense that he and all of us receive medical treatment, legal advice, and accept political regulation from "mercenaries."

¹ Prepared for *Compulsory Service Systems: The Forensic Quarterly*, Vol. 42 (May 1968). Copyright 1968. All rights reserved.

² Congressman Curtis, a Republican from Missouri's 2d District, has served in the House of Representatives since 1951. He has been long-time critic of the Selective Service System and a Congressional proponent of an all-volunteer service. In 1967, he wrote the Introduction to Bruce K. Chapman's *The Wrong Man in Uniform: Our Unfair and Obsolete Draft—and How We Can Replace It*.

To the extent then that there is any danger of unreliability from a professional army we already face it. Most every officer above the rank of major is properly considered a professional career man. It is only the lowly enlistee and the draftee who would be replaced if a voluntary career system of manpower procurement were instituted. It can hardly be said that draftees infuse the system with a healthy civilian influence which counterbalances judgments made by their career officers. Anyone who thinks so has not had first-hand observation of the system in operation and a draftee's influence on military policy.

The notion of paying a soldier what he might be worth in his civilian occupation, far from being ignoble, is eminently just and our failure to do so is a national shame. The beginning pay of an enlisted man in the United States Army, whether he has volunteered or is a draftee, is \$90.60 per month. To this base rate must be added the approximate value of housing and food he receives, and the Department of Defense has estimated that this is \$73.31 per month for a newly enlisted man. Both these figures rise slightly during his early promotions in grade. Thus the newly enlisted soldier receives in his first year of service approximately \$2122.47 in pay and benefits. This figure must be adjusted slightly because of the 5.6 per cent basic pay increase across the board for all services enacted in 1967. Even with this the yearly benefits are approximately \$2191.77 in the first year of service.

This figure is scandalously low—below the statutory minimum wage, below the proclaimed minimum "poverty level," and according to *The New York Times*, only slightly more than the pay of a peasant on a collective farm in Rumania. Small wonder enlistments do not meet requirements! But within these figures there is an additional moral question which must be faced by our society. The difference between the \$2191.77 which the soldier makes in the service and the amount he could have made in his civilian occupation is an additional cost to him. It should be legitimately considered part of the cost of our national defense. However, note who must bear this cost. Not the well-to-do American taxpayer who is receiving all the benefits of the defense, but the draftee who, in addition to having to bear this extra economic loss, is possibly risking life and limb as well.

Professor Milton Friedman, of the University of Chicago, accurately characterizes this discrepancy as an additional tax which must be borne by the service man, and adds that "adequate pay alone may not attract, but inadequate pay can certainly deter" the young man in choosing the military as a career. We are being a bit nonsensical and unreasonable if we expect this difference to be made up by patriotism as some do. As Bruce Chapman points out "men should not be paid for their patriotism, but neither should they be punished for it."

The composition of a volunteer army. A further ethical or philosophical consideration which has been raised with regard to a volunteer army is the representativeness of its members. It is particularly feared by some, including Senator Edward Kennedy, that an all volunteer army would contain a disproportionate number of Negroes and other minority and lower income groups. The statistics in fact bear this out. The Department of Defense has reported that in the first eleven months of fiscal year 1966, 12.9 per cent of the draftees were non-white, compared to 11.1 per cent of the entire United States population which is non-white. Additionally, the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service found that while Negro soldiers comprised only 11 percent of United States personnel in Viet Nam, they accounted for 14.5 percent of all army combat units, and that they represented 22.4 percent of all army troops killed in action.

More significant in consideration of the composition of an all volunteer army is the

fact that Negro re-enlistment rates were double those of white troops as reported by the National Advisory Commission. These figures indicate that it can reasonably be expected that greater proportion of Negroes and other lower income groups would make up our armed services if procurement were solely by voluntary enlistment. However, I feel that those who condemn the concept of an all volunteer army on moral grounds because of this must answer two additional ethical questions. First, isn't the fact that more Negroes re-enlist a condemnation of the civilian conditions from which many of them come, and should we then object to a military procurement system because it affords them greater opportunities than our civilian society? And, second, since a greater percentage of Negroes under the present system are drafted anyway from their total population than are whites, is it better to see these Negroes drafted against their will, or volunteer because they want to?

The ethics of the alternatives. Although the preferable moral and ethical values of the voluntary procurement system can be best seen by affirmatively setting forth the case for that system, some brief mention of the philosophical detractions of the competing systems may be in order.

There are those who feel that some form of a lottery system would be the best method of military manpower procurement. I have said that I would prefer a lottery to the present draft system with all its inequities and deferments, but I think we can do much better than either. Those who turn to a lottery to obtain military manpower are figuratively throwing up their hands in the face of complexity. A rational system of military manpower procurement—a voluntary system—can be achieved through study of the various skills needed by the military which have counterparts in the civilian society, development of the necessary variety of rewards to induce the proper enlistments, and raising the role of military service in the eyes of the nation.

Furthermore, any lottery must itself inevitably have some exemptions and deferments. The physically handicapped for example cannot serve in combat positions, and there may be others who are selected by the lottery whom we may not want to have serve, such as our nuclear physicists. Certain exemptions must then be made, and once this process is begun it may be difficult to find a rational place to stop. The result would probably be a completely new set of inequitable exemptions, and should this be the case any young man selected will hardly feel better because he was singled out through mechanical irrationality rather than human irrationality.

Another commonly discussed alternative to the draft is a system of national service. The philosopher William James once discussed this as the "moral equivalent of war" and in so doing captured the imaginations of social planners and governmental activists ever since. Basically the idea of national service would require all young people to give a few years in service to their country, and, in lieu of the military, this service could consist of social work for society's improvement. Those activities commonly considered as acceptable alternatives today are the Peace Corps, VISTA, poverty work, and the like.

Philosophical and moral objections to this concept run very deep and are not immediately apparent to those who strongly favor the objectives of groups like the Peace Corps and VISTA. The idea that a citizen owes his government a certain number of years of service is foreign to this nation's principles of limited government; and a system of national service, by starting out to expand liberties would end by severely curtailing them. Consider for example who or what agency is to make the decision as to what is valuable social work and what is not, and therefore whether that work can be an alternative to military service. Political judg-

ments would necessarily have to be made on a scale so broad as to effect virtually every member of society in a certain age group. Could activities of a private charitable nature be selected instead of a governmental activity? If not, isn't this saying that government programs are somehow more worthy than private individual action? If so, who is to determine which private activities will qualify—churches, religious institutions, political parties, black power groups, white citizens councils, etc?

The administrative difficulties of national service are no less staggering than the philosophical. Recall that one of the underlying reasons that the draft has been declared inequitable is because only one-third of the available manpower was needed for military service. National service, instead of devising a rational system to cut down the interference of government on the lives of those two-thirds that are not needed, expands government to touch them all. If there are approximately 2 million men in each year of the draft age population, and approximately 2 million women, we are dealing with between 30 to 35 million young people. The administrative costs of dealing with such a large segment of our population would be great. And to this must be added costs of training; for example, the training costs for one peace corps worker alone is on the average \$7800. The costs of national service may be enormously large, much larger than that of a volunteer army discussed subsequently. In addition, most of these charitable and social organizations operate to a great extent on the impetus of volunteerism and individual initiative. We could reasonably expect that many of them would be overwhelmed and severely damaged by an influx of an extremely large number of indirectly coerced young people.

THE ECONOMIC AND STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS

The accurate costs of a volunteer service must reflect the savings obtained through the abolition of the draft system.

The high cost to the draftee. The cost of our present system of procuring military manpower is enormous. At first glance it may seem otherwise to some because the draft is a means of acquiring very cheap labor. As Professor John Kenneth Galbraith has stated "the draft survives principally as a device by which we use compulsion to get young men to serve at less than the market rate of pay. We shift the cost of military service from the well-to-do taxpayer, who benefits by lower taxes, to the impecunious young draftee. This is a highly regressive arrangement which we would not tolerate in any other area." However, in addition to the social costs implicitly underlying Professor Galbraith's criticism, there are also grave economic costs. The draft has served as a crutch for the military services and allowed them to avoid the development of sound personnel policies. Our modern army requires specialists and technicians much more than automatons with rifles. The present procurement policies require the army to waste millions in training these draftees in skills which the military will lose in a few years and which the trainee will generally never have a use for in later life. The present personnel policies encourage further waste by deterring re-enlistments.

Military pay in the lower grades is lower in the United States than in any of the other NATO powers, including those like France and West Germany which have compulsory service. A private E-1 in the United States makes approximately \$90 a month, hardly enough to support himself, much less a wife and family. With an increasingly lower average age for marriage in this country, it is not surprising that many married draftees in the military services are forced to depend on relief payments to support themselves. For example, in 1964, the Air Force alone identified more than 5000 men who were receiving relief support. Such economic facts

hardly encourage volunteering and certainly discourage re-enlistments.

The high cost of low re-enlistment rates. Department of Defense figures reveal that only about 8 per cent of draftees stay in the service and only 25 per cent of first-term volunteers re-enlist. In 1964, the re-enlistment rate for inductees was down to 2.8 per cent and the percentage has never been greater than 20 per cent. Thus approximately 90-95 per cent of all the manpower which is obtained by the draft is "temporary" and the skills of these men, which took about \$6000 per draftee to train, are wasted in the process. The cost, in wasted training and lost skills alone, is approximately 2.4 billion dollars a year for an army that depends on compulsion to secure its manpower. This cost must be borne by Professor Galbraith's "well-to-do taxpayers" and is the penalty we pay for our inefficient manpower procurement system.

The high costs of ignoring technological changes. In addition, the draft ignores the basic changes which have occurred in the technology of war during the past two decades. Back in 1957, a report prepared by a blue-ribbon commission headed by Ralph Cordiner observed that "It is foolish for the Armed Services to obtain highly advanced weapons systems and not have men of sufficient competence to understand, operate, and maintain such equipment. . . . The solution here, of course, is not to draft more men to stand and look helplessly at the machinery. The solution is to give the men already in the armed forces the incentives required to make them want to stay in the service long enough and try hard enough to take these higher responsibilities, gain the skill and experience levels we need and then remain to give the services the full benefit of their skills."

Our modern army requires more highly skilled technicians and less manual laborers in order to operate and maintain its sophisticated weapons systems. But it is precisely these skilled personnel who leave the military services for higher paying, more satisfying jobs in civilian life. The draft, to be sure, provides ample quantity, but what is needed increasingly today is men of special skills or quality. The latter are uninterested in remaining in the services, and because they are also the most expensive to train the army is faced with a discouraging inverse relationship between degree of costs of skills obtained and re-enlistment.

The army, with its alleged traditional talent for putting "square pegs into round holes," has aggravated the situation with the misuse of the skills and talents it has at its disposal. A General Accounting Office study, noted by Senator Gaylord Nelson in 1964, revealed that at least 35,000 soldiers were employed in the wrong jobs wasting some \$48 million. The GAO described the Army's handling of men as a personnel system that generates mismanagement. Examples cited were helicopter pilots serving as dog handlers and airplane mechanics as military policemen.

Unfortunately the military has also been shown to be unable to make effective use of available scientific talent. On August 30, 1962, Senator Proxmire read into the *Congressional Record* a study prepared by a former Army engineer which showed that "the effective utilized time of the enlisted scientist or engineer spent on work commensurate with his qualifications is 10 per cent." This astounding figure was confirmed by the Army's Adjutant General's Office.

For comparison, it is interesting to examine the personnel policies of the Navy Seabees during World War II. The Seabees' practice of placing already trained bulldozer operators, engineers, and other skilled personnel immediately in jobs commensurate with their ability and skills resulted in large savings in time and costs. In addition it encouraged enlistments as the enlistee was assured of an opportunity to make use of his

skills and talents. Regrettably even the Seabees have dropped this policy today.

The high cost of the draft on the civilian economy. Equally important with the distorting effects on the military are the effects of the draft's inefficiency on the civilian sector of our society. The current military buildup in Viet Nam has intensified pressures on business firms faced with severe shortages of skilled labor due to the draft. In June, 1966, a trade journal published by Prentice Hall entitled "Personnel Management—Policies and Pressures" contained a survey of 192 American business firms showing that 35 per cent faced severe shortages of skilled labor. Furthermore, these firms cannot find their way out of their dilemma by instituting job training programs as there is great difficulty in finding young workers to train. The very fact of the draft liability of those presently available makes a company balk at providing expensive training. The Department of Defense reported during the hearings on the draft last June that 39 per cent of the draftees between the ages of 22-25 were refused jobs because of their liability.

A de jure attempt was once made to provide some measure of insulation from the draft to key employees of essential industries in the name of the "national interest." The little known "Department of Commerce List of Currently Essential Activities" and the "Department of Labor's List of Critical Occupations" set down recommendations for jobs which should enjoy draft exemption. Unfortunately this list has not been revised since 1963, despite the new demands for manpower and the current shortage. The lists also use job descriptions which are now out of date according to the 1965 revised edition of the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles* published by the Department of Labor. Furthermore, the committee responsible for compiling these lists, and thus coordinating military and civilian manpower needs, has concentrated solely on "defense" jobs. Critical occupations in the civilian sector have gone unconsidered. For example, a manufacturer of electrical fuses with a large share of the civilian market but only a small number of defense contracts could not qualify for the Commerce list and thus has experienced great difficulties in keeping its trained employees. This failure of the selective service to coordinate its selection process with the needs of the civilian society is damaging to our defense efforts because the health of the civilian economy is an important aspect of our military strength.

During the debate on the floor of the House in June of 1967, when the amendments to the Selective Service Act were being considered, the job of compiling lists of critical skills and essential activities was transferred to the National Security Council with no discussion whatever of the efforts of that agency's predecessor in the task. Subsequently, in February, 1968, the National Security Council announced that it had totally suspended the list of "Currently Essential Activities" even though it never really had one, and with it suspended all except a few occupational deferments, even though it had no knowledge of how many occupational deferments had been granted and were outstanding and in what industries the holders of these deferments might have been employed.

A further ramification of the total lack of coordination between the civilian sector of our economy and the military is the sorry state of the Reserve and National Guard. Originally established in 1955 to serve as an available source of trained manpower in the event of a buildup, the Reserves have become a repository for over-aged former servicemen and young men seeking a way to avoid the draft. For the most part, Reserve units are untrained. A study prepared by the Governors' Advisory Committee on the National Guard indicated that 90,000, or 30 per cent of the total strength of the Guard, had never re-

ceived training. General Hershey stated at the Armed Services Committee hearings in June of 1967, that 50,000 Reservists were in control units and had never received training. This lack of preparedness was illustrated when the Army recently completed a program whereby selected reserve units were given up-to-date training in order to bring them to combat readiness. Unfortunately to achieve this a redistribution of the personnel and material resources of the remaining 70 per cent of the Reserve was necessary. Thus, to get a few Reserve units ready for callup the Army was forced to let the remainder deteriorate.

The lack of coordination of skills between the Reserves and the civilian sector makes any large scale callup dangerous if not impossible. In 1961 the Reserves were called to meet the Berlin crisis resulting in chaos in many communities. The same effect would result if the Reserves were called up today. As an illustration, Lambert Airport in St. Louis where many key employees are also reservists, might have to be shut down.

THE ALTERNATIVE OF VOLUNTEERISM

My proposal focuses on the major elements necessary to achieve a modern career military force. I argue that such a force—sustained by volunteers through increased pay and other benefits and both regular and ready reserves—would have a higher morale, be better trained, and more able to meet the immediate military threats to our country. The essential elements of a career force would include:

I. Higher pay, better housing, and other benefits which would make military life more comparable to civilians in similar jobs utilizing similar skills

This is basic to attracting and keeping a career army and ready reserves. Unfortunately the possibilities have never been given the detailed study necessary. The Defense Department sweepingly argues that it would cost too much to rely on volunteers. In the last days of the hearings held by the House Armed Services Committee in June, 1966, the Defense Department finally came forward with the year-late report. This report, or more correctly, a "report of their report" contained cost estimates ranging from \$4 to \$17 billion. These figures unfortunately were based on the Department's estimates on what it would cost to "hire" 500,000 new men annually without any other changes in personnel policies. I requested supplemental data from the author of the report, Assistant Secretary of Defense Thomas D. Morris, and was advised in a letter that "no estimates were made for the draft study of the combined effects of improvements in fringe benefits upon the rate of volunteering . . . since these benefits—with the exception of training and educational opportunities—were not found to be effective inducements for initial enlistment." (Emphasis added.) Thus the military establishment responded with figures so vague as to be almost meaningless and based them upon inadequate considerations. They have in effect created an artificial monetary barrier to an all volunteer army at the outset. Fortunately I have been advised in a succeeding letter from Assistant Secretary Morris that further study will be done on the effect of higher pay and benefits on reenlistments and the concomitant savings which would be realized by the military.

The National Advisory Commission on the Selective Service, otherwise known as the Marshall Commission, fared no better in this area than the previous Defense Department "studies." After exclusive hearings behind closed doors, and refusals to release its working papers for public examination, the Marshall Commission announced its unsubstantiated verdict on the volunteer army in its report released in March of 1967. The Marshall Commission said only that a volunteer army "would be expensive although the De-

partment of Defense gives no solid estimate of what it would cost."

Others have offered some estimates in this area. Dr. Walter OI, an economist at the University of Washington and former employee of the Department of Defense, estimates that the total extra payroll costs would be around \$3-\$4 billion a year for armed forces equivalent to 2.7 million men under present methods of recruitment and not more than \$8 billion a year for armed forces equivalent to the present higher number of men, around 3.1 to 3.2 million. Dr. OI's exhaustive analysis is found in his paper "The Costs and Implications of an All Volunteer Force" which was presented to the University of Chicago's Conference on the Draft on December 4, 1966. Dr. Milton Friedman, of the University of Chicago, in a paper submitted to the same conference concurred in these figures. Bruce Chapman, using 1965 figures leaked from the Pentagon study, has estimated that a pay increase totaling \$3 billion would reduce—through higher re-enlistments—from 500,000 to 150,000 the number of new army personnel needed each year. One can safely assume that higher fringe benefits and other improvements in military life could bring down the number even further. In this regard I would like to add that greater consideration must be given to making the military life more commensurate to civilian in many respects. To attract career men certain improvements must be made which need not entail a corresponding decrease in discipline. Such things as better family housing and schools for children of servicemen are imperatives.

II. Much greater coordination of the utilization of skills between the civilian and military sectors of our society

Almost 90 per cent of the technical skills which are used by the military are also employed by the civilian economy. Civilian personnel can then be substituted for the military in many cases. Under a program begun in 1965 by Secretary of Defense McNamara, 74,300 military jobs were replaced by 60,500 civilian positions. This program of "civilization" resulted in a net decrease of 13,800 jobs, since trainers and manpower support requirements could be eliminated entirely for the civilian positions. Assistant Secretary Morris also promised me that further study would be done in this area. He did, however, point out that the military is limited in replacement programs of this type by the requirement that many positions be retained in the military in order to rotate combat troops into stateside jobs. Nevertheless significant reductions can still be carried out.

Furthermore, savings may be realized by utilizing existing civilian training establishments, including college campuses, vocational schools, high schools, and on-the-job vocational training programs, to train personnel for the skills the military needs. At the present time the military establishment persists in maintaining costly duplicate and I would say highly inefficient training facilities. This is true even though 80-90 per cent of the military jobs are congruent with jobs in the civilian economy, according to the Department of Labor Statistics. Thus military programs could conceivably be reduced to train only the 10-20 per cent of combat or direct combat support positions which need military as opposed to vocational training. The resulting savings would be extensive, could have the possible additional effect of encouraging business investment in our manpower resources, and could produce a greater amount of skilled labor for the civilian economy.

III. Lowering physical standards where possible to use less than I-A specimens in non-combat jobs

Many non-combat positions could easily be filled by men now exempted from the draft under present selective service regulations. Utilization of all our manpower resources is

essential to an efficient procurement system. The Department of Defense's physical and mental standards for induction are unduly high as the old saw that "every man must be able to carry a rifle" has rarely been borne out in wartime experience and is certainly wasteful.

IV. Improving the capabilities of Reserve units so that they may serve as a means of retaining and maintaining needed skills for potential military usage, and coordinate Reserve organizations with the civilian society

American military theory has always centered around a relatively small standing army with a strong Reserve. Therefore improving the present Reserve system should be one of our first priorities. A vital Reserve could and should be a repository for maintaining crucial skills for possible military use and be coordinated with the civilian economy so that any callup would not endanger the strength of the economy. An effective program would call for a voluntary army of the peacetime size of 2.7 million men, plus a well trained reserve of 1 million men.

V. Revising the Uniform Code of Military Justice to include only those personnel engaged in combat or training for combat under the aegis of Direct Military Authority, and limiting severely its application to noncombat stateside occupations

In making military life more comparable to civilian life consideration should be given to the necessity of maintaining a strict uniform code of military justice across the board to noncombat troops. Military law maintaining discipline and control over combatants' and support troops' activities outside battle areas is essential. However, we should revise the present Code to cover only those activities which need to be under direct military control.

CONCLUSION

The peacetime draft has only been justifiable as a measure of necessity; if it is not necessary, it is not justifiable. Alternatives should be studied in their broadest aspects. The problem of manpower utilization is more than a military one. The arguments I have advanced for a volunteer army affect the civilian sector, our American value system, and the whole universe of military and civilian life.

TWO PARATROOPERS KILLED IN ACTION

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sgt. Jeffrey A. Evans and Sgt. Cecil V. Evans, two fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

TWO PARATROOPERS KILLED IN ACTION: BOTH HAD SHORT TIME YET TO SERVE IN VIETNAM

Two Army paratroop sergeants from Maryland, both with short times yet to serve in Vietnam, have been killed in action, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

The dead are:

Sgt. Jeffrey A. Evans, 19, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas J. Evans, of 7 Admiral boulevard, Dundalk.

Sgt. Cecil V. Evans, 20, husband of Mrs. Nancy Evans, of 712 Ferndale road, Salisbury. They are not related.

Sgt. Cecil Evans was due to be rotated to the United States in "two or three weeks,"

a family spokesman said. Sgt. Jeffrey Evans was scheduled to return in two months.

According to his mother, the Dundalk youth was killed last Friday in a firefight at Cu Chi near Saigon. He was a member of the 101st Airborne Division and had been in Vietnam since last December.

He was born and reared in Dundalk and was a 1966 graduate of Dundalk Senior High School. He worked as an apprentice machinist at the Bethlehem Steel Corporation before enlisting for three years in February, 1967.

He received his basic training at Fort Gordon, Ga., and paratroop training at Fort Benning, Ga.

WAS WOUNDED EARLIER

"He was very proud of that uniform," his mother said yesterday. In his letters, she added, he often spoke of how friendly the Vietnamese children were.

"He never had a bad word about anyone over there," she said.

In his last letter, received yesterday and dated September 2, Mrs. Thomas Evans said her son was looking forward to coming home and wanted to know when the hunting season opened.

She said her son received shrapnel wounds in action last April and was hospitalized for one month.

SURVIVORS NAMED

In addition to his parents, he is survived by a brother, Thomas J. Evans, Jr., 17.

The Salisbury youth died Saturday from wounds received in a firefight in the Central Highlands.

He was a 1966 graduate of Bennett High School in Salisbury and enlisted for three years shortly after graduation.

He took his basic training at Fort Gordon and paratroop training at Fort Benning. He was a member of the 173d Airborne Division.

Sgt. Cecil Evans left for Vietnam last October 15. He would have been 21 on November 16.

In addition to his wife, he is survived by an 18-month-old son, Mark; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Elbert Evans, of 902 Vincent street, Salisbury, and two brothers, Elbert C. Evans, Jr., 19, and William J. Evans, 15.

IN MEMORIAM: ERNEST F. SWIFT

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Nation and my own State of Wisconsin lost a dedicated conservationist with the passing of Ernest F. Swift on July 24, 1968.

Ernie, as he was affectionately called by all who knew him, ranks among the truly greats in the conservation field. He rose from the ranks, from conservation warden in a northern Wisconsin county to director of the Wisconsin Conservation Department, a position which he served with great distinction.

In Washington, he held the position as Assistant Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department of the Interior, and later as executive director of the National Wildlife Federation, the world's largest private conservation organization. In this capacity, Mr. Swift wrote philosophic essays on conservation issues of the day, raising his voice in protest to the growing pollution to our Nation's waters and destruction to our forests and lands.

It is an honor for me to have printed in the RECORD the wonderful trib-

ute to Ernest F. Swift as carried in the August 15, 1968, edition of the Conservation News of the National Wildlife Federation. The article follows:

IN MEMORIAM: ERNEST F. SWIFT, SEPTEMBER 15, 1897, TO JULY 24, 1968

The pen of one of America's greatest conservationists and writers came to the end of the line on July 24th. As it does to all men, death overtook Ernest F. "Ernie" Swift following a heart attack in a hospital near his home at Rice Lake, Wisconsin. No one can fill the void left by his passing; no one will be able to pick up Ernie's pen and continue his style of writing or the personal philosophy toward life which motivated it.

All of us, however, can continue to spread Ernie's message. This nation is better because he lived here and spoke out for those things in which he firmly believed. Every time a victory is won in the never-ending battle for the wise use and management of our natural resources, we will know that he helped win it. Somewhere, sometime, somehow, Ernie Swift—leader, writer, philosopher, conservationist—did or said or wrote something which inspired us to fight the good fight, to stand up and be counted in a noble cause.

His writings were not easy to edit, for his style was unique. Like Hemingway, Ernie never worried much about grammar or punctuation. For him, getting the point across was the main purpose in writing. And he cared little if, along the way, he made editors and readers stop and think about what he was trying to say. He never aimed to entertain or please all of the readers; indeed, at times it almost seemed he tried to start arguments. But regardless of results, Ernie Swift always called the shots as he saw them, always caused people to talk about what he said and wrote. Sincere and unsophisticated, he held no pretensions, either about himself or about his convictions. For Ernie Swift, conservation was always a crusade—a way of life to be shared with others. There was no room for a profiteer in his kind of conservation. He never wrote only to be popular and he never worked for anything or any cause if its only reward was personal fame and fortune.

