

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Honorable Edward Clark

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the pleasure of being present when the Honorable Edward Clark received his commission from President Johnson as Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank.

Our Nation is very fortunate to have available the services of such an able and dedicated individual as Ed Clark, of Texas. Ed, who is a longtime friend of mine, most recently served as our Ambassador to Australia. Certainly never in our history has our representative to that nation been received with such warmth as was accorded him.

Prior to that service, Mr. Clark established an outstanding reputation as an attorney, businessman, and a banker. Because of this background, it would be difficult to find an individual who would be as totally qualified as he is for his new position. As Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank, he will certainly find need to call upon his past experience as a diplomat, a banker, a lawyer, and a businessman.

In making the presentation yesterday, President Johnson expressed his high esteem for and the great confidence which he has in Ambassador Clark. The text of those remarks follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT FOLLOWING THE SIGNING OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES TREATY AMENDMENT, THE EAST ROOM, APRIL 23, 1968

I want to take advantage of this occasion to introduce all of you to a distinguished American who is with us this morning who will be playing a key role in the days ahead in our relations with Latin America.

The man who I have reference to has just completed a tour of duty as our Ambassador to Australia. As Ambassador to Australia, I believe that he learned and understood and knew more about the geography of that country, the resources of that country and the people of that country and had more interest in them than, generally speaking, most Ambassadors are able to display or to accumulate in that brief period.

He did such an outstanding job that when I gave thought to the selection of someone as United States Executive Director on the Inter-American Development Bank, someone who I wanted to know the geography of Latin America, someone who I wanted to know the resources of Latin America, someone who I wanted to know the people of Latin America and to bring all three of these together in the way that the Inter-American Development Bank could play its major role and the United States of America could give its major contribution, I asked Ambassador Clark to take this assignment.

The Bank, as you know, is the financial cornerstone of our Alliance for Progress. In the first seven years of its operation, it has authorized more than 450 loans totaling close to \$2.5 billion. These loans have gone for water systems, schools, health stations and huge dams and highways, satellite communications, and many other activities.

That is why the Bank has earned the title of the Bank of the Alliance in integration.

While Ambassador Clark will be only one of many individuals who make up the personnel of that great institution, I feel sure that he will be an interested one and a very active one.

Last Friday the Senate confirmed Ambassador Clark's appointment to this Bank. It gives me a great deal of pleasure this morning to wish him well in this new assignment and to say to our friends in Latin America that I don't know of an individual in this country who, in my judgment, could or would or can or will display more interest in your problems or do more about helping you solve them.

Thank you very much.

Arson by Juveniles

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an article entitled "Four Arson Cases Last Night Are Blamed on Juveniles," published on page B-1 of yesterday's Washington Evening Star.

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

FOUR ARSON CASES LAST NIGHT ARE BLAMED ON JUVENILES

(By Woody West)

District police reported four more cases of arson here last night, all of them minor and all believed to have involved juveniles. This brings to nine the number of arson cases or suspected arsons in Washington in the last 48 hours.

A 13-year-old youth was charged by District police yesterday in connection with at least two fires during the month's riots after being picked up Sunday by Alexandria police investigating a burglary.

During the Alexandria investigation, the youth denied that some clothing in his possession was from the Virginia burglary and told police he had gotten it during the looting here.

The youth, whose mother lives in Alexandria, was turned over to District police and, after questioning, is being held at the Receiving Home pending action by juvenile court.

GRAND JURY TO MEET

Meanwhile, a special grand jury will begin hearing evidence tomorrow on possibly more than 1,000 cases stemming from the disorders early this month, the balance of them expected to be for burglary II (looting).

The first of last night's fires occurred at 7:22 p.m. when trash was set afire in the basement of a vacant two-story brick building at 721 18th St. NE. The blaze caused only minor damage and police are seeking a 13-year-old youth in connection with the incident.

Less than 20 minutes later, the J. T. Carver Food Market, 5575 Central Ave., which was looted but not burned during the riots, suffered minor damage to shelving and food cartons after a fire was set in the front of the building. Juveniles are believed responsible. Damage was estimated at \$100.

The grocery is next door to a barbershop

in which a fire was set early yesterday, apparently to cover a burglary.

LIQUOR STORE FIRE

At 8:15 p.m. firemen quickly extinguished a blaze in the rear of Wheeler Liquors, 4137 Wheeler Road SE, which also was looted but not burned during the riots.

Fire officials said that a rear door was forced, apparently by juveniles, and the blaze set. Damage was less than \$100 and some liquor may have been taken.

A minor blaze in a vacant store at 1618 8th St. NW, again believed started by juveniles, caused less than \$100 in damage after trash in a first-floor closet was set afire.

Oklahoma Legislators Call for VA Hospital Improvement

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, for many years a number of us have been working hard to get the U.S. Veterans' Administration hospital at Muskogee, Okla., modernized and air conditioned.

This hospital serves a large area of eastern Oklahoma and the neighboring States, and does not have central air conditioning. Despite a number of window units that have been installed, some of the rooms and wards in our veterans hospital range from uncomfortable to intolerable during very hot weather. Our veterans are entitled to a better break when hospitalized.

Mr. Speaker, the Oklahoma Legislature recognizes this problem, and in enrolled House Concurrent Resolution No. 567, the legislature urges Congress to appropriate funds to provide for air conditioning for this hospital. I would like to have this resolution appear in the RECORD. I wholeheartedly support this legislative request, and I deeply appreciate this action by the legislature.

The resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. 567

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to allocate funds and provide for the air-conditioning of Veteran's hospital located at Muskogee, Okla.; and directing distribution

Whereas, the country is deeply indebted to those veterans hospitalized at the Veterans' Hospital located at Muskogee, Oklahoma; and

Whereas, those valorous Americans should be made as comfortable as possible in order to insure rapid recovery and rehabilitation; and

Whereas, the Veterans' Hospital located at Muskogee, Oklahoma, is badly in need of air-conditioning.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the house of representatives of the second session of the thirty-first Oklahoma Legislature, the senate concurring therein:

SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully urged to adopt a measure allocating funds and providing for the air-conditioning of the Veterans' Hospital located at Muskogee, Oklahoma.

SEC. 2. That duly authenticated copies of this Resolution, after consideration and enrollment, be prepared for and transmitted to each member of the Oklahoma Congressional Delegation.

Adopted by the House of Representatives the 20th day of February, 1968.

REX PRIVETT,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the Senate the 8th day of April, 1968.

DON BALDWIN,

Acting President of the Senate.

Address Delivered by Vice President Humphrey at National Farmers Union Convention

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, American agriculture has many friends in public life but few are as knowledgeable of its contribution or as familiar with its problems as Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. In addition, few men in public life are as deeply committed to preserving the rural way of life upon which our Nation has built and prospered as Mr. HUMPHREY.

It is understandable, therefore, that any remarks made by the Vice President to a farming group bear careful reading. On March 18, at the National Farmers Union Convention in Minneapolis, Vice President HUMPHREY delivered a major farm statement. In his remarks the Vice President reviewed the farm message sent recently to the Congress by President Johnson. Mr. HUMPHREY's observations respecting the components of the administration's farm program—extension of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, a 3-year extension of the Food for Freedom Act, and a national food bank for certain commodities—are incisive and informative. I particularly wish to call attention to his remarks favoring the enactment of legislation I have authored in the Senate, the proposed National Agricultural Bargaining Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President's speech on this occasion be reprinted at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, THE VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION CONVENTION, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., MARCH 18, 1968

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Mr. President. It seems like every meeting I go to I always have to start out by saying, "thank you Mr. President." And just in case I get a little bit too big for my boots back home, why The Mr. President comes up here to check on me a little bit. And not only that, to tell tales about me which I, well, which are only partially true. I really did get up in less than forty-five minutes this morning after he called.

I'm very happy that you've had the privilege of listening to my good friends, Senator Mondale and Congresswoman Sullivan. You couldn't have two finer representatives of the Congress of the United States and

two better friends of the American people and, particularly, the American farmer, than these two very able congressional public servants. And, Leonor, I'm so happy to have you in Minnesota. We've worked—I liked that wink, too. Do that again—she's not only a very intelligent Congresswoman, she's very pretty, too. This very fine lady is one that has helped us so much in everything relating to the well being of the American people. I remember her great work for the food stamp program when we were working together trying to get that out of Congress and, just recently, her tremendous efforts and tremendous work in the truth-in-lending program to see to it that the American people, particularly the working people, the farm people, the low- and middle-income people, did not pay exorbitant interest rates, interest charges for farm credit.

You've done a great service for the American people, Leonor, and we want to thank you.

And over here to my left, your right, is this fellow who came down to Washington in that great 89th Session of Congress and he came back here to Minnesota and said, "You know, I've only been down here three months and I've got more work done and more accomplished in three months than Humphrey did in sixteen years." And now he says that it's true. And I don't believe I'll even deny it 'cause I can't think of anyone who has proven himself to be a more dedicated and able and powerful Member of the Congress in the sense of power for good than Senator Walter Mondale and, Fritz, we're proud of you and we wish to goodness that every Member of Congress had all the spunk and get-up-and-go and all the knowledge and brain power and all the people power and farm power that Walter Mondale has.

Well, we've had quite a day. You know, I wasn't so sure I was going to get to speak or not, but some of our friends who were out here with the Washington press corps would have told you, "Well, that's not unusual." I go to these meetings in Washington, D.C. and they're always waiting to see whether or not the President is going to come. He gives us a lot of surprises, you know. And I'll be sitting there and I'll have my notes tucked in my pocket and I'm just getting ready to get up and speak, and just about the time I get up and start to take the first deep breath, in he walks. And I have an understanding with him now that if he doesn't get there by at least 10:30 p.m. that I can bolt the doors and make my speech. And this morning, he arrived here by 10:30 a.m. so we let him speak.

And I'll tell you it was a wonderful occasion and I hope my dear friend, Tony Dechant, knows that the presence of the President here today, the President of the United States, was not important because of the message he gave us, but its importance was also that he came here to the National Convention of the National Farmers Union, this great farm organization of farm families throughout America. It's an honor and a privilege to be here.

You sure do have a lot of the government here today. . . . I hope you can take it. The President, Vice President, Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, this wonderful Congresswoman, this distinguished Senator from Minnesota. You're going to have the Secretary of Agriculture out here. You're really going to get a chance to see all of Washington—I hope you don't get unhappy about it all—I trust you'll like it.

I talked to Orville Freeman on the telephone just before I came down here and he told me, of course, that he's expecting to be out here with you this week—I believe Wednesday night—and he asked me to bring you his warm greetings right now. I told him a few things that I wanted him to bring along that the presidents of the state organizations had already told me about at noon. So, if Orville comes out here with a large suitcase, it isn't because he's bringing shirts. We had

some program things that we were talking about and I want Ed Christianson and Tony Dechant to know that we're going to try to be as helpful as possible.

One other person I want to comment about here just for a minute. When I came to Washington as a young Senator in 1949, we had a great Secretary of Agriculture and I was one of his advocates. I'm happy to say that the President of the United States at that time, Mr. Truman, and the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, were both under attack by the opposition and even under attack by some of the democrats. It isn't unusual—we seem to do a little of that. But I'm happy to tell you that then Senator Humphrey wasn't one of the attackers. I was one of the supporters of Mr. Truman, and I was one of the supporters of Charlie Brannan. And I've lived to see the day that the American people recognize that in Charlie Brannan they had a great Secretary of Agriculture, and in Harry Truman they had one of the greatest Presidents this country's ever had.

I knew Mondale couldn't take that. I'll let you in on it—the Senator's going to do a little work for me this afternoon. He always is. He's working for you 99 percent of the time and gives me 1 percent of the time and leaves none for himself. That's the kind of a man he is.

But in all sincerity, friends, I don't want to look at the history of the past except for an inspiration for the present. But isn't it interesting how people finally get a sense of perspective and judgment? The Brannan plan—oh, how they ridiculed it. Well, let me say to all of America that the proposals Charles Brannan made as Secretary of Agriculture, which were beaten down and ridiculed, are today in the law books and have helped the farmers of America survive during these years and, hopefully, to give them a better future. And believe me, you can walk out of this hotel and stop anybody on the street and say, "Name me five great American Presidents" and I'll bet my life that one of the five will be none other than that spunky, courageous man from Independence, Missouri, a fighting, courageous President who was a friend of the farmer and didn't hesitate to say so and prove it. Boy, am I a Truman Democrat. I just want you to know that I really am. Every time I get discouraged—and that does happen—I go down to Independence, Missouri and go in and just see him. And when I see that dear man, I walk out feeling a little better, a little younger, just a little stronger, and a little more determined. Greatness—greatness in his simplicity; greatness in his honor; greatness in his courage . . . and how they did berate him. I haven't forgotten, and I don't intend to, either. Because it's very difficult, may I say, to remember the little ones who took out after him, but you'll always remember the great one that survived.

Well, we had a good message this morning. I thought it was a humdinger. And I particularly liked it when the President got rid of those notes, just like I'm going to get rid of mine pretty quick, and really started talking to you. I'm going to talk to you today from some notes, but I'm going to basically talk to you from the heart. I think the members of this great organization know that I have never hidden my colors in terms of my friendship for the Farmers Union and my support of the programs and the policies that this great organization has advocated. I've gone up and down, the length and breadth of this state—not once, but a hundred times—even helped in organizing Farmers Union and proud of it because I've never known, I have not known a single request that the Farmers Union has ever made of their government or of their nation that ultimately wasn't good for the country. It's not a self-seeking organization. And there isn't a piece of legislation on the statute books today that's worthy of being called good legislation relating to agriculture that the Farmers Union didn't have something

to do with. You can go back to the days of Franklin Delano Roosevelt right up to this particular time, and you'll find that the statutes that helped Mr. Farmer—that have helped strengthen this farm economy—that had some consideration for the American farm family—that every one of those laws had the input and the inspiration and the backing of the National Farmers Union—everyone.

So I wish you well. I'm proud of you, proud to have had your support in my days in public life, but I'm particularly proud of your friendship. I'm sure everyone here knows that your officers are among my closest personal friends. I'm sure that some of you know that Ed Christianson here in Minnesota has been one of my closest advisors and personal friends, and I'm sure you know that the former President, Jim Patton, and now your President, Tony Dechant, are two of the kindest men, two of the men we look to, that Hubert Humphrey looks to and, more important, that President Lyndon looks to, for guidance and for counsel and sometimes for comfort—and we always get it.

Well, I don't suppose there's any hard news in that stuff, boys, but it's good for the soul. Let me tell you. One thing you learn about this politics is that when you got a friend they're precious, believe me, particularly if they stick with you, and I know where the friends are and we don't always have to look alike and we don't have to agree on everything and we don't always have to speak alike... we just have a sort of common philosophy—we happen to believe that this nation is quite a great place to be in—and this government of ours is one that is designed to serve the people.

I want to talk to you about the farm message of your President. I'm sure that Senator Mondale has done this. I spoke, I visited this noon, with the presidents of the state organizations and I said to them what I am now about to say to you, that a message is a plan of action. It is not action, it is a plan of action. A message is a series of proposals around which we can rally. A message from the President is a line of direction toward which we can point, or a road that we can travel—and that farm message, that agricultural message that the President sent to the Congress, is a charter of hope for American agriculture. It is a program of promise and of performance for American agriculture. And if it's good for the American farm community, the American agricultural community, then it's good for America. Make no mistake about it, because you cannot have a prosperous America and a depressed agriculture. You cannot have a happy, peaceful cities and a growing plight of rural poverty. You cannot have a just America if there's inequity and injustice in rural America. And the one thing that President Johnson and your Vice President are trying to talk to this country about is that we're one great nation and that we have to move together—that the problems of the city are the problems of rural America and the problems of rural America are also the problems of the city. And your President outlined that this morning when he pointed out how all too often we transfer the poverty of rural America into the slums of the city only to find it aggravated and intensified. This is why he emphasized in the moments he had with you the importance of social and economic policies and programs in rural America that lift the quality of life there, that help maintain an economic level in rural America that permits good living. Now, let's take a good look at that message. I've got some notes here and I'm going to run through them.

Point 1.—This, getting right down to cases, calls for the extension of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. Now, why? Because as long as American farmers produce more than we can consume, we're going to need the machinery in government to help balance supply and demand to avoid the income-

depressing, farm-killing cycle of glut and scarcity. Now every farmer knows this and I think that every person that's near a farm producer knows it. This year the Food and Agriculture Act has faced its severest test.

Increased wheat and feed grain allotments for 1967 crops were followed by a series of unforeseen events, and you know in Washington we've got a phrase called the "credibility gap." Nobody quite knows what it means but it sounds interesting and that's why it becomes used more and more. Well, I suppose that you know you can get a little credibility gap if the weather gangs up on you and what happens? We had this year, contrary to all the predictions of all the experts, including ministers and economists, politicians and doctors, we had that world-wide bumper crop all over. Total smaller total demand, and that resulted in lower prices.

Ladies and gentlemen, you can no longer isolate the crop of one country from another. When you produce wheat, it's a world-wide crop. When you produce feed grains, it's a world-wide crop. This world of ours is smaller and the American farmer feels it almost more than any one else. Thirty-five to forty years ago, the American farmer could pretty well judge what was going to happen to his prices by what happened in production in America. No longer, because of the rapid communication, because of the market systems that we have, because of transportation, because of financing. All of the world production comes into one pool, not a series of little lakes like it was 25-40 years ago, but one big ocean. And when that ocean's levels rise, prices fall and they fall world-wide.

Well, that's what happened this past year. We didn't plan it that way. It was no mean, nasty trick on the part of the President or the Secretary of Agriculture, and I'm not going to blame God... I need Him on my side. But it happened, and we didn't know it was going to happen. And I didn't know that it was going to be as dry this winter as it's been and I didn't know it was going to rain today. You just can't predict all these things and that's why we need these farm programs. Well this act, I think, this Food and Agriculture Act, passed a pretty severe test. Its direct payments provided the margin between profit and loss to a great many farmers. It provided an additional 48 cents for each bushel of wheat, 15 cents for each pound of cotton, 20 cents for each bushel of corn, and I'll tell you, my dear friends, had we had none of these programs, agricultural income would have been reduced by one third—and that's a most conservative estimate.

And we wouldn't have had these programs had you folks not fought for them, had you not have taken the constructive policy line of going down the legislative route—not to fight out on the streets but coming down to fight in Washington—and to work to see that a farm program became law.

You know, I had a little something to do with that law when I was the majority whip with the United States Senate. I helped to pass a farm bill three times in one year before we finally got it to the President of the United States—three times because we kept losing it either in the Senate one time or in the House another time. And where were you? You were right there in the front line helping us get it. I think you know what the alternative would have been without this act: Lower prices, lower income. Indeed, the specialists tell us that farm income, as I said, would have dropped as much as a third back to the 1959 levels—wheat at \$1.10 a bushel, corn at 75 cents. Now the President explicitly recognizes that the present act can be improved and we need to work closely with you to improve it.

Now, what's Point 2 of this message? A three-year extension for the Food for Freedom Act. I'm only going to take a minute. The Food for Freedom Act goes far beyond

the old Food for Peace Act, of which I was one of the cosponsors. You know I'm talking about some of my own children here. I'm not one of these fellows that's been out here on the sidelines—I've been in the middle of the fight, and every farmer in this audience knows it. Some of these Johnny-come-latelys, farm specialists that don't know the difference between a ukelele and a corn cob, don't impress me greatly, I'll tell you.

Well, this Food for Freedom Act recognizes that this world of ours needs this blessing of food and fiber in a world that knows too much of hate and selfishness. Our food aid programs have stood out year after year as a great humanitarian beacon of hope and that, within itself, is an ample justification of the Food for Freedom program.

Let me just say to this audience something that I don't have in these notes... that this world of ours faces the specter of famine in ten years. We ought to remember that. Every prediction that's being made today by any specialist, scientist or economist or agricultural expert tells us that unless there is literally a miracle breakthrough, mankind in many parts of this world faces the specter of wholesale famine. This is why Food for Freedom becomes important... this is why what I'm about to talk about—this Reserve program—becomes important. This is why we must preserve our American agricultural system, because we have the most efficient system of agriculture that the world has ever known. And we've got to keep it working, together. We can't afford to dissipate it in the name of cost accounting or in the name of some kind of theoretical efficiency or in the name of what they call change. No part of the American economy is more efficient. No part of the American economy has changed more with the times. No part of the American economy has done more for more people, with fewer people doing it than the American agricultural economy, and every city dweller (and this will get me a bad headline in New York and I know it, but let it go anyway), every city dweller owes a debt of gratitude to the farm producers of America because the farmers have subsidized the food bill for hundreds and thousands, yea, millions of American people.

And that is as true as any man can make a statement. The share of the dollar spent for food today is less than it's been for years. And when I hear people say, "Well, we can't afford to have those farmers get paid a little more because it will cut into the consumer," let's remember we're all consumers and we'd all like to be bigger ones. You would be, but I learned in my dad's drugstore, when you don't have any money you're not a consumer, you're just a visitor, and there's a lot of difference.

Let me also point out that this overseas food assistance, and we poured it out in billions of dollars, billions of dollars, has not only been good compassion, peace and charity, but has been good business because today, American agricultural products find great markets in Japan and Turkey, Greece, Italy, Spain and other parts of the world which once received food assistance as a gift, and who now are cash customers.