He was born and spent his early boyhood on a Minnesota prairie farm, later moved to a Wisconsin "stump farm" where he formed his lasting conservation convictions. Upon his return from the Army after World War I, he made his home in Hayward, Wisconsin, working as a guide and dealing in real estate and forest products. In 1926 Wisconsin appointed him as a conservation warden. He devoted the next 28 years of his life to service with his state's Conservation Department, rising through the ranks to become its Director in 1947. Under his leadership, the age of scientific game management was born; his department was one of the first in the nation to employ trained biologists to get the facts about wild birds and animals upon which sound management programs could be built.

In 1954 he was called to the Nation's capital for service as an Assistant Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. He was placed in charge of federal game management activities and regional offices throughout the country. A year later, he resigned to accept the post of Executive Director of the National Wildlife Federation, the world's largest private conservation organization.

Federation duties and responsibilities took him thousands upon thousands of miles across the nation, speaking to countless groups of sportsmen, conservationists, community leaders—spreading the message of wise use, development and management of natural resources. In 1960 he retired from these strenuous and demanding duties, but continued to serve as Conservation Adviser and Forestry Liaison representative from his home in Wisconsin. In 1967 the Federation

published his partial autobiography and a collection of his best conservation essays in a hard-cover book entitled, "A Conservation Saga."

The saga of Ernest F. Swift is ended now, but Ernie's pen, mightier than any sword, had transmitted to paper his ideas, thoughts, convictions, beliefs, and courage almost to the last. Several of his final essays will be published on these pages during the next few months. The first follows under a title Ernie would have liked, because he lived it . . . "What Made America Great."

AN ADMIRABLE PUBLIC FIGURE

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed regrettable when a public figure of unassailable character such as our colleague, Senator STROM THURMOND, is subjected to the vitriolic tirades of a very few members of the news media.

Senator THURMOND needs no defense from me. The people of South Carolina have overwhelmingly responded to the handful of character assassins who seek to defame the name of this great American. His record of courage, honesty, integrity, and statesmanship is recognized by the voters of our State, as well as patriotic citizens everywhere.

Syndicated columnist Holmes Alexander recently wrote a very stirring tribute to Senator THURMOND which expresses more eloquently than I the remarkable character of this great patriot. I commend it to the attention of our colleagues and the people of this Nation, as follows:

ROASTING THURMOND

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Something's wrong with the blood of honest men if it doesn't boil at the roasting in the press of South Carolina's Sen. Thurmond.

There's the leading editorial in the N.Y. Times which calls it a "repulsive spectacle" when this "flagrant racist" was seen to accompany Richard Nixon to the Miami Beach rostrum.

There's columnist Tom Wicker caterwauling about the "shocking sight of . . . the burning-eye racist" in "the party of Abraham Lincoln," and the mawkish apostrophe to "an Republican if he gains Strom Thurmond and loses his political soul."

Clean newsprint shouldn't be soiled by further examples of hysterical diatribes. The excuse for it, that Thurmond "bossed" the Southern states' support of Nixon and the nomination of Maryland Gov. Agnew, is despicable.

The name-calling and the racist incitation are a disgrace to the truth and decency which journalism aspires to. I don't know when as good a man as Thurmond has been so scurvily treated and the reading public served up such fraudulent malice.

Cross my heart, I think it must be known by every national newscoverer that Strom Thurmond is among the most exemplary men in political life.

It is common-knowledge that he possesses, in abundance, every characteristic that is admirable in a public man. He is deficient, to be sure, in the ancillary virtues, such as humor and bonhomie.

His puritanic abstinence from tobacco, liquor and philandering has combined with his industriousness and serious-mindedness to make him a man apart from the convivial

frollics where many masculine friendships are formed. But this is his loss, not the public's.

Thurmond's dedication to fundamentalism in government has not led him into expediency and experimentalism and has alienated him from social revolutionaries.

But I take him at his word that never in his life has Thurmond spoken an unkind word to a Negro or of the Negro race.

Those who demean him for his opinions' sake are talking about a citizen-soldier with 17 decorations earned in combat with the 82nd Airborne Division at a time when he was past normal military age.

They are deriding the conscience of a Southern governor whose administration, as far back as 1947, abolished the poll tax as a condition of voting.

They are ridiculing a faith in democracy so deep that in 1954 he went on a write-in ballot with the awkward name of J. Strom Thurmond and, having won the Senate seat, resigned in 1956 and ran again so that the people could speak on a regulation ballot.

He changed his party but not his principles in 1964. In 1966 he became the first Republican senator ever elected in South Carolina—carrying 45 of the 46 counties, an impossibility if the Negro electorate completely enfranchised in his state, had opposed him.

Those who vilify Thurmond with racist taunts haven't heard about James Stephens, Negro, of Walterboro, S.C., who dropped out of Howard University for lack of funds, and was advanced funds by the Senator to complete his education and become an Army dentist.

They never heard of Leroy Washington, Negro, of Anderson, S.C., who stands a good chance this year to win Thurmond's appointment to the Naval Academy.

Thurmond's detractors don't know about the \$100,000 Thurmond Foundation at Alken which gives educational grants on the basis of "most worthy, most needy."

The "repulsive spectacle" of Thurmond at Miami Beach was one of honesty so pure that he dissolved a \$200,000 law firm when he came to the Senate.

It exposed a convention "boss" so lenient that he did not demur when Nixon passed over the four men on the Southern preferred list—Senators Tower, Baker, Griffin and Congressman Rogers Morton—and finally chose between two on the acceptable list—Governors Volpe and Agnew.

There are very few absolutes in life, and fewer in politics, but Thurmond comes as close as humanly possible to being a man of unassailable character and unsurpassable virtue.

It would be easier to forgive the assailants of his good name if they knew not what they did. But this man's life of 65 years is an open book. Evil to those who evil speak of one so nearly above reproach.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION BY POPULAR VOTE

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I have offered to the House some recommendations for constitutional reform suggesting the elimination of the electoral college and allowing the people to elect their President directly. The proposals I make are not new, nor are they original with me. But the response received—from the press and public sources and from interested citizens throughout my district and across the land—has reinforced my own personal

belief that the time has come to investigate seriously some of our basic electoral procedures.

This belief is also shared by my distinguished colleague in the other body, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD. In June of this year, Senator MANSFIELD introduced his recommendations calling for the abolition of the electoral college and the replacement of the national convention system with a national primary. If anyone has been the champion of this movement to update and re-align our electoral procedures, it has been Senator MANSFIELD. My resolution is identical to the Mansfield resolution.

I hope that this resolution will be approved and provide the necessary vehicle to conduct the investigation long overdue.

First of all, I ask that the House review the nominating process and offer a plan to replace the present happenstance primary and convention system with a measure calling for a national primary.

The candidates presently flaunt themselves before the various State primaries competing for delegate votes which they may not receive even if victorious. Their politics is ruled by interest-group pressures and their attempted all-encompassing appeal to the people becomes a thin veneer of show and make-believe. We seem to be blindly seeking a choice of a nominee enmeshed in a maze of conflicting State law and dubious custom and practice that precludes a rational popular choice at this most critical point in our election process.

The result of this is that a considerable amount of time and money is spent trying to woo the support and votes of a few primary States, especially those States as California and New York with large delegate votes. The effect may be fatal for the underfinanced, understaffed candidate. The bewildered and confused voter runs off in all directions at once crying: "political payola." Surely any study in this area must also encompass a realistic proposal for re-aligning the financing of presidential primaries and elections.

Perhaps one of the most beneficial aspects of the proposed national primary would be to remove the circus atmosphere that surrounds this frenzied delegate roundup at the archaic convention extravaganza.

My plan also reflects Senator MANSFIELD's call for the abolition of the electoral college. The case has been made, there is little to add to it except to say that the elimination of the electoral college would purge our system of bloc State voting. To continue the electoral college is to deny the cohesiveness of the 50 States as a national unit.

I insert my proposed resolution in the RECORD, as follows:

H.J. Res. 1454

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the nomination and election of the President and Vice President of the United States

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the follow-

ing article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid for all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years and, together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as provided in this Constitution.

"Sec. 2. The official candidates of political parties for President shall be nominated at a primary election by direct popular vote. Voters in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, but, in the primary election each voter shall be eligible to vote only in the primary of the party of his registered affiliation.

"Sec. 3. No person shall be a candidate for nomination for President except in the primary of the party of his registered affiliation, and his name shall be on that party's ballot in all the States if he shall have filed a petition at the seat of the Government of the United States with the President of the Senate, which petition shall be valid only if (1) it is determined by the President of the Senate to have been signed, on or after the first day in January of the year in which the next primary election for President is to be held, by a number of qualified voters, in each of at least seventeen of the several States, equal in number to at least 1 per centum of the vote cast for electors for presidential and vice-presidential candidates of his party in those several States in the most recent previous presidential election; or, in the event the electors for the candidates of a political party shall have appeared on the ballot in fewer than seventeen of the several States in the most recent previous presidential election, it is determined by the President of the Senate to have been signed, on or after the first day in January of the year in which the next primary election for President is to be held, by a number of qualified voters, in any or all of the several States, equal in number to at least 1 per centum of the total number of votes cast throughout the United States for all electors for candidates for President and Vice President in the most recent previous presidential election, and (2) it is filed with the President of the Senate not later than the first Tuesday after the first Monday in April of the year in which the next primary election for President is to be held.

"Sec. 4. For the purposes of this article a political party shall be recognized as such if the electors for candidates for President and Vice President of such party received, in any or all of the several States, an aggregate number of votes, equal in number to at least 10 per centum of the total number of votes cast throughout the United States for all electors for candidates for President and Vice President in the most recent previous presidential election.

"Sec. 5. The time of the primary election shall be the same throughout the United States, and, unless the Congress shall by law appoint a different day, such primary election shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in August in the year preceding the expiration of the regular term of President and Vice President.

"Sec. 6. Within fifteen days after such primary election, the chief executive of each State shall make distinct lists of all persons of each political party for whom votes were cast, and the number of votes for each such person, which lists shall be signed, certified, and transmitted under the seal of such State to the Government of the United States directed to the President of the Senate, who, in the presence of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority and minority leaders of both Houses of the Congress,

shall forthwith open all certificates and count the votes and cause to have published in an appropriate publication the aggregate number of votes cast for each person by the voters of the party of his registered affiliation. The person who shall have received the greatest number of votes cast by the voters of the party of his registered affiliation shall be the official candidate of such party for President throughout the United States, if such number be a plurality amounting to at least 40 per centum of the total number of such votes cast. If no person receives at least 40 per centum of the total number of votes cast for candidates for nomination for President by the voters of a political party, then the Congress shall provide by law, uniform throughout the United States, for a runoff election to be held on the twenty-eighth day after the day on which the primary election was held between the two persons who received the greatest number of votes for candidates for the presidential nomination by voters of such political party in the primary election: *Provided, however,* That no person ineligible to vote in the primary election of any political party shall be eligible to vote in a runoff election of such political party.

"Sec. 7. Each party, for which, in accordance with sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this article, the name of a presidential candidate shall have been placed on the ballots, shall nominate a candidate for Vice President, who, when chosen, shall be the official candidate of such party for Vice President throughout the United States. No person constitutionally ineligible for the office of President shall be eligible for nomination as a candidate for the office of Vice President of the United States.

"Sec. 8. In the event of the death or resignation or disqualification of the official candidate of any political party for President, the person nominated by such political party for Vice President shall resign the vice-presidential nomination and shall be the official candidate of such party for President. In the event of the deaths or resignations or disqualifications of the official candidates of any political party for President and Vice President, a national committee of such party shall designate such candidates, who shall then be deemed the official candidates of such party, but in choosing such candidates the vote shall be taken by States, the delegation from each State having one vote. A quorum for such purposes shall consist of a delegate or delegates from two-thirds of the several States, and a majority of all States shall be necessary to a choice.

"Sec. 9. The places and manner of holding any such primary or runoff election shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations. For purposes of this article the District of Columbia shall be considered as a State, and the primary election shall be held in the District of Columbia in such manner as the Congress may by law prescribe.

"Sec. 10. The electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby abolished. At a time determined by the Congress there shall be held in each State and in the District of Columbia an election in which the people thereof shall vote for President and for Vice President. In such election, each voter shall cast a single ballot for two persons who shall have been nominated as official candidates for said offices as provided herein.

"The legislature of each State shall prescribe the places and manner of holding such election thereof and shall include on the ballot the names of all pairs of persons who shall have been nominated as official candidates for the offices of President and Vice President, but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations. The voters in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, but nothing

in this article shall prohibit a State from adopting a less restrictive residence requirement for voting for President and Vice President than for such members of the State legislature, prohibit the Congress from adopting uniform residence and age requirements for voting in such election.

"The Congress shall prescribe the qualifications for voting and the places and manner of holding such elections in the District of Columbia.

"Within forty-five days after the election, or at such time as the Congress may direct, the chief executive of each State and the District of Columbia shall prepare, sign, certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate, a list of all persons for whom votes were cast for President and for Vice President, together with the number of votes cast for each.

"Sec. 11. On the 6th day of January following the election, unless the Congress shall by law appoint a different day not earlier than the 4th day of January and not later than the 10th day of January, the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and the House of Representatives, open all the certificates, and the votes shall then be totaled. The persons joined as candidates for President and Vice President, having the greatest number of votes shall be declared elected President and Vice President, respectively, if such number be a plurality amounting to at least 40 per centum of the total number of votes certified. If none of the pairs of persons joined as candidates for President and Vice President shall have at least 40 per centum of the total number of votes certified, then Congress shall provide by law, uniform throughout the United States, for a runoff election to be held between the two pairs of persons joined as candidates for President and Vice President, respectively, who received the highest number of votes certified.

"Sec. 12. If, at the time fixed for the counting of the certified vote totals from the respective States, the presidential candidate who would have been entitled to election as President shall have died, the vice-presidential candidate entitled to election as Vice President shall be declared elected President.

"The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of both the persons who, except for their death, would have been entitled to become President and Vice President.

"Sec. 13. The Congress may provide by appropriate legislation for cases in which two or more candidates receive an equal number of votes and for methods of determining any dispute or controversy that may arise in the counting and canvassing of the votes cast in elections held in accordance with sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, and 11 of this article.

"Sec. 14. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation: *Provided, however,* That this article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

THE "PUEBLO": HOW LONG,
MR. PRESIDENT?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 234th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, all of us are anxious for this long session of Congress to end. In our rush to adjourn, however, I want to join my colleagues in noting that two of the most important measures to be introduced in this Congress—the Election Reform Act of 1968 and the Legislation Reorganization Act of 1967—are still pending in the House Rules Committee.

The Senate passed the congressional reform legislation last year. The House Administration Committee recommended the "clean elections" bill in June. Since that time, the bills in the House have been bottled up in the Rules Committee. I think it is imperative that we act on both measures before adjourning this year. If we do not act now, it will mean we must start again and more months will pass before such reforms can be considered through the legislative process.

The strength of our Government, of our federal system as we know it today, depends on the strength of our American system of elections as well as the faith the governed hold in those who govern. Our activity, in the past, in the future, and now, will dictate our constituents' faith in our ability to serve.

It is primarily, Mr. Speaker, through the exercise of the franchise to vote that American citizens participate in self-government. It is therefore, vitally important that we, as their duly elected representatives in this Congress, keep our constituents informed of our actions and purposes and that we leave no doubt in their minds as to the purpose of any actions.

The Election Reform Act, which I have introduced in similar form, will be an important step toward filling a glaring weakness in our present election system. It closes the holes in our present law, the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925. It will make sweeping changes in the reporting by candidates of expenditures for their campaign and the contributions they receive. In effect, it will create a reporting system where now we have none.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967 is a small step toward modernizing Congress—a step toward making Congress more responsive to our changing world and giving it the ability to keep up with an ever-increasing workload.

The bill 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 languished in the House Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about in both of these measures are changes that are long overdue. These are changes that will make Congress more responsive to the electorate, establish ethics within

our electoral system, and better equip Congress to meet these challenging times. There is no question that we should do all we can to see that both bills are passed before Congress adjourns. I support my colleagues in their effort to have action taken on this legislation.

FRED J. BECKER ANNOUNCES RETIREMENT AS EDITOR OF THE EVENING INDEPENDENT

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Fred J. Becker, one of the most distinguished veterans of Ohio journalism, has retired after 55 years on the staff of the Evening Independent at Massillon.

Fred is a great newspaperman. He has always put fairness and honesty above all other considerations. He has always recognized the responsibility of the newspaper to report fully on local, State, and national affairs so that the people are informed and their participation is encouraged. He has made his newspaper interesting. And from time to time he has fulfilled with distinction the responsibility of investigating and exposing unsavory activities in our area. He has more than earned the pleasures of retirement and I wish him well for many years.

Also, I wish to offer congratulations and good wishes to Luther Emery who succeeds to the position of editor and to Herb Nolt who becomes managing editor, both responsible and extremely competent newspapermen.

Under leave to extend, I include with my remarks Mr. Becker's farewell editorial and the Evening Independent's news coverage of the retirement:

WRITES "30" TO 55-YEAR NEWSPAPER CAREER:
FRED J. BECKER ANNOUNCES RETIREMENT AS
EDITOR OF THE EVENING INDEPENDENT

Fred J. Becker today announced his resignation as editor and retirement as a member of the editorial department of The Evening Independent. Both resignation and retirement are effective today.

Becker has been a member of this newspaper's editorial department for more than 55 years, joining the editorial staff in June, 1913, soon after graduation from old Massillon high school, then located where Longfellow junior high school now stands.

During June, July and August of 1913, Becker worked for The Evening Independent on Saturday afternoons, scoring baseball games in the old shop league which was sponsored by this newspaper. On other week days he continued work with the former Everhard brick yard where he had worked each summer while attending high school.

Early in September, Becker joined the editorial staff as a regular member, covering sports, the city hall, police headquarters, council meetings and a number of other city offices, not then located in the city hall, and various civic organizations, including the Massillon Chamber of Commerce.

Massillon at that time was experiencing an industrial and business boom, the largest being the Central Alloy Steel Co., now a part of Republic Steel Corp., which brought a decided growth in Massillon industry and

business, as well as in sports, including the Agathon baseball team, major advancements in athletics at Washington high school and many municipal activities.

The editorial staff when Becker began working for The Evening Independent consisted of 5 people, including Miss B. V. R. Skinner, editor and C. E. Chidester, managing editor. Both are deceased.

As news coverage expanded more reporters were added until today the editorial department has as many as 20 employees, including those hired during the summer vacation season.

Becker's first major assignment as a reporter was to accompany "General" Jacob S. Coxe, sr, on his second march to Washington which Coxe began in March, 1914, on the 20th anniversary of his first march of the unemployed to the nation's capital in 1894.

Becker marched along with many other reporters for metropolitan newspapers, with Coxe and his "soldiers" as far as Salem before being recalled to Massillon. At that time reporters probably outnumbered "soldiers" and Coxe's second attempt to reach Washington broke up soon after the "army" entered Pennsylvania.

In April, 1918, Becker was inducted into the U.S. Army and after a short training period at Camp Sherman, his regiment was dispatched to Europe. His outfit, the 324th Heavy Field Artillery, then attached to the 32nd Division, participated in the Meuse-Argonne offensive which brought about the defeat of the German army. His outfit then spent 6 months in Germany with the Army of Occupation.

Following his discharge from service, Becker returned to The Evening Independent. Before long he was assigned to editing copy of the Associated Press and make-up of the paper, relinquishing his former duties as sports editor and general city hall reporter.

In 1945, following the retirement of Chidester, who had followed Miss Skinner as editor, Becker was appointed editor and has held that post since.

He was one of the organizers and first commander of Massillon Post No. 221, American Legion, and is a 50-year member of Clinton Lodge, No. 47, F. & A. M. He is also a member of St. John's United Church of Christ.

Becker has had one brief experience in municipal government. He served 18 months as clerk of city council following his discharge from military service in 1919, succeeding the late Jack Donahue who had held the post for many years and who retired from the clerk's job before Becker was appointed.

Becker and his wife, Jane, reside at 1277 Stuart NW in Jackson township.

RETIREMENT ARRIVES

It's been a long time since that day in early June, 1913, when a young Massillon high school graduate made application to the late C. E. Chidester, then managing editor, for a job as a reporter in the editorial department of The Evening Independent. He landed the job at a salary of \$4 a week, believe it or not.

So that's why some 55 years later (continuous employment by the same newspaper except for 15 months overseas service during World War I) the writer today is faced with the somewhat difficult task writing something that encompasses those 55 years as briefly as possible while still stressing a few pertinent facts about the development and growth of The Evening Independent from the days when the first half of Page One was devoted to advertisements to today's publication—a family newspaper containing an ever growing amount of local and wire news, features and comics and published in a new building into which we moved more than two years ago.

This is not an editorial.

Rather it will deal with the retirement of the writer who has been editor of The Evening Independent for more than 23 years and the loyalty and dedication of all those presently employed in its daily publication—from top management on down—and particularly with members of the editorial staff who share and daily fulfill the responsibility of providing the readers of The Evening Independent with a factual account of today's happenings through well written news stories and pictures on all news fronts—local, state, national and international.

We step into retirement today with a feeling of relief—after all 55 years is a long time to have been in the employment of one organization and to have accepted advancement and its additional responsibility as it came along—but we walk into the future facing something else we find extremely difficult, just now, to name or define.

All we will say is that with patience we will adjust to the future, we hope, and perhaps find that retirement will offer something worthwhile other than an easy chair and television.

It will be a relief to be free of the daily tensions and pressures which are a part of each day's newspaper and at the end of some days make you feel as if you had been put through a wringer.

Through our 55 years with The Evening Independent we came to know many people in all walks of life—in business, industry, public office and politicians, civic and spiritual leaders and the man on the street whose friendly greeting we have cherished above all.

Many of those we have known through the years are no longer with us but their names recall fond memories and it was their cooperation and willingness to help that played a major part in any success we may have enjoyed.

Had it not been for this friendly cooperation in the early days of our newspaper career we might have been tempted to look elsewhere for employment.

And this cooperation and friendly attitude toward the editorial department has existed down through the years and along with the dedicated efforts of today's editorial staff have provided this newspaper's readers with a complete coverage of each day's happenings.

Fifty-five years ago The Evening Independent had five people on its editorial staff. Today it has 17 with additional help being employed during the summer vacation season. Likewise all other departments of the newspaper have grown in the same proportion.

We could not end this without expressing our thanks to all in the organization, from the publisher on down, for their constant cooperation and their intense desire to make each day's publication a better newspaper than the one the day before.

And again we desire to pay tribute to members of the editorial staff whose dedicated service has played a major role in making The Evening Independent the outstanding type of family newspaper it is today and who will continue to make it a better newspaper in the days to come.

It's been hard, tension-filled work, far more so than many outside a newspaper realize, but through it all it's been a lot of fun and has provided a daily excitement we know we are going to miss.

But we'll never lose our interest in The Evening Independent and will look forward to it each day to keep us abreast of what is going on. Once you have come in contact with printer's ink, they say, you'll never lose your desire for reporting or editing.

It has been a rich and rewarding experience—not rich in a monetary way—but rich and rewarding in the memories of the people we have known and worked with and the daily excitement of watching a new product

come off the presses each day, something which doesn't happen in any other business or industry anywhere.

The one thing we know we will enjoy as retirement becomes effective is that each night upon retiring we can look that old alarm clock full in the face and say:

"Brother, no longer will that silence-shattering alarm waken us at 5:30 a.m. five days a week. And should it by chance do so, your final resting place may well be the trash can."

To our successor we extend sincere best wishes and to the members of the editorial staff and all others in the newspaper's organization we extend "thanks" for your loyal cooperation and may your future, as well as that of The Evening Independent, be bright and ever moving forward to greater progress in the field of producing and publishing a successful and well accepted newspaper.

HELPING THE GOOD SAMARITAN

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill which is designed to help with one of our most troublesome problems—citizen involvement in the apprehension of criminals. We have all read reports of cases where bystanders would not come to the aid of people who were being robbed, raped, or attacked because they did not want to become involved. Probably the most famous of these cases was the Genovese case. On March 13, 1964, 38 men and women in the Kew Gardens section of New York City watched from their apartment windows while 28-year-old Kitty Genovese was stabbed to death—by an attacker who had time to leave the scene and return to finish his murderous assault—and not one of them even called the police. I for one believe that the attitude displayed in this case and others like it is reprehensible and may very well account in some measure for the rapid increase in crime in our streets.

It is easy to see why crime rises when those who are intent on pillaging and terrorizing decent citizens believe that they can carry out their evil activities without interference from ordinary citizens. Still, while the papers may carry reports of such incidents as the Genovese case, there are also many reports of people who do come to the aid of their fellow citizens being terrorized by hoodlums and gangs of young toughs. New York City gives out many medals and citations each year to people who have risked bodily harm and in many cases actually sustained injuries helping in the capture of criminals. In other words we still have many good Samaritans among us.

Unfortunately, society all too often penalizes rather than rewards the person who has the physical and moral courage to actively assist his fellow citizen who is being attacked or to assist in the capture of a person who has committed a felony. In some places he may even be sued either by the victim or the felon if his help can be construed to have abridged rights. In other places, on the other hand,

he may receive public recognition for his good deed.

But what is lacking everywhere is a rational approach to helping the good Samaritan cope with the expenses which he may subsequently incur because of his courageous and unselfish act. One of the main conclusions from a symposium held in Chicago in 1965 on the subject of good and bad Samaritans was that people who do incur extra expenses as a direct result of actions to help stop a felony or to assist in the capture of a person who has just committed, or attempted to commit, a felony should be compensated for those expenses. Unfortunately, very little has been done to carry out that eminently sensible proposal. No one can compensate an individual for the pain and suffering which his injuries produce but certainly there should not be added the worry and concern of how to meet large and unexpected medical bills. It is within our power to help with the latter.

Mr. Speaker, we have available to us a successful and readymade program which can be used to carry out to a large degree the recommendation of the Chicago symposium. The bill which I have introduced today would provide the benefits of the medicare program to meet the medical expenses of an individual who requires medical attention for the treatment of injuries sustained while attempting to stop a felony or to subdue the person or persons attempting to commit a felony. The medicare program, since it covers a wide range of medical benefits, from hospitalization to doctors' fees, is very well suited for this purpose. And the cost to the program would be so insignificant that no change in the financing provisions of the medicare program will be necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that just about every Member of this body will come to support this legislation when they see how simple and fair it is. If we are to expect more active citizen participation in the law enforcement process we must make certain that a person who does show the moral courage and concern for his fellow citizen by becoming directly involved in the prevention of a felony should at the very least be assured that his action will not leave him to face alone the medical bills arising from any injuries he may sustain during his courageous act.

THE LIFE AND DEATH OF INSTITUTIONS

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Dr. John Gardner, who served with distinction as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has recently written a wise and perceptive book entitled "No Easy Victories." One chapter is entitled "The Life and Death of Institutions." In view of the present state of procedural disrepair and the unwillingness to modernize the congressional structure I find this

particular chapter valuable in its observations about the decay of institutions. It follows:

CHAPTER VIII. THE LIFE AND DEATH OF INSTITUTIONS

Most human organizations that fall short of their goals do so not because of stupidity or faulty doctrines, but because of internal decay and rigidification. They grow stiff in the joints. They get in a rut. They go to seed.

We have all seen young organizations that are still going through the diseases of childhood. And we have all seen organizations so far gone in the rigidities of age that they ought to be pensioned off and sent to Florida to live out their days.

There is a pleasantly unpredictable quality about institutional vitality. One can't build a great institution—a great university, for example—as one would put together a prefabricated house: knowing the ingredients and simply arranging for their assembly at an appropriate time and place. Nor can one repair a second-rate or dispirited institution the way one might repair a leaky roof.

In the perspective of decades and centuries, institutional greatness is a transitory thing. The appearance of greatness is more enduring.

Reputation and tradition are effective cosmetics for the fading institution.

What is all too transitory is that fine moment when an institution is responding with vigor and relevance to the needs of its day, when its morale and vitality are high, when it holds itself to unsparing standards of performance.

Organizations go to seed when the people in them go to seed. And they awaken when the people awaken. The renewal of organizations and societies starts with people.

In recent years, most organizations have come to recognize that their continued vitality depends on aggressive recruitment of talent. But the still untapped source of human vitality, the unmined lode of talent, is in those people already recruited and thereafter neglected.

The quickest and most effective road to renewal of the federal service is the mining of that untapped resource. It is not only a means of tapping unused talent and opening up new stores of vitality; it is a solution to the old, old problem of developing a government service that is responsive to changing top leadership. Vital people, using their gifts to the full, are naturally responsive. People who have stopped growing, defeated people, people who no longer have confidence in the use of their own powers, build bastions of procedure between themselves and any vital leadership.

We like to think that institutions are shaped according to the best vision of the best men in them, and sometimes they are. Let me put that more positively: history offers many persuasive examples of just that consequence—able and vigorous men sharing a vision of how they might shape their future and creating institutions to that end. But that is not the only way that institutions get shaped. Sometimes they are simply the sum of the historical accidents that have happened to them. Like the sand dunes in the desert, they are shaped by influences but not by purposes. Like our sprawling and ugly metropolitan centers, they are the unintended consequences of millions of fragmented purposes.

At least in some measure men can shape their institutions to suit their purposes, provided that they are clear as to what those purposes are, and provided that they are not too gravely afflicted with the diseases of which institutions die—among them complacency, myopia, an unwillingness to choose,

When we talk about revitalizing a society, we tend to put exclusive emphasis on finding an unwillingness on the part of individuals to lend themselves to any worthy common purpose.

ing new ideas. But there is usually no shortage of new ideas; the problem is to get a hearing for them.

The body of custom, convention and "reputable" standards exercises such an oppressive effect on creative minds that new developments in a field often originate outside the area of respectable practice. The break with traditional art was not fostered within the academy. Jazz did not spring from the bosom of the respectable music world. The land-grant colleges, possibly the most impressive innovation in the history of American higher education, did not spring from the inner circle of higher education as it then existed. Motels, the most significant development of this generation in innkeeping, were at first regarded with scorn by reputable hotel people.

Professions are subject to the same deadening forces that afflict all other human institutions: an attachment to time-honored ways, reverence for established procedures, a preoccupation with one's own vested interests, and an excessively narrow definition of what is relevant and important.

Self-congratulation should be taken in small doses. It is habit-forming, and most human institutions are far gone in addiction.

Most ailing organizations have developed a functional blindness to their own defects. They are not suffering because they can't solve their problems but because they won't see their problems. They can look straight at their faults and rationalize them as virtues or necessities.

I would lay it down as a basic principle of human organization that the individuals who hold the reins of power in any enterprise cannot trust themselves to be adequately self-critical. For those in power the danger of self-deception is very great, the danger of failing to see the problems or refusing to see them is ever-present. And the only protection is to create an atmosphere in which anyone can speak up. The most enlightened top executives are well aware of this. But I don't need to tell those readers who are below the loftiest level of management that even with enlightened executives a certain amount of prudence is useful. The Turks have a proverb that says, "The man who tells the truth should have one foot in the stirrup."

Perhaps the most important characteristic of an ever-renewing system is that it has built-in provisions for vigorous criticism. It protects the dissenter and the nonconformist. It knows that from the ranks of the critics come not only cranks and troublemakers but saviors and innovators. And since the spirit that welcomes nonconformity is fragile, the ever-renewing society does not depend on that spirit alone. It devises explicit legal and constitutional arrangements to protect the critic.

Why be so considerate of dissent and criticism? To answer that question is to state one of the strongest tenets of our political philosophy. We do not expect organizations or societies to be above criticism, nor do we trust the men who run them to be adequately self-critical. We believe that even those aspects of a society that are healthy today may deteriorate tomorrow. We believe that power wielded justly today may be wielded corruptly tomorrow.

The traditionalist believes that foolishness frozen into custom is preferable to foolishness fresh off the vine. And in some respects he is right.

We are always corrupting the old symbols, drifting away from the old truths. Give us a clean, clear, fresh idea or ideal and we can guarantee, within one generation, to render it positively moldy. And I don't mean health-giving penicillin mold. I mean the strictly nontherapeutic, nonnutritive mold of habit, apathy, complacency and lip service. We smother our values in ritual and encrust them with social observances which rapidly

Most organizations have a structure that was designed to solve problems that no longer exist.

An organization must have some means of combating the process by which men become prisoners of their procedures. The rule book grows fatter as the ideas grow fewer. Almost every well-established organization is a coral reef of procedures that were laid down to achieve some long-forgotten objective.

As a society becomes more concerned with precedent and custom, it comes to care more about *how* things are done and less about *whether* they are done. The man who wins acclaim is not the one who "gets things done" but the one who has an ingrained knowledge of the rules and accepted practices. Whether he accomplishes anything is less important than whether he conducts himself in an "appropriate" manner.

There are plenty of old pros who use their skill and experience to block progress rather than advance it. The phrase "vested interests" has been associated with individuals or organizations of wealth and power, but the vested interests of workers may be as strong as those of the top executives. In any society many established ways of doing things are held in place not by logic nor even by habit, but by the enormous restraining force of vested interests. In an organization certain things remain unchanged for the simple reason that changing them would jeopardize the rights, privileges and advantages of specific individuals—perhaps the president, perhaps the maintenance men.

The vast, leaden weight of vested interest is everywhere—in the building codes that block renewal of the construction industry, in the featherbedding rules of union contracts, in the departmental structure of our universities, in the military services, in the functioning of Congress. No one has ever found a sure way to combat such vested interests.

Whenever a reorganization is proposed, some people object because they have become inseparably attached to old arrangements. I advise against all such attachments. Put your faith in ideas, ideals, movements, goals. Don't put your faith in organizational forms. Human beings are forever building the church and killing the creed. They give such loving attention to organizational forms that the spirit is imprisoned.

Every society must for its own good celebrate the qualities it values most highly and ceremonially recognize the men and women who embody those qualities.

When a top executive is selecting his key associates, there are only two qualities for which he should be willing to pay almost any price—taste and judgment. Almost everything else can be bought by the yard.

Everyone wants the government to be bold and imaginative and infallible—all at the same time. It will never happen.

Is the federal government bureaucratic? It is, indeed! But so are business firms, universities, the military services, state and local governments and philanthropic organizations.

Is the federal government in danger of going to seed? It is in the gravest danger! But so are all other organizations, large and small.

There is no excuse for government to lose out in the competition for talent. It has a built-in advantage over every other employer. The cynics would deny this, but the truth is that talented people are attracted to government because it gives them an opportunity to render service to the entire nation. They come with the highest motives. They leave when their purpose is thwarted or when they begin to feel trapped. Government cannot afford to be inhospitable to such people.

One may argue, as Toynbee does, that a society needs challenge. It is true. But societies differ notably in their capacity to see

the challenge that exists. No society has ever so mastered the environment and itself that no challenge remained, but a good many have gone to sleep because they failed to understand the challenge that was undeniably there.

SUBSIDY HUNTING SWOOPING DOWN ON WASHINGTON

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, the House of Representatives adopted an amendment, which I had proposed, to limit the total farm subsidy payments to a maximum of \$20,000 for any one farmer or farm organization. I repeat today what I had stated then that, "The adoption of this amendment is a great victory for the American taxpayer," and I might add—to the small farmer whom the program was originally meant to assist.

Until my amendment becomes law, these programs will continue to operate in almost an opposite manner—providing substantial benefits to large farmers and well-to-do concerns.

The House bill has gone to conference with the Senate which has approved a 4-year extension of the program without any restriction on the payments. I urge my colleagues to resist any efforts to pass the bill without this restricting amendment.

In a recent article from the Sunday New York Times, September 8, 1968, the entire Federal subsidy program was brought under attack, demonstrating the widespread public support for a more equitable and effective farm subsidy program. Most significant of all, the article points out that the American Farm Bureau Federation, whose 1.75 million members make it the largest group of its kind in the Nation, would have the payments and, because in their opinion, the subsidies perpetuate rural poverty by serving to keep uneconomic farm units functioning.

A complete text of the article follows:

SUBSIDY HUNTERS SWOOPING DOWN ON WASHINGTON

(By H. J. Maidenberg)

WASHINGTON.—A lameduck Administration is still capable of laying golden eggs.

This does not have to be impressed upon the hordes of Federal subsidy hunters and other favor seekers presently gathering in the capital to redeem old campaign pledges or arrange new ones.

Strong in the traditional belief that outgoing Administrations and Congresses are sitting ducks for their private interests, they believe Washington is the place to be today.

The halls of Government are thick with those who would have public funds go increasingly to a dwindling number of farmers, whether the recipients want them or not, and many don't.

Pleaders will be arguing that rural electric cooperatives should continue to be eligible for public funds at 2 per cent a year interest, while private utilities pay the going money market rate of 6 or 7 per cent.

PLEA FOR LOW RATE

Shipbuilders, shipping, aviation and railroad concerns and a multitude of other interests will press for further subsidies or new "programs."

And lost in the confusing last days of this Congress and Administration will be the granting of many new subsidies and favors whose cost will not be tabulated for years. This is because many of the figures will be buried in over-all budgets of Federal agencies handling the specific programs.

What is known today is the cost of subsidies to private industries that were granted years ago, even if the blurred figures are often subject to a debate.

Economists in and out of Government as well as Administration officials and Congressmen describe the nation's subsidy programs as a bewildering morass of legislation piled layer upon layer over the years.

However, the realities of political life here precluded those interviewed from allowing their names to be mentioned.

It is estimated that direct Federal payments subsidies to private industry total \$6-billion a year, and rarely show any indication of declining. The figure equals the cut in Federal spending requested recently by President Johnson to reduce the budget deficit of \$8-billion to \$10-billion forecast for this fiscal year.

COTTON AND SUGAR

Put another way, the \$6-billion in subsidies payments are almost four times the Federal budget for the anti-poverty programs administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Last year, for example, payments to cotton planters alone totaled \$935-million, compared with the antipoverty allocation of \$1.75-billion. The Government spent more than \$500-million to keep 45,000 domestic sugar producers' net income at \$200 million—and raw sugar prices three times the world level.

Substantial subsidy payments are received by tobacco and peanut growers as well. Overall, agricultural subsidies cost the Government almost \$4-billion a year in direct payments through a variety of schemes. This figure does not include money spent by the Department of Agriculture in aiding farmers in many other ways.

Oddly, three large sectors of the farm industry do not receive direct benefits at all. They are the fruit, vegetable and cattle raisers. And those who do receive the payments are unhappy with the subsidies. The American Farm Bureau Federation, whose 1.75 million members make it the largest group of its kind in the nation, would have the payments end.

The Farm Bureau says the subsidies perpetuate rural poverty by serving to keep uneconomic farm units functioning. The payments are said to undermine initiative, and innovation by farmers and quality of crops, except where the program's incentive encourages the production of unwanted surpluses such as in peanuts, to mention just one often-criticized sector.

Specifically, the Farm Bureau's officials interviewed here recently cited the sugar, cotton and tobacco subsidy programs as "dead losses," and considered the other agricultural payments schemes little better.

LIMITED BENEFITS

A Farm Bureau economist observed, "While antipoverty people struggle to get funds, the Government spends more than \$500-million a year to help a handful of sugar growers, most of them large operators in Hawaii and Florida, keep their raw sugar prices above 6 cents a pound. Meantime, many foreign lands receiving United States aid would love to sell the sugar for half that price. The world sugar price, by the way, is less than 2 cents a pound."

But the "handful" of sugar producers is growing. Beet sugar, which is indistinguishable from cane, is now grown in 30 states. A few years ago, only about four or five states had beet sugar operations—and that was before synthetic sweeteners began increasing their hold on the market.

With the growth of beet sugar production around the nation it is considered highly unlikely that the sugar subsidy payments will be reduced because more and more Congressmen have become interested in protecting their local producers.

The Farm Bureau maintains that the cotton payments were started to aid Southern farmers with wornout soil to earn a living. Today, the cotton belt has shifted to Arizona and California, where vast irrigated operations produce as much as three times the bale-an-acre raised in most Southern areas.

SOME NOT APPARENT

Incidentally, not all subsidies are easily identifiable. For example, southern California cotton operators pay about \$20 an acre foot for water, while commercial and other property owners in Los Angeles pay \$70 for a quantity of water that covers one acre to the depth of one foot.

One economist here estimated that if indirect subsidies such as the oil depletion allowance, tariff protection laws and the like were included, the total would exceed \$8.5-billion a year.

In any event, farm subsidies are but one aspect of Federal bounties to selected industries.

The nation's airlines receive the benefits of the \$600-million-a-year Federal air traffic control systems, the \$1-billion spent on commercial airport construction grants and, in some cases, direct subsidies to feeder lines affiliated with their operations. It is estimated that commercial aviation receives directly or indirectly about \$750-million of the Federal Aviation Administration's budget of \$800-million a year.

In fact, considerable military money aids industry through the maintenance of inland waterways, research and related projects as well as direct purchases of billions in goods and services.

Private shipping lines receive \$200-million a year in direct payments, and domestic shipbuilders get more than \$100-million. Other benefits abound. Foreign ships are not permitted to carry freight between United States ports. And any wage increases awarded unionized seamen are usually converted into higher subsidies.

Other benefits consist of having the bulk of foreign-aid shipments go in domestic bottoms. Government personnel are often required to use private ships on part of their travels.

It is estimated that it costs American taxpayers roughly \$7,000 a year to support each merchant marine job.

Almost two generations ago, the Government formed the Rural Electrification Administration to bring power to areas that private utilities deemed uneconomic. The R.E.A. cooperatives were granted the right to borrow money—the largest cost factor for a utility is borrowed funds—from the Government at 2 per cent a year.

Today, most R.E.A. co-ops have become wealthy competitors to private utilities and reportedly have liquid assets of more than \$700-million in savings and loan associations, and other investments. Private utilities pay 6 or 7 per cent for money in today's market. R.E.A. co-ops may still borrow money for which the Government pays its creditors 5 per cent or more—at 2 per cent.

COST ESTIMATED

The cost of the R.E.A. program is estimated at between \$250-million and \$300-million a year, including Federal costs of low-interest loans. Some R.E.A. co-ops have become partners to private utilities, often welcomed because of their wealth and borrowing power.

Government and private economists here are hard pressed to find a dollar figure of benefits to industries from such diverse Federal works as dredging rivers to aid barge lines, water resources development for agri-

culture and grants for research to private industry, to name a few items in the budget.

Defenders of Federal direct subsidies are not limited to grateful Congressmen. Many economists believe that ending subsidies in agriculture would create havoc; that the merchant marine and shipbuilders would be out of business overnight and unavailable in case of national emergencies.

Although few seem pleased with the methods of applying subsidies, the industries receiving them, including the strongest advocates of free enterprise, doubt whether the present systems of institutionalized Federal handouts could be abandoned without bringing down the whole economic house. And many critics of subsidies find it hard to disagree. What the critics seek is reform of the subsidies system to make it conform to market conditions.

The same reasoning is being offered increasingly by industries that have found free enterprise a bit taxing.

BUILDING AID SOUGHT

Presently, there are many in the building construction industry who believe Federal interest-rate subsidies or outright grants are needed to overcome the slowdown in home building caused by the high cost of mortgage money.

Washington is full of cynics who believe commuter railway and bus lines in several large cities are deliberately ruining their services preparatory to seeking new or expanded subsidies.

The insurance industry, the only major one not regulated by the Government, is busily discussing various approaches to Federal aid to cope with losses from civil disturbances mounting highway accidents and other perils they underwrite.

Here, again, many believe that if enough policies are canceled or new business rejected, the Government may be forced to devise some form of reinsurance compensation.

The list of those seeking new or expanded subsidies appears limitless.

But despite the trend, efforts are made by Congress from time to time to slow the race to the Treasury's trough. There is a bill in Congress now to limit subsidy payments to \$20,000 a year for each claimant. Its passage seems doubtful, however, in this election year.

This does not mean that all is rosy for the Federal money seekers. Quite the contrary. For one thing, the political scene is far from clear, an unsettling situation for any lobbyist.

Secondly, money is tight in Washington and agents of industry, education and other interests must keep an alert eye on those who would reduce their share of the pie in favor of others.

True, they can depend on the vast army of civil servants who make careers here by administering subsidy and other programs. They are considered the implacable foes of anyone who would terminate even the most unneeded or unwanted Federal project.

Finally, the capital is also being invested by countless numbers seeking any financial help they can get for their communities, universities, and myriad other purposes.

All Congressmen are being bowed by the pressures of constituents seeking funds for schools, urban renewal and myriad other purposes. Often, smaller colleges, for example, that do not maintain agents in the capital lose out on available Federal money. This is because many programs exist unknown to all but a handful of money hunters.

LIST COMPILED

To bridge this information gap, Representative William V. Roth, Republican of Delaware, and his staff recently spent eight months compiling an admittedly incomplete list of Federal subsidies and other grants available to industry, nonprofit institutions and individuals.

His findings took up 151 pages of fine print in the Congressional Record of last June 25. Furthermore, Representative Roth has introduced two bills in Congress, which have growing bipartisan support, to facilitate the ferreting out of Federal money.

One bill, the Program Information Act, would have the Government "provide full and meaningful reports on available funds," he said the other day. "At present, schools, social-work agencies and others back home don't know what they are missing in the way of existing Federal programs, many of which were passed years ago and forgotten, except to professional money searchers."

The other measure would create a "Commission for the Improvement of Government Management and Organization" to study, among other things, the relationship between Federal and state governments to better utilize public funds, and examine the effectiveness of existing payments programs. "We should know," Representative Roth said, "what we have on the books and how best to handle it."

At present, he said, most information about these programs comes from the agencies administering them—and "all have a vested interest in keeping the programs going on and on, regardless of effectiveness."

Commenting on farm subsidies, the freshman Congressman observed, "Some are needed to prevent chaos. Others have outgrown their usefulness, and all should be modernized regularly, not just passed and forgotten."

One program that has yet to be discussed during these confusing days in Washington are subsidies for enterprising persons interested in growing tea and coffee in hot houses.

EXPLODING THE MYTH ABOUT AIRLINE SAFETY

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, recent plane accidents and near accidents point up the urgent need for action—positive action—in dealing with this pressing problem of safety in the air. The National Police Gazette—November issue—has a very interesting article which I recommend to this House for its consideration:

EXPLODING THE MYTH ABOUT AIRLINE SAFETY
(By Harvey Wilson)

You can forget all those airline commercials that talk about the in-flight movies, the delicious food, the free drinks, and the curvy stewardesses. The truth is, that flying today is more dangerous than ever. And instead of getting better, it's getting worse.

Decrepit runways, outmoded airports, new noise abatement regulations, overloaded planes and the fact that no one seems to be interested in safety research all contribute to the fact that when you fly today you are literally taking your life in your hands.

ONE HUNDRED AND TEN MILLION PASSENGERS
The Civil Aeronautics Board told the *Police Gazette* that our domestic airlines alone carried almost 110 million passengers last year. The CAB predicts that by 1975 three times that number will be flying every year.

What that means to you is that it will be three times as dangerous to board a plane then as it is now, unless someone—the government, the industry itself, or the public—demands a whole new approach to the problem of safety in the air.

To anyone who's ever sat with clammy hands and pounding heart through a rough flight, that possibility is terrifying.

Already, statistical facts prove that people who fly run a 30 per cent greater risk of being killed than those who drive.

The main problem is money. No one wants to spend it.

A confidential report dated May 1966, prepared for the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Studies, said flatly:

"Money spent by the government for airplane safety research is very small compared with other aspects of aeronautical research and development."

Right now, only 10 per cent of all the money that the government appropriates for aviation goes to improve safety conditions either in the air or on the ground.

Where does the other 90 per cent go? It is mainly used to subsidize private airplane manufacturers who are concerned mainly with increasing the capacity of passenger planes.

Even when research experts do develop proven safety measures they are not always used. The Federal Aviation Agency, for example, has known for years how to improve seats, survival equipment and evacuation procedures which can save lives and minimize injuries.

It has also been aware for a long time of a device that will all but eliminate fires, the number one cause of airplane deaths.

But none of these devices has been installed, largely because the FAA doesn't require them. Why? One high ranking agency member told the *Police Gazette*: "Such measures are too expensive."

Think about that the next time you fly.

The federal government isn't alone in its indifference. Local government, which builds and operates most airports isn't any better.

That's why all but a few major fields in this country are second rate and hazardous. Most of them are outdated before they are ever completed, the runways too short for today's big jets, the approach patterns a lethal maze that result in hundreds of nearly missed collisions that the public rarely ever hears about.

A survey of airline pilots by the *Police Gazette* turned up these airports as the least favorable in the industry:

Norfolk, Va., Pensacola, Fla., New Orleans, Cincinnati, San Diego, Seattle, San Francisco, Kansas City, Mo., and both of New York's airports, La Guardia and John F. Kennedy, both of which have a long and tragic history of airline disasters that have taken literally thousands of lives over the years.

REASONS FOR FEAR

The reasons for the pilots' mistrust, and in some cases sheer dread, of these airports differs of course.

They consider the Norfolk airport bad because it is a typical example of bad planning. It was built in the age before jets on the site of an old golf course, between two lakes that make approaches exceedingly difficult.

Kansas City is a nightmare of rivers, bridges and tall buildings. The San Francisco field has, of course a severe fog problem.

New York's biggest problem, aside from the volume of air traffic and a surplus of approach problems, has been noise abatement procedures. Those regulations put tight restrictions on the number of runways that can be used, flight patterns, and the amount of power in climbing to cruising altitude.

This may make life in the houses below much pleasanter but it isn't doing much for your safety on board any large jet. Here's why:

Any pilot will tell you that takeoffs and landings are some 30 per cent more dangerous than any other aspect of your flight.

A large jet actually leaves the ground at

a rate of speed somewhere around 200 miles an hour. In order to fulfill noise abatement procedures at most airports, the plane must make a twenty degree turn to the left at an altitude of only 300 feet.

At that height, such a turn must be done at an air speed very close to the speed required just to keep the plane in the air. If the plane should stall, there is absolutely no chance of recovery.

As if that weren't bad enough, the pilot is required by law to actually reduce his speed to cut the noise of the powerful jet engines, regardless of the chances he is taking with the lives of his passengers and crew.

UNNECESSARY RISKS

While the FAA insists that it will not approve noise abatement plans that affect the safety of planes and passengers, the fact is that five years ago, if a pilot had gone through all the tricky maneuvers now required to cut noise he would have risked failing his flight check and losing his pilot's license.

And, in case you're wondering whether many pilots, to avoid the hazardous procedures of noise abatement, simply don't bother to cut back their engines, the answer is, they don't. They can't because most of the larger airports have elaborate equipment that would disclose just such a maneuver.

Most pilots agree that the problem of noise, like everything else about modern flying, is going to get worse before it gets better. With big, new jets that can carry as many as 180 or more passengers, the noise is going to be even louder.

The answer, they say, lies not in daredevil flying but in scientific research that could find a way to muffle the roar of airplane engines.

Another solution would be to build the airports of tomorrow outside of the residential areas where most of them now lie and shuttle passengers by rail or road to their destinations. Longer? Yes, but much safer.

Safer not only because of the noise abatement solution, but also because the airports themselves, with longer runways and better approaches with the obstacles of tall buildings, industrial smog and weather all removed, would be safer.

But long range planning has never been a strong point of the airlines industry, which is selling glamor, not safety, to its unsuspecting customers.

Take the problem of midair collisions. Last year, more than 500 near misses were reported by pilots though the figure is probably twice that since many are afraid to risk their reputations by reporting a near collision.

If all 500 near misses were actual collisions, involving 1,000 planes, as many as 100,000 passengers and crew members could have died. Nothing has been done about avoiding this hazard.

Commercial air traffic in this country is controlled from the ground, with airliners being passed from one ground control station to another as they cross the country.

Depending on their capabilities as planes and their destinations, they fly at different altitudes, in layers, so to speak.

Rarely do they come within 2,000 vertical feet of each other. But that isn't the problem. On a foggy night or bad weather, air traffic backs up over any major airport in the country so that often it just isn't possible to keep them that far apart.