You know everybody talked about this balance of payments. Very few know what it means, but they talk a lot about it. It's one of the reasons we talk a lot about it. So, if you don't know what it means, you don't have to feel responsible, you know. Very few people understand the problem about gold except that there isn't as much of it around here as there used to be. But I'll tell you what you can understand—that if it were not for American agricultural exports that are dollar earners, gold earners for America, this American economy would be in serious trouble. American agricultural exports can compete with any agricultural economy and any agricultural product anywhere in the world. We can out-produce, we can outsell,

we can out-distribute any country in the world when it comes to agricultural products. Pretty good record, I'd say, for just a bunch of farmers. Wouldn't you say so?

So when I say to you that food aid is more than being kind and good, it's more than good neighborliness—it's good business, it's good foreign policy, and it's one of the building blocks of peace. The late, beloved Pope John said, "Where there is constant want there is no peace." And when you think of peace, work for peace, want peace, you better think about food and fiber, you better think about God's children that are hungry, ill clothed, sick, the victims of poverty, hopelessness. There isn't any peace in that kind of a world. And I'm looking at more peace makers in this audience than all the sign carriers put together across this country.

Now I want to talk to you about another little matter, and that is a program that relates to Point 3 of the President's message, namely, a National Food Bank for wheat, feed grains and soybeans. That's Point 3. We call this the food reserve. This isn't new, we've just been fighting for it for years. I can remember as a Senator when I introduced this legislation. We passed it a couple of times in the Senate, Lenore, but we couldn't get some of those folks over in the House to help us. You did, but we couldn't get some of them. Well, the food bank would serve multiple purposes. It would protect the consumer against food scarcity. It would protect the farmer against falling prices and would further cushion the ups and downs of any commodity program. This program has three critical ingredients and we need to have our people understand it.

A reserve owned by farmers under strengthened resale provisions in a price support program. The Johnson-Humphrey Administration has always believed that farmers should be able to retain their equity as long as possible, and the inventory in the hands of Commodity Credit Corporation should be reduced to a safe minimum. That is why we extended recently the resale privilege to warehouses. If we get this food reserve program, this food bank, we'll have for the first time the kind of assured stability with a forward movement of progress for agriculture that a continuing efficient and prosperous agriculture needs. And I appeal to you today to have your voices heard on Capitol Hill, to speak to your Congressmen and your Representatives and your Senators to see if we can't get this food bank, this great reserve program of commodities that the President discussed this morning, to see if we can't get this program on the statute books.

This particular proposal also provides authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to buy additional reserves at market prices without waiting until prices drop to support levels, and it provides insulation of the food bank from the commercial market. And one of the reasons we've been concerned over the years about the reserve program is that it might be used as a dumping mechanism to depress prices. The Administration proposal and the proposal supported by Congressman Poage and Senator Mondale is a proposal which will insulate these reserves from the commercial market so that the country can be sure of a food supply and the farmers can be sure of a decent price in the marketplace. That's the only kind of a reserve program that's worth while.

Now let's talk a little bit about Point 4. This is perhaps the most important of all the points in the President's message. All of the other programs put together require this program if we're really going to have an effective farm program, and I'm talking about increased bargaining power for the farmer in the American marketplace. This isn't the first time I've talked about it. And I'm proud, boy am I proud, to have a Senator from Minnesota who is the author of this bill . . . and there it is, S. 2973, by

Senator Mondale . . . and I believe there are eighteen co-sponsors. If you will get behind this proposal, if you will go with every member of the Senate, if you will speak with your friends in the House—Republican or Democrat—and there are several different kinds of Democrats this day, take any kind you want). Just go talk to them. If you go talk to them, talk to them plainly, talk to them constructively, talk to them patiently, talk to them insistently. I think we can get some action.

Tony Dechant was in Des Moines reminding the National Farm Institute last month that the farmer is the only businessman left in America who is still forced to sell his products at wholesale prices set by somebody else . . . that's a losing game, friends . . . and to buy his products at wholesale prices, also set by somebody else. Heads I win, tails you lose. When a farmer has to have his wholesale prices set by somebody else and the retail prices for the things he buys set by somebody else, he's in trouble. So, what we're talking about when we talk about bargaining power is to no longer permit the farmer to get what somebody else offers him, but to charge what he thinks is fair and reasonable for his commodity and to go into the competitive marketplace with his price tag on him. That's what you do when you buy a car or a plow or a tractor.

Yes, it's interesting, this kind of language. The farmer gets a certain price. Somebody else charges a certain price. When you go to see your lawyer or your doctor, your druggist, your hardware merchant, your implement dealer, he says if you want this service or this product, the price is so much. Mr. Farmer goes in with his commodities, somebody says, "Well, how ya doin', Jake. I'll give ya so much." When you're on the "give ya" line and the other fellas on the "charge ya" line, you're at the end of the line and you know it.

Real and effective bargaining power is long overdue, particularly for commodities like livestock, poultry, fruits and vegetables, which are not covered by any price support payment programs, and I have said already that we have this bill before us which has several titles in it, but Title I has the National Agriculture Relations Act. The National Agriculture Relations Act, which was designed and conceived by the people in this organization. It was advocated many times by Tony Dechant and your officers, and may I say also, by that old firebrand from over at GTA, Bill Thatcher. I've heard him talk about it time after time.

Imagine what the labor movement would be without a National Labor Relations Board. Imagine what American agriculture can be with a National Agriculture Relations Act, which permits you to, in a sense, bargain for yourselves, organize for yourselves, within the rules laid down by public policy by government. It'll make a better America, friends.

Now, we don't know all of the how's and the if's and the and's of effective farm bargaining, but we know that it is possible. More importantly, we know that it is necessary and I want to make it quite clear now, lest there be any doubt, that the Johnson-Humphrey Administration is for it, and we're going to fight for it too.

The Farmers Union has a long record of building cooperatives. And you can't really have any prosperous, even a reasonably prosperous, farm economy without our cooperatives. They've already increased the farmer's voice in the marketplace and they're going to be a crucial element in this future bargaining strength. But let me re-emphasize that partnership between the farmers and the government is essential to bargaining power. If you're going to have effective bargaining, you can have it, you can do most of it yourself, but you're going to need the partnership with the friendly government, and be sure that it's friendly. I'll get to that a little later on.

Now, when you have the machinery, let

me talk to you about bargaining for a minute. I've been thinking about this for several years and, as you know, this isn't my first time to talk to you about it. When you have the machinery to maintain a reasonable supply-demand balance like you have in your Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, only then farm bargaining power increases. When you allow farmers to reveal their grain on their farm or under their ownership, farm bargaining power increases. When you improve nutrition for children under the School Milk program, School Lunch, Food Stamp, Domestic Donation program, farm bargaining power increases. When you reduce unemployment, when you employ the hard-core unemployed, when you help people lift themselves out of poverty so that they become producing citizens and consuming citizens, and when you enable more Americans to have a decent diet—and this Administration has done these things more than any other—then farm bargaining power increases.

Remember, Mr. and Mrs. Farmer, every time you read that a hard-core unemployed worker in Harlem or Cleveland or Chicago or Detroit is employed, and he starts to earn a paycheck, you've helped yourself. He helps you because his standard of living comes up and he starts to consume, he starts to use food and fiber. So all of these programs are tied together. When you negotiate an international commodity agreement, as Tony Dechant and others helped us to do last summer over in Europe in the Kennedy Round trade negotiations, farm bargaining power increases. When you do any of these and all of these things you add to the sum total of your strength in the marketplace, you increase your bargaining and, with the National Agriculture Relations Act and with the improvement in commodity agreements and marketing agreements and marketing orders, then you begin to get strength so that you can start determining your own destiny within the rules laid down by public policy. But, more importantly, with a partnership with your government. And it's bargaining power that can put the American farmer firmly on his two feet in the American marketplace. And that's why we're for it . . . it's good for this country.

Just imagine what America would have been like today with sweat-shop labor. Imagine what America would be like today if people weren't paid a living wage and a decent wage in our factories. And let me be quite candid with you, Mr. Farmer . . . every time a worker gets a decent wage, he's a better customer. And, Mr. Worker, let me be equally candid with you . . . every time a farmer gets a fair price he can buy what you produce in that factory—automobiles, textiles, home appliances. The thousand and one things that people want for what we call a good standard of living are only possible when people are paid a fair wage for their work and receive a fair price for their production. And when you get the fair wage and the fair price for production, you never fail to make a profit, Mr. Businessman. Profits are made, not out of the poor; profits are made out of the people who have decent income and decent prices and a decent reward for their work and their services. That's the way you do it in a great economy.

Your President emphasized this morning that we have a number of proposals to improve the general quality of life in rural America. And it's essential that we do so. Our young people are not going to stay in rural America just because the air is clean. As a matter of fact, pollution is extending that far out now. They're not going to stay in rural America just because they can read nice stories about grandfather and grandmother. They're not going to stay in rural America if they find out they can earn more per hour working in a filling station than they can with a \$100 thousand or a \$50

thousand investment on the farm. And they're not going to stay in rural America either after they've had a highschool education, and many of them a college education, when they find out that the schools are not as good or that the hospitals are not as good, or that the library is non-existent, or that the town is starting to dry up.

So we have got to get in this country an urban-rural balance. Part of the answer to the problem of the over-crowded city is a better and more modern American countryside . . . not to keep the boys simply down on the farm, but to see that this great population explosion that we have in America . . . which will increase our population by 100 million people between now and the year 2000 . . . that those 100 million will not just filter into the over-crowded metropolitan centers but they'll find opportunity and they'll find decent living—they'll find a good wage—they'll find a wholesome environment out in what we call rural America. And part of all of that means that the producers of food and fiber in rural America must share equitably, must share fairly in the economic growth and the prosperity of this nation. It isn't good enough any longer just to conjure up beautiful memories about this wonderful countryside of ours.

You can't live on memories. You can't live on fiction. You cannot live even on nice poetry. Your young men and women have television and can see what's going on in this world. They are better educated than any generation in our history. They're going to want a modern community next door. They're going to want a decent home on their farm if they're going to live there. They're going to want running water—that's not the name of an Indian Chief, you know. They're going to want inside sanitary facilities, they're going to want a modern living experience. And if we're going to have it we're going to have to do the things that we've done for our urban communities and then some. I'm happy to tell you that as your Vice President, I chair a Cabinet committee of the top Cabinet officers of this government to try to bring to bear in rural America today more and more of these programs for better roads, for sanitary facilities, for hospitals, for schools, for cultural centers, for new industries, so that if some members of the family who live out in the country and produce food and fiber wish to go to town and work in the factory, there'll be a factory there; that they don't have to run off to Chicago or even to Minneapolis, or to Peoria or someplace else; they can be near Worthington, or Huron, or Butte, or some other place. I think I know these communities.

Well, we have Operation Out-Reach which will continue to bring ninety federal programs designed to improve everything from health to housing, from education to economic development right out in the countryside.

So parity for the farmer today is not just parity of price, it's parity of living, because man does not live by bread alone. Parity of living—all of the benefits that come with a good American life.

Now for the final words to you—I want to talk to you—and I'm very reluctant to do this, as you know. I'd like to reluctantly talk a little to you about politics. All kinds of politics. Republican politics; Democratic politics; concerned Democratic politics; Republican conservatives—we've got all kinds of politics in this country.

And I want to talk to you about farm politics for a minute. You're practical people. And passing farm programs is a practical business. What's the use of standing here at these meetings and talking about a legislative program if we're not going to do anything about it. And I know how important it is to pass these programs.

But I'll tell you something else, friends . . . it's important to find out who your friends are and who your enemies are, and even if you can't pass them, you ought to get a vote on them and then you have your day. I tell you you never, you just cannot imagine how pious and how repenting a man can be the closer he comes to hanging. And the closer that people become—the closer that people in Congress and elsewhere come to that election—the more they seem to see in you and I think you ought to take a look and see what's in them. And having been down in Washington for twenty years, there's only one way to find out. Have the eyes and the nays, the yeses and the noes, call the roll, because when they call the roll in Congress there is no little line that says maybe. It's either yes or no, and then you can find out who your friends are and who your enemies are.

And I'm going to give you that old Samuel Gompers labor leader formula—punish your enemies and reward your friends—and if you find some in the Democratic Party that haven't been helping you, you know what to do about it. And if you want to look over in the other party, the hunting will be much better. You'll know what to do about it.

I remind this audience that on Election Day in November, you're going to negotiate a four-year contract and it's not subject to renegotiate in the middle . . . a four-year contract for whoever is to be President—a two-year contract for your Congressman—a six-year contract for your Senators, if you have a Senator up in your state . . . and every one of them are final. Very seldom do we impeach anybody or recall them around this country. So whatever you vote for on that day, until the next election do us part, you're stuck with them. And you better be careful. You're going to the marketplace of political decision to decide what happens to American agriculture.

I happen to be one that maybe has a slightly prejudiced point of view about this. You have to take that into consideration. I think you already have.

That reminds me of a story that I heard about a football team—and we tell it down in Washington. We've got what we call the "Redskins" down there. Shows how far this country's come—we're even willing to have some Reds around Washington—some Redskins. Otto Graham's our coach. He used to play football at Northwestern University. They tell this story about a young fellow that came out of college and this great professional football team was looking for talent. Otto Graham was interviewing this half-back and this half-back said, "Listen, coach, I'm good. I can run a hundred yards fully uniformed in ten seconds." The coach said, "That's almost impossible." He said, "Well, I can do it. I've been doing it all the time." And then the fellow said, "And that's not all coach. Listen, my average punt last year was 72 yards." The coach looked at him disbelieving. He said, "That's a fact, coach. You can look at my record. My average punt is 72 yards." The coach said, "Well, that's fantastic—that's phenomenal." The player said, "But that isn't all. My average pass for the last three years, and I played varsity at the University for three years, was fifty-two yards, and I was always on target." Coach Graham said, "My goodness. I've never heard anything like it. You are the most incredible, you are the most fantastic football player I've ever heard of. Now, you've told me all about your assets, do you have any limitations?" And this young fellow said, "Well, coach, I do exaggerate a bit."

And I suppose when you're in political life, you tend to once in a while get a little over-exuberant. Well, I'd just like to take a few minutes to tell you that you take off ten percent now if you wish to for exuberance. But I don't think you have to take off that much. First of all, I believe that we have a President today whose record as a

Senator, whose record as a Congressman, whose record as President is clear and unequivocal pro farmer. We have a President who's fought from the days that he served in the House of Representatives to the White House for fair prices, for a decent profit for the farmer, for protection from the speculator, and the unpredictable forces of the market, and the health and welfare of rural America.

I served in that Senate with him for sixteen years and I'll challenge anyone in this office, in this audience, to find one time that Lyndon Johnson, Senator, or Lyndon Johnson, Congressman, did not support the program that the Farmers Union had before the Congress of the United States for American agriculture. He believes in parity for American agriculture—not just parity of price but of opportunity and living. I doubt if you've forgotten the effects of some neglect . . . and it was some Republican neglect . . . a few years ago. I haven't. I was serving in the Senate when you people used to come to me when we had another Secretary of Agriculture. I really miss that fellow. I made some of the best speeches of my life in the name of Benson, but I don't blame just him alone.

Farm income dropped a full twenty percent in eight years. And that's net income. I know it's not as good now as I'd like it or as you'd like it, but, oh, let me tell you it looks like a paradise compared to what it was back eight years ago . . . down \$2¼ billion and by 1960 the Commodity Credit Corporation had \$8 billion worth of surplus supplies in stock. And we've been bailing ourselves out of that surplus ever since. I know what that meant out here in Minnesota. I don't think this nation or its food producers wants to go through it again.

I think you've got a different situation today. I know that you have a friend in the President and in the Vice President and in those who have been with you here today. But it takes a lot more than a strong determined friend of the farmer in the White House to enact sound farm legislation. Much of what I've said here today will just be another speech unless we can get it through Congress. The people in Congress, ultimately set the policy and there's nothing automatic about Congress adopting farm programs anymore. Particularly when some Senators and some Representatives, even from rural districts, vote against them.

So keep this in mind when you look over your presidential and congressional candidates in the months ahead. Find out where they and their supporters stand on farm prices, farm programs, farm bargaining, Food for Freedom, the Reserve bill, the Food Bank. Ask them, and then take a look at the list of sponsors of the Curtis bill . . . the Curtis bill—that's farm poison you know—agricultural arsenic—a program to eliminate all farm programs and introduced by a prominent member of the House of Representatives . . . and plenty of people who support it, as Lenore Sullivan can tell you here today. It includes the names of some of the Republicans who voted 110 to 14 to kill the 1965 Farm Act. You know I've been down there fighting with these fellows . . . if I sort of wiggle and wobble a little bit, it's still that I'm suffering from the blows. I know what it takes, so do you.

Democrats, farm and city alike, provided the margin to get that 1965 act through. We got more votes out of Chicago Democrats than we got out of farm Republicans. Somebody said to me, "Now what in the world has happened?" Why don't we do better in the Ninetieth Congress? Well, I'll tell you why. I was talking to our friend here from Iowa. When you lose three or four good congressmen from the state of Iowa who voted solidly for the farm program, who backed the Farmers Union program, who backed the Administration program . . . when you lose forty-

seven congressmen in one election that went down the line for you, you don't need to look any further as to why you have trouble. Believe me.

Sam Rayburn, the Speaker of the House, used to say that any mule can kick a barn down, but it takes a good carpenter to build one. Well, we've got some barn kickers around, and they've been kicking. I urge you to ask some pointed questions before you step up to the polls, not just questions on peace and war, not just questions on taxes and on beautification or on highway construction, but ask some questions, too, about your program.

There are many issues that confront the American people. There's a lot of unfinished business ahead of us in America and a lot of unfinished business for American agriculture. And it's going to take some builders and not barn wreckers to carry on and, hopefully, to finish that business.

Now, my fellow Americans, you've been kind to me again today. You've listened to my message and, in a very real sense, my plea to you. Cause if there's been one lesson that I've learned in my public life, it is that no man alone can do very much. You can be an advocate, you can speak, you can work, and you can vote, but it takes a lot of us pulling together, building together. Ben Franklin once said we're either going to hang together or we're going to hang separately. And you're not going to find very much success in the future unless you're able to find people that you can work with and build with and help create the kind of America that we want.

And I don't come here just to tell you to think of the farmer. I come here to tell you to think of your country, to think of every part of it, to think of every city, to think of every county and every state . . . to remember that this is one nation and it needs your help. Your President asked for it today. I shall not repeat his words. I ask you to remember just this . . . that every American is entitled to his chance whether he's black or white, city or rural, poor or rich. He's entitled to his chance to live and to work and to be himself, and he's entitled from this government of ours to at least have the gates of opportunity thrown open so if he can bring to bear his talents and his capacities, possibly he can make something out of his life.

We're in a great adventure in this America of ours today. An adventure in opportunity. Millions of our fellow Americans that never before even knew what it was to realize first-class citizenship are beginning to . . . beginning to taste it, beginning to have it. Millions of people have been broken out of the prison and bondage of poverty in the last four or five years. We've expanded our programs in education more in three years than we did in one hundred. We've increased our programs in health for the young, for the elderly in medical research, 300 percent in four years. We have created a great partnership in this country. At least we're in the beginning of creating one between the government and the people. Just last Saturday I stood with a thousand of the corporate directors of this country and some of the top labor leaders talking to them about business and labor joining together in a mighty effort, in an alliance, to provide jobs, not relief, not a dole . . . but jobs—good-paying jobs for the hard-core unemployed. It's a difficult assignment, but one that has to be done.

I've gone the length and breadth of this country as your Vice President. I've been in over 500 of the communities of this nation. I've traveled over a half million miles. I've been with the richest of the rich and the poorest of the poor. I've been in the penthouses and the palaces, and I've been in the slums and the dirty, filthy shacks. I think I know a little bit about what's going on in

this country. Some of our fellow Americans would have you believe that America is sick. I tell you it's not sick at all. America is going through a great change. It's in ferment, it's restless, and a person that's sick doesn't have the strength for ferment and for change and for restlessness. A great moral decision is being made in this country—a decision about people. That decision is that if you bear the title "Citizen of the United States," you have the greatest title that anybody can give you . . . and that as a citizen of this Republic, regardless of your station in life, regardless of your color, or your religion, or your political affiliation, you're entitled to a fair break . . . you're entitled to a chance. And we are breaking through the barriers of yesterday, the barriers of race, the barriers of class, the barriers of discrimination, the barriers of hate and, at long last, we're beginning to stand up like real Americans. Oh, I know it's troublesome, and I know that those who preach doom and despondency and despair can make a wonderful case unless you start to examine it.

But there's never been a time when there were great changes in the world that there wasn't turbulence and tension and some degree of restlessness—never . . . always been the same. When labor unions were organized, when the industrial age came upon us, when political democracy was on the march . . . always what some people call trouble . . . but what I call the growing pains of a free people.

In a very little while I'll take off in a plane and fly back to Washington. I've looked at the weather map, and I've used this analogy because it's so true. And, like you, I always wonder how, what kind of a flight it's going to be, but I've been told they're going to go out of a low, with rain and clouds and fog, and we're finally—after we get out around Detroit—we're going to come into a high. And the pilot has already said, "Mr. Vice President, when we go through that fine line between the low and the high, you're going to have some turbulence, so put on your seat belt."

Ladies and gentlemen, you've all traveled, you know of what I speak. And when you're going through that turbulence, you don't get up and start running around the cabin shouting and hollering and then want to throw the pilot out. They used to say, don't change horses in the middle of the stream. I say, don't change pilots in the middle of a storm. And believe me, if you stay with us, and if you have faith in your country and what it stands for, faith in yourself, of the knowledge of this country and its great resources, with a commitment of yourself and your courage and your energy, we're going to get out of this turbulent period. We're going to get through this band of storm clouds, and we're going to come into the bright sunlight of a better day. We'll be in the high of American democracy. That's what's happening in this country. That's what's happening in this world.