Most of the near misses involving commercial planes occur with just such traffic.

Again, the pilots say, the federal government should require anyone who owns his own plane to equip it with electronic collision warning devices.

Another thing they want is a complete overhaul of existing flight patterns to cope with the tremendous volume of air traffic.

So far, no one has done much about taking responsibility for such a step.

Apparently, in the long run; it's cheaper to pay insurance claims and go on selling glamor instead of safety on the theory that what the passenger doesn't know won't hurt him, even if it may kill him.

SALUTE TO A FINE NEWS DIRECTOR

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be personally acquainted with the news director of one of Cleveland's larger radio stations, Bob Campbell. His excellent news reporting has gained for the station national recognition, and for himself great respect among his fellow newsmen.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer chose to comment upon his ability, and I commend the article which appeared in the September 8 issue to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

INVOLVEMENT IN NEWS IS KEY FOR WERE'S BOB CAMPBELL

(By Raymond P. Hart)

What's next for Bob Campbell, WERE news director?

That is a logical question to ask about the bass-voiced radio newsmen who believes in getting involved in the news.

In fact, helping make news—or at least helping it along—is turning into his specialty.

The majority of the stories he has covered, of course, occurred without his helping hand. But he was right in the middle reporting the action.

Campbell, 49, brings a varied show business career and news background into his reporting and believes "it has helped to produce a better news show."

His regular beat is anchoring WERE's "Info" news and information block aired weekdays from 4 to 7:30 p.m. He's made quite an impact since he joined the station 11 months ago.

"I like to believe I'm a communicator rather than a reporter," Campbell stated, "and in communicating you have to become involved—when there is time and the circumstances permit it."

Campbell's theory have paid off handsomely for WERE. It has one of the smaller news staffs among the large Cleveland radio stations, but does a fine job of presenting news—content and style-wise.

Involvement was the key to the station's "Operation: Pork Chop" last April in which 60 tons of pork were distributed to Cleveland welfare recipients.

The involvement started when Campbell notice a three-line news wire story revealing the fact that the National Farmers Organization was threatening to bury 1,000 hogs unless the price they were paid for pork was raised.

It took a week for Campbell to arrange to get the pork dressed and packaged. A week later, it was parceled out by white farmers to persons on welfare, including many Negroes.

"That was the most rewarding story in which I have ever been involved, especially considering it came to a fitting climax on the day after Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was assassinated," Campbell said.

As a result of his NFO involvement Campbell has been asked to address the organiza-

tion's annual convention in Wapakoneta. He will do so on Saturday.

A story in which there was no time for planned involvement but hard news to report was the police-shooting incident in Glenville in July.

Campbell and WERE newsmen Bob Eastman were savoring steaks at the Campbells when a phone call alerted them of the tragedy. Tape recorder in tow, they went to the scene.

After phoning in several reports, Campbell ducked down beside a police car when occupants of a moving auto were blazing away. A bullet evidently bounced off the hood of the shield car and Bob's forehead was creased.

Helped into a nearby alley, he was pinned down by gunfire for an hour. When police permitted him to emerge, he went on reporting the story, giving one of the first accounts of what actually was believed to have triggered the incident.

When the situation had cooled, he went to a hospital where x-rays showed he had suffered a "routine fracture."

Despite the wound, Campbell went back to the station to air more local reports, then did 14 network feeds to CBS and reports to 25 stations in the U.S., Canada, Puerto Rico and Bogota, Colombia.

He went 67 hours without sleep.

Campbell is used to appearing before the public, in one way or another. At age 4, he sang and played violin on the old Keith vaudeville circuit in New York. He continued on the circuit until 1930 when he, his late father, Les, and twin brothers, Dee and Duane, formed a quartet.

They sang on radio, recorded and toured the Midwest until 1949 when the quartet was disbanded.

Bob began his radio career in 1936 in South Bend, Ind., as a staff announcer and writer. He has been a newsmen, announcer, producer, disc jockey and general manager in the ensuing years in many cities.

"My first love is news, although for quite a while, I couldn't seem to stay in that field," he said.

His radio memories include filling in for the regular announcer on a man-in-the-street program in South Bend. "I asked a fellow how he liked our sponsor's bread and he told me—it was soggy."

Campbell also has performed on television. He was the first person employed by WHIO-TV in Dayton, his hometown. He had a kiddie show, "but I never could make it as a TV cowboy host because I couldn't master a Texas accent," he said.

He went on to become the first executive director of the Dayton Educational Television Foundation.

Bob and his wife, Alberta, reside in Cleveland Heights. Married 25 years, they have a married son, Doug, 21.

"WERE has been fortunate in obtaining the talents of a dedicated and in-depth reporter like Bob," according to Harry Dennis, station manager. "He will be doing even more specialized news projects in the near future."

Humorous when the situation calls for it, Campbell also is serious at the appropriate time. Concerning coverage by the news media of the recent Democratic National Convention in Chicago, he said:

"Many of the newsmen were unwittingly guilty of taking the easy way of reporting what was presented to them by those who had a particular axe to grind.

"Perhaps much of this was due to the fact that there was so much to cover over such a wide area. But I believe that Mayor (Richard) Daley made somewhat more than a small point when he criticized newsmen for telling part of the story rather than all of the story.

"In broadcasting, time is important. But there are times when I would rather be late and accurate, than first and biased."

POLISH HEROISM REMEMBERED: 285TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RELIEF OF VIENNA

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the fast-paced national and international developments of the present, it is all too easy to overlook the monuments of the past. But, in the wake of the free, rising in Czechoslovakia, there is an anniversary of special relevance which we should not fail to observe.

For, 285 years ago today, another people struck a blow for freedom in Eastern Europe when Jan Sobieski, one of Poland's greatest rulers, led an army of volunteers to the relief of Vienna, besieged by a savage horde of over 200,000 Turks, Tartars, and Moslem fanatics.

At the head of the Turkish force was Kara Mustafa, Grand Vizier of the Ottoman Empire. His magnificent camp, strewn with booty, lavish quarters, harem women, and the corpses of Christian victims, sprawled out before the crumbling ramparts of Vienna.

By September, it was only a matter of time before the walls would be completely breached, and the Janissaries, striking force of the Ottoman Army, would pour into the beleaguered city, spreading death, rapine, and arson.

Emperor Leopold had already fled his capital, and watched, trembling, from afar. His Austrian Army was helpless in the face of the Turks and retreated before them.

The fate of Vienna seemed to be sealed. And, if Vienna had fallen, as Voltaire observed, nothing would have stood between the Turks and the Rhine.

Fortunately, the trying times had produced a leader equal to their challenge. Jan Sobieski, the elected King of Poland had already earned his reputation fighting against the Turks in the Ukraine. He was the one man they feared.

Now, placing the interest of Western civilization above his personal ambitions and national interests, he led Europe's last great crusade.

At the head of an army of princes and commoners drawn from every corner of Europe, Jan Sobieski marched to the relief of Vienna.

Bavarians, Saxons, Frenchmen, and Italians joined together for a common purpose. The most splendid troops of them all were the Polish Winged Hussars—last of the great armored cavalrymen.

When the relieving army streamed down from the hills of Kahlenburg to face the Turks, it was the Polish Winged Hussars, charging in glittering formation, who led the attack and earned the greatest share of glory.

The Turks were routed. The city was saved.

To the tolling of church bells, the gates of Vienna were thrown open to Jan Sobieski, King of Poland.

He was greeted by thousands of grateful citizens, for he came, not as a con-

queror, but as a liberator. History knows few such examples.

Nearly three centuries have passed since September 12, 1683. The memory of man is short, and his gratitude even more so. Before 100 years had passed, the same countries Jan Sobieski had led to triumph in 1683 had turned on his native Poland and torn her to pieces.

But even in the darkest days of occupation and persecution, under the heel of Germans, Austrians or Russians, the Polish people have kept alive the spirit and the resolution which Jan Sobieski personified.

And that makes this anniversary worth observing.

It is also ironic, Mr. Speaker, that the Soviet-imposed Communist dictators who continue to misrule Poland and deprive its people of fundamental freedom participated in the Soviet military invasion of Czechoslovakia. The participation by the Polish Communist government is in complete contradiction to the wishes of the Polish people and is in direct contrast to the great contribution of King Jan Sobieski to the cause of freedom in Europe.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON ADDRESSES B'NAI B'RITH

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, President Johnson addressed the 125th anniversary meeting of B'nai B'rith, here in Washington. In his remarks, the President discussed the serious threats to world peace that presently exist in Eastern Europe and in the Middle East.

The President reviewed the history of conflict that has surrounded the State of Israel since its founding, and he reaffirmed America's commitment to the principle that each nation's right to exist must be recognized by all other nations in the area.

In elaboration, he said:

It is clear, however, that a return to the situation of June 4, 1967, will not bring peace. There must be secure, and there must be recognized, borders.

In summary, the President's remarks were thoughtful, compassionate, and balanced.

Under unanimous consent I submit the text of his speech for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY MEETING OF B'NAI B'RITH, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 10, 1968

Dr. Wexler, my delightful friend Deputy Prime Minister Allon, Members of the Diplomatic Corps, Members of the Cabinet, Distinguished Members of the Congress, Reverend Clergy, and my fellow Americans:

In a time of troubles, I am glad to be with those who have known trouble, and who still treasure the spirit of man.

The proverb says, "A friend loveth at all times and a brother is born for adversity."

You have been my friends, and some of you have been like brothers to me.

So in the words of the proverb, we were born for these times.

Adversity is in the air that we breathe. The tanks have rolled again in Europe. The virus of anti-Semitism threatens again to infect nations which should have learned its awful lessons a generation ago.

The road to peace in Southeast Asia is long and hard. The fires of unreasoning hostility tonight burn in the Middle East. Democracy in our own country, Mr. Prime Minister, and elsewhere, seems to be beset by the extremists of the right and the left.

In such a time, it is quite fashionable to despair over our prospects. To some people the events of 1968 prove that there never can be a peaceful accommodation between nations, or between races, or, indeed, between generations.

To others, the solution lies in a radical change of policy. Exactly what is never quite said, except that it just must be radical.

I can assure my friends that I am not in the least complacent about these events. There have been a great many charges, complaints—columnists and commentators have made observations and laid them at my door during these past five years, as some of you have observed. But I do not think that complacency has ever been among any of them.

But if I am not complacent, neither do I despair. For I believe that the great American people face the adversities of 1968 far stronger, far wiser, than any people before them, including their fathers and their grandfathers.

Their strength comes from an economy that has provided more jobs, more employment, and more profit than any economy in human history. It comes also from a moral commitment to eliminate racism and injustice, and to eliminate it from the face of this earth that we live on.

Their wisdom comes from the experience of three decades which have taught them that appeasement—appeasement—does not yield peace; that they cannot be secure in this country if there is not security in other countries, if they, in their cowardice of the moment, turn their backs on free men; and they cannot protect themselves behind a wall of affluence from the tumult of a world that is raging with want and disease.

This knowledge, which all Americans have gained at a very heavy cost, is a priceless asset in meeting the adversities of today and, surely, those that lie ahead.

So tonight I want to speak to you as I spoke earlier this afternoon in New Orleans, Louisiana, about the quest for peace—specifically, about conditions in Eastern Europe and the Middle East that really quite threaten the peace, and also what I believe must be done to change those conditions.

The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia just a few days ago has set back the course of peace. It rejects the very idea that better understanding and more human contacts—and a relaxation of tensions—can lead to more peaceful ways of coexistence on this small and yet this very dangerous planet.

We hope—and we shall strive—to make this setback a very temporary one. But I assure you that will not be easy. It will require calm determination on the part of us and on the part of all of our allies. It will also require the considered second thoughts of those who lead the Soviet Union.

These men, who bear with us the terrifying responsibility of an immense military power, must come to realize that the ideals of peaceful men and women just cannot be smashed by force. They must come to understand that peace—peace based on respect for human dignity—offers to all people, including their own people, the only real hope for security in the world.

Some leaders of Eastern Europe have sought to indict those of Jewish faith for spreading ideas of freedom among their peo-

ple. Well, this is shocking, not only because it is a very thin disguise for anti-Semitism, but because it really suggests that freedom is the cause and the passion of just one people alone.

So tonight let there be no doubt in anyone's mind about who cares for freedom. Mankind itself cares.

We have worked now for more than 20 years not only to protect Western Europe, but to try to promote a peaceful understanding with the countries of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

It was nearly two years ago that I proposed a series of European initiatives. I hoped to achieve better understanding with our allies. I hoped to have more and freer exchanges with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, because only through such improvement of the political atmosphere, as I stated then, could we ever truly hope for peace in Europe, a coming together of Germany and a healing of the deep wounds across the entire face of Europe.

We have taken in this country a series of important steps in that direction. Last June I proposed to the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe a program of balanced and mutual force reductions. We had made somewhat similar proposals to the Soviet Union alone during the very first month that I occupied the Presidency.

Our offer threatens no legitimate interest of any state. It rests on the respect for the equal rights of all states to their territorial integrity and to their political independence.

In the discussions that we have proposed for the reduction of tension in Europe, no topic whatever would be barred from those discussions. These proposals represent the only sound approach to the problems of peace and security in Europe. All of these proposals have been rebuffed for the moment.

The leaders of the Soviet Union seem to have decided that a movement toward a humane version of communism in a small, friendly country is a threat to their security, despite the fact that the Czechs remain their ally in the Warsaw Pact.

So new military and political risks have now arisen from this aggressive act which demand ever closer cooperation among the Western allies. For our part, I made it unmistakably clear that the use of force, and the threat of force, will not be tolerated in areas of our common responsibility like Berlin, because the use of force generates fears and stimulates passions whose consequences no man can predict or control.

As I said the other day in San Antonio, let no one unleash the dogs of war. Europe has suffered enough—enough in this century.

The Soviet Union tonight can still return to the only road that really can lead to peace and security for us all. That is the road of reducing tension, of enlarging the area of understanding and agreement. It can still change—if not undo—what it has done in Czechoslovakia. It can still act there and can act elsewhere with the prudence and the confidence which characterize the conduct of any great nation—because it is never too late to choose the path of reason.

Every man of sanity will hope that the Soviets will act now before some new turn of events throws the world back to the grim confrontations of Mr. Stalin's time.

Now let me turn to the Middle East. That is an area of deep national interest to the American people, to all of our people, for the safety and the future of small nations are not the concern of one group of citizens alone.

To you tonight, I assure you they concern all Americans.

Our society is illuminated by the spiritual insights of the Hebrew prophets. America and Israel have a common love of human freedom, and they have a common faith in a democratic way of life.

It is quite natural that American Jews should feel particularly involved with Is-

rael's destiny. That small land in the Eastern Mediterranean saw the birth of your faith and your people thousands and thousands of years ago. Down through the centuries, through dispersion and through very grievous trials, your forefathers cling to their Jewish identity and clung to their ties with the land of Israel.

As the prophet Isaiah foretold—"And He shall set up an ensign for the nations, and He shall assemble the outcasts of Israel and gather together the dispersed of Judah from all the four corners of the earth." History knows no more moving example of persistence against the cruelest odds.

But conflict has surrounded the modern state of Israel since its very beginning. It is now more than a year that has passed since the 6-day war between Israel and its neighbors—a tragic and an unnecessary war which we tried in every way we could to prevent. That war was the third round of major hostilities in the Middle East since the United Nations established Israel just 21 years ago—the third round—and it just must be the last round.

From the day that war broke out, our policy, the policy of this Government, has been to work in every capital, to labor in the United Nations, to convert the armistice arrangements of 1949 into a stable and agreed regime of peace. The time has come for real peace in the area—a peace of justice and reconciliation, not a cease fire, not a temporary truce, not a renewal of the fragile armistice. No day has passed since then without our taking active steps to try to achieve this end.

The atmosphere of fear and mutual suspicion has made communication between the two sides extremely difficult. In this setting, the plans of reasonable men, both Arabs and Israelis—have been frustrated. Despite the patient and perceptive efforts of Ambassador Jarring, little real progress towards peace has been made.

I am convinced that a just and a dignified peace, a peace fair to the rightful interests of both sides, is possible. Without it, the people of the Middle East cannot shape their own destinies, because outsiders are going to exploit their rivalries, and their energies and abilities will be diverted to warfare instead of welfare. That just should not happen.

No nation that has been part of the tragic drama of these past 20 years is totally without blame. Violence and counter-violence have absorbed the energy of all the parties. The process of peace-making cannot be further delayed without danger and without peril. The United Nations Security Council resolution of last November laid down the principles of a just and a lasting peace.

But I would remind the world tonight that that resolution is not self-executing. It created a framework within which men of good will ought to be able to arrive at a reasonable settlement.

For its part, the United States of America has fully supported the efforts of the United Nations representative, Ambassador Jarring, and we shall continue to do so. But it is the parties themselves who must make the major effort to begin seriously this much needed peace-making process.

One fact is sure: The process of peace-making will not begin until the leaders of the Middle East begin exchanging views on the hard issues through some agreed procedure which could permit active discussions to be pursued. Otherwise no progress toward peace will be made.

In recent weeks, some progress in this direction has been achieved. So tonight I appeal and I urge the leaders of the Middle East to try to maintain and to accelerate their dialogue. I urge them to put their views out on the table, to begin talking the substance of peace.

Many channels are open. How the talking is done at the outset is not very important

tonight. But we just must not lose whatever momentum exists for peace. And, in the end, those who must live together must, in the words of Isaiah, learn to reason together.

The position of the United States rests on the principles of peace that I outlined on June 19, 1967. That statement remains the foundation of American policy.

First, it remains crucial that each nation's right to live be recognized. Arab governments must convince Israel and the world community that they have abandoned the idea of destroying Israel. But equally, Israel must persuade its Arab neighbors and the world community that Israel has no expansionist designs on their territory.

We are not here to judge whose fears are right or whose are wrong. Right or wrong, fear is the first obstacle to any peace-making. Each side must do its share to overcome it. A major step in this direction would be for each party to issue promptly a clear, unqualified public assurance that it is now ready to commit itself to recognize the right of each of its neighbors to national life.

Second, the political independence and territorial integrity of all the states in the area must be assured.

We are not the ones to say where other nations should draw lines between them that will assure each the greatest security. It is clear, however, that a return to the situation of June 4, 1967, will not bring peace. There must be secure, and there must be recognized, borders.

Some such lines must be agreed to by the neighbors involved as part of the transition from armistice to peace.

At the same time, it should be equally clear that boundaries cannot and should not reflect the weight of conquest. Each change must have a reason which each side, in honest negotiation, can accept as a part of a just compromise.

Third, it is more certain than ever that Jerusalem is a critical issue of any peace settlement. No one wishes to see the Holy City again divided by barbed wire and by machine guns. I therefore tonight urge an appeal to the parties to stretch their imaginations so that their interests and all the world's interest in Jerusalem, can be taken fully into account in any final settlement.

Fourth, the number of refugees is still increasing. The June war added some 200,000 refugees to those already displaced by the 1948 war. They face a bleak prospect as the winter approaches. We share a very deep concern for these refugees. Their plight is a symbol in the minds of the Arab peoples. In their eyes, it is a symbol of a wrong that must be made right before 20 years of war can end. And that fact must be dealt with in reaching a condition of peace.

All nations who are able, including Israel and her Arab neighbors, should participate directly and wholeheartedly in a massive program to assure these people a better and a more stable future.

Fifth, maritime rights must be respected. Their violation led to war in 1967. Respect for those rights is not only a legal consequence of peace. It is a symbolic recognition that all nations in the Middle East enjoy equal treatment before the law.

And no enduring peace settlement is possible until the Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran are open to the ships of all nations and their right of passage is effectively guaranteed.

Sixth, the arms race continues. We have exercised restraint while recognizing the legitimate needs of friendly governments. But we have no intention of allowing the balance of forces in the area to ever become an incentive for war.

We continue to hope that our restraint will be matched by the restraint of others, though I must observe that has been lacking since the end of the June war.

We have proposed, and I reiterate again tonight, the urgent need now for an international understanding on arms limitation for this region of the world.

The American interest in the Middle East is definite, is clear. There just must be a just peace in that region, and soon. Time is not on the side of peace.

Now, my friends, I know that these two areas of the world are of very great concern to you as they are to me. Many of you have roots in Europe from which you or your forebearers came in order to enrich the quality of the life here in America. Most, if not all of you, have very deep ties with the land and with the people of Israel, as I do, for my Christian faith sprang from yours.

The Bible stories are woven into my childhood memories as the gallant struggle of modern Jews to be free of persecution is also woven into our souls.

I think it is tragic that in our time Eastern Europe and the Middle East have been subjected to military aggression. And I must speak frankly. Military aggression. And that tragedy is just as real in Southeast Asia.

Southeast Asia is a part of the world with which few Americans have any family ties. Most of you have none there. But its freedom is as dear and as cherished and as vital, not only to America's security, but to the 200 million poor humans who live there and who do not believe in communist conquest any more than you do.

American policy there, as in other parts of the world, has been to resist the dark tide of violence and totalitarian rule. We have tried to encourage in all three areas the rule of reason, of forbearance, because we believe that that alone can provide ultimately the conditions of lasting peace.

We have acted in the belief that there is no such thing as harmless aggression—no such thing as harmless aggression anywhere, anytime—that because a nation was small, and thousands of miles away, it did not make its plight any less urgent or any less demanding of American concern.

I want you to know that we seek a world where neighbors are at each other's side and not at each other's throat. We seek no dominion except that of the free, independent human spirit, and we want to help everybody in that quest.

In such a world, the people of Eastern Europe tonight, the people of little Israel, the people of her Arab neighbors, the people of South and North Vietnam, the people of India, Pakistan, Africa and Latin America can live without fear, and so can we.

In a time of adversity, let us all work to secure such a world—secure it bravely and resolutely with compassion for those who are also our brothers on this earth. And, my dear friends, let us work with our heads instead of our passions and our emotions.

Let us work with our sense of justice, instead of our sense of bigotry.

And after 5,000 years or more, I believe most of you here know what I mean.

May it be said of each of us, in the ancient Hebrew words: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that proclaimeth peace, that publishes salvation."

God be with you. Thank you.

AID FOR RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on August 19, 1968, Mr. Thomas G. Walters, president of the National Association of Re-

tired Civil Employees, addressed the platform committee of the Democratic National Convention and spoke of the need to qualify more than 611,000 former Federal employees or their survivors for welfare, medical aid, and surplus commodities.

Mr. Walters told the platform committee that this staggering number of retired Federal employees and survivors, which represents more than 75 percent of the 800,000 annuitants under the civil service retirement system, now live below the accepted poverty income level of \$3,000 a year.

Even more distressing is the knowledge that some 279,000 annuitants receive a monthly income of less than \$100.

Statistics such as these can never adequately express the hardship of even one individual who strives to make ends meet on a limited income. This is why I introduced H.R. 19332 in this session of Congress and will reintroduce the bill in the next session if necessary to guarantee a minimum income of \$100 a month to every person over the age of 62.

So that my House colleagues will have full knowledge of the economic plight faced daily by so many thousands of persons who gave their working years to Federal service, I include the statement of Mr. Thomas G. Walters to the platform committee in full as part of the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF THOMAS G. WALTERS, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED CIVIL EMPLOYEES, BEFORE THE PLATFORM COMMITTEE OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION, WASHINGTON, D.C., AUGUST 19, 1968

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

My name is Thomas G. Walters, President of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, an organization with over 134,000 members representing the interests of more than 800,000 annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement System, as retired Federal employees or survivors of deceased employees and retirees. While we are primarily concerned with the problems of those receiving civil service retirement annuities, we also take particular interest in the problems, welfare and status of all the aged and aging in our Nation.

Thanks to the progress of medical science, people are living longer now than ever before, and the percentage of persons over 65 years of age has grown to almost 10 percent of the population of our country. By now, it is probable that the total number of older Americans (over 65 years of age) has passed 20 million.

Thousands upon thousands of these people have basic living problems. Many of them must live on meager incomes, far less than the yearly minimum of \$3,000 per couple believed to be necessary to escape poverty. Although Medicare provisions have aided in the solution of health problems, many of them still lack the means to secure medical care necessary to prolong life. Many of them have inadequate housing.

Our association is interested in every proposal to help these older Americans. We believe that those who served so well should now have the means to live in comfort and security and that medical aid should be provided when it is necessary. We cannot pay our debt to them but we should do something for these people in need.

Our members are retired Federal employees and survivors with the same problems as other older Americans. Of an approximate 800,000 retired civil employees and their survivors, some 279,000 receive a

monthly annuity of less than \$100 and 513,000 receive less than \$200 per month. Using a poverty level income of \$3,000 per year, 611,000 plus former Federal employees and their survivors are now living in poverty, with 220,000 of them having yearly annuity incomes of over \$3,000.

Although the Medicare provisions are helpful to many older Americans, not all Federal retirees and their dependents are eligible for full Medicare coverage, an omission in the Medicare Law which we feel is unjust.

Some of our members retired a number of years ago when salaries were much lower and the retirement formula was less favorable. Although their meager annuities have been supplemented by occasional increases, a majority of these increases have been based on, and aided only in, meeting the continually rising cost-of-living. Recent increases for persons covered by Social Security, Railroad Retirement, and with minimum annuity increase: for those under Social Security, have not been extended to persons covered under the Civil Service Retirement System.

The 1967 Comparability Pay Law recognized the need for Federal salaries to be comparable with those in private industry, but it did not extend an increase to Federal retirees. At the present time, with the aid of Social Security, many private industries are more liberal in providing benefits for their former employees than our own Government.

Thousands of our Federal retirees who were predeceased by their spouse must continue to take a reduction in their annuities, and if they remarry their second spouse cannot be named as a survivor annuitant. Also many retirees and survivors are penalized by reductions in their annuities and excluded from liberalizing benefits due to the fact that the liberalized benefits go only to employees retiring after the date of the amendment's enactment.

Federal income tax exemptions are more liberal for Social Security and Railroad Retirement beneficiaries than for Civil Service annuitants. These are all examples of inequities existing against former employees of our Federal Government. These men and women have given their loyal and devoted service as Civil Servants and we think that the United States should set an example with respect to treatment of the older Americans who grew old in the service of our great Government.

We urge this panel and the Committee to recommend, and the Convention to adopt, a declaration in the 1968 Democratic platform, basically as follows:

"As an example to all employers, public and private, that it is not only wise but just, to provide comfort and security in their declining years to those who have rendered dedicated service during their careers, we favor a retirement system for Federal civilian employees and dependents under which benefits are adequate and are equalized as nearly as practicable for all beneficiaries, according to the length and character of service rendered; and in keeping with today's living standards, those retirees receiving total incomes of less than \$3,000 per year be made eligible for welfare, medical aid and surplus commodities as other citizens in similar circumstances."

UNITED STATES FAVORS RUSSIA OVER RHODESIA FOR ORE PURCHASES

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the incredible foreign policy determinations of

this administration were projected in sharp focus in a recent news item in the Des Moines Tribune. It begins:

Despite U.S. feelings over the invasion of Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union continues to supplant Rhodesia as the major source of strategic chromite ore, vital to American space and military programs.

Reporter Edward J. Michelson then explains that although there are only two sources of high grade chromite ore in the world, we purchase from the Soviets rather than the Rhodesians.

We are appalled at the invasion of Czechoslovakia and watch as thousands flee their homeland. Yet, we impose sanctions against a nation—Rhodesia—where each year thousands of Africans immigrate to find jobs and a better life.

We trade, and purchase chromite, from the U.S.S.R. while they and their satellites supply nearly all of the materials of war for fellow Communists in Vietnam. Yet, we literally force revolution against a staunchly anti-Communist nation who has offered to help our fight for the self-determination of Vietnam.

We purchase from the state-owned mines of the Soviet Union; yet, we will not support a 100-percent American-owned mining operation in Rhodesia, even though it is of one of only two areas in the world that produces what is to us an essential product.

This can only be incredible. Yet, this administration, for either unknown or certainly unsubstantiated reasons, continues to foist these policies onto the American people.

The article referred to follows:

A MATERIAL VITAL TO SPACE PROGRAM: UNITED STATES FAVORS RUSSIA OVER RHODESIA FOR ORE PURCHASES

(By Edward J. Michelson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Despite U.S. feelings over the invasion of Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union continues to supplant Rhodesia as the major source of strategic chromite ore, vital to American space and military programs.

Rhodesia and the U.S.S.R. are the only sources of high-grade chrome ore in the world.

On Jan. 5, 1967, President Johnson issued an executive order backing up the United Nations' sanctions against Prime Minister Ian Smith's white-ruled government in Rhodesia.

Chromite ore is not mined in the United States. Current stockpile inventories are said to be enough for only six months, although strategic requirements call for a 30-month supply.

The reliance of the United States largely on imports from the Soviet Union has been repeatedly denounced in Congress, mainly by conservatives, including Senator Strom Thurmond (Rep., S.C.) and Representative John R. Rarick (Dem., La.) but a good many other lawmakers are aware of the trade, and are displeased.

PALLADIUM

The U.S.S.R. also has been a substantial shipper of palladium, a metal in the platinum family, and of titanium, which is essential to the construction of supersonic aircraft because of its tremendous strength and very light weight.

One of the mining firms producing chromite ore in Rhodesia is 100 per cent American owned. Foote Mineral Co. In recent weeks it has been seeking authority to ship 40,000 tons a year to the United States, for use by processors in Ohio and West Virginia.

Sources on Capitol Hill say the request has been denied.

SELLS TO CHINA

Rhodesia reportedly has been selling chromite to Communist China and other markets not affected by U.N. sanctions. The sanctions include a resolution adopted by the Security Council on May 29, asking all nations to halt exports to and imports from Rhodesia, bar investments in that country, and halt international airline services to Salisbury, the capital.

The "Economist" of London reports that the Ian Smith government is "going strong" despite the sanctions following Rhodesia's unilateral declaration of independence from Britain on Nov. 11, 1966, and the Security Council resolution this year.

The "Economist" says Rhodesia's gross national product rose by 8.6 per cent last year, and the mining industry increased production by 800,000 Rhodesian pounds. Output of manufacturing industries increased by 5.5 per cent.

HALABY OF PAN AMERICAN SEES HAWAII IN A "WESTERN LEADERSHIP" ROLE IN ASIA

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Na-jeeb Halaby, president of Pan American World Airways, delivered a most provocative speech at the annual meeting of the Hawaii Visitors Bureau in Honolulu last week.

The former FAA Administrator touched on many wide-ranging topics in his presentation, and voiced particular concern over a "drift backward" into isolation by this Nation. He challenged a new Western leadership in the foreign relations of our Nation, and stressed Hawaii's role in shaping American policy in Asia.

In his statement that "Hawaii is the first window, the first door to Asians visiting the United States," he again emphasized Hawaii's strategic location and unique responsibility as a link to Asia in the Pacific Basin.

With the 21st century only 31 years away, Halaby stressed:

Let us look ahead—toward the year 2000—beyond Vietnam—to a postwar Pacific—to Asia as it moves into the last years of this century and approaches the year 2000.

Halaby said that Hawaii should help to keep American interest focused on "building a peaceful Asia, a progressive Asia, and in time a stable Asian community of states living with and contributing to a more hopeful and sane world."

I am confident that the people and the institutions of Hawaii will fulfill the island State's destiny by continuing to offer the leadership and help to meet that challenge.

Hawaii is honored that Mr. Halaby chose our State as a forum for such a significant and far-reaching address. I know that my colleagues in Congress would wish to read this extraordinary speech by one of the world's top leaders in transportation and one of this Nation's most knowledgeable observers on world affairs.

I therefore take pleasure in submit-

ting for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Pan Am president Najeeb Halaby's speech as it appeared in the September 6, 1968 issue of the Honolulu Advertiser. I also submit for inclusion in the RECORD two excellent editorials from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and the Honolulu Advertiser concerning Mr. Halaby's speech:

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Sept. 6, 1968]

HAWAII'S ROLE IN ASIA

Impatience over Vietnam is creating in many Americans a mood of isolationism about Asia. Yet, common sense and concern over the human condition everywhere must lead us in exactly the opposite direction.

This was the message yesterday of one of the world's top leaders in transportation, Najeeb E. Halaby, president of Pan American World Airways.

That he has chosen Hawaii for its delivery is the latest reminder of the Islands' strategic location and unique responsibility as an East-West bridge.

Asia, Halaby reminded, has half the world's people now and may have two-thirds by the year 2000, less than a third of a century away. There is growing evidence that advanced techniques may be able to produce enough food for them.

Asia is rich in natural resources, which science can convert into better living conditions. Economic levels and outlook vary from country to country, but Japan—the world's third industrial power—is a reminder of what can be done.

Projections are tempered by the instability of the Asian political scene, but this very fact presents a high order of challenge to the U.S.

It's increasingly clear that while we must remain involved in Asia, the nature of our relationship will be greatly altered.

The countries there intend to determine their own destiny, their own directions; we can help, to their benefit and to ours, through programs of aid and cooperation. But we must look for new opportunities and concepts, unfettered by outmoded ideas or past prejudices.

What happens in Japan, in India and in mainland China will fundamentally shape Asia's future. The paths they will take, the relationships between themselves, and between them and us (and the rest of the West)—these are the big questions—marks, as Halaby pointed out.

He properly stressed that China is pivotal—that while Japan is our major hope in Asia, China epitomizes our greatest concern.

Conceding we cannot force change upon China, Halaby wisely urged that we reexamine our own attitudes since getting China into the family of nations would likely reduce her paranoia.

This would require on China's part a new type of leadership, coupled with a more sophisticated view of the world—and neither is in early prospect.

But while not easing our resistance to possibilities, however dim, of overt Chinese aggression, we can in concert with others show our interest in cultural, commercial and technical interchange.

(Locally, the East-West Center might well invite a number of grantees from mainland China to see at firsthand the American system in operation. Peking at this stage would probably say no, but we would at least have the offer on record.)

The great ferment in Asia will continue for a long time. But, as Halaby noted, it can be speeded toward constructive ends "by the rapid transference of science and technology, by improvement in internal and external transportation and communications, by an education explosion, by international travel

and exchange, and by regional and international cooperation."

A new breed of leaders will rise in Asia—"a tough, fresh, intelligent breed; congenial but not subservient, independent but more realistic and worldly."

We must be prepared, in relations with them, to go beyond the economic, political and security problems of the moment—and look to the long future.

In this, Hawaii—as the first place many Asians see on their way to the U.S., as the site of the East-West Center, as a state where most citizens have their ethnic roots in Asia—can play a meaningful role that goes beyond the modest size of our population or square mileage.

We must keep abreast of Asian developments, we must understand them, and in all the ways possible we must work for mutual respect between Orient and Occident, for the stakes are high and our destinies are interwoven.

If at times this is a cause of concern, it is also a basis of hope.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Sept. 9, 1968]

WESTERN LEADERSHIP

The provocative idea that Hawaii should help to create a new "Western Leadership" to counterbalance America's well-intrenched "Eastern Establishment" deserves further discussion.

Najeeb Halaby, president of Pan American World Airways, tossed out the thought last week, putting a name—"Western Leadership"—on an idea that has preoccupied Hawaii leaders at least since the days, three decades ago, that Gregg M. Sinclair was trying to get the East-West Philosophers Conference organized at the University of Hawaii.

For decades, America has been dominated by leaders based in Washington and New York, many of them Ivy League college graduates.

This elite group has tended by cultural inheritance, by racial affinity, by upbringing, by education, by geography and probably by instinct to see America's problems in terms of relations with Europe.

It has been eastward-oriented and not unwisely so considering the concentration of world power in Europe and Russia.

Yet there is an understandable suspicion in the West that the eastward emphasis is too myopic for the last half of the 20th century and the 21st century that will follow.

There is also a suspicion that some of President Lyndon Johnson's troubles in relationships with the nation stem from the fact that he is not a part of the Eastern Establishment and is in fact offensive to it.

His style is Texas not Ivy League, and his eyes have tended to look west not east.

In the eyes of offended Easterners his mistakes tend to be magnified where those of a friend might be minimized.

Johnson has recognized that we are at the start of a Pacific Era, but there is strong eastern sentiment for a pullback from the Pacific, for a re-orientation back toward Europe. The frustration over Vietnam makes it possible that a sharp over-reaction against the Pacific may indeed set in.

Pan Am's Halaby noted this possibility and said that he is worried if it should be true.

He did not suggest that the U.S. should abandon Europe, or the Mediterranean, or the Atlantic—but he strongly suggested that it also should not abandon the Pacific.

What American needs for the future, Halaby suggests, is not a Pacific orientation or an Atlantic orientation but a world orientation.

For it to develop such an orientation requires as a first step some counterbalance to the Eastern Establishment.

Thus the meaningful suggestion that a new Western Leadership should develop.

How remains the question but it seems obvious that Hawaii and other Pacific-oriented states must be as assertive as possible in national councils on the need for attention to Pacific affairs.

It seems obvious, too, that Pacific-oriented economic enterprises must play a role in this.

Stress must be put on organizations—political, economic, cultural and scientific—that involve the U.S. in international cooperation in the Pacific.

America's great partner in Pacific endeavor must be Japan, the most advanced power in the area.

Reliance for developing Pacific-oriented leaders must also be placed heavily on educational institutions like the East-West Center and the University of Hawaii but they must be only part of a much bigger picture if the strong Europe-bias of the Eastern Establishment is to be matched by a strong Western Leadership.

Halaby made the point that time is shorter than we think—the 21st century is only 31 years away. People the world around will soon be only an hour or so apart and able to reach each other instantly through electronic tubes that will reproduce taste, feeling and smell as well as sight and sound.

The contrast between the wealth of America and the poverty of Asia will be greater, not smaller, even though Asia's living standard may be several times better than today.

Most of the world's people will be living in the Pacific-Asian area and the challenge of relationships with them will be a pressing one for America.

There is reason to believe that the Eastern Establishment is not up to the challenge. That is why the idea of building toward a Western Leadership is such a provocative one.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Sept. 6, 1968]

ASIA AND HAWAII FACE THE 21ST CENTURY

(Following is a condensation of a speech delivered yesterday by Najeeb E. Halaby, president of Pan American World Airways at the annual meeting of the Hawaii Visitors Bureau.)

Our two limited wars, which are so trying for the American people with their traditional concepts of "total victory"—one of the most tragic and enduring illusions in history—have both been in Asia and it would be very easy for those too impatient to grapple with long range, complex and shifting problems to conclude that America has no business there and that the thing to do is to "let them stew in their own juice."

A drift backwards may be setting in. The divisiveness generated by the war in Vietnam on top of our domestic travail may have started it. We are all for an honorable peace in Vietnam and I'm sure we are all for letting the Vietnamese run their own affairs, once it appears possible that they would really have the opportunity, so I am not talking about a resolution of the war, solely.

I am concerned about a trend back toward isolationism, a selected and somewhat more worldly isolationism but real, nonetheless, directed mostly at Southeast Asia and including, to some lesser degree, all of Asia.

If this is true, I am worried. We must not permit disappointment and frustration in what we have tried to accomplish in Vietnam to set us back a half century in our awareness of what Asia means to us, now and in the future. We do not have that kind of time any more.

In world terms, one of the greatest of all frontiers continues to lie to the west—the Pacific and Asia. Asia has been, and is still, called by many, the Far East. This is a European outlook dating back to the days of sail. To the continental American, to the citizen of Hawaii, Asia is not the Far East—it is the Far West—a frontier that holds unheralded promise and unlimited potential, if the

energies of a billion minds and bodies can be released in a creative way.

The two countries of India and China, in population alone, are equal to all of Europe, Africa and North and South American combined. And to show what an Asian nation can do—think of Japan, which is fast becoming the third most powerful industrial country in the world, surpassed only by the United States and the USSR. It would be folly to underestimate Asia's potential—to assume that the Japanese rate of growth cannot be repeated by other peoples in Asia as the 20th Century gives way to the 21st.

Just as many of the eastern seaboard have had a natural affinity and bias for Europe, those on our western extremity must have a Pacific and Asian perspective to give balance to our world view. This need places a heavy responsibility on our Pacific states.

In this effort, Hawaii has a special leadership role to play—a unique opportunity to influence and shape future American attitudes and policy in the Pacific and beyond.

Let us now look ahead—toward the year 2000—beyond Vietnam—to a postwar Pacific—to Asia as it moves into the last years of this century and approaches the year 2000.

Looking ahead and taking a wide-angle view of the Pacific Ocean and Asia, what do we see?

First, the grim race in Asia between population growth and food production. According to the latest UN figures, the world population in 1967 stood at 3.3 billion. Fifty-six percent of this total live in Asia and one-third of the world's people, an estimated 1.1 billion, live in Asia outside of the boundaries of mainland China.

If the present growth rate continues, the world population will exceed 6 billion before 2000—with most of the increase taking place in the newly developing world.

While Asia is now awake to its population growth and while promising steps are being taken in concert with the United Nations and the Population Council and other agencies to reduce the birthrate, the hard fact remains that even with a dramatic drop, Asia will be by far the most densely populated area in the world in the year 2000, with perhaps two out of every three humans alive at the turn of the century being Asian.

Can they be fed—can Asia overcome its chronic lack of food and spectre of periodic famine? The outlook, fortunately, gives a hopeful "maybe"—for the food production prospects in Asia have changed almost beyond belief in the last two or three years—and projections now are more optimistic than ever before that Asia food production can forestall the crises of growing population pressure.

Thinking about Asia's broader economic future, however, is most difficult. It must be kept in mind that while old in terms of culture and history, Asia is mostly made up of newly formed, independent nations simultaneously trying to emerge from traditional and colonial socio-economic-political systems into modern states.

Despite these aids and some encouraging progress, most of the underdeveloped countries in Asia will find that, in relative terms, the gap in the living standards between the developed countries and the less developed ones will be further widened.

Looking ahead, the pattern of Asian economic growth resembles a quilt with bright patches of hope here and there—but mostly blurred designs of various hues. Of all the economic ailments, protectionism—the infection of nationalism—may be the most damaging.

Progress overall will be slow, a step-by-step process. Cooperation will be needed within the area, as will an infusion of foreign capital and management know-how. A few Asian countries will certainly have passed their "take-off" stage by the 21st Century—but

many, whose starting base is slow, will still be struggling to attain self-sustaining economy by the year 2000.

Correcting this imbalance between the haves and the have-nots will require continuing international measures and new forms of financial and technical assistance if the less advanced states of Asia are to be brought into the modern world.

I turn now to the political outlook in Asia. It is in this one-half of the world that our country has suffered its major disappointments and most serious foreign policy failures in the post-World War II period.

First, Vietnam. It would be tragic to think of the war and a possible settlement in isolated terms, geographically, or otherwise, for the outcome will have its effect, one way or another, elsewhere in Asia and far into the future. The problems will not disappear with our November election.

What we must consider are the longer range consequences of our actions in Washington, Saigon, and Paris, and their psychological and political impact in all of Asia and the world at large.

Asia itself has the greatest stake in the outcome, for no objective survey of Asian opinion can overlook the concern felt and the conclusion that most of Asia will feel less secure in the event of an American defeat and withdrawal. To ignore this fact under the pressure of immediate imperatives could lead to greater instability and tragedy in the long run.

Perhaps, it is time to change the character of our presence in Asia. Maybe, we don't even have an option. It is becoming increasingly apparent that no nation, with the possible exception of Korea, will in the years ahead be happy about having American bases and large numbers of American troops stationed on its soil.

But this may be best for all concerned. The original Cold War threat of military intervention posed by the Sino-Soviet juggernaut—as we then viewed it—seems to have been badly weakened by dialectic fevers and internal hemorrhages. In any case, we will have new options in meeting our defense needs and won't have to "stand" in 19th Century traditions.

While I believe it is true that the original threat to the security of the Pacific community has changed through the years, a threat remains and it is more complicated because it relates more directly to the needs—the demands—of the masses of people involved in each country and less on external forces.

We must learn to deal with this, to deal with each nation in terms of their needs and their potential for realization of their aspirations, rather than in terms of our needs, hopes, and fears.

These efforts would, no doubt, include some of the assistance programs we now have, or a version of them, but at the very least they will have to be redefined and re-audited in terms of longer range plans than anything we have had.

There must be greater efforts from the private sector and even the personal sector, but all efforts should be part of a concept we can freely show to the world, including Peking. Your East-West Center may have an extraordinary opportunity to point the way to an up-to-date, constructive and rewarding policy for the U.S. in Asia.

The second great question in Asia's future and the American interest in the Pacific, is Japan and its political and economic orientation in the years ahead. It stands today as the most stable, most powerful, nation in Asia. Its potential for further development and constructive world cooperation, given its national genius, is great . . .

Japan's significance to the United States and to future peace, prosperity and security in Asia, cannot be underestimated. Its economic and trade importance is well known. What is less clear is its future political role.

Will it extend its security treaty with the United States beyond 1970? Will it move toward rearmament and a greater reliance on its own power? Will it feel compelled to develop its own nuclear arsenal?

Will it seek greater accommodation with Communist China? Will it resist its opportunities for economic domination of less advanced countries? Will it seek mutually advantageous regional and international arrangements for cooperative relations? Will U.S.-Japanese friendship continue?

Moving farther west, I come to the third great question mark of Asia—India. Its future, too, will determine the Asia of tomorrow. Next to China, it is the world's most populous country—with more than 500 million people.

Today it is the world's largest democracy—and this is the issue that may be decided in the remaining years of this century—can democracy survive in India? Can India move against its massive and at times depressive problems within a democratic framework?

Can it overcome its staggering burdens of population, food, poverty, language, education, communalism, and caste, and emerge as a viable political, social and economic entity?

Some are betting that it cannot; some are laying the groundwork for a break-up of the democratic parliamentary approach, some are predicting a political disintegration following on a massive failure of the present system to meet the growing demand of the Indian masses for change and a better life.

Indonesia, lying under the land mass of Southeast Asia and between the Indian and Pacific Oceans, is another country whose future will be of growing importance to all of Asia. As an independent country, it is young, it has yet to begin to tap its human and natural wealth.

With intelligent exploitation and development it can in time become the middle anchor in a stable and prosperous Asia.

From the very edge of Communist takeover and economic chaos, the Indonesian government is attempting to come back, to overcome the mistakes of the past, the confusion and waste and misadventures of former leadership. By disavowing earlier policies of confrontation and hostility with its neighbors, by seeking new and friendly relations in Asia and the outside world, Jakarta is contributing to the prospects of a better Southeast Asia.

Its internal problems, however, remain acute. Its future will depend on its ability to achieve financial and political growth and stability, to turn promise into performance, to provide a social infrastructure for 130 million people upon which individual and national progress can be built.

I have saved Communist China for the last item on my agenda of major Asian issues in the remaining years of this century . . .

Given its present course, Communist China constitutes the greatest challenge in Asia. As Japan embodies our major hope for Asia—Communist China epitomizes our greatest concern.

Our focus on this huge land mass and between 700 and 800 million human beings is distorted by a lack of information, a lack of knowledge upon which understanding is based. Communist China is living in a self-determined isolation. Its own contacts with the outside world are strictly controlled and the shades of its windows are drawn.

As the world shrinks, as the threat of the nuclear age to all mankind mounts, as the need for world cooperation grows, the isolation of one-third of the world is dangerous and even intolerable.

We cannot force a change on Communist China, but we can encourage a gradual change by a reexamination of our own attitudes and policies and their psychological impact on those who may be covering their

feelings of national insecurity with belligerence.

In the long run we have more to gain than to lose by bringing the mainland of China into the family of nations than by abetting her own isolationist desires by giving her an excuse for irrational behavior.

She cannot continue her present lonely course forever. It would seem to be clear that a gradual and peaceful emergence would be far preferable to an explosive and hostile one at a time of her own choosing. And so we must give more thought to the unthinkable, to new relationships with Communist China, to increased contact, to greater trade, and more stable political arrangements that will enhance the security of the whole world.

I say this now, recognizing that Mainland China is today under the control of leaders who are violently hostile to us and zealots to the doctrine that their particular political faith is the only true world religion.

I recognize that their dogma, and their fanaticism and zeal to spread their faith, pose a threat to their neighbors and to the world order. We must also be aware of the dangers and tensions that flow from their limited but growing nuclear capability.

I do not underestimate the danger to the internal security of Asian states posed by mainland China's posture. The threat will continue. It should be countered primarily by gradually eliminating those conditions of poverty, despair and social injustice upon which insurgency feeds.

Progress in this direction is being made. What I am saying is that so long as we make our intentions firm and clear Communist China today appears to be in no position to undertake a major foreign military adventure and is not likely to do so in the immediate future. The larger threat is not now—but over the long run.

Today the mainland of China appears torn with intense disorder. This has resulted in serious splits within the communist leadership, between the party's bureaucracy and the Mao followers, between the young and the old, between the pragmatists and the dogmatists, the old politicians and the new technicians.

China is in a weakened position. The threat of further national disintegration remains, a cruel power struggle for succession is in progress, revolution within a revolution continues. Peking's image in Asia has been tarnished; its foreign policy is largely in shambles.

But what of tomorrow? No one knows what will emerge. What we do know is that China has a history of rising to meet crises, a genius for organization, a people with a tradition of hard work, an enthusiasm for learning, and a pride in race unmatched in the world.

It is likely that all of these characteristics will influence her future as she first seeks self-sufficiency and order within her own borders.

For the foreseeable future, it appears that there is almost no likelihood that Communist China will adopt a policy of international cooperation.

However, our only reasonable hope is that their leaders will slowly begin to realize the realities of the world around them and begin to see that no nation, no people, can live unto themselves as if time had stood still.

With a new generation of leaders, as their ignorance of the world lessens, as they gain confidence, they may gradually come to understand that a prosperous and secure China will depend upon a relaxation of tensions and eventually world cooperation, as well as upon their own domestic efforts.

This shift in attitude will probably take a long time—it may not come about. If it doesn't, China will remain the greatest threat to the world far into the next century. This is why we and others should not fall to use the time remaining in this century to try

to bring Communist China gradually into the mainstream of the world community—both in their interest and in the interest of all mankind.

Shifting our lens back to the widest angle view, I see, in summary, forces of change pervading all of Asia. The peace of the revolution in ideas and action that is reshaping Asian society will quicken in the decades ahead.

I foresee an Asia that will continue and may, in fact, grow in instability. I see an explosive Asia that may be torn by ancient antagonisms between races, between religious and political loyalties, within and between national societies.

What Asia wants and needs is time to overcome the humiliations of the past, to move with increasing speed toward a more self-respecting future. In the process and in varying degrees as between countries, the effort may be a convulsive one, for Asia is impatient.

The solution to Asian problems must come from within, based on indigenous Asian initiatives, intelligence, commitment and leadership. For the rest of this century and on into the 21st a new type of leader will be emerging in Asia: leadership that is youthful, pragmatic, and responsive to popular demands.

It will be the first generation of leadership educated and trained free from the influences of colonialism, and therefore nationalistic. These leaders will be more aware of the concepts of science, the possibilities of technology, and modern techniques of management.

We will find them a tough, fresh, intelligent breed: congenial but not subservient, independent but more realistic and worldly.

The U.S. interest in Asia that will emerge goes beyond the economic, political and security problems of today and tomorrow, important as they may be.

We must think in terms beyond our own life span and on into the next century to find the root of our national interest, because the odds favor a future Asia which will have far more relative power at its command vis-à-vis the United States than it does today.

The American interest should be focused on building a peaceful Asia, a progressive Asia and in time a stable Asian community of states living with and contributing to a more hopeful and sane world. It should continue to be concerned with assisting in the economic development of the poor countries of Asia, leading them toward relatively free enterprise systems with incentives that will release productive energies.

It should be concerned with the establishment of mutually beneficial Asian-American trade relations and a breaking down of restrictive barriers to commerce, to an increase in travel and cultural and educational exchange, to a freer flow of ideas. It should be concerned with the building of permanent bridges of mutual respect between the peoples of Asia and the United States. This is our national agenda for Asia.

It holds a challenge for all Americans, especially for the people of Hawaii. For Asians traveling to the United States across the Pacific, Hawaii is the first window through which they see America.