All over the world there's this restlessness, and it's not bad. Not bad, my friends, except for those that will it. For the strong and the brave and the conscientious and the determined, and people that know what they want and are willing to make some sacrifices for it, I swear to you that if we stick with what we're doing at home and abroad, if we do not yield, if we do not panic, if we do not retreat, if we do not despair, if we will be the kind of Americans we think we are and that we say we are, that we've got a better day coming, the likes of which no nation has known.

Boy, am I proud to live at this time and be a part of this history . . . proud to be an American in the last third of the twentieth century because, as surely as I stand before you, I know that in the decade ahead America will be even better than the America that you and I have known.

Thank you, and good luck!

This is ZIP?

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include a remarkable editorial from the Kewaunee Enterprise, a weekly newspaper in my district.

The editorial, written by Mabel K. Temby, editor of the paper, portrays graphically the problems confronting weekly newspapers and other businesses in complying with the mountains of red-tape involved in postal regulations and the various interpretations thereof.

I agree with Mrs. Temby that "drastic changes" are needed.

The editorial follows:

THIS IS ZIP?

Rep. John W. Byrnes has introduced a bill to take postmaster and rural carrier appointments out of politics.

I would go a long step farther and take the entire postal system out of government and into private industry.

In 1960 our postage bill was \$1,535.47. In 1967 it was \$4,854.14.

In 1960 we addressed our newspapers and took them to the post office. They were mailed, and they were delivered. Today we address, zip code, and package. Where we had about 25 packages, we now have more than 100 to wrap. Our entire mailing list had to be redone. Every zip code of more than 6 of the same number must be packaged separately. Each area with the first 3 digits of the zip code the same, 6 or more, must be packaged separately. Sounds confusing? It is. In order to get and keep this straight we have a directory with 1,772 pages. One week we will have an area with 6 papers. If we have a drop-out that means 5, and they must all be refiled into a different bundle. Then we will have an additional one in a section where we had 5 papers. This must now be repackaged into a different bundle with a different label. Mailing takes us six times as long with twice as many people as it did in 1960.

We print Press Woman, a magazine for the National Federation of Press Women. We go through this whole bit, but worse, since most of them are out of state, and where we used to have 28 bundles, we now have 174.

Until last week. Then this mailing has been increased to about 775 packages instead of 174.

A postmaster in Little Rock, Ark., wrote to say that all magazines that were bundled in the miscellaneous for that state have to be wrapped individually. These were nice, flat magazines, now they are going to be rolled, and they will be harder to handle than the flat.

But the rule book at the postoffice was studied, and they decided, yes, he was right; yes, we had to wrap each one separately, and that includes the newspaper, too.

"Well," I said, "it is a good thing we just bought a tying machine to cope with our wrapping problem." It was \$921.00. "I don't know if you can tie them," I was told, "The rule says the package must be tied."

"I intend to close it with twine," I retorted, only to be told that permission would have to be obtained, since it was their opinion that twine would not "close" the package, but a strip of gummed tape would.

"And we would like them flat," I was told. "You were getting them flat, if we have to wrap them they are going to be rolled."

They brought the Reader's Digest as a sample. "Do it like that," I was told. The Readers Digest and this newspaper are two different things. It is one thing to keep a thick magazine flat, and another thing to keep a 10 to 12 page newspaper flat, with a wrapper around it. "Use envelopes," I was told.

All right! Stuff 250 or more newspapers in an envelope, with one eye on the clock. Envelopes are costly.

Then, no two post offices interpret the rule book in the same way. What is permissible to one, is not to another. This is not surprising. One of the areas in which no one seems to understand the rules is the stuffing of supplements in a newspaper. Some postmasters allow what others refuse.

No, this is not surprising. I read an article this week about the filing of income tax returns. One man took his statement of earnings and deductions to five different accountants, and each one ended up with a different figure as to the amount due.

The rules are so confusing the experts themselves cannot agree on an interpretation.

At the time I redid the mailing list for Press Woman, I inquired of a firm who corrected mailing lists, of the cost. It was \$480.00, plus the cost of the stencils. The stencils cost 3½ cents each. Since I took the job on a two-year basis, with a fixed budget, I had to do the work myself. It took an entire year and many, many Sundays, plus any spare hour anyone in the family had.

Now we bring all the second class mail to the post office, carefully labeled as to where it should go, properly zipped according to the 1,772-page book, paying three and one-half times what we did five years ago, thousands of dollars to keep the mailing list according to the rules, and what happens?

We mail the Luxemburg News on Thursday. People on a Kewaunee route tell us they usually receive it on Saturday. This week it was received on Monday. Luxemburg is 13 miles from Kewaunee. Five days for delivery? This is zip?

We do a monthly bulletin for the American Association of University Women, Chicago Branch. The editor sends us the copy, we mail her a proof, first class mail. First class mail to Chicago—five days. Special delivery is better, that made it in 3. Then the proof has to come back to us. Three, four days it takes, usually; once it took nine days! First class mail. The reply we got to this was that it was in a large envelope, and probably the mailmen thought it was third class mail. Front and back it was marked First Class, and first class postage was paid.

The corrected proof of the bulletin then must be mailed back to us, but we no longer can trust the mail to get it back in time to meet the deadline, so we use the phone for corrections.

We do printing for several customers in Green Bay. A package sent to Green Bay—a program—did not arrive there until 7 days after it had been mailed in Kewaunee, 7 days—28 miles! Meanwhile, we had to re-print the program and deliver it personally so it would be there on time. The original package was insured. We checked here, in Green Bay our customer checked at the postoffice there. No one had it. So we reprinted an order that cost more than \$40.00. I filed a claim. Did I get paid? No sir, the package was not lost, just delayed.

At no time in the years we have been in the newspaper business have we had the complaints about mail delivery that we have today. Today a subscriber said her son had not received the paper for the last month. The stencil was checked, the address was correct. Then you do what? You can have it traced. The post office does that. And that week the son's paper was delivered nice and promptly, and a slip comes back saying it was delivered Thursday. The week of the check-up, of course.

I am absolutely in earnest when I say the postoffice belongs out of government. Every-

time we have an increase in rates for postage the answer is that the volume has increased so much. In any other business but postal, when volume goes up cost goes down. Look at what United Parcel has done for parcel post. The mail order catalog store came into being because of dissatisfaction with parcel post.

The post office department continues to operate parts of their business that take up their time and lose money for the taxpayer. Postal money orders should have been dumped many years ago. And so should the printing of envelopes. Anyone knows that you cannot sell a post card for the cost of a stamp. The paper stock costs something. Or that it costs more money to deliver a letter to San Francisco than it does across the street.

Private industry, running its business like the postal department, would be out of business in six months. And out of customers, too, if they had a competitor. What businessman could set up the dictatorial rules customers are given by the postal authorities and get away with it?

We have to measure the amount of advertising in the paper each week, and report the percentage to the postmaster. Each ad must be marked as such. We always marked them with an X. A few years ago a postal inspector arrived, and came to tell us that from now on they had to be "circled" not X'ed. When I asked why, there was no answer except that was how he wanted it done. Someone, with nothing to do, had to find something to "correct" in order to feel he was doing something. Anyone knows it is easier to X a square than circle it. Ever try circling a full page? This is the kind of outrageous bureaucratic stupidity that drives a busy person really wild.

And—along with all of this—we have to figure out how much each paper weighs, and how much each sheet weighs, and figure the poundage. I can understand that we need to know how much each paper weighs in order to get a pound weight, but no one has ever explained to me any reason why I have to figure out how much each sheet weighs. I never use that figure in reaching my totals, but it must be there! At the end of the month we used to take the percentage of each week's advertising, and divide it by four, the number of issues. But this was too easy, so we were told we had to add the inches of advertising each week, get the total inches of the papers each month, and figure the percentage that way. It never came out any differently than the first way, but it was a lot harder to do, and by all means let's make things as rough as possible for the customer.

Incidentally, I love all the post office boys across the street. I just think that they are part and parcel of a vicious system that is choking American business, and needs some drastic changes.

Code of Ethics for Political Campaign Advertising

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, on April 19 the American Association of Advertising Agencies announced the issuance of a code of ethics for political campaign advertising for the guidance of those advertising agencies which might become involved in political campaigns.

The code has been endorsed by the Fair Campaign Practices Committee and the League of Women Voters. I am sure that

Senators will be interested in the association's concise and penetrating code. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF ADVERTISING AGENCIES' CODE OF ETHICS FOR POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS ADVERTISING

The advertising agency has become an increasingly important factor in the conduct of American political campaigns. Just as the political candidate must observe the highest standards of fairness and morality in his campaign, so must the advertising agency operate under a code that reflects the finest values of our political system rather than any unethical temptations that arise in the heat of battle.

The advertising agency should not represent any candidate who has not signed or who does not observe the Code of Fair Campaign Practices of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, endorsed by the A.A.A.A.

The agency should not knowingly misrepresent the views or stated record of any candidates nor quote them out of proper context.

The agency should not prepare any material which unfairly or prejudicially exploits the race, creed or national origin of any candidate.

The agency should take care to avoid unsubstantial charges and accusations, especially those deliberately made too late in the campaign for opposing candidates to answer.

The agency should stand as an independent judge of fair campaign practices, rather than automatically yield to the wishes of the candidate or his authorized representatives.

The agency should not indulge in any practices which might be deceptive or misleading in word, photograph, film or sound.

Adopted by the Board of Directors of the American Association of Advertising Agencies, February 22, 1968.

Endorsed by Fair Campaign Practices Committee and League of Women Voters.

This Is My Country

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to attend the 27th annual banquet of the American Slovak Society of Lackawanna and Susquehanna Counties, which was held last Sunday, April 21, in the Hotel Jermyn in Scranton, Pa.

It was, I assure you, a delightful and moving experience to be there.

The distinguished chairman, Michael C. Spigut was his usual splendid self. President Michael Zurine and Toastmaster John Sirotnak, M.D., were most professional in moving the program; and the Reverends John A. Balberchak and John Zipay were the embodiment of religious dignity in rendering the invocation and benediction.

But of all those present, certainly every one of us will remember the splendid oration by the principal speaker, the Right Reverend Jerome Koval, O.S.B., abbot of St. Andrew's Abbey, Cleveland, Ohio.

On the program which was given me

when I came to the dinner was the motto: "To Promote Spiritual, Cultural, and Social Activities." When the abbot spoke, there was the very personification of the promotion of all these activities in his words, as well as a ringing testimony to the work of building the greatness of America in the past, and a call to continue that building in the future.

I will include here the words of Father Abbot Jerome:

THIS IS MY COUNTRY

Once again through the kindness of your program committee I am back home. I greatly appreciate this opportunity to revisit the scenes of my happy boyhood days in Wilkes-Barre, and I feel highly honored to have the privilege of addressing you on the occasion of your traditional annual dinner sponsored by the American Slovaks of Lackawanna and Susquehanna Counties.

This annual affair helps to keep alive the Slovak spirit that prompted our Slovak fathers and mothers or grandparents as the case may be, to cross the ocean and settle here in quest of a better way of life. That they found the answer to their everyday needs appears to be true in view of the fact that the great majority of the newcomers from Slovakia chose to remain here. They organized societies, built churches and schools soon after their coming—obviously they intended to establish a permanent residence in their new homeland—contrary to the false charge, that all that these strangers to American shores wanted, was to get rich and return to the old country with their savings. You know, and I know, that our Slovak pioneers worked hard for their living. They put in an honest day's work for every dollar they earned in those first years of toll underground where they kept an endless procession of coal cars on the move through long tunnels to the breakers outside. They furnished the fuel for heat, energy, and power for millions of homes, and thousands of factories and mills throughout the land. Our Slovaks here constituted the bulk of the man-power in many communities in an age that antedated the machine-age and automation which have largely supplanted human brawn in our present-day world.

Many changes in all walks of life have occurred recently. Life is not the same, but the life of the Slovak mine-worker over a period of a half century that saw the United States emerge as a world power remains a colorful chapter in the saga of the black-diamond industry of northeastern Pennsylvania.

If one could total up the long line of coal cars loaded by the intrepid Slovak miner, who worked faithfully and tirelessly alongside his Polish, Ukrainian or Russian companions hundreds or thousands of feet below ground, this would encircle the globe, not once perhaps but a number of times. Only a modern computer could accurately estimate the grand total of tons of coal that filled thousands of freight cars destined for all parts of our great country.

We Slovaks, here and elsewhere, have much to be grateful for; much to be proud of and much to emulate in the future.

We thank a kind providence that directed our forebears here where they learned to enjoy freedom, make use of every opportunity and share the responsibilities and bear the burdens of their new homeland, for they came not merely to take but to give. We can be proud of their industrial, moral, and civic record of achievement. We can all profit by their noble example as God-fearing people and loyal citizens of this country, our country.

The early Slovaks, your parents and grandparents and mine, too, were people of great courage, deep faith, unique endurance and integrity. They possessed humility and idealism, and all the ingredients of true greatness of character that seem to be vanishing

from our daily life as godlessness, cowardice, violence, dishonesty, cynicism and apathy march together to disaster. We who are the proud heirs of a great Christian heritage of a thousand years must stem this tide of despair and destruction by cherishing the ideals and traditions of our Slovak predecessors who knew how to live and die as men and women of prayer. If ever anyone deserved the title, "People of God," I, for one, believe firmly they did.

While we are reminiscing, we must not lose sight of a little known and unappreciated phase in the life of our Slovak pioneers. That was their willingness to share their blessings with their fellow countrymen overseas. Accordingly, in World War I, the American Slovaks under the leadership of such great Slovaks as Father Murgas and Michael Bosak, Sr. donated generously to a nationwide campaign for the liberation of Slovakia. They did not forget their native country where they were born. After World War II, when the Slovaks suffered from the invasion of their country by no less than three Russian armies, it was the American Slovaks who helped to feed and clothe more than four million war-battered fellow countrymen in their historic homeland below the Tatra mountains in picturesque Slovakia. Moreover, thousands of Slovak refugees found ready help here and in nearby Canada wherever the Slovaks lived.

It is no wonder that our Slovaks did not get rich, for they always believed it was more blessed to give than to receive. Yet they were truly rich in other ways. They were contented, and they were ever ready to do their duty and fulfill their obligations towards God, their Church and their Country. Their record speaks for itself and the motto on our nation's currency, "In God we trust," was more than a high-sounding phrase. It was, for them, as it must be for us, a daily reminder that we are all in the hands of God.

Our salvation and the national security of our country depend upon a renewal of a strong faith in God that characterized the lives of our pioneer Slovaks who migrated to our shores from their homeland across the sea. A land filled and overrun by beatniks, hippies, protesters, and groups of imported banshees wailing with anguish over synthetic woes dreamed up by LSD addicts—all seeking a Shangri-la at somebody else's expense—cannot long endure. Unless we replenish this great land of ours with honest, God-fearing folk, strong men of faith and many virtues, we too, will perish, for no country can afford to tolerate for too long destructive elements that endanger its foundations.

May God in His mercy and goodness watch over us and guide us. May He inspire genuine renewal of spirit that touches our very souls so that we will go forward to our destiny, in this world and in the world here-after, united and strong, loyal and brave, fearless and invincible in a common cause against the evils of the world, the spirit of darkness, ignorance and sin. Life, as St. Paul reminded us, is a warfare and a man must be willing to fight if he is to merit a reward. Our daily fight is against many evils that endanger body and soul. Our Slovak fathers and mothers fought the good fight, and now they are at rest. God grant that we do as well as they did in their time.

**Better Training for Foreign Service
Officers**

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, next October begins the 50th anniversary year of

the School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University. The school is now in the process of revising its curriculum in the hope of making it even more effective in preparing young men and women for serving their country abroad. As the Nation's oldest institution for the training of personnel for careers in both diplomacy and trade, the school of foreign service has produced in its half century an impressive number of graduates.

Dr. Carroll Quigley, a professor of history at the school of foreign service for 28 years, has written an informative and interesting article about the changes now underway in this leading institution. He argues persuasively that when the founder and regent of the school, Rev. Dr. Edmund A. Walsh, S.J., revised the curriculum in 1951, shortly before his death, he envisioned a course of education that would provide the student with a broad, interrelated background in government, economics, history, languages, and philosophy. This, rather than any specialized or narrow training, would best prepare men to grapple with the problems of international relations and foreign trade. Because of the significance of this development, not only to other colleges and universities but also to those who are intending to prepare themselves for service abroad, I ask unanimous consent that the article, which appeared in the November 16 issue of the *Hoya*, be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

QUIGLEY PROBES POSSIBILITIES FOR FOREIGN SERVICE CURRICULUM REFORM
(By Carroll Quigley, Ph. D.)

Those who ignore history are condemned to repeat it.

Ends should determine means.

These two rules should be the guide posts to any reform of the curriculum of the Foreign Service School, as to most other things. That means that anyone talking or planning on this subject must be aware of what the aim of the Foreign Service School is and of what has been done in the past for achieving that aim.

In the last few years, there has been a fair amount of talk about SFS curriculum reform, but most of it has been very badly informed in respect to these two indispensable foundations. This article will seek to sketch these as I have come to know them in my 26 years in this School.

The goal of the SFS never was to prepare students for careers in the Foreign Service of the United States, since the latter was not established until the school was five years old. The similarity of name is thus only coincidental. The School was established in 1919 in recognition of the fact that the United States had just become a World Power with obligations in private as well as public areas. There was a new need for trained personnel for many international agencies besides those of our own government. The fact that the League of Nations was founded in the same year as the Foreign Service School is much more significant than the fact that the Diplomatic Corps and the Consular Service of the United States were combined into a single agency called "the Foreign Service of the United States" in 1924, five years after the School was established. Moreover, it was always expected that more graduates would go into private activities overseas than would go to work for public agencies. For this reason, the curriculum included study of accounting and

commercial law as required courses until fairly recently.

The wisdom of this early and persistent view of the goals of the School will be evident to anyone who examines the areas in which Foreign Service graduates have worked successfully. In the years after World War II, when the largest classes were graduated, not over 3 or 4% even took the State Department Foreign Service examinations. On the other hand, many graduates went into a great variety of overseas work, in airlines and shipping, in education and journalism in foreign areas, as well as all kinds of overseas business. For these positions they needed a broad and integrated preparation in all aspects of international work.

In time this broad and integrated program came to provide one of the best undergraduate programs in general social sciences available in the United States, and it thus became, without anyone intending it, one of the best preparations available for law school or for graduate work in one of the social science specialties such as history, political science, or economics. For graduate school the SFS curriculum was better preparation than an undergraduate major in the same field, either here or anywhere else, because it meant that a SFS alumnus at graduate school in one of these fields had a solid grounding in the other two, something which is absolutely essential, but is rarely obtained from an ordinary undergraduate major, since most colleges do not require this and many advise against it. Yet any one who examines what is done in graduate schools and by their graduates can see that a history major, for example, needs some knowledge of both economics and government, just as concentrators in the latter two fields need some knowledge of the other as well as of history. Moreover, knowledge of these fields used to be obtained in the SFS in an atmosphere where the emphasis was on teaching and understanding these subjects, and on explaining their mutual interrelationships in the actual experience of human life, and, above all, on the *understanding of this nexus as a basis for decision-making in active life*, and not taught, as they usually are in university-colleges today, as preparation for specialized work, especially research, on the graduate level. This last point is fundamental; it was at the basis of the thinking of Constantine McGuire and Father Walsh when they founded the School (see my article, "Constantine McGuire: Man of Mystery" in *Courier*, December 1965).

WARTIME EFFORTS

The curriculum of the SFS was directed to these ends, as judged best by Father Walsh and his advisers, from 1919 until the School was mobilized for the war effort in June 1943. During that time, there were no departments and no faculty ranks (all the faculty were called "lecturers"). For much of that time, most of the faculty and many of the students were part-time, and all courses were offered in the evening, although, by 1930, most courses were repeated in the day-time. Each course was two credit hours, and a student often took eight or more courses at a time. In time, as new courses were added, the integration among them came to be less than desired. By 1940 or so, curriculum reform was very necessary, but the outbreak of war put such demands on the School, and above all on Father Walsh, that the task could not be tackled until 1950.

The SFS made a major effort in the war, turning almost entirely to training of men in uniform in June 1943 and being swamped with returning veterans as soon as the fighting stopped. In 1947 the School had about 2300 students (more than twice its present enrollment). In those first postwar years, Father Walsh was very busy with missions to Germany and Japan, with writing two major books, and with the establishment of the Institute of Languages and Linguistics. As a result, the long needed reform of the Foreign

Service curriculum was not undertaken until the spring of 1950.

Perhaps because this task had been so long delayed, it was done very thoroughly. Members of the faculty and administration met about a dozen times, under the chairmanship of Father Walsh and with Walter I. Giles as secretary, in Room 8 Healy, the "Constitution Room." Most of these assemblies lasted several hours, some of them for a good part of Saturday mornings. The whole group was divided up into smaller committees which met elsewhere to work on parts of the problem before reporting back to the plenary sessions. The general ground rules were set by Father Walsh, after discussion with many others.

REVISED CURRICULUM

These general rules were as follows: (1) The number of courses taken at any one time must be reduced, and the courses themselves strengthened so that they should leave the student with a real familiarity with the subject concerned; (2) the courses should be made more general, with the numerous specialized courses which had grown up over the years either eliminated or made electives; (3) a balance must be maintained between the various academic disciplines so that a graduate would be familiar in some depth with all the tools he might need in his post-graduate experience; and (4) the School must ensure that these various disciplines and courses are integrated in the students mind, and not simply memorized as discrete academic subjects.