What they see should make all Americans proud—a free, dynamic, progressive, prosperous multi-racial society—living in harmony on islands of great beauty, with an appreciation and determination to conserve the paradise found by those who came before for those who will follow.

Hawaii, too, should be the center for the blending of Western and Asian culture. It should be known for the quality of its culture—not the quantity of its commercial ventures, for its fine museums, for its architecture, for its sensitivity to Asian history, Asian culture, Asian religions and Asian art.

Hawaii should be proud of its University,

its Asian and Pacific studies, its special library collections, its East-West Center, its scholarly research and publications on Asia, its important basic and applied research on tropical agriculture, Pacific marine biology, public health and Asian food nutrition.

Hawaii has already contributed to Asian development and its potential for further constructive effort is here—within your public and private institutions, your business houses, and your unique human resources.

Perhaps our most basic national need as we look to Asia and the year 2000 is an educational system that does not largely ignore the more than one-half of the people of the world.

Education in the United States on Asia, especially at the secondary school level has been woefully deficient. I am told that here in Hawaii the Pacific-Asian Affairs Council's high school education program has no equal in the other 49 states. Your example could be followed and Hawaii should be concerned that it is—for your pioneering educational work on Asia could reach into schoolrooms across our land to the benefit of all.

Lastly, Hawaii could be the natural leader of a new "Western Leadership," as interested in the Pacific and Asia as the so-called "Eastern Establishment" is in the Atlantic and Europe. Hawaii should think in terms of leadership in making certain that the American view of the world is a balanced one—that policies and decisions are not forged for Asia and the Pacific by those whose background, interests and knowledge do not match those of this community.

To the contrary, the United States should look to the leaders of Hawaii—the Burns and Quinns, the Inouyes and Fongs, the Minks, Blaisdells and Matsunagas, as well as the Dillinghams, Hamiltons and Chinn Hos, your business, civic and cultural leaders, your educational institutions, your people, for a vision of Asia and the future that takes advantage of your geographical position, the sensitivity that comes from your present and past associations, the ethnic heritage of so many of our citizens which has enriched your society, and your superior understanding of Asian tradition, values and aspirations.

In an interesting way, the performance of your delegation to the recent Chicago convention may presage the future. Governor Burns and his colleagues inserted this plank in his party's platform:

"Recognizing the growing importance of Asia and the Pacific, we will encourage increased cultural and educational efforts such as those undertaken in multi-racial Hawaii, to facilitate a better understanding of the problems and opportunities of this vast area."

And the keynote speaker, your own beloved and effective Senator Dan Inouye, made the greatest sense of probably the entire week there when he said:

"I wish to share with you a most sacred word of Hawaii. It is Aloha. To some of you who visited us, it may mean hello. To others, it may have meant goodbye. But those of us who have been privileged to live in Hawaii, Aloha means—I love you."

COST OF LIVING SOARS UNDER JOHNSON-HUMPHREY

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad fact that the cost of living has risen 11 percent since the Johnson-Humphrey administration took office. We have got to reverse the trend which has sent the

national cost of living for the average city family up by nearly 11.6 percent since the Johnson-Humphrey administration took office on January 20, 1965.

And the latest cost-of-living index released by the Labor Department showed that in June and July the cost of living was rising at an annual rate of 6 percent.

The cost-of-living index in July was 4.3 percent higher than it was a year before. Thus, a 6 percent rate of increase in June and July reveals that costs are moving upward more rapidly. Living costs in July were more than 17 percent above the level of January 1961, when the Democratic regime came into power.

This increase is substantially greater than the 12.3-percent cost of living increase from 1949 to 1953, which included the era of the Korean war and the widespread hoarding and scare buying that led to the imposition of wage and price controls.

As a result of the increase in the 3½ years of the Johnson-Humphrey administration, this is what has happened:

Your dollar of January 1965, is now worth less than 90 cents.

A \$10 bill acquired in January 1965, is now worth \$8.96.

A \$100 paycheck in January 1965, is now worth \$89.63.

A \$500 savings account in January 1965, is now worth \$448.15, a loss of nearly \$52.

A \$10,000 insurance policy in January 1965, is now worth \$8,962.90, a depreciation of \$1,037.10.

Retirement income of \$2,500 a year in January 1965, is now down to \$2,240.73, a loss of \$259.27.

A SALUTE TO TRANSPORTATION IN THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, North Carolina is the Nation's leading textile manufacturing State. Over 230,000 North Carolinians earn their livelihood in textile plants.

The growth of the textile industry has been made possible to a large extent by the magnificent transportation facilities in North Carolina. We are very fortunate in having some of the largest trucking companies in the Nation located in our State.

One of these is Carolina Freight Carriers Corp., of Cherryville, N.C. Carolina Freight operates 32 terminals in 20 States and the District of Columbia. The carrier employs more than 2,600 people and has an annual payroll of more than \$20 million.

All of the officials and many of the employees are close personal friends of mine. Carolina Freight is one of the largest carriers of textile and textile-related products in the United States. The trucking company has been one of the primary factors in the growth of the textile industry in North Carolina.

Southern Textile News, Charlotte, N.C., carried a story on September 9, 1968, entitled "A Salute to Transportation in the Textile Industry." The article described the part that Carolina Freight has had in the growth of the textile economy in the Southeast.

Mr. Speaker, I believe everyone will find the story to be most interesting, therefore, I insert it in the RECORD:

A SALUTE TO TRANSPORTATION IN THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY: CAROLINA FREIGHT CARRIERS PARALLELS TEXTILE INDUSTRY IN STEADY GROWTH

The trucking industry and the textile industry have grown up together. Carolina Freight Carriers Corporation, the third largest carrier in North Carolina, has been one of these thriving trucking industry members.

Over three decades ago, C. G. Beam and Cross Cotton Mills of Marion, North Carolina began working together. Mr. Beam with two trucks and both with a lot of faith. That was the beginning of Carolina's association with the textile industry. Today the largest single commodity division handled by Carolina is basic textiles.

Two decades ago, probably 80 percent of the freight handled by Carolina Freight Carriers was directly related to the textile industry. Today, although the percentage is down, the tonnage of textile commodities handled is ever increasing. Of course, in the passing years, other commodities have come into the picture. But, textiles remain a mainstay, not only for Carolina, but for the entire trucking industry and particularly in the south.

In the Rome, Georgia, area, a carpet center, approximately 80 percent of the traffic carried by Carolina is carpet material. To handle this huge volume, Carolina made some adjustments. Special equipment was purchased to handle the carpet rolls more efficiently and safely. Training programs are conducted at all times to educate employees in the most modern methods of handling, not only carpet materials, but all types of textile materials and products. Carolina people are trained and geared for textile transportation.

Carolina is constantly striving to improve an already excellent loss and damage picture and to expedite service. Carolina equipment has been converted to handle finished textiles. Some trailers have also been equipped with special racks to handle beams of yarn and other material.

Chemicals, dyes, softeners and related products connected with the textile industry receive preferred treatment. Many of these are usually shipped in temperature-controlled trucks. Some chemicals require a constant temperature, so do some dyes. Softeners may become rubbery when exposed to low temperatures and cannot be reclaimed.

Carolina's O.S. and D. department is constantly striving to overcome losses and damages. The textile industry is working with the trucking firm to help minimize problems in this area.

One large textile firm was having trouble shipping certain bolts of fabric. Investigation by Carolina disclosed that the bolts were wrapped too loosely and the movement of the truck over the roads caused soil damage to this material. Tighter rolls and a different wrapping foundation solved the problem. Carolina and the textile company worked together to find the solution.

Carolina is constantly investigating, experimenting and checking to help make the transportation of all commodities safer and more claim free. This is especially true of textiles. And the textile people work well with the trucking company.

In a recent case, a carton of material went astray. Carolina paid the claim but some time later, the carton was found, intact and

undamaged. The textile mill for which it was intended took the material, paid the invoice price for the shipment and neutralized the trucking firm's loss.

The National Freight Claims Council of the American Trucking Association maintains certain committees to work on areas of loss and damage in the various commodity areas. At present there is no working committee to cover textiles and the reason is that close cooperation between trucking and textile has established a position where seriously problems rarely exist. If and when these problems do arise, the textile committee will immediately investigate and attempt to work out suitable solutions.

One problem does exist, not only for the textile shipper and the trucking company, but for all shippers. That problem is theft and pilferage.

Trucking people are disturbed about the increasing instances of theft, high-jacking and pilfering. This is rapidly becoming one of the major causes of losses. And, they are working hard to eliminate the problem.

At Carolina this area is receiving the constant and concentrated efforts of the claims department. Claims Vice President J. L. Boies is conducting a personal investigation and is working to cut theft and pilferage losses in every possible way.

This problem is certainly not exclusive with the trucking industry. The textile people and others have also experienced these losses. Solutions which work for the trucking industry should in turn aid the textile industry.

Boies has called on Carolina people to provide "greater vigilance in the office, yard and on the dock and on the road; tighter screening of job applicants, especially casual labor; periodic checks of employees; fingerprinting and fuller cooperation with law enforcement agencies." He reports that these measures are advocated by the F.B.I. to help prevent theft and pilferage of shipments.

The textile industry products are especially tempting to thieves. Clothing and other finished products are easy to sell. There are ready markets. This situation will be improved by close working cooperation of the trucking industry and the textile industry.

There are other areas in handling textiles that could easily cause trouble: new employees may not be educated as to the proper methods of handling certain commodities. For instance, at Carolina these people are fully trained to handle all special freight, even though it may have been handled by the company for many years. Veteran employees as well as newcomers are trained in methods of handling new types of materials. Equipment is converted where and when needed to provide a more efficient method of transportation.

Back in 1933, C. G. Beam, Carolina President, had no idea Carolina Freight Carriers Corporation would gross more than \$40 million in the year 1968. He had no idea that his first experience with Cross Cotton Mills would be the beginning of a tremendous textile transportation operation. What he did know was that during those depression-ridden days, he needed to make a living and this seemed one way.

Since that time both textile and trucking, and Carolina Freight in particular, have become big brothers together. Both are becoming more sophisticated. Both have developed more problems. And, both are solving these problems, working together, even as they did more than three decades ago.

Today, Carolina operates 32 terminals in 20 states and the District of Columbia, serving the Southeast, the Northeast, the Midwest.

Carolina employs more than 2,600 people with an annual payroll of more than \$20 million. All this is due in great part to textile growth.

RONNIE BARRETT COMMENTS ON
CHICAGO

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Chicago's popular television personality, Mr. Ronnie Barrett, recently put into proper perspective the situation in Chicago during the Democratic Convention.

The American Broadcasting Co. and its affiliate in Chicago, WBKB on channel 7, are to be congratulated for Mr. Barrett's forthright remarks which follow:

TEXT OF RONNIE BARRETT'S COMMENTS ON
"CHICAGO," AUGUST 30, 1968

In the past few days, we have all seen things we hoped we'd never see in our city—and worse—the whole country saw it on network television. It was shocking . . . appalling . . . sickening.

But what did we see, really?

What we saw was carefully edited tape and film of a police line pushing, shoving, clubbing, dragging young protesters whose leaders told us these youngsters were peaceful in every way . . . who did not provoke the police . . . but were simply attacked.

This was the picture of Chicago sent not just to every part of this nation, but to all the capitals of the world. With it went the blistering commentary of the reporters in the amphitheater, and thereafter, all through the convention proceedings, Chicago was referred to as a police state, an armed camp, a jungle. These commentators, remember, were at the amphitheater when the violence broke out, and so they saw the story unfold the same way you and I did—on TV tape and film.

Let me tell you a little more about what we saw.

First, almost all the pictures were taken from behind the police lines, with the big TV news lights placed, by necessity, so that they illuminated areas up to the police line. Sensible, of course, because that's where the action would be. Or the re-action. Beyond that line—the lighted area, that is—practically nothing at all could be distinguished.

So . . . what did we not see?

We didn't see broken bottles being thrown. We didn't see the rocks, garbage, bags of feces. We didn't see the styrofoam balls with spikes driven through them. . . .

We didn't see policemen being kicked, in-steps jumped on. We didn't see the spitting in officers faces, and we didn't hear the curses and vilification. And in those terrible hours Messrs. Huntley, Brinkley, Cronkite and Smith didn't see them either. And so nobody who wasn't actually there could see what went on in that unlighted area behind the police line. And some who were there couldn't see.

Were the protestors attacked by the police without provocation? No.

Did the police simply act or did they react? Which is doing their jobs. Yes.

Joel Daly said it last night. Sadistical brutal police officers should be thrown off the force. And revolutionaries who organize young people to break the law, knowing full well some of these kids will be hurt . . . perhaps killed . . . or kill someone else in the process . . . should be jailed.

But to condemn this entire city just because this confrontation took place here, to blame all of Chicago for the actions of a few, is irresponsible, and the one-sided way the story was handled by the networks did just that.

Perhaps Mayor Daley went too far with security, both in the Amphitheater, which

ranked the usually omnipotent press corps, and on the streets.

Perhaps, on the other hand, the Mayor didn't go far enough. Maybe some action might have been taken sooner . . . I don't know.

This I do know. This is my home—my town. And I can't stand by and hear it being called a police state, a jungle, a mid-west iron curtain city . . .

Gore Vidal, on this program last night, said "This is your city. If this is the way you want it, keep it that way. You have to live here."

Well, Mr. Vidal had it almost right. It is our city. And it's not perfect. In some areas it's not even good. And in others it's downright bad. There are lots of things about Chicago we'd like to change—and we're trying. But when the sophisticated, so called big names come in from New York and vent their petty frustrations by presenting Chicago as a concentration camp . . . Chicagoans won't stand for it. Especially this one.

KEEP IT OUT OF THE HOUSE

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion in recent months about the defects in the constitutionally sanctioned electoral college system. The defects have long been recognized but the candidacy of George Wallace of Alabama has underscored the urgency of securing a remedy. Our distinguished colleague, JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, has written a thoughtful article about the problem that appears in the current issue of the Atlantic magazine. The article is a lucid and compelling presentation of the problem and contains a recommended solution which Americans should carefully consider. I wish to congratulate Mr. BINGHAM for bringing this problem into focus and I urge each of my colleagues to read the article which follows:

KEEP IT OUT OF THE HOUSE

(By JONATHAN B. BINGHAM)

Our American Constitution has proved a durable document, but it has an Achilles' heel that this year could cause us acute pain—and might even prove to be a fatal flaw.

Alexander Hamilton singled out the provisions governing the election of the President and Vice President as the only part of the Constitution which "received the slightest mark of approbation from its opponents." Yet it is those very provisions which almost never worked as intended and which are potentially disastrous.

The Twelfth Amendment to the Constitution, which is a modification of part of the original Article II, provides that if no presidential candidate obtains a majority of the electoral college, the choice must be made from the top three candidates by the House of Representatives. The vote in the House is to be cast by states, with each state having one vote, and an absolute majority (or 26 states today) is required to elect. The Vice President is chosen by the Senate from among the two top candidates for that office.

Not since 1824 has the electoral college failed to produce a majority for a President or a Vice President, but it could easily happen this year because the two major candi-

dates may be in a close finish and because the American Independent Party candidate, George Wallace, is expected to win in some states.

There are a number of plausible combinations of state results that could produce the impasse. Here is just one such combination, based on perfectly reasonable expectations: Wallace wins Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina, for a total of 47 electoral votes; the Democratic candidate wins Arkansas, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Washington, and West Virginia, for a total of 250 electoral votes; the Republican wins the remaining states for a total of 241 electoral votes. No one has the required 270.

Former Governor Wallace has made no secret of what he will do if the voters place such power in his hands. In the event of a deadlock, he says, he will offer his electoral votes to either major candidate who agrees in a solemn "covenant" to Wallace's demands. "Covenant" is the Alabamian's euphemism for a racist political deal, probably involving Southern veto power over future Supreme Court appointments and a decided slowdown, if not a halt, in federal efforts to push the pace of desegregation. If precedent is any guide, a step-up in federal bounty flowing South without strings would also be a part of the price.

ELECTION IMPASSE?

Tom Wicker of the New York Times has argued that no Democratic or Republican candidate could possibly make such a deal. I am not so sure, but let us assume that Mr. Wicker is correct and that no deal is made in the electoral college. The election then goes into the House, which would at the least mean a dangerous delay in starting the now very complicated process of arranging for the transfer of power from one Administration to the next.

It might also mean that the party defeated in electoral votes might win a majority of the state delegations in the House, as happened, for instance, in 1956.

An even more awkward contingency would be if the House of Representatives, like the electoral college, found itself deadlocked and unable to elect. This could happen if several state delegations were evenly split and therefore unable to vote, or if, with the state delegations fairly evenly divided between the major parties, three or four conservative Southern Democratic delegations were prepared either to support Wallace or to refuse to vote for the Democratic candidate.

The result would be severe uncertainty and unrest, causing acute problems at home and loss of confidence abroad. Again, as in the electoral college, Wallace would be trying to make a trade, and he might just succeed; or the deadlock in the House could continue past January 20, when the President's term ends pursuant to the Twentieth Amendment. At that point, if the Senate had chosen a Vice President, he would become acting President.

Because of its different composition, the Senate might well choose a Vice President whose ticket had been second best in the popular vote and in the electoral college. Since next year's Senate will probably be Democratic, they would presumably elect the Democratic choice for Vice President no matter what the House does.

A deadlock in the Senate is most unlikely, since it must choose from the top two vice presidential contenders, but such a frustrating contingency is not out of the question in a nip and tuck situation. An absolute majority (now 51 senators) is required to elect, and some senators might simply refuse to vote. Presumably, if both Houses were

deadlocked, the Speaker of the House would then have to take over as acting President until the knot could be unraveled.

ORGY OF DEALS

The possibilities for maneuvering in such situations as these are almost limitless. Twice in our history, when a presidential election was thrust into the House of Representatives, the result was in fact an orgy of wheeling and dealing, blatant manipulation, and pressure politics. Both elections nearly led to armed uprisings. And one of them gave the country a President who had secured a plurality neither of the electoral nor of the popular vote.

In the first case, the election of 1800, the deadlock occurred because the original Article II of the Constitution directed that each elector vote for two persons, but did not require that he specify which one was his choice for President. Thomas Jefferson, his party's candidate for the top office, and Aaron Burr, his ostensible running mate, each received 73 electoral votes. But the unscrupulous Burr refused to concede the presidency to Jefferson and thus forced the election into the House, which deadlocked on the first ballot with 8 states for Jefferson (one short of the majority), 6 for Burr, and 2 evenly divided.

The power of determining the vote, and thus of shaping the future destiny of the nation, lay in the hands of obscure congressmen such as Joseph Nicholson, a critically ill member of the stalemated Maryland delegation, who cast his vote from a cot on the House floor to keep his state out of the Burr lineup, and young playboy James Bayard, Delaware's single-member delegation, who vacillated agonizingly between Jefferson and Burr. The outcome was decided in Jefferson's favor only after 35 ballots—and an unbelievable amount of maneuvering.

After this fiasco, the Constitution was changed by the Twelfth Amendment to read as it does today. But this did not prevent the absurdities of 1824-1825.

Early in December, 1824, with all of the electoral votes counted except Louisiana's, the tally stood at 96 for General Andrew Jackson, 84 for John Quincy Adams, 41 for William Crawford, and 37 for Speaker of the House Henry Clay. Louisiana was considered a major Clay stronghold, and with its five votes he would have been one of the three top candidates to go before the House, where his power was supreme.

But Clay drew a blank from Louisiana. The state assembly, which was to choose the electors, was closely divided. Because two assemblymen favorable to Clay had a carriage accident on their way to the state capital, and two others simply neglected to show up, Clay did not get his majority in the assembly, and a slate of unfavorable electors was named. So the choice in the House was between Jackson, Adams, and Crawford.

When the House convened in February, 1825, the big New York delegation was at first evenly split with 17 members for Adams and 17 for Crawford. This situation neutralized a vote which Adams needed to control a majority of the state delegations. Once again, the partisan pressures focused upon a single wavering representative, Stephen Van Rensselaer of upstate New York. When the critical moment came, the election was decided by a discarded paper ballot, bearing the name of Adams, which Van Rensselaer took as a divine signal and dropped into the ballot box.¹

Jackson and his people were furious and charged that Adams had made a deal with Clay to win. When Clay turned up as Adams' Secretary of State, Jackson spoke of "the Judas of the West" as receiving his "thirty pieces of silver."

¹ For these details I am indebted to Theodore Venetoullis, whose book *And the House Shall Choose* has just been published by the Elias Press.

The recital of horrors that actually have occurred under our electoral system would not be complete without at least some reference to the sordid story of 1876 when backroom deals deprived Samuel J. Tilden of election and Rutherford B. Hayes emerged the winner in the electoral college by one vote, all three contested states—Florida, Louisiana, and South Carolina—having been adjudged to fall in the Republican column. The mess of pottage in this case for the Southern Democrats of the day who went along with Hayes included Cabinet appointments, restoration of "home rule" in the South (that is, rule by white Democrats), and public works, known then as "internal improvements," and later as "pork barrel." In those days it was merely inconvenient that the country did not know who its President would be until a few hours before his inauguration. Today the uncertainty would create grave problems.

ABSURD AND UNDEMOCRATIC

Surely a system for presidential election that contains a serious risk of such results should not be allowed to continue. The system is not only dangerous, it is absurdly undemocratic, since each state regardless of size has an equal vote in the House. This gives the smallest state in the nation, with fewer than 300,000 inhabitants, the same voice as the largest state, which has more than 19 million. An evenly divided delegation has no vote at all, regardless of the size of the state.

To be elected President, a candidate needs the support of a majority of the delegations of any 26 states. To win the delegations of the 26 smallest states, he would need to control the votes of only 59 members—about 13 percent of the total membership of the House!

With the grave and unprecedented tensions that exist in our society today, and the widespread questioning of the validity of our democratic system, an unpopular, rigged, and undemocratic election of a President by Congress might well spark the revolution that is already building in our cities. Such a revolution would be likely to produce an even stronger counterrevolution with totalitarian overtones.

It is too late now for the Constitution to be amended before the November elections. But it has been my hope, and the hope of many others who are concerned about our constitutional Achilles' heel, that the fears of this season would provide the needed incentive for a change in the Constitution.

There are various ways in which the amendment could be drawn. Some, including the *New York Times* editorially, are in favor of providing for the election of our Presidents by direct popular vote. This solution is attractive, but there are two main objections to it.

First, unless provision is made for a runoff contest, the election of a President by a plurality far short of a majority would be possible (like the election of President Thieu in Vietnam with 32 percent of the vote).

Second, such a constitutional amendment has been rejected often in the past and has little chance of adoption because the present electoral vote system is favored by a powerful coalition of forces. The small states like it because they are assured of at least three electoral votes. And the big states like it because, with their electoral votes going on a winner-take-all basis, they get special attention from the major parties. Because most of the big states are big-city states as well, many perceptive liberals, who want to see the federal government pay more attention to big-city problems, are opposed to giving up the electoral vote arrangement. Also in this political lineup, oddly enough, are the advocates of strong state authority, who fear—with some reason—that popular presidential elections would lead to stronger pres-

ures for federal laws governing voting qualifications and similar questions now left to the states.

Another kind of proposed constitutional amendment would call for the election of the President by a majority vote of a joint session of Congress if no candidate obtained a majority of the electoral college. This would certainly be an improvement over the existing system, in that each member rather than each state would have one vote. But making the President dependent on Congress for his election would still leave the door open for postelection political bargaining, and it ignores the fact that the voters may prefer a presidential candidate of one party while electing a Congress dominated by the other party, as in 1956. Moreover, the participation of the Senate in the choice is particularly questionable since two thirds of the Senate would have been elected in prior elections.

RUN IT OFF

The simplest way to avoid the dangers of the present system, and one that would not arouse the same opposition as the idea of a direct popular vote, would be to provide for a runoff election between the two top contenders if no presidential candidate received a majority of the electoral votes on the first go-around. This would not only prevent the election from being thrown into the Congress, but it would assure that the new President would be elected by a majority of the electoral votes (and in all likelihood the majority of the popular vote also). The runoff works well in a number of states which use it in party primary elections. And we urged the Vietnamese Constituent Assembly to adopt it for their presidential election and were chagrined when they did not.

The chief argument against such a system is that it will tend to discourage third- or fourth-party candidacies. As one who believes that the two-party system has had much to do with the stability and strength of our democratic system, I am not greatly impressed by that argument.

In addition to the essential idea of a runoff, the proposed constitutional amendment and complementary legislation which I have introduced in the Congress contain two other elements. First, in order to assure an adequate period for the transfer of power to the new President, the date of the main election would be moved up three weeks, so that the runoff, if needed, could be held on the present election day.

Second, the archaic "electoral college" would be eliminated, without disturbing the present electoral vote-counting system. This would do away with the potentially disruptive and dangerous power of electors to disregard the instructions of the voters who elected them.

In 1960, all eight of Mississippi's electors and six of Alabama's electors withheld their votes from both national candidates and cast them instead for Senator Harry Byrd of Virginia, who was not even a candidate. To prevent a similar occurrence in the future, and to make it impossible for a third-party candidate to bargain with his electoral votes, the slates of electors should be abolished. In their place, each state would be allotted the number of electoral votes corresponding to its representation in the House and Senate, and these votes would be cast automatically for the presidential candidate receiving the largest popular vote in that state.

Today, when most people could not name a single elector who represented their state in 1964, the electoral college, like the vermillion appendix, is no longer useful and may be hazardous. If the coming election does produce a deadlock in the electoral college and an ensuing mess of one sort or another, we can be sure that the Congress and the states will be sufficiently disturbed to pass and ratify a corrective constitutional amendment. Proposals such as that by Congress-

man Charles Goodell, Republican of New York, and Morris Udall, Democrat of Arizona, for a gentleman's agreement that the House would elect whoever won a plurality of the electoral votes are ingenious but offer no reliable or permanent solution. But if no deadlock occurs, the problem is likely to be neglected for another four years—unless, of course, an aroused citizenry demands otherwise.

OF THE, BY THE, AND FOR THE
PEOPLE

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Joseph A. Scerra, past commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, was one of the greatest national commanders in the history of any of our veterans' organizations.