Two difficulties, from opposite directions, arose in the general discussions. On one side, those who had been teaching specialized courses, such as "Staple Commodities in World Trade," or "Exporting Practice," or commercial law, accounting, and shipping, objected to their subjects being reduced in time or made electives. On the other hand, a group of the political scientists insisted that international affairs was merely one part of the general subject of political science and should be treated as such, with the main core of the curriculum built on a political science department expanded to include additional courses, especially a new course in "International Relations." Father Walsh was most emphatic in rejecting this last suggestion, insisting that the whole program of study of the School was on international relations, and that this subject was not simply a matter of political science but was equally concerned with economic, psychological, intellectual, and other issues. He emphasized, against the efforts of this group to cut down the time devoted to economics, that even in the Foreign Service of the United States 80 percent of the time of personnel on the lower levels was devoted to economic issues not to political ones.

In this reform, most courses which were retained as required courses were increased from two to three hours a week, and, at the same time, the number of courses taken each year was reduced, with freshmen and sophomores taking only five courses. Father Walsh insisted that this adoption of the standard three-credit course must not lead students to look at the achievement of the degree as simply the accumulation of a number of discrete and separate courses. To avoid this danger, it was decided to introduce an oral comprehensive examination for all seniors to force them to review the work of the first three years and to look at the assemblage of courses as a single comprehensive body of knowledge. To assist in this end, each professor was to prepare and submit for mimeograph publication a syllabus of the content of his course so that all might know what was in each course and how it fitted in with the others.

This curriculum reform of 1950 took months of work and established the outlines of the program still found at the School of Foreign Service. However, it has been so much subjected to tinkering and manipula-

tion that much of its original value has been lost. These changes arose from two directions. On the one hand, new administrators who knew nothing about the original reasons for the courses as they were established made or allowed changes which weakened the whole effect. On the other hand, the establishment of university-wide departments, which did not exist in 1950, led to changes in the content, sequence, and perspective of both faculty and courses so that they fitted together less effectively for the SFS curriculum.

As set up in 1950, there were four years of history and political science, three of economics, and two each of English, philosophy, and language. The two years of required religion for Catholics were non-credit courses. In the early 1950's, the religion courses were given credit to force students to take them more seriously. A few years later, a new Regent could not see why Catholics had to take 12 credit hours more than non-Catholics to get the same degree, so the latter were forced to take 12 hours more of history of political theory as a substitute for religion. These 12 hours have since been juggled in various ways. About the same time, a University official felt that freshmen were not able to handle generalities, so used his influence to have the SFS required freshman course in "Principles of Political Science" abolished, with the result that most of them now never get much of the material which was in that course.

The greatest changes in the curriculum, however, were not ones which could be seen in the catalogue, but were simply the result of the establishment of University-wide departments since 1950. During Father Walsh's regime, the SFS was a completely separate entity whose only connection with the University was that it gave its degrees under the University charter and rented room-space from the University. It had a separate library, bank account, admissions policy, administration, and faculty. In fact, about that time, the College issued a ruling that no one who taught in the College could also teach in the SFS. As a result of this order, William Flaherty, one of the greatest teachers in the history of the School, resigned from both and left to become, in a short while, chief statistician of Chrysler Corporation.

The creation of University departments meant that the course syllabi were forgotten, the content of the courses changed even when names remained the same, and the whole context of the School's educational process changed, with the substitution of departmental courses aiming toward preparation for graduate work in that departmental discipline replacing foreign service courses aiming at the establishment of an integrated understanding of international affairs as an area of decision-making and action. At the same time, the new University faculty, possessed by the unique value of their own subject, or even of their narrow specialty within that subject, were increasingly unable to ask or to judge comprehensive questions on the oral comprehensive examinations. In fact one of the amusing evidences of this process has been the growing reluctance of the examiners to judge the candidates in all three fields as the rules of the examination have always required them to do.

CRUCIAL PROBLEMS

There is no need to explain in detail what has gone wrong with the SFS curriculum in recent years. It should be sufficient to say that many of the courses no longer contain what they should contain or even what their titles would lead one to expect, because their teachers are often off riding hobby-horses instead of teaching what the SFS curriculum requires them to teach. Thus students often have had no logic, even when their transcript lists a course called "Logic," their courses in English now often consist of impressionistic studies of literature rather

than the training in verbal communication skills which the curriculum requires; they may well graduate with all kinds of specialized knowledge in government, but are unable to define such basic concepts as "state," "nationalism," or "democracy;" in a similar way they often miss fundamental movements in the historical past depending on which section they happened to be in in the required history courses; and, most astounding of all, they take a degree in "Foreign Service" without ever having studied geography, simply because the teacher of that subject refused to teach the course described in the syllabus. And, finally as a culmination of all these erosions of a once-excellent program, the fitting together and integration of the courses has become disjointed, the years of study have become unbalanced (so that the freshman year is now too easy and the sophomore year too difficult), and the better students in the last few years are constantly being drained away from the SFS curriculum to fill up special elective and proseminar courses so that teachers whose primary interest is in some special subject on the graduate level may have a sufficiently large group of good students to make his efforts satisfactory to himself.

"Red Relative" Racket

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, I introduced legislation to block the outflow of U.S. decedents estates to persons in countries where the government does not allow estates to be paid to American beneficiaries. My bill was particularly concerned with the flight of dollars behind the Iron Curtain. In the New York Knickerbocker of April 14, 1968, Columnist Ed Mowery explains how another Communist racket is draining dollars out of the United States for the benefit of Red bloc economies.

In my opinion, our national balance-of-payments program is missing a great opportunity in not taking stiffer measures to curb these abuses. I realize that this administration is very much in favor of trade with and aid to the Soviet bloc, but I would hope that it is not in favor of these clandestine transactions which bilk American citizens and fuel the economies of the Communist bloc nations.

The article referred to follows:

"RED RELATIVE" RACKET

(By Edward J. Mowery)

WASHINGTON.—Uncle Sam is probing every avenue to halt the dollar flow to Europe. But little or no attention has apparently been given to the multimillion-dollar flow of greenbacks sent by compassionate Americans to ease the economic plight of relatives behind the Iron Curtain.

Certainly no blame can be attached to thousands of Americans who send their hostage relatives dollars for food and the barest living necessities. But dollar-hungry officials of communist countries have turned the Good Samaritan gesture into a lush racket.

A newly-released study made by the Czechoslovak National Council of America blueprints the operations of a "thriving" Communist government business invented for the extraction of dollars from Americans. Similar dollar-drain schemes presumably function in every Iron Curtain country.

The Czech government operates its merchandising racket through a sort of chain-store outlet known as Tuzex, which has numerous agents in the United States who deluge Americans of Czech descent with elaborate brochures of items exchangeable for dollars.

REDS BLOCK REAL DONATIONS

Red cunning plugs all loopholes in the normal donation of gift packages to Czech residents. The Czech government has halted receipt of such packages from America through a prohibitive duty. Food and worn clothing gifts from U.S. citizens are out. Instead, American relatives of trapped Czechs must purchase Tuzex coupons with dollars. The coupons are then redeemed at Tuzex stores by recipient relatives.

It's a cute swindle to replenish the empty Czech treasury. Our dollars are then used to purchase raw materials for the manufacture of goods flowing to the USSR and communist bloc.

The startling ease with which the communist Czech government can grab American dollars is reflected in the mushrooming growth of the Tuzex enterprise. For 20 years, the disconsolate Czechs have borne communist rule. Their businesses, homes, possessions expropriated, they became drones in a steadily-deteriorating economy.

Gift packages of food and used clothing often made life bearable. Then came creation of the dollar-draining Tuzex gimmick. And Czech-made goods could no longer be purchased for Czech crowns. Tuzex became a government monopoly, expanding its inventory from "necessity" items to luxury bait.

In addition to clothing, shoes, glassware, etc., Czechs with dollar-backed Tuzex coupons can now purchase Russian vodka, Pilsner beer, plum brandy slivovic, TV sets, transistor radios and automobiles—the current Czech "status" symbol formerly available only to communist bigshots.

Tens of thousands of Americans receiving the Tuzex catalogue gasped at the Reds' newest lure. American dollars can now buy a co-operative apartment or private homes (with gardens) for Czechs scratching to make ends meet. Homes are offered in four models, and furniture is "readily available" for enough U.S. bucks.

The "private" homes, of course, would revert to government ownership upon completion. And because of the Reds neglect of properties they seized massive dilapidation haunts urban housing. The shortage is acute.

What can the United States do to halt the deluge of dollars into Iron Curtain treasuries? It's a sticky question now being debated. The Czech National Council in its current issue of the American Bulletin urges U.S. officials to "plug the Iron Curtain holes through which millions of dollars are being drained."

It might be tough on Czechs and other hostages for a while. But the swindle cries for official action.

Dr. Harold Taylor's "The World and the American Teacher"

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Dr. Harold Taylor recently made the final report of a 2-year study which he directed concerning the education of teachers in world affairs for the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education. The entire 300-page publication,

entitled "The World and the American Teacher," will be published early in May.

Dr. Taylor is an internationally known educator, lecturer, and writer. He is the author of "On Education and Freedom," "Art and the Intellect," coauthor and editor of "Essays in Teaching," and editor of "The Idea of a World University," written by Michael Zweig. In 1963, he served as director of a pilot project in a world college, and in 1965-66 was consultant in human rights to the late Adlai E. Stevenson and the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation. Before assuming the presidency of Sarah Lawrence College in 1945, a post he held for 14 years, Dr. Taylor taught philosophy at the University of Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of Dr. Taylor's report, entitled "The World and the American Teacher," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THE WORLD AND THE AMERICAN TEACHER

(Final report of a study directed by Dr. Harold Taylor of the education of teachers in world affairs for the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education)

After directing a two-year study of the education of American teachers in world affairs, Dr. Harold Taylor, former president of Sarah Lawrence College, has concluded in his final report that the standard curriculum in American higher education, through which teachers and most college students go, has become obsolete both in method and content. The Report calls for large scale revision in the way teachers are educated for every part of the educational system, from nursery school to graduate education, beginning with the formation of a nation-wide volunteer Student Corps of 25,000 students as an extension of the ideas of VISTA, Head Start, the National Teacher Corps, the Peace Corps and exchange Peace Corps programs, with service and study in foreign and American communities considered as a regular part of the student's program.

"With world society in a state of expanding revolution and our own society and its place in the world changing radically before our eyes," says Dr. Taylor, "the American educational system has remained frozen into older patterns of thought and content. One result is that the average student's idea of the world, like that of so many other citizens, is dangerously out of touch with reality."

"As presently organized, the standard curriculum for undergraduates takes as its framework white American middle class society in a setting of Western culture, and the student is seldom given direct experience or knowledge of people in cultures other than his own, either inside the United States or in non-Western societies. Accordingly, the student learns to develop a parochial view of the world which, if he becomes a teacher, is transferred back into the school curriculum and reinforced there by the ideas and values of the local community. Either that or the parochialism makes it impossible for him to break through to the culture of the children he is teaching."

The 300 page publication, entitled *The World and the American Teacher* will be released in early spring. It is based on extensive research in the United States and abroad, on conferences and interviews with administrators, students and faculty, along with classroom visits and discussions in a cross-section of 50 American colleges and universities where teachers are educated.

Contrary to present trends in university

thought, Dr. Taylor holds that students are the major resource for transmitting and recreating their own culture, that the primary purpose of the university is to teach students, and that the best way to do so is by teaching them to teach themselves. He calls for a reorganization of the colleges and universities to give responsibility for teaching to all students, graduate and undergraduate, as a regular part of their education—through student courses and seminars, tutorials, team-study and research, student symposia, field work, study-travel projects in the United States and overseas, study and service in local communities in whatever capacity student talents can be used. The college campus should become "a staging-ground for expeditions into the world, a place where students can learn to use the world as an educational instrument."

"In modern society," says Dr. Taylor, "there are no 'foreign' cultures and problems, only human problems shared by all societies. The problems of the world are reflected in those of American social change, the issues of racial conflict, poverty, under-privilege, unemployment, educational shortages, the development of the arts, national and cultural identity, ideological dispute, leadership, war and peace, political freedom and control, human rights and social action, the fulfillment of human lives. Involvement by students in studies and action in the field of cultural change, in the United States and abroad, is a means of coming to terms with the natural concerns of the world's people, and of developing an empathy with members of foreign cultures, societies and political systems."

"The American teacher is linked to the wider world by the experience available to him in his own society. This is not merely a question of taking courses in world affairs and non-Western cultures in his academic program. A main route to the understanding of world affairs lies through direct and deep experience in the varieties of American culture, ranging from the Spanish-American, Indian, Negro, Puerto Rican, Chinese-American and others, to the culture of the urban and rural poor."

The Report defines education as a social science, a branch of the humanities and of the healing arts, and it recommends the fusion of liberal and professional studies in education, especially in the fields of cultural anthropology, psychology and educational sociology, and the inclusion of the creative arts on an international scale as a primary element in the education of teachers.

Among the findings of the Report are the following:

New and promising trends in the direction of internationalism in higher education have come as a result of efforts by the foundations, educational associations such as AACTE, Government projects in AID and other agencies, consortia of colleges and universities, several State Departments of Education, NEA institutes in foreign language and cultures, volunteer service organizations, the appointment of Directors of International Programs in more than 100 colleges and universities, research institutes in educational problems of developing countries, the extension of Junior Year Abroad programs to include more than 35,000 students, and the work of the foundation-supported programs of the private organization, Education and World Affairs.

The effect of the Peace Corps in recruiting, training and providing foreign teaching experience for a majority of 7,000 new volunteers each year is beginning to show in increased interest in teaching and world affairs on the part of American students, and is a major resource, along with the exchange Peace Corps, for ideas and programs in the international education of teachers.

The younger generation of social and political activities and educational reformers in the student movement constitute a force for

the development of internationalism in student outlook; if such students are to become teachers with a knowledge of the world, they should be given a chance to join forces with foreign students and to try out their own educational ideas in practice, in their own schools and colleges and within the American communities at large.

Only three to five percent of teachers in the public schools have, in their preparation to teach, taken courses which deal with world society, international issues, or non-Western materials.

The standard professional courses in education, potentially a major center for stimulating the interest of students in social and educational issues and in world affairs, currently offer little opportunity for the study of foreign cultures and their educational systems.

In relying on the lecture system, tests, grades and credits as its mode of instruction, the present undergraduate curriculum, for students of education and others, gives the student almost no responsibility for conducting his own education or for teaching himself and others; it teaches him to accept and rely on intellectual and political authority rather than to take his own initiatives or to extend his range of enquiry into world affairs or world problems.

The best kind of program for educating teachers in world affairs is a cross between the Peace Corps, the National Student Corps, VISTA, and the Experiment in International Living, with the emphasis on teaching and practical experience in a foreign culture (foreign in the sense that it is not one's own) combined with selected studies in the arts, sciences and foreign languages, including the languages of American subcultures, chosen for their relevance to the subjects to be taught and to the culture in which the teaching is to be carried on.

International programs such as those in operation at Justin Morrill College at Michigan State University, Wilmington College in Wilmington, Ohio, the University of Michigan College of Education in Ann Arbor, Antioch College in Yellow Springs, Ohio, and San Francisco State College provide models on which new forms of international teacher education can be built.

In a wide-ranging set of recommendations, the Taylor Report provides an analysis of the problems of teacher education, not only as they relate to education in world affairs, but to the major areas where reforms are already under national discussion—in the system of teacher certification, in the professional education courses, practice teaching, urban education, the arts and sciences curriculum, teacher recruitment, graduate schools of education, and methods of instruction.

"Historically," says Taylor, "the system of teacher education has been the outcome of local efforts by citizens through their schools and related institutions—normal schools, certifying agencies, teachers colleges—to arrange for the education of their children, and has not, until very recently, been brought in touch with the main stream of higher education, university life, world problems and cultural affairs. It has been a populist movement, carried on outside the colleges and universities, urged on by those seeking improvement and advancement in the educational, economic and social position of children and youth without previous access to full educational opportunity. In the past, teacher education has been ignored by the universities. This has meant that the education of teachers for the universities and for the schools has been placed far down on the national educational agenda and has been scandalously neglected. While funds for university research, graduate study, professional schools and the B.A. degree in the universities have sharply increased over the years, support and concern for teacher education of all kinds, for the schools or for the colleges, has been comparatively negligible."

Among further recommendations of the Report are:

State Departments of Education, certification agencies and colleges of education should take the initiative in including foreign and domestic service in teaching and community development as favored elements in qualifying students for the teaching certificate.

That a network of connections between American and foreign institutions of teacher education be organized through initiatives by State Departments of Education, school systems, colleges and universities for the exchange of students, faculty members, research and curricular materials, as called for in the International Education Act and its proposed Center for Educational Cooperation.

That World Urban Teaching Centers be established on American campuses to which students and educators from foreign countries would come to work with their American counterparts on the educational problems of the world's cities, with the American urban community used as a laboratory for international work in educational and social change.

That the international educational programs of the State Department, AID and other Government agencies, including the Office of Overseas Schools, concentrate their efforts and budgets on the education of teachers, and that faculty members serving AID projects abroad take students of education with them for research and teaching experience in foreign countries.

That foreign students already in the United States and others recruited from abroad for that purpose be invited to act as student-teachers in American public schools and colleges, in an extension of the exchange Peace Corps idea to a national and international scale.

That the idea of the world as a campus be made central to the thinking and planning of American educators, and that practical programs reflecting this idea become a major concern of all those working on problems of teacher education.

That the creative arts of all cultures be brought directly into the curriculum of teacher education, through International Festivals of the Arts on American campuses and abroad, with student performers, poets, composers, painters, sculptors and others recruited for service in the communities and schools.

That wherever there are organizations and agencies with international connections and interests—the United Nations Association, UNICEF, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Science Foundation, AID, the Atomic Energy Commission, AACTE, and the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession—arrangements for specific projects in the education of teachers be built into existing programs.

That the test of a teacher and the award of a teaching certificate should be made to depend on his proven ability to enable students to learn the subjects he is teaching, and not on the completion of a series of academic and professional courses prescribed by the controlling agencies.

That new Master of Arts and Doctor of Philosophy degrees be developed in the Universities and colleges of education, through which returned Peace Corps volunteers and others with foreign experience and service can, without formal course requirements, build upon their previous experience.

(a) by studying in greater depth the foreign culture and region from which they have returned,

(b) by developing new curriculum materials based on the previous experience and present study and trying them out as interns in schools, and

(c) by studying local educational and community problems on a comparative basis with those encountered in service abroad.

That two and three year M.A. and Ph.D. degrees programs be developed in which one year is spent in study, teaching and community service abroad, with parallel studies, teaching and service on the home campus and its surrounding communities.

Other recommendations, more than forty in all, have to do with the revision of college curricula, international summer institutes in the United States and abroad, extensive collaboration with the Peace Corps, linking graduate research centers to teacher education, appointment of foreign teachers and scholars to the staff of State Departments and colleges of Education, extending the Junior Year Abroad to student-teachers, recruiting veterans of Vietnam for teaching preparation and later duties there and in Southeast Asia, developing new graduate programs with a component of foreign study and teaching, replacing former CIA subsidies to students by Government and foundation grants for student-initiated projects in international education.

Dr. Taylor, an internationally known educator, is the author of *On Education and Freedom, Art and the Intellect*, and was co-author and editor of *Essays in Teaching*, editor of *The Idea of a World University* by Michael Zweig, served in 1963 as director of a pilot project in a World College and, in 1965-66, was consultant in human rights to the late Adlai E. Stevenson and the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation. Before assuming the presidency of Sarah Lawrence College in 1945, a post he held for fourteen years, Dr. Taylor taught philosophy at the University of Wisconsin.

Crane Haussamen, former minister from the United States to UNESCO, served as research associate in the study; Miss Miriam Willey and Miss Clara Grossman as administrative and research assistants. Members of the Advisory Committee for the study were: Harris Wofford, President, State University of New York at Old Westbury, and former Associate Director of the Peace Corps in charge of the Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Research.

Brian Urquhart, Office of the Secretary General of the United Nations.

Henry Steele Commager, Professor of American History, Amherst College.

Peter Gillingham, Executive Associate of Education and World Affairs, Counsel to the House of Representatives Task Force on the International Education Act.

Frank Hamblin, Academic Vice President, Northern Arizona University, and current Chairman, Committee on International Relations of The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Kenneth Barker, Dean, School of Education, University of Akron.

Frank H. Klassen, Associate Secretary of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in charge of International Relations.

Resolution Adopted by the Lions Club of Kearny, N.J.

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to inform all Members of this House that the Lions Club of Kearny, N.J., has adopted a resolution passed earlier by the board of governors of the Lions Club of New Jersey. Under unanimous consent I shall insert it following my remarks.

The Lions, who have done splendid work, are asking the Congress to set up a

National Eye Institute under the aegis of the National Institutes of Health.

I would like to announce my support of this worthy proposal, and I urge all Members to join with me in support of the establishment of such an Institute.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the Kearny Lions and, as a Lion myself, I am very proud to tell my colleagues that the principles of Lionism and the principles of Americanism are totally indistinguishable.

The resolution follows:

Whereas, The cardinal aim of Lionism is Sight Conservation and Aid to the blind; and Whereas, Blindness and disorders are increasing at an alarming rate; and

Whereas, Among other sight statistics it is estimated that 90,000,000 Americans have some ocular malfunction—that 12,000,000 school children need some form of eye care—that 1,000,000 Americans are functionally blind—and that 42,000 persons go blind each year; and

Whereas, Eight percent of all blindness is the result of diseases whose causes are unknown to science; and

Whereas, There is indicated a tremendous need for a vastly accelerated and intensified program of Eye Research so as to provide medical science with additional knowledge and tools to cope with visual disorders; and

Whereas, There is pending before the Congress of the United States a proposal to establish a separate National Eye Institute within the National Institutes of Health; and

Whereas, There is pending before the Congress of the United States a proposal to establish a separate National Eye Institute within the National Institutes of Health; and

Whereas, The establishment of the aforementioned National Eye Institute would make more funds available for Eye Research and would further provide the organizational means and the impetus for greater Eye Research Programs inuring to the benefit of all mankind; now therefore be it

Resolved, That we the Council of Governors of Multiple District No. 16, New Jersey, Lions International, in meeting assembled at New Brunswick, New Jersey this 29th day of January, 1968 enthusiastically endorse the proposal to establish a National Eye Institute within the National Institutes of Health; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Senator and Representative from New Jersey apprising them of the action taken by the Council of Governors representing approximately 12,000 Lions members in New Jersey and soliciting their support for the pending legislation.

LIONS INTERNATIONAL, MULTIPLE DISTRICT 16, NEW JERSEY
WILLIAM F. RINALDI, Secretary.

I hereby certify that the above Resolution was approved at a meeting of the Directors of the Palisades Park, Lions Club, Palisades Park, N.J.

Gradualism: Fuel of Wars

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the U.S. News & World Report, April 29, 1968, issue carries an excellent article describing the major points of the Republican coordinating committee paper, "Gradualism: Fuel of Wars."

Some of the Nation's top military experts serve on the committee that prepared this report. Included are two former

Secretaries of Defense, Neil H. McElroy and Thomas S. Gates, Jr.; two former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Nathan W. Twining and Adm. Arthur W. Radford; and Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, and many others.

Principal among the committee's criticisms of the military policy of the present administration, is the use of flexible response as a military concept. The committee report called flexible response, "a new open door policy for Soviets," and recommended several constructive policies to correct errors of the past.

These are primarily concerned with using sufficient force to meet any challenge, being prepared to crush all threats to peace with force, if required, and utilizing force to the fullest extent that the situation may demand.

The committee members concluded that flexible response and gradualism, as developed by the administration, exposed the country and the world to intolerable, but largely avoidable, risks. These doctrines are costly in lives and resources, and are perilous to our security and world peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted in the Extensions of Remarks at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

MILITARY EXPERTS TELL WHY "GRADUALISM" FAILED IN VIETNAM

(NOTE.—Why does victory seem out of reach in Vietnam?)

(Is it U.S. policy now to be deliberately satisfied with stalemate everywhere? What happened to the idea of fighting to win? In practical terms, exactly what has "gradualism" meant?)

(U.S. defense strategy has been closely examined by a panel of experts—the Republican Task Force on National Security. On the panel: two former Defense Secretaries, top military commanders with outstanding records.

(In the report are charges that the administration's policy has been "tragic" for the country, a failure that prolonged and escalated the war. Also expressed—a deep concern for the future.

(The judgment and experience of many of the nation's top military experts is reflected in the accompanying report on U.S. strategy. Its authors include the following: Neil H. McElroy, cochairman, Secretary of Defense, 1957-59; Thomas S. Gates, Jr., cochairman, Secretary of Defense, 1959-61; Wilfred J. McNeil, vice chairman, Assistant Secretary of Defense and Comptroller, 1949-59; Alfred M. Gruenther, Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, 1953-56; Nathan W. Twining, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, 1957-60; Arthur W. Radford, chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, 1953-57; Bernard A. Schriever, Commander, Air Force Systems Command, 1961-66; Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of U.S. Naval Operations, 1955-61; George H. Decker, Chief of Staff, United States Army, 1960-62; and Harry D. Felt, Commander in Chief in Pacific, 1958-64.

(The following is from the text of a Republican coordinating committee paper "Gradualism Fuel of Wars," released April 18, 1968.)

A military power strong enough to maintain the peace must follow four principles as old as warfare and diplomacy: It must maintain a force strong enough to meet any challenge; it must be prepared to crush all threats to the peace with force, if required;

it must clearly convince those who would disturb the peace that force will be used against them, and, once force is brought into play, it must be applied to the fullest extent the situation may demand.

Beginning in 1961, two related doctrines began to evolve, and in succeeding years have radically altered our nation's defense planning. One is a basic revision of an earlier concept known as "flexible response." The other was a singular stratagem called "gradualism."

Flexible response, in the current thinking, does not mean, as it has historically meant, the capability to respond to a variety of threats with applicable and sufficient force to crush it. It has come to designate, instead, a deliberate policy of reaction which induces stalemate.

Though separate doctrines conceptually, they have the same effect—to de-emphasize our strength, leash our power and replace our superiority with "parity," all in the euphoric hope that, through such demonstrations of peaceful purpose and restraint, America would entice her sworn enemies away from aggression and subversion and into the pathways of peace.

However well intended, these departures have been tragic for America. Prudent firmness was displaced by extreme caution, then hesitancy, then indecisiveness. Unchallengeable power was eroded by the fact or appearance of a wavering will. Our tested guardians of peace—manifest strength and determination—have lost credibility throughout the world.

And so, two doctrines—the revised flexible response and gradualism—have grievously disserved the United States. They have fostered aggression. They have prolonged and escalated a war, undermined our alliances, divided the nation and stripped our reserves to the bone.

As doctrines of response, not of initiative, they have created a worldwide crisis of confidence in United States deterrence. In place of peace they have spawned the very evils they were conceived to banish—war and escalation of war.

Flexible response, a traditional military concept, is neither complex nor objectionable. It prescribes the maintenance of military forces capable of containing all levels of aggression from guerrilla actions to unlimited war. For many years the armed forces of the United States adhered to this doctrine.

In very recent years a deadly new definition has been introduced transforming flexible response from an instrument for peace into a trigger of wars. As revised by the present Administration, flexible response means to an aggressor that his military excursions will initially encounter only comparable force.

Thus war is invited as aggressors measure attractive options—freedom to choose the time, the place and the means of doing battle, all with an acceptable risk. Assured that America's crushing force will be dribbled into battle, the military marauder is encouraged to believe that even a protracted conflict will be pursued on his terms. It is this new application of flexible response that is conveyed when the expression appears in this paper.

As the new version of flexible response invites war, so gradualism escalates war once begun.

Ironically, gradualism—designed to prevent intensification of war—does the very opposite by preventing timely use of force against aggression. While flexible response blunts our first reactions, gradualism assures the aggressor that our subsequent reactions will also be cautiously phased to prevent overapplication of force. Skillfully and patiently applied, the process can hardly fail to nourish a skirmish into a major war.

HOW PAUSES IN WAR AID ENEMY

Moreover, after each carefully restrained escalation, gradualism dictates a pause. This ingenious stratagem is, in effect, a one-sided military recess during which the enemy is

importuned to recalculate his risks and contritely review his indiscretions as his own depredations continue. The pause, occurring when the aggressor's force has been at least temporarily stalemated by our military effort, actually enables the enemy to recoup his strength at his most vulnerable moment. Thus rejuvenated by successive pauses, the struggle continues and intensifies.

America's laboratory for testing the gradualism experiment has been Vietnam. There it has failed—it has prolonged and escalated the war.

It has permitted North Vietnam to acquire the weapons, supplies and training from the Soviet Union and Communist China needed to maintain and expand its war-making capability and to withstand punishing attacks. It has preserved the sanctuaries in which the Communists can safely regroup and reinforce. It has long delayed interdiction of the flow of supplies to the South. It has denied our own military the strength and decisiveness the circumstances have required.

So completely has the Administration applied this policy of gradualism that tactical military decisions have been often made by civilians 9,000 miles away in Washington.

Even advance warnings to the enemy of U.S. steps to augment her forces or otherwise strengthen her military position have characterized gradualism in Vietnam. The professed object of this surprising tactic has been to prevent "overreaction" by the enemy or his allies. One result, however, is clear: The enemy has been allowed to phase his buildup with our own.

Thus, gradualism has salvaged the enemy's warmaking capacity, enabling the tiny nation of North Vietnam to develop a major capability to sustain aggression in the South, and to obtain massive assistance from the Soviet Union and Red China to offset U.S. pressure from land, sea and air. America's overwhelming power has been fended off, not by the enemy, but by our own hand. We have escalated, through gradualism, a minor engagement into our fourth-largest war.

The shackling of our Air Force and naval air power in Vietnam affords us a striking exhibition of gradualism in action.

In our system it is axiomatic that the highest civilian level of Government must establish broad policies to govern the general direction in which our nation is to move. An obsession with preventing escalation of the air war in Vietnam, however, has led the Administration to transfer approval of attacks on specific targets from field commanders and even the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the President himself.

Operational decisions reached far away in Washington have prevented some attacks altogether, and in other instances have been so delayed as to forfeit precious military advantage. Certain targets unanimously recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff two years ago have but recently been placed on the approved lists.

During this long interval between target recommendations and approval, the enemy vastly strengthened his ability to withstand U.S. pressure from the air. He scattered his targets. Many of his vital operations were moved underground. With Soviet assistance he multiplied his air defenses.

In the 18 months prior to August, 1967, the number of anti-aircraft guns deployed in North Vietnam increased more than 250 per cent. Surface-to-air missile (SA-2) sites more than doubled. Radar early-warning capability tripled, and radar fire-control capability increased at an even faster rate. U.S. losses in pilots and equipment soared.

Surveying this appalling sequence, the Military Preparedness Subcommittee of the United States reported on Aug. 31, 1967: "It is not our intention to point a finger or to second-guess those who determine this policy, but the cold fact is that this policy has not done the job, and it has been contrary to military judgment."

A similar sequence has marked the pros-

ecution of the ground actions of this solicitously directed war. As in the application of air power, "too little, too late" has been the pattern dictated by gradualism, with consequent terrible cost to us and the stricken people of Vietnam.

For many months, the military leadership vainly pressed the Administration for a substantial increase of ground forces for Vietnam....

Gradualism has restrained us from applying enough pressure, in adequate time, to convince the enemy of the futility of his effort. Restraints, imposed not by the enemy but by ourselves, have made it possible for him to carry forward an aggression with a growing expectation of at least partial success.

This conduct of our efforts in Vietnam has been bitterly disappointing both militarily and politically and has imposed immense costs upon the American people.

The war has already caused over 100,000 U.S. casualties, consumed some 50 billions of dollars, gravely impaired our international relationships and sharply divided the American people. Continued adherence to this doctrine promises not only more disappointments, but also an escalating risk of world war. The newly revised doctrine of flexible response is not regional in scope. Its injury to our nation's vital interests has been worldwide.

DAMAGE TO ATLANTIC ALLIANCE

Announcement of adoption by NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) of the Administration's version of flexible response was made as recently as December, 1967, but U.S. acceptance of this doctrine in the early '60s left NATO no alternative. Now, Soviet Communism in Eastern Europe can reasonably conclude from U.S. and NATO policy that military response to a thrust from the east would be initially opposed only with commensurate force.

For NATO, however, conventional response to a major conventional military thrust would be unrealistic. NATO military strategists are acutely aware of this. The huge conventional forces of East European Communism, coupled with the political realities of the region, suggest that the new doctrine of flexible response may gravely menace all of Europe.

Before this basic strategic revision, the NATO security design had given full consideration to conventional responses to acts of aggression short of major war. However, it was universally recognized and stressed that this capability had severe limitations. For the enemy who pushed the Alliance beyond these limits, such force as necessary would be swiftly applied. That this force might not materialize was never contemplated. Because it was known to all that the NATO nations had not only the capability but also the will to repel aggression, peace was preserved.

The doctrine of flexible response as now incorporated into NATO planning would seem to dictate initial reliance on conventional defense—a doctrine conceding the loss of forward areas early in any conflict. Then, with enemy forces occupying Allied territory, our own military options would become critically restricted. Expecting an enemy to desist following his initial success is at best a deadly gamble, and at worst inviting defeat.

NEW OPEN DOOR POLICY: FOR SOVIETS

For the new flexible response to become credible for Western Europe, a major increase of conventional forces would be required—an increase so great as to be economically and politically impracticable. We view the incorporation of this new doctrine into NATO security planning as a new Open Door policy—for Soviet Communism.

Shortly after this new doctrine was enunciated, former Chancellor Adenauer (of West Germany) expressed concern that it would weaken NATO and cause fragmentation of the Alliance. His assessment has since been borne out.

Thus, in but a brief span of years the new defense doctrine, flexible response, has gravely weakened the West's long-established objective of presenting any aggressor in Europe with unacceptable risks.

In contrast to the Administration's premises, we are convinced that these judgments must underpin America's security policy:

(1) Our defense posture must confront an enemy with a clearly unacceptable risk; otherwise it invites political opportunism and aggression.

(2) Our policies in the course of a conflict must not allow an enemy to control the level and nature of the U.S. military response, or allow him to disengage at will; otherwise they invite a continuing escalation of the conflict.

(3) Our policies must not publicly proclaim that America will withhold any element of her might to prevent or repel aggression; otherwise they strip this nation of those military and diplomatic options indispensable to the attainment of her national goals, the success of her foreign policies and her influence for peace.

These criticisms of the current doctrines in no way diminish our concern for safeguarding against irresponsibility in the use of military force. In a world of nuclear peril, application of direct military force must always be a last resort. Rather, we are convinced that an intensive re-examination of this country's national-security policies is long overdue. A reappraisal of our strategic policies for countering aggression has become critical in the light of our mismanagement of the Vietnam conflict and the thrust of events elsewhere in the world.

It is recognized that certain types of conflict are not susceptible to solution by military power alone. This paper cannot properly be read as embracing the proposition that a military solution to the situation in Vietnam should have been undertaken at its inception six years ago. It should also be noted that the paper does not attempt in any way to treat the exceedingly complicated military-diplomatic issue of whether or not this war, having been so grievously mismanaged, can now reach a military solution lacking very major escalations evidently not now contemplated by the Administration.

There is urgent need to establish a credibility with the world at large—indeed, with our own people—that the U.S. does have the determination, and does have the will, to use its strength to restore and keep the peace.

The Administration's beguiling formulation for these new doctrines of flexible response and gradualism conceals a perilous unreality. Offered in the name of prudence and humanitarianism, in application these doctrines are breeders of war and killers of men. . . .

Once this nation resorts to arms to stem aggression, force should be applied quickly and decisively to bring the conflict swiftly to an end. The longer a conflict is indulged, the greater the likelihood of its escalation and expansion, and the greater its casualties and destruction. And once America is committed to military action, we must no longer merely respond; we must achieve and maintain the initiative.

In view of the current tensions and instability of world affairs, America can little afford to forearm potential aggressors with the assurance that she is unlikely to use any element of her power against them. Where our vital interests are at stake, meddlers and brigands must know that the risks they face are unacceptable.

Looking to the future, there remains a probability of conflicts in other parts of the world. Communism is still enamored of fomenting "wars of national liberation."

Communist forces are actively probing in the Middle East, Africa and South America, as well as Asia, undermining the established orders and relentlessly striving to extend

their influence. The thrust of their effort is still to weaken U.S. and free-world positions in international affairs. Many areas under increasing pressure in recent months are vital to the interests of the United States and the West, as well as to indigenous forces of freedom.

America has neither the aspiration nor the resources to serve as policeman of the world. Yet, realities of geography, ideology, and international politics dictate that this nation's vital interests project far beyond her shores. We must maintain these interests, and we must defend them. Policies and a posture which unmistakably show this nation's determination to protect these interests will discourage nibbling aggression and reduce the number of U.S. physical involvements. Such policies, and such a posture, do not exist today.

WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

The doctrines of flexible response and gradualism as developed by this Administration expose this nation and the world to intolerable, largely avoidable risks. They impose terrible costs in lives and resources. They are incompatible with the security of the United States and perilous to world peace.

Our country should announce at the highest level the resumption of a national-security policy that the size of our response to aggression will be our own decision tailored to each situation as it arises. A potential enemy will be denied the assurance he has appeared to have under the gradualism policy of a moderate and limited price in response to aggression. At the same time, we will continue to have the leeway to make our response as moderate or as potent as we consider appropriate.

Government Spending the True Cause of Our Current Inflation

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the April 16, 1968, issue of the Journal of Commerce contains an editorial on the subject of inflation that is most pertinent to discussions currently going on in the Congress.

The basic point made by the editorial is that the reasons for the current growing rate of inflation will not be cured by a tax increase alone. The real cause of the trouble is massive Government spending. If a tax increase could indeed be seen as going to reduce the deficit caused by this spending, I believe the Congress would immediately respond. But the fear of many of us is that any additional revenues that might be produced by a tax increase would merely lead to increased Government spending. This in turn would push the rate of inflation even higher.

To give us confidence that it really means to put its fiscal house in order, the administration must make a clear-cut public commitment to reduce current spending levels. Until that occurs, opposition to a tax increase will remain strong.

For the valid points this editorial makes, I commend it to your attention, as follows:

THE SILENT TREATMENT

Those who are saying that U.S. spending is going to remain high for at least a year,

regardless of whatever settlement Washington may be able to negotiate with Hanoi, are right. It may be possible to avoid significant increases in defense outlays, but there is so much already committed that little chance remains of making substantial cuts in overseas expenditures for a year and perhaps for the better part of two.

But those who use this in support of arguments that the House must pass and the President approve the 10 per cent tax surcharge increase voted by the Senate are still on dubious ground.

Inflation is certainly with us and its steady spread strikes many as providing solid reasons for raising income taxes. Still, it didn't get here all by itself. It was ushered in by a combination of administration policies. These won't be corrected by a tax increase alone. Not for a minute.

When the government spends consistently more than it takes in and finances the shortfall by borrowing and by increasing the money supply, it is natural that the consequences are inflationary, as pointed out last week by Virginia Polytechnic Institute's Prof. Paul C. Roberts.

To argue, however, that because inflation of itself is a threat to the nation's economic stability is not necessarily to present a convincing case for higher taxes. Why take the point of view that it is inflation alone that has made higher taxes imperative? Why not admit the truth of the matter: namely, that massive spending on all sorts of old and new programs, social welfare in particular, is the cause of the real trouble? Too many people who should know better are giving this question the silent treatment.

The answer, we think is clear. If it is only to fight inflation that a tax increase is considered necessary, opposition to the latter will melt, as indeed it has in a great many quarters.

But what would the public reaction be if the questions were put like this: Are you willing to pay substantially heavier taxes to maintain existing welfare programs and make way for new ones? If offered the alternative two years ago, together with a warning that spending at this rate would certainly create inflationary conditions (and thereby bring closer the imminence of tax boost), would you have approved the administration's choice or disapproved of it with this foreknowledge?

We have said before that the principal basis of our opposition to the income tax increase is economic and have done our best to explain why we feel as we do.

The considerations raised by Professor Roberts are more political, but they are important, too. If a government, equipped with a formidable array of new economic thought, can force the nation into an inflationary situation by borrowing heavily to finance war and the Great Society simultaneously, then it really seldom need go back to the people and ask whether they approve of its measures or not. Taxes can be forced steadily upward (always disguised as means of combating inflation) and the higher revenues can be used to finance still more social programs.

They can, that is, if tax revenues actually do prove higher (there is a good case to be made for the likelihood they won't, and may even drift lower, along with trends in business activity). After all, if the effect of 1964's tax cuts was to increase revenues through a vigorous stimulation of production, who can be so confident that an increase now wouldn't accomplish the very opposite of what the administration seems to expect of it?

If there were today any real grounds for confidence that a tax increase this year would mark the limits of the distance Congress is willing to go in this direction, and that it would be followed by a return to something approaching fiscal prudence in Washington, that would be one thing. It might almost make the game worth the candle.

But the growing talk of massive new outlays in the cities, together with the govern-

ment's stubborn refusal to drop such redundant older programs as rural electrification (long since completed) indicate to us nothing more pleasant than the prospect of more of the same—more new programs, more borrowing, more boosts in the money supply, more inflation and, in consequence, more pressure for more tax increases.

It is true that Mr. Johnson can stand pretty well aside from these basic pressures now. While he has one more budget to prepare, its implementation will actually be the responsibility of his successor, who can change it. But Messrs. Humphrey, Nixon, Kennedy, probably Rockefeller and McCarthy ought to have something to say about them, especially now that Vietnam is receding as an American political issue. How long can so many so-called leaders of the nation's two great political parties go on pretending that one of the most urgent issues facing the American people is either secondary or simply doesn't exist?

**Employ the Handicapped: Essay by
Karen L. Caprai, Boise, Idaho**

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, we all know of the important work being done by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, which will be meeting in Washington next week. Working with all segments of our society, the Committee undertakes the important task of enlisting public and private groups in a year-round program to promote the employment of physically and mentally handicapped workers.

To emphasize the importance of its work, the Committee each year sponsors the "ability counts" essay contest. Idaho's entry in this year's national competition is an excellent essay written by Miss Karen L. Caprai, a student at Boise High School. Karen's essay calls attention to the handicapped who are successfully employed in Idaho's capital city.

Not only was Karen's essay judged to be the best in Idaho, but I am pleased to report that it was named to share honors for fifth place in the national competition.