An outstanding editorial by Comdr. Joseph A. Scerra appeared in the July issue of the Veterans of Foreign Wars magazine. I commend this timely and superb editorial to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and to the people of our country, as follows:

OF THE, BY THE, AND FOR THE PEOPLE

(By Joseph A. Scerra)

Let's go "cop" hunting. Why not? It's open season on law enforcement officers. The audible portion of the American public has turned its back on law and order. Even J. Edgar Hoover, whose name is synonymous with integrity, is being snapped at by jackals.

In a large metropolitan city the other day, a young police officer was brutally murdered on the public sidewalk by a gang of criminals. A thousand policemen from a score of cities attended his funeral, but the only private citizens there were the widows of other murdered officers. "The People" for whom he kept the peace, and gave his life, scarcely heeded his passing. To them he was just a "Cop." And "Cops" aren't really human beings.

He was just a "Cop." And yet the Police Department Chaplain said of him:

"He performed an act of heroism equal to any this city has ever seen. He, too, had a dream . . . he had a zest for life. He looked forward to advancement. His goals were set extremely high. He had ambition . . . What is heroism? What is dedication? A young officer, deciding to give up his dream so you and I might have ours."

He was just a "Cop"! He was 26. He was an ex-marine. He was an honorable, law-abiding citizen. He was a patriotic and dedicated public servant. He was a great American. He was also a Negro. He was proud of both his race and his country—proud enough to die for them—and for "The People."

Yet none of that vast majority of silent "fellow citizens," whose burdens and responsibilities he carried, cared very much. He was just a "Cop" to them. Not a fellow human being. Not a person with normal feelings of pain and pride and anger. Not a sorrowing mother's only son. Not even a courageous and unselfish fellow citizen doing his duty, and theirs, to uphold their law—to preserve their "government of laws." No, he was just a "Cop," the "Fuzz," a "Flat-foot," a "Harness Bull"—a despised creature apart and far below their gay and irresponsible social whirl.

"You will never respond to verbal abuse."

This was the firm admonition of a Peace Chief to a graduating class of 39 young policemen recently—in a great city which has vacancies for at least 500 more and a need for several thousand.

Why only 39, when so many people are clamoring for jobs? How much abuse are you willing to take from total strangers? How much abuse are you willing to take from any man? How much verbal abuse can you take without "responding"?

It is growing more and more difficult to induce young men in this country to enter the field of law enforcement. Why should they?

Read the newspapers. Listen to the radio. Watch television. There is a firmly established group of newscasters and reporters who regularly indoctrinate you with the anti-law-enforcement mania of our times. In their subtle, "completely impersonal," but degenerating way, they are chipping away at the very foundation of American democracy. They routinely suggest and produce alleged "evidence" to prove that policemen represent no one but themselves; that individual officers are sadistic in their treatment of persons accused of crime—who are always "innocent," of course, or "justified" in breaking the law.

The "heroes" of these monsters of the media are the criminals—because "society made them so." They are the "users," the "pushers," the narcotics peddlers, the rioters, the destructive demonstrators, the anarchists and the Communists. Never the policeman. He is the villain.

It has been said over and over again that ours is a "government of laws and not of men." Yet no law is self-operative. Enforcement is not inherent in the words of any statute. Men enact our laws. Men interpret and apply them. And men enforce them.

Who are these men? They are policemen. They are official representatives of "The People." The trouble with us today is that we have forgotten who "The People" are.

They are not the criminals. They are not the anti-American demonstrators or the draft dodgers. They are not the destructive and militant dissenters who hate all things American. They are that vast and silent majority of decent human beings who pay pyramiding taxes to support these drones. These are "The People" for whom policemen daily risk their lives to provide protection under the law.

This hard-working, tax-paying, law-abiding majority is this nation. It is they who have the greater right to be heard—and the greater duty to speak out. It is "of them," "by them" and "for them" that this government exists. One of the most essential functions of any government is to protect decent citizens from those who violate their laws.

Police officers are the official agents of "The People" to carry out this purpose of self-government in their behalf. Abuse them and you abuse the nation.

It is not always easy to draw a line of demarcation between conflicting rights. It is even more difficult for partisans to recognize and honor that line once it is drawn. Beyond that, there are always persons who refuse to respect either the line or the rights. Thus, if civilization is to continue to progress, we must have laws and they must be enforced.

To accomplish this we must have a police force, and this police force makes up the very foundation of our government. Upon their courage and integrity; upon their good judgment and loyalty to principle; upon their unselfish devotion to duty rests the superstructure of justice. Our form of government must stand or fall upon the quality of that structure.

When a police officer seeks to arrest one charged with crime he is not acting in self-

defense or for any selfish motive. He acts in defense of the State—and the State is "The People."

Since the early attempts of man to govern himself and his neighbors, certain individuals have been selected, prevailed upon and appointed to assume the burdens and the risks of providing protection under the rules adopted for that purpose by the majority of those concerned. Whether frontier marshals, county sheriffs, town constables or city police, they have always been official representatives of "The People." They have served no private purpose. They have served "of the people, by the people and for the people."

Historically, they are underpaid. Traditionally, they are something less than socially acceptable. Officially, they have always been fair game for persons with ulterior motives. Judicially, they are routinely ridiculed, maligned and insulted.

They go their quiet way, serving "The People"—sometimes in the dark recesses of the night; often in the nervous tenseness of the pre-dawn hours; in the sweltering heat of the day in heavy woolen uniforms; in the rain and snow of winter, harassed, imposed upon, slandered and abused by the benefactors of their dedicated service.

They are unfairly criticized by every disgruntled citizen. They are threatened, insulted, falsely accused, sued, condemned and suspended without pay upon any man's allegation. Every day and every night, somewhere in this nation, a police officer is being cursed, assaulted, beaten and murdered.

Their grieving families suffer in silence and alone, except for the sympathy extended by their fellow officers. None of them ever leaves enough money to care for those families. Yet "The People" simply shrug and call them "fools" for ever having entered the profession.

"Honest and upright citizens" threaten each day of their lives, on some pretext of righteous anger, to "get their jobs." They are invariably presumed to be at fault by elected officials.

Let a police officer shoot an escaping or attacking felon, caught in an act of vicious depredation, and the headlines scream, "Policeman Kills Young Boy."

Let a police officer fail to arrive in time to prevent a crime and listen to the tirade of the "taxpayer."

Let a police officer be beaten by demonstrators who are violating the law and "it was good enough for him for interfering with their civil rights."

Let a police officer be mauled to the point of death, and even murdered by rioters, and what private citizen will come to his assistance?

Let a police officer be brutally slain in the process of preventing a robbery, a burglary, arson or rape and what paper will give him sympathetic headlines?

On every hand the false claim of "police brutality" is aflame throughout the land. It has become the standard banner of defense in every criminal trial. The criminal is "presumed to be innocent," and the arresting officer's character is routinely made the "defendant" in every court room. Lawyers deliberately and painstakingly misrepresent the facts to blacken the good name of every officer. Judges tolerate it and even encourage it. The news media lend "sob sister" credence to it. And "The People" continue to believe only "what they read in the papers." All of the brutalities of life are currently marshaled against law enforcement.

What difference does it make? After all, they are only "Cops." But whatever you choose to call them, this nation cannot survive without them. And this nation is "The People."

**NEEDED: A NEW PRESIDENT AT
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY**

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the more that New York University seeks to whitewash its appointment of John F. Hatchett as director of its new Martin Luther King, Jr., Afro-American Student Center the more reprehensible does the situation become.

Mr. Hatchett was dismissed as a substitute teacher for escorting his class of pupils, in violation of board of education regulations, to a memorial service for Malcolm X, at which the audience was exhorted to get and kill "whitey."

He is also the author of an article, titled "The Phenomenon of the Anti-Black Jew and the Black Anglo Saxons: A Study in Educational Perfidy," published in the November-December 1967 issue of the Afro-American Teachers Forum.

In this article, Mr. Hatchett asserted:

We are witnessing today in New York City a phenomenon that spells death for the minds and souls of our Black children. It is the systematic coming of age of Jews who dominate and control the educational bureaucracy of the New York Public School system and their power starved imitators . . . this collusion . . . is one of the fundamental reasons why our Black children are being educationally castrated, individually and socially devastated to the extent that they are incapable of participating in, and carrying through to a reasonable conclusion, any meaningful educational experience.

This article was denounced by the American Jewish Congress, the Protestant Council and the Catholic Interracial Council in a joint public statement as a "naked appeal to racial and religious hatred" and as an attempt "to divide black from white, Christian from Jew." These organizations also jointly condemned the appointment of Mr. Hatchett as director of the University's Martin Luther King, Jr., Afro-American Student Center as a desecration of the ideals of Reverend King and as an affront to the people of our city.

The attempts by Dr. James Hester, president of New York University, to justify the appointment and retention of Mr. Hatchett as director has served merely to inflame a situation already explosive. Dr. Hester denied that Mr. Hatchett's views were anti-Semitic and in fact defended those views on the theory that Jewish teachers exposed themselves to such criticism by organizing a Jewish Teachers Association. Dr. Hester suggested that Mr. Hatchett was not anti-Semitic in the "classic sense" as if racial and religious bigotry were a question of degree.

Two facts clearly emerge from this controversy. First, Mr. Hatchett is manifestly unfit to direct the Martin Luther King, Jr., Afro-American Student Center as his actions and attitudes are the antitheses of the ideals of the late Dr. King. Mr. Hatchett, therefore, should be dismissed immediately.

Second, Dr. Hester having made this unfortunate appointment through—in the most charitable interpretation—ignorance of Mr. Hatchett's background, continues to compound the error by rationalization and vacillation inexcusable in a president of any university. Dr. Hester has so compromised his position by these errors of judgment that in the interests of New York University and of racial amity in our city he should resign at once.

RETIREMENT OF PAUL E. MATHIAS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, few men in Illinois have left such a positive impact on the rural communities of our State as Paul E. Mathias who has retired as general counsel of the Illinois Agriculture Association. Mr. Mathias served with IAA for 35 years, the last 18 of which were spent as general counsel.

His wise counsel has been important to those of us who represent Illinois in Washington as well as those who serve in the State legislative bodies in Springfield. In addition to his excellent work for the IAA, he also held a number of responsible positions with the State. He was a member of the Illinois School Finance and Tax Commission in 1946-47; a member of the State advisory commission on the reorganization of schools in 1947-51; a member of the revenue laws commission in 1949 and a member of the State revenue study commission in 1961-63.

His leadership was especially influential in the strengthening of IAA for during the period in which he was associated with this leading farm organization, its membership grew from 40,000 families to 192,000 families. In other areas his work was effective for he handled a considerable amount of work involved in setting up local rural electric cooperatives' articles of incorporation, bylaws, and corporate structure.

His career was highly commended in resolutions of the Illinois State Senate and the Association of Illinois Electric Cooperatives. The following article published in the June IAA Record summarizes his impressive contributions to rural America:

PAUL E. MATHIAS RETIRES

Paul E. Mathias is a man who will long be remembered for his wise counsel and outstanding service to Farm Bureau and agriculture in Illinois.

Mathias retired May 31 as the general counsel of the Illinois Agricultural Association under the organization's mandatory retirement rule for 65-year-old employees.

His retirement ended a professional career with Farm Bureau which spanned 35 years of the 52-year history of IAA. Mathias joined the IAA legal department staff in 1933 as assistant to General Counsel Donald Kirkpatrick in the administration of IAA President Earl C. Smith. Mathias became general counsel in 1950 when Kirkpatrick retired.

As general counsel, Mathias headed a division which consisted of not only the legal department but departments for legislation,

local government, transportation, taxation, stock records, and natural resources.

At his retirement, he also held a number of important legal and corporate posts with many of the Farm Bureau-affiliated companies. He was general counsel and a member of the investment committee of the four insurance companies making up the Country Companies as well as general counsel of FS Services, Inc., and the Illinois Agricultural Holding Co., which holds the controlling capital stock of Country Life Insurance Company for Farm Bureau.

He also served as a board member and assistant secretary of the Illinois Agricultural Service Company, which provides management consultation and coordination services to 13 Farm Bureau-affiliated companies. Mathias also was secretary of Country Capital Investment Fund, Inc., and a member of the board of Country Capital Management Company.

Mathias has been succeeded as IAA general counsel by Gordon C. Adler, who formerly served as assistant general counsel.

SERVED IN ADVISORY CAPACITIES

During his Farm Bureau career, Mathias has served in various advisory capacities to the state government of Illinois. In 1946-47 he served on the Illinois School Finance and Tax Commission which developed the foundation program for state financial support of public schools. He served as a member of the state Advisory Commission on the Reorganization of Schools in 1947-51, on the Revenue Laws Commission of 1949, and in 1961-63 as a member of the state Revenue Study Commission and as chairman of its constitutional limitations study subcommittee.

In agricultural fields, Mathias handled a lot of the legal work involved in setting up local rural electric cooperatives' articles of incorporation, bylaws, and corporate structure.

Mathias is well known in legal and government circles throughout Illinois. Since 1935 he has supervised the legislative activities of the IAA in representing farmers before the Illinois General Assembly.

Those who have worked with Paul Mathias know him to be a capable and efficient counselor, a quiet man with a sense of humor, a man whose dedication to agriculture's interests has never flagged.

Mathias and his wife, Lucille, will continue to reside in Bloomington where he will do some private law work. Retirement will afford him more time now to supervise his 224-acre grain and hog farm near Bloomington, to travel upon occasion, and perhaps even to polish up his golf game which has been a casualty to his job these past years.

Mr. and Mrs. Mathias have two adult sons, John, of Allentown, Pa., and Richard, of Chicago.

PRESIDENTS PAY TRIBUTE

Mathias served under four IAA presidents—the late Earl Smith, Charles B. Shuman (now American Farm Bureau Federation president), the late Otto Steffey, and William J. Kuhfuss, the present IAA head.

Both Shuman and Kuhfuss are profuse, and deeply sincere, in their expressions of appreciation of Mathias' service over the years.

"Paul's candid, straightforward, reliable counsel has been a pillar of strength for the organization and for me personally," Kuhfuss said. "His influence has been a dominant factor in building the stature and effectiveness of the Illinois Agricultural Association."

Shuman acknowledged that he came to the IAA with little organizational or business experience, "but I found that my predecessor, Earl C. Smith, had built a very capable and loyal staff—and among these outstanding men was Paul E. Mathias."

Shuman added: "Without Paul's kindly and wise counsel I could not have carried the new and heavy responsibilities. At all times

his first consideration was for the Farm Bureau families of Illinois and the organizations which they had built. Farm Bureau in Illinois, and throughout the nation, will be forever indebted to Paul Mathias for his many years of service to our organization and its members."

BRING ON "POLICE BRUTALITY"

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, Americans applaud the efforts of the police, the National Guard, and the backup forces of the U.S. Army to assure that the National Democratic Convention held in Chicago should not be disrupted and brought to a halt by the well-planned and well-organized mobs who gathered in Chicago. Mrs. Ann B. Carroll, editor of the *Pocahontas*, Ark., *Star-Herald*, in the September 5 issue of that fine newspaper, comments on this matter. It is a pleasure to call the remarks of Mrs. Carroll to the attention of the Congress:

BRING ON "POLICE BRUTALITY"

Our country continues to show alarming signs of digression with the reaction of thousands to "police brutality" in the handling of demonstrators at Chicago last week during the National Democratic Convention.

News media and many delegates to the convention expressed sympathy for demonstrators as they clashed with Chicago police.

Our reaction upon viewing the situation via TV was that police had no alternative other than to get rough with the demonstrators, who refused to heed police warnings to disperse and cease their marches.

The Chicago demonstrations had been planned for the week of the National Democratic Convention, for months ahead, and the hippies and yuppies had laid plans well in advance, to make sure that when they provoked lawmen to the use of force, they do so in full view of TV cameras, in an effort to obtain sympathy.

The results were as the demonstrators planned—big-hearted Americans, when they saw citizens being handled roughly, immediately went to their defense and turned against the police.

Had those TV viewers who sympathized with the demonstrators stopped to think, we believe they would have realized that such tactics by Chicago's police were necessary.

The hundreds of demonstrators were told by police to disperse; the demonstrators refused to obey; the police then began making arrests and the lawbreakers resisted these arrests. When a citizen is arrested, he is not supposed to resist in a "physical" manner. Had the demonstrators walked to the police paddywagons and entered them when told to do so, it would not have been necessary for lawmen to use night sticks on them. It simply boils down to the fact that the hippies and yuppies were resisting arrest and got what they deserved.

We believe that Chicago's Mayor Daley's instructions to police to use strong-arm tactics where needed was sound advice.

We are fed up with cities whose officials are soft on rioters and demonstrators. We are also fed up with government officials who advise Army and National Guard units against arrest of such trouble-makers.

A salute to Mayor Daley for his sensible handling of a bad situation. It made those of us take heart who were beginning to wonder if law and order weren't vanishing in our country.

THIEU SEES FEWER U.S. TROOPS IN VIETNAM BY 1969

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THIEU SEES FEWER U.S. TROOPS IN VIETNAM BY 1969

(By James D. Hittle, brigadier general, USMC, retired)

SAIGON.—"A reduction in U.S. troops in South Vietnam can start next year."

President Nguyen van Thieu made this forecast in a private meeting with Joseph A. Scerra, commander-in-chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and me in the presidential office of the government palace here.

"We are now willing to take more responsibility," Thieu explained. "By increasing our strength we can move toward starting a phase-out of U.S. troops. We could begin phasing out one U.S. division in mid-1969."

"WE CAN'T ASK MORE"

"The United States has done so much; we cannot ask more from you."

In Thieu's opinion three basic developments will permit a U.S. troop reduction:

The manpower buildup of South Vietnam's armed forces. (This increase, according to U.S. sources, is ahead of schedule).

Equipping South Vietnamese units with the U.S. M-16 rifle. This provides a big boost in firepower.

The deterioration of the combat efficiency of North Vietnamese troops arriving in the south.

Thieu's conversation with Scerra was wide-ranging. He saw the Communist Tet truce violation last February as a turning point in the war.

"The Tet offensive was a mistake for the Communists," he said.

Until the Tet attacks, he said, the people in the cities were somewhat remote from the actual war.

"Now the people in the cities understand the war and they know what kind of treatment they would get from the Communists."

Thieu calls the Tet and subsequent attacks a failure.

FAILURES CITED

"There was no uprising against the government. There was no defection of the armed forces. The government did not fall.

"The Communists did not succeed in taking a single major objective.

Thieu did not minimize the damage done by the Communists, particularly to the pacification program in the rural areas. He said this setback was temporary, however, and that his government emerged from the attacks in a much stronger position.

He also said "the Viet Cong are having serious manpower problems."

Communist recruiting in South Vietnam has become so difficult that North Vietnamese troops are being used as replacements in Viet Cong units.

NEW ATTACK SEEN

"North Vietnam regulars now provide close to 70 percent of the strength of VC main force units," he said.

Does he expect another Communist offensive?

"Sure. They are waiting for the critical time to launch a big attack. They want to time it, for best results from their standpoint, with the U.S. political situation and the Paris peace talks.

"They will try to make it a bigger and more sustained attack than last time, but we are in better shape than last time. They are in worse shape."

Thieu minced no words about a coalition government with the Reds.

"We cannot accept a coalition government."

DANGER EXPLAINED

His government has already taken a "great risk," he said, in expressing a willingness to accept, as individuals, Communists who want to return. They could total, after a halt to hostilities, close to 100,000.

"We will have to be in a strong position to absorb them.

"The danger is that they may return as individuals, but later form a party that will give them camouflage for Communist political activity. The problem will become dangerous with peace.

"CAN'T TAKE RISK

"We cannot take the added risk of a coalition government. If we did, they could take over in six months."

What has been the most important single accomplishment of the Saigon government thus far?

"We have gained the confidence of the people," Thieu replied.

"Those who say we don't want peace are wrong. We do want peace. Our country has everything but peace."

From his expression and tone it was obvious that Thieu does not intend to buy that peace at the cost of surrender.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Gen. Hittle is Director of National Security and Foreign Affairs for Veterans of Foreign Wars.

TIME IS RIPE FOR ELECTION REFORMS

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, a very timely editorial appeared in the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, Sunday, September 8, citing the need for election reforms. Realizing the impending adjournment sine die of Congress and the necessity for a thorough study to prepare a proper measure to be submitted as a constitutional amendment, I feel that time is too short for the introduction of such a measure in this session. However, I intend to ask Congress in the next session to conduct hearings and a thorough study so that needed election reforms may become law.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial above mentioned:

TIME IS RIPE FOR ELECTION REFORMS

The Vietnam war protesters did not succeed in getting a "dove" plank written into either major party's platform but they have at least helped awaken the American public to some of the inadequacies in this nation's system of nominating and electing its presidents.

There is good reason to believe that the presidential nominees of both parties—Democrat Hubert H. Humphrey and Republican Richard M. Nixon—could very likely have been the same men if their nominations had been made through some sort of direct nationwide primary.

But if those nominations had come through such a primary, the voters as a whole would have felt that they had a personal effect on the outcome. The dissident voices would have difficulty persuading anyone that the party bosses had silenced them.

Whether the picking of presidential nominees at nationwide primaries is practical or

possible or even advisable, we are not sure. Party responsibility calls for convention delegates to try to put their best man forward. Direct nomination could open the way for unprincipled demagogues to win party support by emotional appeals.

But we sincerely believe the whole question of the nomination and election of presidents should be thoroughly explored in the Congress.

Defenders of the convention system point to the fact that great presidents such as Abraham Lincoln and Franklin D. and Theodore Roosevelt were produced under that system and that the nation grew to its present greatness while operating under it. Critics point to some of the lesser presidents, such as Warren G. Harding, that the system produced and they wonder whether the present ills plaguing the nation could have been avoided under a different system more responsive to the people.

The Plain Dealer already has called for abolition of the electoral college and the election of the president and vice president by direct popular vote. We are happy to see that sentiment in Congress for this change, which requires a constitutional amendment, is rapidly increasing.

If after thorough study, Congress determines that nomination of presidential candidates by direct vote is not feasible, we hope that at least the pressure for reforms in the manner in which delegates to the nomination convention are chosen will continue and that changes will be forthcoming before 1972.

There is no time like the present, when the conventions of 1968 are fresh in everyone's mind, to strive to bring about reforms. If nothing is started this year or next, the voters will forget and there will be nothing new in 1972.

THE GOOD THINGS ABOUT THE UNITED STATES TODAY

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, during my frequent visits back to the district, and from some of the mail that I receive here in Washington, it is clear to me that many of our citizens are deeply concerned about the stories they read and the pictures they see on television about our troubled country.

There is no question in my mind that our Nation has many serious problems which we as Americans must try to resolve. But an excellent article which appeared in the highly distinguished American weekly magazine—U.S. News & World Report—summarized in a most eloquent manner what is right about America. I am pleased to place this article in the RECORD today because while I never want to blind myself to our Nation's shortcomings, I believe it is high time that we Americans took note of what is right about this country.

The U.S. News & World Report article follows:

THE GOOD THINGS ABOUT THE UNITED STATES TODAY

At home and abroad, America now is being pictured as an ailing giant.

Racial strife, student anarchy, a rising wave of crime, dissent over the war in Vietnam—these and other troubles are leading many in the world to conclude that the

United States is on the road to decline and downfall.

Yet a close look at the facts of life in the America of today turns up quite different conclusions. The nation's strengths are found to be great and varied.

So much for so many. Below the surface turmoil, a peaceful revolution is transforming not only the economy but the social structure. Never, in the past, has a society offered so much prosperity to so many of its people.

Far from being a "sick" society, Americans in the majority are showing themselves to be strong and morally responsible.

They are spending billions to erase poverty in the nation—and more billions to help other nations.

It is the nuclear defense system maintained by the United States that is providing security for much of the world. American troops drove Communist invaders out of South Korea, kept the peace in Lebanon and staved off a Communist take-over in South Vietnam.

Succor to world. U.S. aid, flowing generously overseas since 1945, rescued Western Europe from the brink of anarchy after World War II and averted famine in India. Now it is generating social revolutions in many of the world's small nations.

Recently Australia's Prime Minister John Gorton said:

"I wonder if anybody has thought what the situation of comparatively small nations would be if there were not in existence a United States—with a heritage of democracy and a willingness to see that small nations who otherwise might not be able to protect themselves are given some shield. Imagine what the situation in the world would be if there were not a great and giant country prepared to make those sacrifices."

Today, despite its supposed "weakness," the United States towers over the globe as no other power in history ever has been able to do.

American capital investment in Europe comes to about 16 billion dollars. Predictions are heard that U.S. industry on that continent soon will become the world's third-largest economic power—after America itself and Soviet Russia.

Not only in terms of political power, but in culture, the "American way of life" is turning up everywhere.

Even in Communist countries, young people are playing "rock" music. The light luncheon favored by American businessmen is making heavy inroads on the Parisian cuisine.

Not long ago President Lyndon B. Johnson took issue with those who say that the U.S. is "sick." He said: "America, I believe, is essentially healthy [and] is getting healthier."

Story of progress. A wide range of arguments can be marshaled to support the view that the U.S., if not living in the "best of times," is far from moving toward the "worst of times."

In the U.S. itself, steady progress is being made on a broad front toward a solution of major problems. This is being done in the energetic and experimental way of Americans.

As just one example—

Quietly, behind the scenes of racial strife that draw world scorn, Negroes—by the hundreds of thousands every year—are moving out of poverty into the ranks of the middle class. In the past two years, President Johnson said, more Negroes and other nonwhites have risen above poverty than in all the previous six years combined.

Since 1960, the number of Negro families earning more than \$7,000 a year has more than doubled. Median income of the Negro family has gone up from \$3,233 in 1960 to \$4,900.

Reason for this is that a larger number of Negroes are getting jobs—and better jobs, too.

Between 1963 and 1967, the number of

Negroes hired for professional, technical and managerial jobs rose 35 per cent. Total Negro employment rose 20 per cent.