In order that all Senators may have a chance to read this excellent essay, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CHALLENGE OF EMPLOYMENT BARRIERS TO THE HANDICAPPED: A COMMUNITY SURVEY

(By Karen L. Caprai, Boise High School, Boise, Idaho)

The bell atop the old country school rings merrily, announcing the beginning of class. In the seventh grade classroom, the teacher (who also happens to double as school principal) sits behind his enormous wooden desk, tolling over a mountain of papers. When the last student is finally seated, he leaves his work and starts the class off with a cheery remark. Then it's down to business, a full day's curriculum ahead. The students all think he's great. He is more than a teacher,

he is a friend! He gladly spends any free time he has teaching his students art crafts. He also coaches the school baseball, football, and basketball teams; and usually finds a free Saturday every now and then to take some of the boys fishing.

In a nearby high school, a biology teacher sits at a lab table peering into a microscope. Looking around the room, you will see shelves of sparkling test tubes, row upon row of scientific data, and several experiments in the making. A very interesting room, and an even more interesting teacher—the kind of teacher who can keep a class of students enthralled in a subject well known as being boring. He is a fine man, with a cup of coffee and a warm smile for everyone.

In other parts of the city—a television announcer sits in front of a huge camera preparing for his daily news broadcast. At the cameraman's signal, he greets his television audience with a cheerful smile and the latest breaking news. An architect sits in front of his drawing board carefully sketching plans for a new office building. He is a man well known in our community for his original, artistic designs. A female artist adds the final touches to a painting. This woman's artwork is viewed by many people. She's the art director for the State Employment Agency.

After reading about the above people, I am sure you would agree they are all quite outstanding. However, one more thing about them makes their accomplishments even greater. Our country school teacher walks with crutches because of childhood muscular disease. The biology teacher has an arm missing. The television announcer is a polio victim. The architect and the artist are both confined to a wheelchair, the architect having lost his legs in the war and the artist's legs were paralyzed in an automobile accident.

Although these people now hold excellent jobs, they, like thousands of other handicapped persons, had several employment barriers to overcome before gaining their desired professions or jobs.

Prejudice is usually the most difficult and disheartening barrier confronting the handicapped person. Prejudices formed by people who are afraid of something or someone that is different. They look at only the person's disability and not his abilities. The architect, for example, can handle his job skillfully because the use of the legs is not required. Some employers, however, would think someone confined to a wheelchair could not handle such a job, although the architect has proven they can.

The handicapped person may even have some doubts about his own ability. He must gain confidence in himself if he wants someone else to have confidence in him. He must learn to use his abilities to overcome his disability. The country school teacher did not let his disability get him down. With the aid of the Vocational Rehabilitation Center and wages earned repairing watches in a jewelry store, he made his way through college. This teacher was Idaho's Handicapped Person for 1966.

The handicapped employee also has to overcome construction barriers. Our country school teacher had quite some time getting up the steps of the school. This, however, was soon remedied. He had a ramp built that he can easily get up and down. Wheelchair employees have difficulty in the use of such facilities as telephone booths which are out of reach, and with doors that are too narrow. Special arrangements can usually be made quite easily so that these people can have access to facilities that we take for granted.

The handicapped person, as you have seen, is faced with many employment barriers, but as these people, and thousands more like them, have proven—these barriers can be surpassed!

What Is a Volunteer Fireman?

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the volunteer fireman is one of the most important public servants in the Nation. Through his unselfish efforts millions of dollars worth of property is prevented from destruction each year and countless lives are saved. The volunteer fireman is the unsung hero of our Nation.

A very fine editorial appeared in the April 11, 1968, edition of the News-Herald, Morganton, N.C., entitled "What's a Volunteer Fireman?" I believe the editorial will be of interest to everyone who shares my appreciation for the fine work that these unselfish Americans are performing 24 hours a day each day in the year. I insert the editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS A VOLUNTEER FIREMAN?

As have many others, we have wondered often what makes a volunteer fireman tick.

What sense of selfless service causes a man to make himself available at all hours to go to the rescue of life and property in a frequently thankless task of fighting fires?

This and other questions serve only to heighten gratitude the public should hold for volunteer firemen.

It remained for a chief of a volunteer fire department in Guilford County to answer our question and to explain something of the difficulties which a volunteer encounters in filling his role.

It's so good that we pass along these extracts:

What makes a volunteer fireman get up in the middle of the night or the wee hours of the morning, and go fight a fire realizing that he must put in a long hard day on his job tomorrow?

What makes him endure the stinging criticism for not getting there sooner—when maybe one of the city's newest fire engines could not have gotten there any earlier? However, if he is more hasty he may find himself facing a stiff fine for speeding. These are very difficult to pay indeed when first of all he is not receiving one cent for his services. These speeding tickets go over great when he gets home and tells the "little woman" what has happened.

To add to his troubles, she has already been trying to get her man to stop this foolishness. However, I wonder if the invalid that he has just rescued from a burning building thought what he was doing was just a lot of bunk.

To top it all, he pays just as much "fire tax" as anyone else. He goes to the grocery store on Friday and takes Johnny to the dentist. On his way home he stops by the drug store and gets a prescription filled for his daughter who is sick. All these bills run just as high for him as anyone else.

Tonight is also his night to sleep at the fire house. So in the event of a fire his department will be able to respond instantly. However, when he arrives on the scene he hears that age old cry. "I called you thirty minutes ago." However, the truth finally comes to light. The property owner didn't know how to call the fire department so he ran out in the front yard and began to shout "my house is on fire." His cry was heard by a neighbor but he doesn't call the fire department. He calls the telephone operator. Many precious minutes are lost in this fashion. So—the firemen are blamed for it all.

Not being a fainthearted man, our fireman sighs and thinks about tomorrow and smiles to himself. For tomorrow is Saturday and he has plans to take his young son, Johnny, hunting. Although, what he doesn't realize is that all his neighbors are going to be at home tomorrow, too. Many of them have planned to burn off their garden or leaves in their yard. Early Saturday morning our fireman and his son are just about to get into the car and be on their merry way, when the fire house siren sounds.

Being truly a servant of others, he drops everything and rushes to the fire station. He learns that Mr. X who lives in the community, set a pile of leaves on fire and went back into the house. Now this pile of leaves has ignited about 15 acres of woodland. No hunting today, for this will take about three hours of hard labor to extinguish Mr. X's pile of leaves.

Yes, friend, this is the type individual you are criticizing when you criticize a volunteer fireman.

I believe that our volunteer fireman became a volunteer because of his concern for the safety of his friends, neighbors and loved ones.

He became what he is because he realizes that criticism never changed anything. Only by hard work can things be improved.

Our volunteer became a volunteer fireman because he realized his community must have protection. Not being one to shirk responsibility he joined the fire department in his respective community. I believe the thing that makes him tick is the satisfaction of helping others. The old proverb of placing others above self is a reality with him.

Why Celebrate Illinois' Sesquicentennial?

Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an article entitled "Why Celebrate Illinois' Sesquicentennial?" written by Ralph G. Newman, chairman of the Illinois Sesquicentennial Commission, and published in Illinois Public Official for March 1968.

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

WHY CELEBRATE ILLINOIS' SESQUICENTENNIAL?
(By Ralph G. Newman, chairman, Illinois Sesquicentennial Commission)

Why celebrate Illinois' Sesquicentennial? A good question—it deserves a thoughtful answer. How about the one the explorer gave for scaling Mount Everest: "Because it's there." Excepting that in the case of Illinois' 150th birthday, one had better say "Because it's here."

It is here—a party a "year long and a state wide," as Governor Otto Kerner has so aptly said. Actually the Jubilee State in '68 will celebrate more than 1,500 birthday parties from Chicago to Cairo, from Galena to Shawneetown, with special fetes in Springfield, Vandalia, Nauvoo and Carbondale, among hundreds of others. And, guests from everywhere in the world will be made truly welcome.

Even though Illinois contains only a tiny bit of the world's real estate, it has given more than its share of ideas that have made for progress and enriched civilization.

Illinois, at the 150-year landmark, can look back at a proud past, a dynamic present and a promising future.

CITES STATE'S HERITAGE

The heritage of Illinois includes the gift of Abraham Lincoln to the nation, of Jane Addams, of Carl Sandburg, and of Adlai Stevenson. It includes great scientists and industrialists who gave us the steel plow and the harvester, radio and television, and the men who measured the speed of light, Michelson and Morley.

Illinois gave the world great architects who invented the skyscraper and produced other innovations in building that are copied all over the world; medical scientists who vastly lengthened the human life span; pioneers in physics who first split the atom and now have developed the peaceful uses for nuclear energy to their greatest promise in Illinois. The vast development of railroads in Illinois made it the crossroads of the nation and Chicago the hub of the continent. And now, in the air age, O'Hare International Airport has become the busiest airport in the nation—and the world.

These are only a few of the great achievements in Illinois. But, they opened the door to the great NOW—the present in Illinois! A magnificent record! Illinois is the greatest state in agriculture and exports. It is an Empire by an inland sea. It is the center of population in the United States! It is the heartland of America.

POETIC QUOTES NOTED

The late Donald Culross Peattie, a native who, however, spent most of his adult life in California, called it "The best State of the Fifty." Why? "Illinois is the best State precisely because it is so American—Illinois is core America—it is American in its unappreciated beauty of plainness—something that Thoreau would have understood, perhaps, something that the three poets of the State who really sound to me like Illinois, give voice to—Sandburg, all of the time; Vachel Lindsay, sometimes; and, Edgar Lee Masters in "Spoon River Anthology."—Illinois is beautiful, it seems to me, as only a great fertile plain can be beautiful."

A fertile plain, if you wish, but still a State of great hustle and bustle. Chicago may well be the most dynamic of American cities, as it bursts its seams and great new towers rise to the skies. It is rapidly developing the most beautiful waterfront in the world.

EDUCATION NOW ESTABLISHED

Only a few years ago it suffered from a brain drain—to the east and west coasts. That trend seems now to have been reversed with the tremendous growth and expansion of education in Illinois, especially at the level of advanced study and research—in all the great universities of the State: Chicago, Northwestern, Illinois, Southern Illinois, Northern Illinois, Eastern Illinois, and many others. Everywhere town and gown are working together to give Illinois a fuller, richer life. Marvin Camras developed the wire recorder at Armour Research Foundation; Enrico Fermi led the team of nuclear physicists to the first self-sustained nuclear reaction; Charles B. Huggins won the 1966 Nobel Prize in medicine. Only recently, Illinois won the great nuclear prize—the greatest of all atom smashers—to be built at Weston.

George W. Beadle, University of Chicago President and Nobel-prize winning geneticist, (Nobel winners from the University number 25) puts it this way: "Chicagoland is home to a great many Universities. They all contribute to a climate in which research and development activities can thrive."

PROGRESS DEMONSTRATED

Research and development opens the door to industry and manufacture. More and more businesses are finding homes—good new homes in Illinois. There's the gigantic new Chrysler Plant at Belvidere. Bell Telephone Laboratories has built the new Indian Hill Center for some 1,200 scientists and engineers at Naperville. Bell is also building a big new technical center at Lisle. Jones and

Laughlin Steel Company has built a great new 150 Million Dollar steel plant at Hennepin on the Illinois River. Republic Steel Company has announced a new \$35,000,000 expansion program in East Chicago, Indiana, Caterpillar Tractor, at Peoria, and John Deere Company become ever greater giants. The First National Bank and the John Hancock Center rise majestically skyward—Chicago's tallest structures. Hancock will be a 100-story tower, topped by the City's TV antennae.

A new 30-story \$40,000,000 Mies Van der Rohe designed structure is to rise at Wacker Drive, east of Michigan Avenue. This will give added beauty to Michigan Avenue, which rapidly is becoming one of the great streets of the world, comparable to the Champs Elysees, Fifth Avenue, and Wilshire Boulevard. The Civic Center in Chicago now boasts the new Picasso.

ATTRACTIONS FOR TOURISTS

Illinois is a great place to visit. Tourism is a Two Billion Dollar business annually in the State. Springfield is the City that has the greatest attraction for foreign visitors, especially those from the underdeveloped nations, because of its Lincoln heritage. The beauty of Galena, New Salem, the Threshermen's Reunion at Pontiac, the magnolias of Cairo, the Shawnee National Forest, the Art Institute of Chicago, the Crab Orchard Wild Life Refuge—all are places of great attraction that come to mind. There are hundreds of others. The National Campers and Hikers Association is holding its national convention at DuQuoin, from July 15th to 18th. Some 35,000 persons are coming.

Doesn't this suggest that Illinois is going to be the place to come to in 1968? For great things are happening in Illinois! So, make a date and celebrate with this great State in '68.

Anniversary in Greece

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an especially timely and succulent editorial in yesterday's Washington Evening Star dealt with recent developments in Greece. In view of the barrage of criticism to which the Greek Government has been subjected over the last year, this editorial on the anniversary of the Greek Army coup merits attention.

The editorial follows:

ANNIVERSARY IN GREECE

Melina Mercouri, the sexy far-left movie actress, tried to stir things up in London. But the first anniversary of the Greek army coup—coinciding with the Orthodox Easter—was marked in Athens with complete quiet, if not indifference.

The fact seems to be that the people of Greece do not feel terribly upset by the military junta now ruling them. The junta, headed by Premier George Papadopoulos, still holds over 2,000 persons in prison or under house arrest, but the International Red Cross—which has looked into the situation—has absolved it of charges of cruelty. The charges have been made by absentee Greeks like Miss Mercouri, but they appear to amount to little more than propaganda.

It is noteworthy, in any case, that the Greeks—a volatile and voluble people—have reacted to both Easter and the coup anniversary with a degree of calm suggesting that they may not be unhappy with the absence of their old political pandemonium. The Papadopoulos junta has established order in place of the chaos threatened under the free-wheel-

ing politics of the ousted—and sinister—80-year-old Premier George Papandreou. What is promised now is a national referendum on a new constitution designed to guarantee all the basic freedoms for Greece, the great historic birthplace of democracy.

The Greek leftists are doing their best to discredit the referendum before it is held—a characteristic Communist tactic. After it takes place, however, Greece itself should be the stronger for it.

Trend Toward Huge Farms and Declining Rural Opportunity

HON. GEORGE MCGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, my attention has been called to an excellent article by Farm Editor Don Muhm, published in the Des Moines Register, reporting the acquisition of 10,000 acres of land in three counties in that State by a single farm operator.

The article is not only a striking illustration of the trend toward huge farming operations, and the elimination of family agriculture, it is an unusually competent job of reporting by Mr. Muhm, who has developed factually, in a news story, the effect of this type of agricultural trend on rural communities.

Mr. Muhm has interviewed bankers and merchants in the communities involved, who see in the huge semitrailers hauling in large cargoes of fertilizer a decline in business and banking volume for their towns. Muhm reports the decline in farm population in one of the counties—Wayne County, Iowa—which has already occurred, from 5,757 in 1947 to 3,528 today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Muhm's article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

MISSOURIAN BUYS 10,000 ACRES OF IOWA LAND—BIG LAND BUYER PAYS \$100 TO \$400 AN ACRE

(By Don Muhm)

HUMESTON, IOWA.—A new concern about farming and its future exists in this southern Iowa community following the purchases of about 10,000 acres of land by a Missouri man.

The purchases actually began a couple of years ago with transactions involving about 1,800 acres.

But then last fall, in mid-October, a one-man buying wave began that resulted in the purchase of 13 farms through one Humeston farm realtor by the Missourian.

While there is no exact figure available as to how much land was actually bought, or how much was paid, one reliable report indicated that the Missourian bought at least \$1 million worth of land from one farm realtor alone.

There's talk about the "big land buyer" along the main street of this Wayne County town of about 638 persons.

And there's talk in the country, where the farmers usually worry more about weather, commodity prices and machinery costs.

Included in these conversations are comments about "corporate farms," the decline in farm numbers and farm population and the average age of farmers.

Little is known locally about the buyer. But land sale records at the courthouses in three counties—Wayne, Decatur and Lucas—list his name as Adrian Craigmiles of Rich Hill, Mo.

Craigmiles has both banking interests. He is young (41 years old) and was once named Farmer of the Year in Bates County, Mo., by the Farm Bureau.

It is believed that his many recent farm real estate purchases make him the owner of the largest amount of Iowa land owned by any one individual.

Estimates currently indicate that he owns about 4,000 more acres than is involved in Iowa's most famous 6,000-acre operation near Odebolt in Sac County, now known as Shinrone Farms. Until recently it was the Lakin Ranch and before that was the Adams Ranch.

The chief difference between the Odebolt "ranch" and the Craigmiles property is that the Odebolt property is in one tract, while the Missourian's land is scattered across three counties of southern Iowa.

Folks here in general express concern about the future, and wonder about the things taking place in their farming community.

Many know that there has been a substantial migration away from the land during the past 20 years. In 1947, there were 1,829 farms in Wayne County; today, there are about 645 fewer farms in that county.

In other words, there has been an average of 30 farm families leaving the land annually in Wayne County during the past two decades.

The farm population in Wayne County was 5,757 in 1947; today it is 3,528.

Wayne County is not unique in the loss of farms and farm population. Annually anywhere from 3,000 to 5,000 farm families in Iowa call it quits for various reasons and leave the land.

Into this out-migration picture last fall entered the Missouri buyer.

The sale of this large amount of land brings forth ready comments from Humeston citizens.

"This is pretty tough competition for the young farmer who has a hard time picking up land anyway," said Lester Ragan, Humeston implement dealer.

"Besides, people are leaving the farm fast enough because of low farm income without someone coming in and trying to monopolize the land."

Two bank officers in Humeston also commented on the purchases:

"This won't do either the town or the bank much good," said Glen Greenlee of the Citizens State Bank.

"We're afraid that all of the buying of supply items will be done centrally, and that our local merchants will be left out," said A. E. Jennison, also an officer in the Humeston bank.

"They've got semi-trucks coming in here loaded with fertilizer," said one businessman who declined to be identified. "I question whether this guy will buy anything locally."

The first man to sell his farm to the Missouri buyer last October was Daryl Carter, 57, of Humeston. Carter's 320-acre farm had been listed for sale for two years, according to M. F. Latham, Humeston realtor.

"I didn't have any idea of what was going to follow," said Carter.

He had planned, however, to spend more time in a seed corn and insurance business that he had developed. Also he and his wife plan to build a new home in Humeston.

Carter had farmed the 320-acre unit for 37 years, raising crops and livestock.

Latham, the farm realtor, provided information about the Carter farm sale as well as 12 other sales made to the Missourian. Latham operates Agri-Business Associates, which specializes in farm real estate and farm management pursuits.

Here is Latham's own schedule beginning Oct. 9:

320-acre farm sold by Daryl Carter of Humeston.

360-acre farm sold by Warren Exley of Humeston, who plans to curtail his farming efforts and will operate about 280 acres he has left.

240-acre farm sold by Harold Rood, who is thinking about retiring from the farm and may live in Humeston.

900-acre farm sold by Charles Shivers of Corydon, a farmer and farm inventor.

167-acre farm owned by Roy Johnson, an absentee landlord from Corwith in north central Iowa.

720 acres in two farms sold by James Woosley of Garden Grove, a former Illinois farmer who has rented back the land and who will act as a farm manager for the Missouri owner.

940-acre farm owned by Eric Olson of Garden Grove who, according to Latham, is thinking about retirement.

160-acre farm owned by L. C. Cantwell, a former career military man who lives near Garden Grove but now lives in California.

934-acre farm (in Lucas County) owned by Balley Bros. of Leeton, Mo.

760-acre farm in Decatur County owned by Paul J. Kelly of Britt and his brother, Joseph R. Kelly.

140-acre farm owned by Vernon Marks of Lucas.

150-acre farm owned by Boyce Estate of Humeston.

In total these 13 farms amount to nearly 6,000 acres of land—or about the same size as Shinrone Farms at Odebolt.

Other realtors sold about 4,000 acres of land in this area to Craigmiles.

The purchases from one realtor alone amounted to about \$1 million worth of Iowa farm land.

Latham said that the land was purchased on a contract basis, with 25 per cent of the purchase price paid at the time of the transaction and the balance to be paid over a 10-year period.

Latham said that the farm land sold in a range of from \$100 to \$400 an acre.

By comparison, the Iowa State University annual survey of land prices indicated that in November, 1967, the average price of "southern pasture land" was \$244 an acre, up \$19 an acre from price levels of a year earlier.

The Missouri buyer bought all kinds of land—flat row crop fields and rough, hilly ground, pasture land and wooded land.

Virtually all of the land is being farmed by tenants. One of the tenants is James Woosley, 34, who also is acting as farm manager.

Woosley sold 720 acres to the Missourian, as well as 375 acres to another family. He and his brother, William, 29, will conduct a farming operation on a total of 3,700 acres.

They will have the aid of one farm employe, Gary Thomas, and part-time help during the busy seasons.

The Woosleys originally farmed in Illinois.

"This is good land in here," said James Woosley. "It responds good to fertilizer. If you take care of it, it's going to give you a good return."

"I think a lot of people have been selling southern Iowa short."

One of the reasons for his appreciation of the land in this area is the fact that for a couple of years his brother, William, has won the county corn-growing contest. One year he harvested 157 bushels of corn per acre; last year, his official yield was 150 bushels.

Woosley said that the new owner plans to raise a lot of corn, grub out trees and fence-lines with bulldozers to make the land tillable in these areas. Also, he indicated that much of the land would be seeded down to grasses, and a livestock operation started.

Latham pointed out that the Missourian

has run a beef cow herd on his land near Rich Hill, Mo., raising Angus, Hereford, Charolais and Santa Gertrudis cattle.

Latham, a former teacher and vocational agriculture instructor, feels much like Woosley about the southern Iowa farm land.