Educationally, the Negro-white gap in school years completed has narrowed from an average of two years in 1960 to six months at present. And statistics show that a U.S. Negro is more likely to go on to college than is any citizen of any Western European country except France.

The racial upheaval, taking place peacefully behind outward turmoil, is only part of the nation's transformation in recent years.

Rise from poverty. Altogether, more than 14 million Americans have left poverty behind them during the past seven years.

Latest estimates indicate that the proportion of families earning \$7,000 or more annually, in terms of 1966 dollars, had risen from 22 per cent in 1950 to about 55 per cent in 1966. And last year, for the first time, median family income reached \$8,000 a year.

Meanwhile, the proportion of families earning under \$5,000 a year, in terms of 1966 dollars, had dropped from 58 per cent in 1950 to about 28 per cent.

Socially and politically, the result is that the middle class is becoming the dominant fact of life in today's America, to an extent that most foreigners can only dream about.

Five million more American families own stock than in 1963, while 23 million more have savings accounts.

Home ownership has gone up from 33 million families to 37 million since 1960. Multi-car ownership has gone up from 9.5 million to 14.7 million, and 94 per cent of all American families have at least one television set—often two—in the house.

What passes for poverty in America is seen by many foreigners as an acceptable standard of living.

One visitor from Europe told of meeting a woman in the Louisiana "back country." She was sitting on the porch of her wooden shack, and wore an old shirt, faded blue jeans and sneakers. She described herself as "poor."

Yet, this visitor noted, an automobile was parked in the yard, and the kitchen was equipped with the latest electrical devices. The visitor remarked later:

"The distinction between poverty and well-being in the United States is far less clear than in Europe. Telling a millionaire from a person of middle income by the clothing he wears or the food he eats is almost impossible here."

Production miracle. What has enabled the American middle class to mushroom so rapidly—reducing the ranks of the very poor and very rich—is an economic revolution that is unmatched in history.

In the past seven years the total output of goods and services—the gross national product—in terms of 1968 dollars has gone up by 254 billion dollars. That gain, itself, is larger than the total output of the nation in 1937, or the total output of any other nation in the world today except the Soviet Union.

Statistics tell the story of U.S. strength in economic terms as follows:

America, with 7 per cent of the world's land area and 6 per cent of its population, accounts for one third of the world's production of goods and services.

Its farmlands produce 13 per cent of the world's wheat, 46 per cent of its corn and 21 per cent of its meat—enough to feed 200 million Americans and much of the world besides.

Its factories produce a flow of goods almost equal in size to the combined output of the Soviet Union and Western Europe.

In electrical production, the U.S. figure of 1.3 trillion kilowatt-hours in 1967 came to one third of the world's output, and exceeded the combined capacity of the Soviet Union, Western Europe and Japan put together.

U.S. automobile factories produced 7.4 million passenger cars in 1967, or 41 per cent of the world output. Of the 149 million cars in

use throughout the world, about 78 million—or 53 per cent—are found on American streets or highways.

Per capita disposable income in America, as of 1967, came to \$2,744, or 45 per cent more than per capita income in Canada and the United Kingdom, and 70 per cent more than in France.

A *rugged dollar*. For years, many of the world's economists have been unable to believe that prosperity of this sort could last. Dire warnings have been heard about the dangers of inflation, as well as the drain of U.S. dollars abroad which puts pressure on gold reserves.

Yet, between 1957 and 1967, currency of the United States declined in purchasing power by only 16 per cent—as against 21 per cent for the West German mark, 24 per cent for the Swiss franc and 32 per cent for the Swedish krona, supposedly among the world's stronger currencies.

Result: Year by year, the dollar remains the only currency in which world trade can be carried on with confidence. And despite the large outflow of gold in recent years, the U.S. still holds one quarter of the world's reserves.

Beginning to dawn on leading thinkers abroad is the discovery that America's economic power, far from declining, is pushing ahead to even more dominance in the world.

America's head start. A French intellectual, Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber, says this in his just-published book, "The American Challenge":

"During the past 10 years, roughly from the end of the cold war and the launching of the first sputnik, American power has made an unprecedented leap forward. It has undergone a violent and productive internal revolution. Technological innovation has now become the basic objective of economic policy. In America today the government official, the industrial manager, the economics professor, the engineer, and the scientist have joined forces to develop coordinated techniques for integrating factors of production."

The author concludes:

"America today still resembles Europe—with a fifteen-year head start. She belongs to the same industrial society. But in 1980 America will have entered another world, and if we fail to catch up, the Americans will have a monopoly on know-how, science and power."

Passion for education. Back of this economic revolution is found an educational system unparalleled in the world.

Today Americans are the best-educated people the world has ever known. More Americans—50 per cent—have finished secondary school than any other people. No other nation comes even close to matching the 6.5 million students enrolled in U.S. colleges and universities. That figure represents 3.3 per cent of the nation's population, compared with 1 per cent in France, the nearest competitor in Western Europe.

Altogether, the American passion for learning enlists about 60 million people at the present time, ranging almost from cradle to grave.

Youngsters of three and four are enrolled in "Head Start" and other nurseries. Business firms are sending young executives back to the campus for postgraduate courses—and senior executives go to seminars such as that at Aspen, Colo., to thresh out the nation's larger problems not only in terms of economy, but in history and philosophy.

"Education in America is a never-ending process," declared a European professor after spending several months lecturing in this country.

Europe surpassed. In that process, American institutions of higher learning have displaced those of Europe as the mecca of students the world over.

Today it is a physics degree from "Caltech" or a diploma from Harvard's graduate school of business that is the prize sought

by many of Europe's top students. Even lesser-known colleges in the U.S. draw hundreds of foreign students each year. Institutions that once provided little more than the traditional disciplines now are offering such specialties as biophysics, telecommunications and Asian economic studies as part of their regular curriculums.

Not only foreign students but their professors are crossing the Atlantic in a steady flow called the "brain drain." A British physicist explained:

"It's not just the pay. It's the fact that you Americans really support the pursuit of knowledge.

"You have not only the means, but the will to get things done."

From this academic surge is emerging new strengths in the field of culture and the arts, dispelling the notion of Americans as being interested only in the material things of life.

Book-buying people. Between 1952 and 1962, book sales across the nation doubled in dollar volume, and may have doubled again since then. A "paperback explosion" has brought popularity in America and overseas to such widely different poets and novelists as Joseph Heller, Allen Ginsberg, and John Updike. University presses, alone, have multiplied sales five times since 1948.

Such artists as the late Jackson Pollock, and representatives of the new school of Western painters, are being widely imitated in Western Europe.

Musically, American composers are getting wide attention, not only in jazz and "rock" but in serious music.

Cities such as Cleveland and Boston have orchestras that are world famous, and across the nation are hundreds of amateur and youth symphonies performing music simply because they like to.

Wide map for culture. It is this decentralization of culture that impresses many foreigners visiting the country for the first time.

They find topflight opera being produced in Santa Fe, N.M., and the Shakespeare Festival in Ashland, Oreg., draws critics from Europe as well as New York. The town of Cherokee, Ia., offers its 8,000 people not only a museum of fine arts but classes in painting and sculpture.

How Americans really feel. People of the U.S. are shown in a recent Gallup Poll of 12 countries to be more dubious about the basic health of their nation than are the people of the 11 other countries about the health of their nation.

Yet there is considerable evidence that the large majority of Americans continue to frown on drug-taking, sexual promiscuity and cheating. The nude frolics of "Hair," a recent Broadway musical hit, appear unlikely to match in longevity the traditional Yiddish humor of "Fiddler on the Roof," a smash success for four years. And Americans, more and more, seem inclined to spend their money on such hardy pursuits as skiing, camping and sailing—not on "fun" clubs and night life.

Nor is there visible evidence that religion no longer plays an important role in shaping the nation's goals and ideals.

Last year Gallup Polls found that 45 per cent of all Americans attended church during a typical week, and 70 per cent thought religion "very important." Furthermore, despite the publicity that has been given in recent years to "God is dead" theology, 97 per cent of adult Americans indicated a belief in the existence of God.

On campuses, even agnostic students are reading and arguing about the new "theology of hope" and the "secular theology" of Dr. Harvey Cox, a professor at Harvard.

Steady, undramatic lives. Equally, available evidence tends to discount another widely heralded "weakness" of America—that its people are ridden by frustrations, sexual and otherwise, and are despairing of their lot in

life. A New York advertising firm, surveying housewives in the U.S. came up with these discoveries:

The average housewife had been married to the same man for 22 years, is not strong on clubs, thinks she is happier than her mother was, drinks not at all or very little, and is wrapped up in her home and family.

Foreign students staying with American families are invariably amazed by the warmth and "naturalness" of the hospitality accorded them.

Equally, visitors from abroad note the American talent for combining efforts to solve common problems. Such instances as these draw comment:

On eastern Long Island, near Riverhead, former migrant workers are building their own homes in a "self-help" program—pooling their skills to help each other as frontiersmen used to do.

In Tucson, Ariz., interested citizens launched a campaign to raise funds that would pay the \$17,500 needed by a Mexican-American woman for a kidney transplant and follow-up treatment.

A spirit of philanthropy, even with growth of Social Security, continues to be a major strength of America.

The so-called American conscience last year prompted private spending of more than 14 billion dollars on worthy causes. More than three fourths of this huge sum came from private individuals. The rest was donated by business firms and foundations.

Each year, more than 50 million Americans donate time to charity. They collect money door to door, bake pies for church bazaars and volunteer services at playgrounds in the slums.

Money ignored. Youth, too, is caught up in the American habit of helping neighbors. Said a Florida educator:

"A tremendous number of today's youngsters simply aren't interested in making a lot of money. Their first aim is to be of service, their second is to live a 'satisfying' life."

Tens of thousands of college youngsters this summer are working in the slums of the big cities as volunteer social workers and tutors. Eighteen graduate students in architecture from Yale University are building a camp for underprivileged children of New York City. Schoolchildren in New Jersey are collecting money, clothing and schoolbooks for children of migrant workers.

Over the years, observers from Alexis de Tocqueville onward have noted the incessant drive of Americans for self-improvement. Dr. Daniel Bell, chairman of Columbia University's department of sociology, wrote:

"The great thrust of the American character—the urge, the compulsion to strike out on one's own, to cut away from the father and even to surpass him—has been one of the richest of the sources of dynamism in American life."

Today it is commonplace to read of instances such as a 63-year-old accountant's plodding toward a college degree, one three-hour course at a time, or of a retired businessman taking up a new interest—flying an airplane.

Similarly, a French philosopher noted: "To make life simpler in an increasingly complicated world is an American art."

That art is making it possible, as one instance, for Americans to dial a number on the telephone and hear a prayer, a short sermon, the latest baseball scores, a lecture on alcoholism, or arguments against committing suicide.

They can go to drive-in churches, drive-in banks and drive-in movies. A drive-in marriage service is being offered on the Texas-Oklahoma border. In the burgeoning age of technology, one highly respected U.S. composer and mathematician, Milton Babbitt, is writing "electronic music" in serial repetition—with the help of a computer as well as tape recorder.

Americans voice criticisms of the new world they are pioneering. Complaints are being heard about ZIP codes, electronic eavesdropping, traffic jams, water pollution and the sonic boom.

Growing, too, is fear that "bigness" threatens the traditional belief in the compensations of individual enterprise and persistence.

Courage rewarded. For many, however, America is still the land of the free and the home of the brave.

One success story is that of a Negro trucker and World War II veteran, Joe Jones, of Atlanta, who fought for years to get a Government permit to haul goods across the nation. Repeatedly his application was blocked by the big truckers. Mr. Jones nevertheless, kept up his fight—and last year won a federal-court order that his application be granted. His comment: "I'm a little man, and I think when a little man sticks in there and fights, a lot of people will come to his aid."

As another example, a Spanish-speaking New Yorker, Adrian Cancil, was convicted three years ago of possessing a loaded pistol during a barroom disturbance, despite his protestations of innocence. Last year, he obtained a used tape recorder, strapped it under his shirt and began looking for the man he suspected of actually owning the pistol.

After a long search, he found his quarry in a pool hall, and managed to put on tape the man's unwitting confession to ownership of the pistol. A few weeks ago, Mr. Cancil was able to win complete exoneration.

The Legal Aid Society described the outcome as "a wonderful example of American justice."

As some historians see it, Americans over the years have made a habit of finding out what is wrong with the nation in order to discover ways of improving it.

That habit is throwing the spotlight on the weaknesses of America today. Yet it is also one reason why the United States today is not the "sick giant" so often portrayed by critics—but a strong and powerful nation, one that continues to be the envy of the world at large.

CROSS-BROOKLYN EXPRESSWAY NONESSENTIAL

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, last night I spoke to the Coordinating Committee of Civic Organizations Opposed to the Cross-Brooklyn Expressway at Brooklyn College regarding a grievous error about to be committed in the name of improved transportation. The proposed Cross-Brooklyn Expressway will destroy Brooklyn homes, businesses, and neighborhoods by establishing a veritable Berlin wall to facilitate the travel of specialized interests.

My remarks follow:

STATEMENT OF HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK, TO THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE OF CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSED TO THE CROSS-BROOKLYN EXPRESSWAY, BROOKLYN COLLEGE, BROOKLYN, N.Y., SEPTEMBER 11, 1968

We are gathered here this evening once again in a community effort to save our homes, our businesses, our jobs, and our neighborhoods from irresponsible destruction for a proposed Truckway, which, according to reliable engineering surveys will create more traffic congestion and more traffic confusion than we suffer today.

I know that all of us here this evening, and the thousands of Brooklyn families who support our cause, but are unable to be here tonight, are grateful to the Co-ordinating Committee, and to the 26 Civic Groups who are affiliated with the Committee, for the leadership they have taken to keep our people alert and vigilant to this threat to our community life.

And let us make no mistake about this simple fact: We are fighting not only for our homes, our businesses, our jobs and our neighborhoods. More significantly we are fighting to preserve our Borough and to preserve our city.

What the Lindsay Administration proposes to do is to build a Berlin Wall through the heart of Brooklyn. He proposes to scorch Brooklyn's earth in a manner which will make General Sherman's march through Georgia seem like a picnic. He proposes to dislocate thousands of people, destroy the Brooklyn College campus, remove millions of dollars of property values from the tax rolls, uproot businesses and eliminate hundreds of jobs.

In a city long beset with fiscal problems, in a city where the rising cost of welfare threatens to throw it over the brink into bankruptcy, Mayor Lindsay proposes to force more than 1,000 self-sustaining, tax producing middle income families into the suburbs.

No one but the Lindsay Administration wants the Cross-Brooklyn Expressway. Last year when Governor Rockefeller called upon the people of our State to support the two and one-half billion dollar Transportation Bond Issue, he made public certain plans for the use of those monies. Nowhere in the Governor's plans will you find a reference to the Cross-Brooklyn Expressway. You will find no such reference because the Governor does not want the Expressway.

Commissioner Robert Moses, America's leading highway authority and most prominent road builder, has denounced the Cross-Brooklyn Expressway as a monstrous waste of taxpayer's money.

The 26 Brooklyn civic groups represented here this evening don't want the Cross-Brooklyn Expressway.

I know that your elected representatives in Congress, in the State Senate, and in the State Assembly are opposed to this Expressway.

Less than two months ago, I called a conference in my Washington office of other Congressmen from Brooklyn and your elected representatives in the State Legislature. We were unanimous in our opposition to the Cross-Brooklyn Expressway.

We warned the Congressional leaders and we warned the Secretary of Transportation, Alan S. Boyd, that we would oppose all Federal highway appropriations, if any money is used for the Cross-Brooklyn Expressway. We made it clear to the Secretary of Transportation that if he could make no better use of Federal highway funds than to finance the Cross-Brooklyn Expressway, then he is demonstrating that the Federal highway program is complete and that all other highway plans and programs should be liquidated. Certainly, there is no warrant for wasting two to three hundred million dollars of taxpayer money on a Truckway which no one wants and which no principle of sound planning can justify.

We have been assured by the Secretary of Transportation that no Federal funds will be spent on this proposal, without first holding a public hearing, at which residents and business interests of this community will be given every opportunity to establish their case against this monstrous Truckway.

About a year and a half ago, I attended a meeting at City Hall, where spokesmen for the Lindsay Administration outlined plans for the so-called Linear City as an appendage to the proposed Cross-Brooklyn Expressway.

I left that meeting outraged at the obvious

and blatant attempt of the City spokesmen to blackmail and bribe a whole community into surrender of their homes, their businesses, and their jobs for a Truckway which the people of our community neither need nor want.

The whole concept of Linear City is an affront to the people of Brooklyn and an insult to our intelligence. Your presence here tonight is clear demonstration that you will neither tolerate the affront nor stand for the insult.

Indeed the proposal for a Linear City can best be described as a proposal for a Carbon Monoxide city, which the people of our community totally and completely reject.

We reject it because the entire plan offers nothing but a Carbon Monoxide City—an air polluted, noise wracking, ear splitting, death trap, through which Mayor Lindsay proposes to run a dirty freight train, which will rip your nervous system to bits, at all hours of the day and night, as it runs through the very bedrooms of your homes.

Certainly, this community could use the several hundred million dollars of capital funds, which Mayor Lindsay proposes to waste on his Truckway. Certainly we need more schools. But while the Lindsay Administration talked some months ago about a Central High School in our area, that plan is now dead.

With the number of fires on the increase, the Lindsay Administration closed a firehouse in our District.

Statistics show that the people of our District are victimized four times every hour of every day. Yet the Lindsay Administration proposes to close a Police Precinct Station House, at a time when more police protection is urgently needed.

Certainly, we need better transportation facilities and services in our area. We need better subway and bus service. We must have a Nostrand Avenue Subway Extension. The one thing that will not help transportation in this Borough is the Cross-Brooklyn Expressway. That will help only the large trucking firms plying their trade between Long Island and New Jersey.

This is a fight we can and will win. Your presence here tonight is a symbol of our unity for victory. So long as we remain united, we will protect our homes, our neighborhood, and our community.

THE SMILE OF SINCERITY IN AN AGE OF CONTRIVANCE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from Life magazine of August 16, 1968:

THE PRESIDENCY: THE SMILE OF SINCERITY IN AN AGE OF CONTRIVANCE

(By Hugh Sidey)

Dwight Eisenhower came into the living rooms of 30 million Americans the other night, and he was old and bald and he used a Teleprompter and still flubbed a few of his lines, but there was more power in his 10-minute appeal than in any of the presidential political oratory of the past 12 months. And it may be that the effort to make his talk brought on the heart attack that has him seriously ill.

It has been one of those mysteries of national life why all the would-be Presidents (and President) who have been frantically searching for some formula to catapult them to the heights of popularity have failed to

study the example of Eisenhower. Perhaps in this age of contrivance it is too simple to be believed—decency, sincerity and honesty. It shines out of Ike like a beacon, and it should give those in the political business some pause. Because it illustrates anew that all the programs espoused and the bills passed and the billions spent are only a part of this thing of being President and maybe even the lesser part in a time of dispirited affluence.

It should be of some significance that while almost everybody else was engaged in a season of shifting views, cloaked opinions, denials of internal trouble and even espousal of the right of a government to lie to its people, the steady virtue of Eisenhower raised him to a new pedestal while all those others fell lower. He was polled the most admired man in the nation last year and probably ranks as high today. There is some kind of hunger there. Even among the unwashed and on the campus, the cry is for candor and compassion, which is the same thing.

Lyndon Johnson has used an inordinate amount of his time and energy raising monuments to his own greatness, and all the while his esteem has slipped. Ike's self-promotion runs at such a low voltage as to be undiscernible. He still acts a little embarrassed at new honors. He still wonders why people care—and that only intensifies the phenomenon. A while back in his modest office on the corner of the Gettysburg College campus he marveled at this public. He didn't have an unusually big nose or extraordinary ears or any other physical features that made him easily identifiable, he explained. Yet, there he had been in New York in the back of an unmarked limousine, almost out of sight, and as he drove down the street, "the darndest thing happened. People leaned out and yelled, 'Hello, Ike.' How did they know who I was?"

While all the candidates from Reagan to McCarthy diagnosed in detail the national ailments, Ike maintained a hearty belief that it was a fever, and the body was fundamentally sound. He could beat any of them in a runoff. While the scowl has become the symbol of this season's stump (with the exception of Hubert Humphrey), there has been that enduring smile of Eisenhower's that reached more men's hearts than social security. There is the feeling from Ike that he trusts people and they return it in spades. He has confessed that it would be nice sometime to take Mamie and go to the Metropolitan Museum and "just drift through it without having to shake hands or sign an autograph." But, says Ike, with a chuckle, whenever he brings up that complaint (one of the few anybody has heard him make about his lot in life), Mamie turns to him and says, "How would you like it if they all disliked you?"

In these days of rebellion against order, Ike has been more than ever conscious of the example he must set, which is another of those unmeasurable qualities that go into leadership and has been missing on occasion with the men now in the ring. Eisenhower confesses a liking for horses and horse racing, yet he has scrupulously limited himself to one appearance at the track each year, simply because he believes that that is enough for a man who is held in the public gaze.

There are a lot of people who still feel that Ike never really understood his job of being President. Yet today his common-sense observations about the Presidency are more cogent than a lot of the other talk. He, for instance, does not like the disuse of the Cabinet and the National Security Council in the executive branch and the resulting deep personalization of the Presidency. "You need," he says, "bitterly debated advice and conflicting considerations." The frantic pace of today's Presidency has also disturbed him. He played golf, yes, but the business was

never out of his mind. "A President has got to have time to think about his main problems." There are a growing number of presidential observers who endorse that need.

He feels that the heads of the great federal departments should have more far-reaching power in setting up their staffs. He feels that the momentum of the big bureaucracies tends to sweep the Cabinet officers right along with them, and these men are often almost powerless to combat the system which grows bigger when it is obvious that in some ways it should grow smaller. This is the theme song now of all the candidates.

So far the historians have not ranked Eisenhower very high in the presidential legend. But there is growing conviction that the measure of the man himself may be more of a factor in the national life than anyone has been willing to admit before. Ike has not been referred to as a top-drawer expeditor, one who knew the machinery of government, but there are hints that the traditional assessment of those qualities may be outdated and inaccurate. The eight years of relative world calm under Ike, achieved without losing any territory or much prestige, have taken on new importance. There are even those who dare suggest that his soothing spirit, the innate goodness of the man himself, did more to lift up the hearts of Americans and hold them together in a reasonable state of public happiness than many of the social reforms that have been propounded since.

SHOULD CHURCHES ADOPT DOCTRINE OF VIOLENCE?

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Louis Cassels, columnist of United Press International, poses a most timely query, "Should Churches Adopt Doctrine of Violence?" It is most enlightening to a vast number of Christian people whose funds go for the support of the National Council of Churches to learn that this organization issued a statement from its policymaking board that violence under certain circumstances may be a lesser wrong than toleration continually of injustice.

Mr. Cassels' article is well worthy of the consideration of the Congress. The text of this article follows:

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Press-Scimitar, Aug. 10, 1968]

SHOULD CHURCHES ADOPT DOCTRINE OF VIOLENCE?

(By Louis Cassels)

What is the appropriate Christian attitude toward violent revolutionary acts?

Some church members are surprised that anyone should even raise the question. To them, it seems perfectly clear the followers of Christ should at all times abhor violence, uphold law and order, and obey the government.

But another point of view is expressed in a statement adopted recently by the policymaking general board of the National Council of Churches. It holds that violence, under some circumstances, may be a lesser evil than continued toleration of injustice.

The statement suggests that Christians should first try through political processes to change laws or policies they consider unjust. If that fails, they may move on to "civil disobedience," defined in the statement as "peaceable violation of a law deemed to be

unjust . . . with recognition of the state's legal authority to punish the violator."

Finally, the statement says, "we recognize that when justice cannot be secured either through action within the existing structures or through civil disobedience, an increasing number of Christians may feel called to seek justice through resistance or revolution."

APPLAUDED IN SOME QUARTERS

The National Council statement has been applauded in some quarters as a courageous affirmation that God's law has a higher claim on a Christian's obedience than any human law.

Supporters point to Biblical evidence that Jesus was not an advocate of peace-at-any-price. He told his disciples, "I came to bring not peace but a sword"—and the context makes clear He meant that He was more concerned with righting wrongs than with avoiding conflict.

Other Christians question whether it was wise or helpful for the National Council of Churches to go out of its way at this particular point in history to condone violence as a last resort for those who feel ill-used by society.

These critics note that the council statement was issued shortly after Sen. Robert F. Kennedy was assassinated by a gunman who may well have believed that he was resisting injustice by the only effective means available to him.

If carefully read, with attention to all of the qualifications its drafters intended, the statement says only that violent acts of revolution may be justified "when justice cannot be secured" by any other means.

BIG QUESTION UNANSWERED

The big question which the statement doesn't answer is how to determine when it's impossible to achieve justice by peaceable processes.

People living under a ruthless dictatorship obviously have little chance of changing things through ordinary political action (although they may get results from covert passive resistance.)

But the National Council statement was not addressed primarily to oppressed peoples of dictatorships. It was issued for the moral guidance of Americans, who live under a system of government that may be balky at times but is ultimately responsive to the will of the people.

It can be contended that American democracy has been disgracefully slow about righting the wrongs inflicted on Negroes and other minorities, and that it is even now doing far too little to alleviate poverty and inequity.

But the progress toward social justice achieved in recent years is adequate proof that patient, persistent, peaceful effort can get results.

OF CONCERN TO THE CRITICS

Critics ask why the general board of the National Council of Churches did not see fit to emphasize the workability of American democracy rather than possible justification for violent revolution.

The answer may lie in the deep psychological need which some clergymen feel to overcome the church's image as a bastion of the status quo by lining up on the way-out radical side of every issue.

Unfortunately, this business of exalting revolution and canonizing violence can cut two ways. The Rev. O. Carroll Arnold, pastor of First Baptist Church, Boulder, Colo., made the point in a recent article in the Christian Century.

"The doctrine of violence," he said, "can be used by the righteous and the unrighteous, the just and the unjust alike. The Ku Klux Klan, the John Birch Society, the Minutemen and the German-American Bund rejoice that somebody is developing a doctrine of Christian violence which they can employ to justify their deeds too."