"The potential growth is bigger in this area than in any area I know," said Latham.

"Where land sells for \$600 an acre or more in north central Iowa, generally the top price here is \$350 an acre. And I know they can't raise two bushels of corn for every bushel we raise down here."

Latham admits that there has been criticism of his role in selling nearly 6,000 acres to the Missouri buyer. But he points out that also involved in the sales were Alvin R. Reynolds, a Chillicothe, Mo., realtor and William J. Carter, a farm specialist with the National Bank & Trust Co. of Chariton.

"If we hadn't sold the land to him, someone else would have," added Latham.

The Humeston realtor doesn't believe that the Missourian is tied in with a farm corporation, or that he intends to set up a corporate farm, or a farm conglomerate.

"He had the money and the desire to buy and he feels the same way about the great potential for his country that I and others do," he said.

"This area can raise good crops. And there is a great avenue wide open here for the development of a good livestock industry, cattle feeding, cattle raising, hog production and so on.

"This potential figures into what's happening here now."

But the Missourian, Craigmiles, did sell land to a relatively new, large Kansas City, Mo., farm corporation. And money from this land sale was used by him to make his purchase of the Iowa farms.

Double Standard: U.S. Style

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, it was not until dozens of patriotic organizations throughout this Nation began to alert the American people to the dangers of the Socialist-Communist ascendancy to power in this country, that the hierarchy of the Communist international conspiracy decided that it was high time to destroy the anti-Communists. To this end, they called a meeting in Moscow, which was attended by 80 Communist organizations from all parts of the world. The delegates to this meeting were instructed to return to their respective countries and begin a massive program to destroy all anti-Communists. Gus Hall, president of the Communist Party, U.S.A., returned from Moscow and inaugurated that program of destruction. The first to feel the ax was General Walker, who was indoctrinating his troops so that they would recognize the dangers of communism as a conspiracy and so that they would not be brainwashed as they were in Korea. For this bit of patriotism he was dismissed, degraded, demoted, and deprived of his rights under the Constitution.

This served only to accelerate and intensify the work of patriotic anti-Communist organizations. The administration was frantic because the New Frontier was being equated with social-

ism and socialism with communism, and something had to be done. Who was to do it? None other than Walter and Victor Reuther, who came to Washington in the fall of 1961 and had a strategy conference. At this conference Walter Reuther promised to write a memorandum for Attorney General ROBERT KENNEDY. That memo was a 24-page blueprint for the destruction of the anti-Communists. The memo was actually written by Victor Reuther, whom you remember as being the Soviet devotee, who in his earlier days spent some time in Russia writing glowing reports on the Soviet socialist program, and in a moment of reverie wrote a letter to his colleagues in America urging them to "keep up the fight for a Soviet America." This man, then became the chief adviser to the administration on how to deal with the anti-Communists. In his note, which accompanied the memo, he said:

We are hopeful that this memorandum may have some value to you in focusing attention upon possible administration policies and programs to combat the radical right.

Now it must be understood that the "radical right" refers to any and all patriotic organizations which stand opposed to the Socialist-Communist doctrine as set forth in the Communist manifesto of 1848 and restated by the Moscow Communist Convention in 1960. That, of course, means you as well as me.

Woodrow Wilson said many years ago:

Liberty cannot exist where government takes care of the people, but it can only thrive where the people take care of the government.

He might just as well have spelled it out more clearly by saying that liberty and socialism cannot coexist, that they are incompatible and only one can survive. In 1937, Pope Pius XI asked a searching question:

How is it possible that such a system long since rejected scientifically and now proved erroneous by experience, how is it, we ask, that such a system could spread so rapidly in all parts of the world?

If Pope Pius XI was shocked in 1937, what would he say today after seeing an additional 750 million human beings swept behind the Iron Curtain? Pope Pius XI also said in 1931 that the Socialist state cannot exist without an obviously excessive use of force. We are seeing that excessive use of force not only in the Communist countries, such as East Germany, Hungary, and Cuba, but also in our own country.

Now let us examine the recommendations of the Reuther brothers to be used for your own destruction. The first recommendation was:

The radical right inside the Armed Forces poses an immediate and special problem requiring immediate and special measures.

Under this heading, he recommended that Secretary McNamara investigate the extent of the radical right in the military. The memorandum claimed that it was widespread pressure from rightwing generals and admirals in the Pentagon which brought about the recall of Gen. James Van Fleet to active duty. What was wrong with General Van Fleet? Simply this, he was a member of the

board of For America, he endorsed the Florida Coalition of Patriotic Societies, and he was on the board of advisers of H. L. Hunt's Life Lines. The memorandum complained that all that Van Fleet accomplished was to embarrass Adlai Stevenson by saying that Stevenson was to blame for the U.S. failure to provide air support in the Bay of Pigs invasion and that General Van Fleet would have fired Stevenson. Had I been President, I would not have fired Adlai Stevenson for the simple reason that I would never have hired him in the first place.

The No. 2 complaint in the Reuther memorandum was that the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations is lending aid and comfort to the radical right—that's you. The memo goes on to state:

Although the radical right poses a far greater danger to the success of this country in its battle against international communism than does the domestic Communist movement, the latter has been branded subversive by the Government and the former (radical right) has not.

The memo goes on to state:

The list today is almost like a Good House-keeping seal for the radical right and as long as it exists (indicating it should be abolished) it should not remain one sided and permitted to work in favor of the radical right.

It is interesting to note that the adjective "radical" precedes any mention of "right." You see, radicalism has always been an offensive word to the American people, and, if the brothers Reuther can implant the word "radical" in connection with conservatism or rightwing movements, it would prove destructive.

The memo continues:

It might be advisable for the Attorney General to announce at this time that he is going to investigate one or more of these organizations with a view of determining whether charges will be filed and hearings held on the question of listing one or more of these organizations. The mere act of indicating that an investigation will be made will certainly bring home to many people something they have never considered—the subversive character of these organizations and the similarity to listed groups on the left.

Now that is really something. Many of these organizations to which Reuther refers have requested an investigation, and I can assure you that if one is held there will be no witness who will take the fifth amendment.

One specific proposal in the memo was that FBI agents infiltrate ultraconservative organizations to determine whether they should be classified as subversive or not. My dear friends, the FBI does not have to infiltrate these organizations. They have an open invitation to join with any of them.

The third suggestion was:

The flow of big money to the radical right should be dammed to the extent possible.

You should note that the word "dammed" is spelled with two m's although their direct intent was to spell it the other way. The proposal further stated:

As funds are a source of power to the radical right, action to dam up these funds may be the quickest way to turn the tide now running in their favor.

At least that is an admission never before heard, that the tide is running in our favor. The memo suggested that tax exemptions be carefully checked and that the list of major donors to the far right be made public and that the Federal Communications Commission check radio and television stations carrying far-propaganda, but listing their programs as religious, news analysis, or public service, and that the program, "Know Your Enemy," emanating from Washington would be a good place to start.

Incidentally, immediately after the memo was circulated, the income tax reports of Walter Knott of Knott's Berry Farm, one of the greatest exponents of free enterprise, and a true patriot, were examined and he was found liable for deductions which he had taken on contributions to support the California Free Enterprise Association. It is amazing how easy it is to deduct money for contributions to the Fund for the Republic and other leftwing organizations which support the socialistic Communist ideology, but when you attempt to educate people on the free-enterprise capitalistic system, you are then dispensing political propaganda. When you consider the massive political propaganda spewed forth by the National Education Association, the Rural Electrification outfit, and even the National Council of Churches, the double standard becomes so apparent that a schoolchild would recognize it.

Skipping one recommendation, I go to the fifth, which was:

The domestic Communist problems should be put into proper perspective for the American people, thus exposing the basic fallacy of the radical right.

What we are doing here tonight is putting the domestic Communist problem in its proper perspective for the American people, and in so doing we are not exposing any basic fallacy of the conservative right.

Now we come to the real "meat and potatoes" of what seems to be bothering the liberals, and that is that the Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover, "exaggerates the domestic Communist menace at every turn, and contributes to the public's frame of mind upon which the radical right feeds." The memo further charges that Assistant Attorney General J. Walter Yeagley, who continues in charge of internal security matters, has always maximized the domestic Communist menace.

The memo continues:

There is no need of a further effort to dramatize the Communist issue, the need now is to rein in those who have created the unreasoned fear of the domestic Communist movement in the minds of American people and to slowly develop a more rational attitude toward the strength of this movement.

In other words, the rational attitude which the pseudoliberals want is that we should appease and even embrace the international Communist menace. The memo suggests that it would not be well to forbid dissenting officials from expressing a contrary view for fear of the charge that the administration was attempting to muzzle J. Edgar Hoover, but

that "any effort to take a more realistic view by the leaders of this administration would probably cause most of the administration officials to fall in line, and even some legislators might be affected thereby."

This, then, is the key to the recent attacks upon our patriotic conservatism by some Members of the U.S. Senate and some Members of the House, and, if you will read these attacks appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, you will be amazed to see how closely they have followed the substance and the language used in the 24-page memo of Victor Reuther.

The authors of the book, "The Far Right," Donald Janson and Bernard Eisemann, state:

No formal action was taken on the suggestions, although the document was read by key members of the administration and circulated to sympathetic Congressmen.

With that statement I completely disagree, for sympathetic Congressmen and Senators have been following the directions of this memorandum, and many TV and radio station licenses are being withheld. These charges by sympathetic Congressmen are replete with the charge of guilt by association and similar techniques, and anyone who disagrees with these so-called sympathetic Congressmen becomes anti-Semitic, anti-Negro, and is charged with being a greater menace to American society than is the domestic Communist establishment.

At this point I wish to refer to the third suggestion in the Reuther memorandum:

The flow of big money to the radical right should be dammed to the extent possible.

The implementation of this recommendation began shortly after it was issued, and actions were commenced by the Internal Revenue Service to eliminate the tax exemption for most or all of the active conservative organizations throughout the country. The next step was initiated by the Federal Communications Commission, to curtail the broadcasting privileges of conservative and patriotic people, such as Dr. Carl McIntire and the Reverend Billy James Hargis.

At no time was there any effort to remove the tax exemption of the liberal, Socialist foundations, which far outnumber the patriotic and conservative institutions. This is a double standard which should not be countenanced by this Republic.

I am including herewith a recent statement by Dr. Hargis on this subject:

Twenty years ago, Dr. Billy James Hargis began Christian Crusade. In a very real sense, it was a "pulpit" from which he could tell his story to the people about what was happening to the churches and to the nation.

On March 12, 1953, the U.S. Treasury Department recognized the ministry of Christian Crusade in a ruling letter which granted tax exemption. This meant, of course, gifts to the religious, non-profit organization were tax deductible, and the organization would incur no liability in the matter of social security taxes.

On September 22, 1966, the Treasury Department completely reversed itself and arbitrarily revoked this tax-exempt status,

allegedly on the grounds Christian Crusade is not operating as a religious or educational institution and is influencing legislation and intervening in political campaigns.

During these years, between 1953 and 1966, the content and vigor of the message proclaimed by Billy James Hargis have remained unchanged. He has been uncompromising in his exposure of and opposition to religious apostasy and godless communism. Consequently, he is either loyally supported or bitterly attacked.

But, not until immediately after the elections of 1964, when the Internal Revenue Service made its first threat, has any agency of government sought to interfere with his right as a crusading evangelist to express his convictions and to speak out fearlessly for Christ and against communism.

Why the change? The true story has never been told to the public at large in the press or communications media. For this reason, the staff of Christian Crusade has prepared this message, setting forth the facts simply and concisely, and hoping it will receive wide public distribution.

Two things especially are worthy of explanation and public attention. (1) The real influence behind the government's action against Christian Crusade; and (2) the unjust treatment Christian Crusade has received at the hands of the Internal Revenue Service.

On December 19, 1961, Walter Reuther delivered his infamous Reuther Memorandum to the Justice Department, a twenty-four-page blueprint for action against anti-Communists unprecedented in the history of this country. On pages 20 and 21, Reuther suggested that Christian Crusade could be destroyed by revoking its tax-exempt status. (Copies of the Reuther Memorandum are available for 50 cents by writing Christian Crusade Publications, P.O. Box 977, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74102.)

Within a period of time after the memorandum was dispatched to all high Administration officials and, in fact, became policy, this organization has been subjected to threats, intimidations and harassment, resulting finally in the actual revocation of its tax exemption effective October 10, 1966.

The grounds on which the IRS made its arbitrary decision are utterly false and unfounded. Christian Crusade as an organization has never, directly or indirectly, intervened on the part of any political candidate. It does, however, as a matter of Christian principle, support amendments for voluntary prayer and Bible reading in the schools, but certainly not in the sense of lobbying or picketing.

Obviously, a double standard exists in the matter of tax exemption. Any number of leftwing organizations actively support or denounce political candidates and maintain lobbyists in Washington for the purpose of influencing legislation—all the while enjoying a tax-exempt status.

In its treatment of Christian Crusade, the IRS has acted in a manner, characterized by one American, as "a law unto itself." You may recall the article, "Tyranny in the Internal Revenue Service," in Reader's Digest of August, 1967.

In January, 1968, the Internal Revenue Service assessed Christian Crusade for payment of social security taxes retroactive from 1961 through 1965—an unheard of action. Remember, during these years, we operated as a tax-exempt organization by authority of the U.S. Treasury Department itself with the assurance in its own words we were not liable for social security taxes. This assessment, with interest and penalties, amounted to \$61,691.70.

Put yourself in our place for a moment. What would it do to you as an individual or to your business if all contributions you have made in the last ten years to your church or charitable organizations should become taxable on a retroactive basis?

Can the IRS make this action against Christian Crusade stick? IRS officials doubt it themselves (so we have been informed by our attorneys).

One of our tax accountants, who worked for years as an employee of the IRS, told us that in the case of Christian Crusade, the IRS is moving more rapidly than it did in any case during his entire employment. Much of the information on assessments and penalties has been handled by long distance telephone between IRS offices instead of the usual exchange of mail. It did not allow Christian Crusade the usual ten days to pay the assessment, but demanded immediate payment. It did not grant the customary postponement of an appeals hearing (which often amounts to weeks or months) when such postponements are requested. Attorneys for Christian Crusade were allowed only a two-day postponement.

Through persistence, our attorneys have unearthed another ominous development—more than sixty-eight Christian, anti-Communist leaders and prominent public figures are being involved in the case by the federal government through the taking of depositions. What is the purpose? What else but to range far and wide in an attempt to harass and intimidate patriotic Christian Americans, in the implementing of the Reuther Memorandum?

You may rest assured that Dr. Hargis and Christian Crusade will fight this injustice now and in the months to come. The point is—it is not our fight alone. The issue in the case of Christian Crusade is that a court—eventually the Supreme Court—will decide what is religion . . . so that what happens to Christian Crusade will conceivably affect all churches, all religious institutions, as well as all Conservatives and anti-Communist causes.

Because we believe in the power of prayer, freedom and justice, this tyranny will be providentially overruled . . . and we will win.

Income Maintenance

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last year, Congress passed one of the most regressive social security bills in the history of this Nation. It was punitive; it was restrictive; and it betrayed the attitude that those unfortunate enough to be on welfare should be punished for their inability to be self-sufficient.

I was pleased at the Senate action aimed at removing many of the bill's deficiencies in this session. Unfortunately, these gains may be lost unless action is taken to turn this action into law in this session.

For it is not as if we were doing very much that was positive. At best, these amendments represent a short-term response to the problems of the Nation's welfare system.

Longer run solutions are needed, one of which may well be some kind of guaranteed annual income, or negative income tax arrangement. A Presidential Commission now is studying the matter, and I eagerly await the results of its endeavors.

A recent article in Look magazine, "Do We Owe People a Living?" by George T. Harris, discusses many of the issues this Nation will have to face. I ask unanimous

consent to the inclusion of his article in the Extensions of Remarks to forward the public discussion of income maintenance.

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

THE CRY FOR THE NEGATIVE INCOME TAX SETS UP THE MEANEST DEBATE SINCE PROHIBITION: DO WE OWE PEOPLE A LIVING?

(By T. George Harris)

Having just mailed in Form 1040, along with the skin off your soul, you may get sore at the Guaranteed Income (GI) movement. These GI's, not soldiers, are a strangely mixed group of liberals, Negro mothers, conservatives and radicals. They are moving right along to their common goal: to make Uncle Sam give poor families and their children cash enough to live in moderate ease—whether they work, loaf or riot. The first Federal test of GI is now at the start-up stage in New Jersey.

The notion is simple. Taxes withheld from our paychecks will slide straight through the U.S. Treasury and out again into the mail as Government Issue pay for any citizen who happens to eat low on the hog.

Payouts will be automatic, not as a welfare dole but as a civil right insured by law. The hardluck victim will get no preference over the lusty freeloader whose only social contribution is an upward push on the birth-rate.

The prospect looks like a victory for Robert Theobald, 38, India-born guru of the free-money sect. "Some form of national-payments system is coming—that's no longer the issue," he says, with passion bristling from both bars of his mustache. "My greatest problem is that Americans have a pathological desire to toll, and we have more people who want to toll than we have opportunities [jobs] for toll. . . . Guaranteed Income involves a total change in the values of the society."

Theobald preaches openly, and has for years, against capitalism's ancient habit of requiring a man to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow or the muscle of his brain. "We must," he insists, "break the link between job and income."

Why? This socioeconomicist believes that automation is destroying jobs so fast that government must take over most of the money-spreading duty from employers. Since his prophecies of doomsday unemployment have so far proved false, he has countered, like an end-of-the-world preacher, by moving his disaster dates forward.

Between trips on the lecture circuit, Theobald beats out books in Apartment 19H of a private-housing project looking north over New York's Harlem. Here lately, he has spied another sign of Armageddon in the sky: credit cards. Without GI, the buy-everything cards will bring on the bloodiest rebellion yet imagined, he tells me, because they draw the first clear and absolute line between those who have and those who have not.

Nor does the worry stop with cash-passing. Theobald also tolls over plans to keep people busy enough to stay out of trouble once they are forced into well-subsidized leisure: "A GI that is not accompanied by a strong thrust to provide meaningful activity would be a disaster."

It might be restful to pause for a paragraph while Theobald's ideas cool. He confirms the worst fears, and wildest dreams, aroused by income-maintenance thought. His is an original mind, and uncommonly provocative, but he sometimes sees mountains that, on closer study, are mounds. After talking with him, you need considerable time to absorb a new, little-known political fact: the GI notion is also selling like hot cakes among big businessmen and Republican bigwigs.

Detroit's Arjay Miller, vice-chairman of

Ford Motor Co., has taken a public stand. Other industrialists and bankers, generally the opinion-setters of commerce, have surprised me in quiet talks by shifting sharply toward Miller's view.

"Five years ago, even three," mutters a blue-chip chief, "this kind of talk would have gotten a man drummed out of the private-sector corps."

Chicago & North Western Railway boss Ben Heineman, already on record for measures very close to GI, is heading a Presidential commission on income distribution. "I'm not worried about positions that might upset conventional wisdom," says Democrat Heineman. Last month, a leading banker delved into the tangle of Federal housing, decided it might be simpler to give people cash and let them find their own homes in the market. Others see hope for the poverty pockets, white and black, to sprout a self-service commercial sector.

The change in sentiment makes blips on Washington's political radar. Richard Nixon's closest advisers have been urging him to campaign hard for Guaranteed Income, taking it away from LBJ. "For one thing," says Nixon economic consultant Pierre Rinfret, "it would be a strong stabilizer against business cycles."

Wisconsin's Melvin Laird, chairman of the House Republican Conference, is drafting a bill on the subject. Since liberals charge that Laird "stands at the center of the largest conservative apparatus in American politics," his GI proposal will stir up press dust when it hits the hopper. It will also notify both parties that committee hearings and a mean battle aren't far up the road. If Vietnam ever quits drawing the butterfat out of the economy, a few billions are apt to get churned into a new kind of poor law.

Heaven save the John Birchers! Here's the GOP taking up the same cause as Theobald, whose ambition is to scrub out capitalism's labor system. Just as Mr. Robert Welch says, the Commie conspiracy is brainwashing us for sure. Even the debate teams in U.S. colleges are talking GI this year. Worst of all, Republican leaders are being led down this strange path by Sen. Barry Goldwater's Presidential campaign policy adviser: Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago, chief economist to the American Right.

Nervous friends dearly hope that Professor Friedman is kidding, playing an impractical joke. But he, a bouncy egghead of 55 and not famous for humility, confesses that he had the idea, and published it, before the Left took it up. Indeed, most GI's admit, Friedman invented the most efficient way to pass the cash: the Negative Income Tax.

Back in World War II, while in the Treasury Department, economist Friedman decided that if Federal revenue is raised by positive taxes, then public outlays have to be thought of as reverse, or negative, taxes. He believed, as a conservative, that voters would be less spendthrift if they could see where the positive taxes came from to match each negative tax. In a series of lectures, given in 1956 and published in '62, he outlined a below-ground extension for the income tax system. It would pipe money directly, instantly, from the high and middle brackets down to those too poor to pay.

"It gives help in the form most useful to the individual, namely, cash," he wrote.

The scheme would be far less expensive, Friedman argued, than the welfare, public housing, farm subsidy and other projects being run in the name of the needy. His figures showed that in 1961, the Federal, state and local governments sank \$33 billion into such efforts, but only one dollar in five ever reached the empty pocket to which it was addressed. His purpose, then a nutty notion to both liberals and conservatives, was to replace inefficient bureaucracy with a check-mailing machine. The urgency of the need to avoid total reliance on public agencies for services was not to become clear

until the advent of the new strike era among public employees.

Friedman also had his eye on such sacred but scrubby cows as minimum wage. He foresaw the day when the legal minimum, putting entry-level jobs out of reach of low-skill workers, would consign millions to a sub-machine caste. (The latest three-stage boost of the legal wage, to \$1.60, has wiped out enough jobs to nullify the efforts of Government and industry to train and hire more Negro teen-agers.) Friedman's version of GI would supplement low wages, draw idle teen-agers into their first jobs and undercut future demands for fast boosts in the minimum wage.

And there was, above all, Friedman's pet hate: the harsh Federal penalty on work by the poor. A man or woman on welfare was taxed 100 percent, often several hundred, on any income he earned. Here's how: if he went out and got a low-pay or part-time job, his welfare payments would be cut dollar for dollar. If the job petered out, as often happened, he might not get the payments restored for months. It was (and is) hazardous to try that big jump out of the welfare trap. A negative income tax, Friedman argued, would let people climb out step by step.

The thing sounds weird at first, but once you get the hang of it, nothing could be more like horse sense. Friedman's Negative Income Payments—let's call them NIP's—are to be graduated the way our positive taxes are. Those who earn least will draw the most, but earnings on a job will not be confiscated dollar for dollar.

People who earn nothing at all will live on a basic payment from Uncle Sam, say between \$1,500 and \$3,200 a year to cover a family of four. For each dollar earned by working, the recipient will be able to keep 50 cents. (To put it another way, if his job pay is \$40 a week, his NIP check goes down \$20.) The payments taper off to nothing just before a worker moves up to the wage level where he or she is initiated, like the rest of us, into the joys of tax-paying instead of tax-taking. Thus improved, the dear old Internal Revenue Service will look like Dr. Dolittle's pushmi-pullyu.

"Everyone would fill out the same Form 1040, and get the same exemptions and deductions," says Friedman. "Some will pay taxes, and some will be paid." Not since Beardsley Ruml invented pay-as-you-go withholding has a new idea grabbed the minds of so many policy makers.

Something was needed. The gathering racial storm in the cities finally brought on one of those rare searches for new insight. Neither Friedman nor Theobald got much attention when, in 1962 and 1963, each published a guaranteed-income proposal without knowing of the other's effort. They lived in different worlds of ideology, the Right and the Left, I don't even remember hearing of Theobald until Ralph Helstein, president of the United Packinghouse Workers, took me, in late '63, to a New York luncheon given by a small, informed band of thinking in the AFL-CIO. Most, including me, were cool to Theobald's work-is-passé pitch over coffee, but Helstein saw the income floor as "a way to hold out hope" to members of his automation-hurt union.

Collaborating with the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Helstein soon joined 36 academics, writers and random brains in signing a 1964 document dubbed *The Triple Revolution*. As boss of a tough union, he gave practical reality to an otherwise free-form group. Their paper, widely quoted, pushed Theobald and his GI into the national limelight. Negro hopes raised by civil rights, it argued, would be frustrated by the loss of jobs through automation and by cuts in war production under the nuclear standoff.

Helstein, round as a dumpling but with a very hard core, stayed way out front in the racial struggle. He had put up seed money

to help start Martin Luther King's SCLC, funded early SNCC projects and served as a director of hell-raiser Saul Alinsky's Industrial Areas Foundation. In the winter of 1964-65, Helstein happened across a copy of *Context*, an eggy magazine now defunct, that reprinted Friedman's Negative Income Tax proposal.

"That's it," Helstein told the Theobald group. "This conservative has provided us with a way to get guaranteed income."

Others agreed, or had the notion serendipitously. Soon, liberals and conservatives alike were touting NIP's not sure who was conning whom. President Johnson, in signing the 1964 tax-cut bill, promised the next slice to "those who need it most." By 1965, Treasury statisticians were doing feasibility numbers on cuts for the lower brackets and pushing the data on down to cover negative-tax proposals. It was an academic exercise, of course, since the general public had not yet heard of NIP's, let alone work up a hunger for them.

Meanwhile, the big-income play came rolling out of the Labor Department. Assistant Secretary Daniel "Pat" Moynihan, a 6'5" leprechaun trained in a Manhattan bar, flew boisterously back from an Irishman's tour of Europe with an entirely different scheme for income maintenance. "We're the only industrial democracy left," he reported, "without a family, or children's allowance."

France, Canada and 50 other countries pay per-child state subsidies to every family, rich or poor. The family allowance, while an expensive and inefficient way to aid the poor and near-poor, jibed with Moynihan's belief in "unities." By that, he meant programs that build bridges of mutual interest (e.g., money) across income and race divisions. Two out of three poverty families are white, but most Federal schemes focus, realistically, upon poverty's concentrated growth sector, the ghetto. Moynihan wanted to make a political sale based on the needs of 13.9 million innocent victims, poverty's children. "Everybody knows that the day after we pass a family allowance," he still believes, "it will be the most popular legislation on the books."

So it might. But Moynihan made what can only be called an expert's error. Author of a remarkable study on the sensitive pride of ethnic groups, he set up the Administration case for family allowances in a report that offended the pride of his biggest target group, Negro families. The "Moynihan Report" said their society was a shambles.

Rising advocates of Black Power raged on into 1966 against both his report and his allowance. President Johnson, thus forced to retreat to routine urban spending, fell back on the barnyard idiom to express his dismay. "If the niggers want crap," he told an aide, "we'll give them crap."

As a young man, the President had seen ragged white folks use New Deal agencies to buy their homes, reclaim bankrupt farms, set up their own electrical companies (REA cops), boost production with fertilizer and hybrids, make homelife bearable and get their kids educated. By comparison, today's urban programs are leftover scraps for the leftover poor. Urban-renewal bulldozers destroy more homes than they build. Public housing locks tenants into high-rise slave quarters. Poverty Warriors, for all their good intent, pour their money into middle-class professionals, urban experts, in the faint hope that some will trickle down to the poverty people. The welfare state seems to have turned the New Deal upside down.

Though allergic to any lessons from Friedman, many an earnest liberal has begun to doubt agencies that once were sacrosanct. Moynihan, who fled Washington for Harvard, compares the old system to a plan for fattening the sparrows in the street by feeding the horses. "We might as well admit that Government is a disaster at distributing services," he says. "It is rather good at distrib-

uting income." That's what the income tax, positive division, has been doing since 1913.

The most savage attacks have been thrown against welfare itself, mainly by those who know it best: its bosses and customers. Mitchell Ginsberg, as New York's welfare commissioner, wrote of the whole welfare establishment as "bankrupt."

The trouble centers in the federally sponsored AFDC—Aid to Families with Dependent Children—which annually enrolls thousands of new clients from among Negro migrants to Northern ghettos. With the onrush of affluence, all other kinds of relief have, in recent years, lost absolute or relative numbers. U.S. welfare costs have slid well below one percent of gross personal income.

The horror is in the effect on people. Intended to sustain, AFDC acts more like pump-primed leukemia. Set up for mothers without husbands, AFDC enforces a rule against "a man in the house." So the father who earns too little, or loses his job, can help his family best by bugging out. If he comes back, or a prospective new husband is seen around the house, the money must be cut off.

You can imagine the slum woman's rage at caseworkers who "peep under the bed looking for men's underwear." AFDC makes it prudent to call your child a bastard and blocks a divorcee's effort to recruit a man to head the family. One mother of six, going on seven, has adapted to the official system. She insists upon being called "Miss."

But few adapt completely, even to the ban against working, and a little freedom is in sight. A drop of Friedman's negative-tax thinking seeped through Congress and into the latest welfare law. An AFDC mother will not get to keep 33 percent of any wage she earns. So the lowest income group will no longer be taxed more than 66 percent. That's progress. In the positive-tax brackets, however, such steep disincentives are reserved for the very rich and energetic.

The paradox is clear. Our nation decided long ago that if we fail to give people a chance at a productive role, then we do owe them a living. But the dole reinforces the helplessness that trapped most recipients into welfare. Under its stern rules, only those proud enough to fight back are apt to be ambitious enough to break out.

Some such spirit is now boiling up, abetted by a pair of trouble-loving white radicals, a black chemist and squads of formidable ladies. Richard Cloward and Frances Piven, a brawny professor and a chic researcher, operate in Harlem out of Columbia University's School of Social Work. They discovered three years ago that many of the poor are too timid to apply for welfare, and those who do are often afraid to demand the full amount due them and their children.

Because of tight budgets in most states, Cloward estimated, welfare administrators actually pay out about half as much money as the poor could legally claim. The budget-balancing techniques range from terror in Mississippi to camera-clicking spies in Washington, to routine incompetence in most cities. The standard tales of welfare cheats are, literally, less than half the truth.

Cloward-Piven laid out a strategy of deliberate disruption. By organizing welfare clients to demand full rights (or more) and recruit other clients, they would overload the welfare bureaucracy, break it and bring on, they hoped, a guaranteed income. This strategy could—and of late seems likely to—make the cumbersome caseworker system more costly than NIP will be.

Searching for a man to put muscle into their plan, they found George Wiley, 37, a soft-spoken giant who had barely missed being elected national chief of CORE. Wiley, a Cornell Ph.D., used his personal savings from industrial-chemistry research to start NWRO, the National Welfare Rights Organization. Slowly, at first in New York and now in 26 states, he found the ghetto fire-

brands, AFDC mothers. More than half the AFDC recipients are Negro.

Wiley's mothers started herding groups of disappointed claimants into local welfare centers. They cited laws and rules better than caseworkers, demanded instant action. "We generally pack a little lunch," says Mrs. Beulah Sanders, sturdy chairman of the New York NWRO. "If the administrator don't give satisfaction, we settle down to spend the night." Her city's welfare rolls, doubled to 800,000 since 1963, are now rising faster than ever. Welfare officials tend to cave in, if possible, before reporters arrive, and quick victories rouse the timid to fight.

Wiley's big break came last fall at congressional hearings on the new welfare bill. Sen. Russell Long of Louisiana, beset by NWRO ladies, called them "Brood Mares." They put the title on like a new hat. "Well," said one, "the Brood Mares are going to stampepe."

The new House Bill 12080 provided that if an AFDC mother refuses to leave her children to attend job-training, caseworkers have the authority to take away her children and farm them out to foster homes. That provision helped convert private shame into public indignation. NWRO's national membership broke the 6,000 mark. The Brood Mares in many cities planned Mother's Day protests against welfare offices this May 12, signed up with Martin Luther King's Washington demonstrators. The first asphalt-roots organization had found its battle cry: "Don't take our children away!"

Curiously, 12080, now law, is well-intended. Chairman Wilbur Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee, coauthor of the bill, has been gouging the welfare establishment for years, trying to make it help people up into self-supporting jobs. He might as well try to eat peas with a kitchen knife. Social workers make poor job-replacement experts. And, except for the 33 percent earning incentive he wrote in, the new bill leans heavily on brute force. "Yes, it is coercive—but only when the state decides that a person is an appropriate candidate for training and work," Mills told the House.

There's the rub. To free-enterpriser Friedman, state coercion is the least effective instrument of a capitalist society. For one thing, it works only on scared subjects. "We are getting two kinds of people: those who are free, and those who are wards of the state and must do what the state says," says Friedman. "On the Negative Income Tax, some would choose not to try. That is part of the loss you take; but the proportion, I believe, would be small and would decline."

We will soon find out. On a \$4 million line of credit from OEO's anti-poverty larder, 800 poor and near-poor in New Jersey are being picked to receive the first NIP's for the next three years. The Ford Foundation is petty-cashing an expansion of the experiments. Squads of economists are checking the lucky guinea-pig people, eager to find out if the free dough inhibits whatever impulse they have to work. Unlike the experts, I'm betting that the average guinea pig will strive harder, not less, and boost earned income by 15 to 20 percent. It's the post-affluent, not the never-had-its, who deliberately cop out of the rat race. There's nothing like the first taste of money and freedom to whet the appetite for more.

This is precisely the outcome that Theobald fears. He feels betrayed by OEO's "failure to take advice." And therein lies the irony of the five-year debate over income guarantees. Theobald's plan, meant to pull people out of jobs—and thus, I think, freeze them forever in a lower caste—has been turned around and fitted to the opposite purpose: luring, not forcing, the underemployed into more productive roles and better lives. The Jersey NIP's are even called WIP's: Wage Incentive Payments.

Prepared to follow up, Poverty Warrior Jim Lyday of OEO has drafted a national

proposal that will cost \$2 billion the first year, not the \$6 to \$33 billion often talked about. Not radical, not reactionary, it would simply replace AFDC in half the states, and invite the other half to add their own NIP supplements to the Federal payment.

"No, it's not enough to meet the need," admits Lyday. "But it erodes the base of poverty transfer from generation to generation. This begins to make real the promise of America."

You may feel, as I felt for years, that there is something inherently wrong, perhaps devilish, about Federal guarantee of income. This fear looks silly, however, when you see that we have such an income floor promised in welfare—and delivered in a way that perverts its benign purpose.

The case for the Negative Income Tax is compelling. The steady buildup of evidence as well as argument, especially from the implacably genial Dr. Friedman, makes the role of the holdout tedious. The Friedman NIP is distinctly different from the rigid subsidy systems of the past. It weaves public policy with the flexible means of private life, gives elbowroom for Americans to make their own choices and brings us all together—none left out—for the annual liturgy around Form 1040.

But one reservation remains. Though it may breach the bureaucratic wall around the ghetto, an income-support plan is neither a revolution nor an all-purpose cure. Without the efforts of churches, communities and business, the test of the times will be flunked. Government cannot absolve the larger society from its direct duty, nor can a subsidy check in the mail take the place of a real job, at a decent wage, in a society that will allow you to make your place.

Impression on Southern Africa

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, people who have visited Africa firsthand seem far more understanding and tolerant of the problems of Africa than the guided victims of the egalitarian theorist.

In fact, most African travelers agree that patience and sympathy are needed far more than threats and reprisals—that is, if our foreign policy objective is designed to help rather than hinder the people.

I include a paper entitled, "The Dark Continent Is in Need of Patience and Sympathy," by Dr. James F. Bishop of Davenport, Iowa, giving his impressions of Africa following my remarks:

THE DARK CONTINENT IS IN NEED OF PATIENCE AND SYMPATHY
(By James F. Bishop, M.D.)

I was privileged to join an American newspapermen's study mission to Africa, this past summer, because Mr. Henry Hook a co-publisher of the Davenport Times-Democrat, is a friend and neighbor of mine. Another non-newsman who attached himself to the entourage is Dr. Jay Houlahan, of Mason City. He wrote a letter to Mr. Hook which sounded so wistful that he was invited to go, too. There were 12 in the group, including representatives of newspapers in Arkansas, Nebraska, Mississippi, Ohio, Connecticut, and Iowa, and the two Iowa medicos who represented nothing but their own curiosity.

We gathered in New York City on July 21 for briefings by the Big Bwana, our tour di-

rector, and by representatives of the various nations which we were to visit. After Lufthansa had softened us up by means of a farewell party, its aircraft lugged us over to Frankfurt and then on to Africa. It was August 10 when Lufthansa brought us back up across the dark continent and over to New York City, and there it left us to cope with the airline strike as best we could.

With complete justice it might be said that three weeks is hardly long enough to create an expert on the vast and complex land that is Africa. Yet, our newspaper study mission had certain privileges and advantages not open to the usual tourist. We asked questions, listened carefully, and persistently picked brains from Nairobi to Cape Town.

Three different types of nations were there for us to see: the newly-independent and black controlled Kenya and Zambia, a remnant of a colonial empire in Mozambique, and two nations governed by white minorities Rhodesia and the Republic of South Africa. In each, citizens and officials alike tried, with apparent sincerity, to answer our questions and help us to know the formidable problems which beset them. There was, in each country, an almost desperate anxiety to be understood.

Our time in Kenya was short, because of a mixup in airline reservations. We did, though, tour Nairobi, its capital and watched its black citizens obviously enjoying their parks which possibly, in the not too distant past, had been denied them. To keep our schedule, it was necessary to charter two small twin engine airplanes and fly 1,150 miles across the bleak and deserted bush country to Lusaka, capital of Zambia.

Here we found a modern city with a broad boulevard flanked by up to date buildings. There were substantial-looking banks, busy supermarkets, apartments, automobile dealers, and all the other trappings of today. As we watched, the impressive figure of President Kenneth Kaunda emerged from a building to enter his car, stopping a minute to wave a white handkerchief at his people who waited for him. They waved back, silently and without any sign of a contrived demonstration.

AMERICANS TWITTED

In the crowd near me was a citizen of Israel, a member of an agricultural mission come to help the Zambians with their farms. He twitted me a little, saying they brought no money, as Americans are prone to do, but came only with service. He was not quite fair, however, for our Ambassador Robert C. Good told us that American help to Zambia has been largely in service marked by community planning and teaching in their schools.

Each year, 55-60 Zambians come to America to school, mostly in agriculture. The ambassador invited us to a reception in his home where we met many Zambian officials. They were obviously intelligent, eager, and full of enthusiastic plans for their country.

They were, also, slightly touchy, self-conscious, and perhaps a bit immature. There is much to do in Zambia for they had only 100 college graduates and 1,000 high school graduates at the time of independence in 1964.

Rhodesia was next. Here was the nation so much in the news because of its declaration of independence and because of the retaliation against it by Britain and her friends—including the United States. We found courteous and speedy treatment in customs as we landed at Salisbury.

We were late for dinner at Melkle's Hotel but were promptly fed. There were no horns sprouting from the foreheads of these friendly, vigorous people—they might well have been Americans. Salisbury might well have been Minneapolis. They are about the same size, have the same modern buildings and businesses, and the same car-filled streets. Because of the sanctions, there was gas

rationing in Rhodesia but it was not severe or crippling.

SEGREGATED TOWNSHIP

We visited a Township, an area of segregation in which 80,000 Africans live and found the houses, while not luxurious, stouter and drier than grass huts. There were fine, modern schools with large playgrounds, a big gymnasium and recreation center, and a swimming pool. It was on Saturday and the people were not working but were milling around at all those pursuits necessary on a day off. One could only be reminded of the efforts of our own South, some years ago, to provide separate but equal facilities.

All Rhodesians have an equal chance at education and are encouraged to go as high as they can, regardless of color. All can qualify to vote by satisfying rather modest educational and economic requirements. The Africans are represented in the Rhodesian Parliament for we attended a session and saw them sitting there.

Any African who can pay for it can take a room or have dinner at Meikle's Hotel or anywhere else he wishes and is not denied because of his color. He may take any position in government for which he can qualify by education.

Rhodesia has been termed a police state yet it has an opposition party whose headquarters are plainly marked on a prominent street. There are 6,000 policemen, two-thirds of whom are African, and none of whom are armed. Per unit of population it has fewer policemen than Britain. The Europeans in Rhodesia pay 98 per cent of the tax revenue of the government, a large part of which goes to improve the living and educational facilities of the Africans.

Perhaps some terms need clarification. Any white person, be his origin British, Dutch, American, or any other is a European. The Negro is an African. Those whose origins lie in India are, logically enough, called Indians. South Africa has still another group called Coloured—descendants of Hottentots, Bushmen, and slaves brought over from the Dutch East Indies.

A PART OF PORTUGAL

Rhodesia's neighbor to the east is Mozambique, once called Portuguese East Africa but now stated to be a province of Portugal. This arrangement is condemned by some as a ploy to escape the stigma of colonialism. Be that as it may, all its inhabitants, regardless of color, are considered to be Portuguese and all have equal rights.

Each citizen qualifies to vote by paying a very modest amount of taxes each year, this sum not being considered in any way a poll tax. Its capital, Lorenzo Marques, is modern and busy and boasts a new university filled with promise. Foreign investment is welcomed and favorably treated while settlers are sought for the 75,000 acre Limpopo River development with its irrigation and specialized villages.

To the south and west of Mozambique is the Republic of South Africa, the giant of southern Africa, Maligned because of its apartheid—apartness—policy, it too seeks understanding but, understood or not, forges doggedly ahead on the course it deems best.

The first Dutch settlers arrived there in 1652 and, strangely enough, encountered no Negroes for the black tribes were still moving down from the north and had not yet reached the southern coast. The only natives were the Hottentots and the Bushmen, both extremely primitive. The arrival of the British precipitated conflict which is now history. The Europeans accommodated to each other and the nation now has two official languages, English and Afrikaans, the latter a modification of Dutch. There are now some 17,000,000 people in South Africa of whom about 3,000,000 are white, 500,000 Indians, the same number of Coloured, and the rest Africans.

"BANTU" MEANS AFRICAN

The word Bantu—meaning, roughly, the people—does not identify a certain tribe but rather refers to all Africans. There are nine separate Bantu nations in South Africa, each with its own tribal customs and numerous dialects. They have nothing in common except the color of their skins and have always found their greatest delight in trying to decimate each other. Even today, members of different tribes cannot be put to work on the same farm or mine for each will be logical prey for the silent knife of the other.

The principle of apartheid sets each major group apart from the others. The African has large areas which are his and a European may not live or set up a business there. The Indians have their own assigned areas where they must live, some in \$75,000-\$80,000 homes for they are successful traders and businessmen.

The government improves the lot of the African with homes which he may rent very reasonably or, possibly, buy. The apartheid, however, is the law of the land and there is no official provision for change. Privately, officials and citizens alike agree that nothing ever stays the same and change is inevitable but now is not the time for it.

The African cannot vote in South Africa and there is no present provision for him ever to gain the right. He is encouraged to go to school, as far as he can, but the resulting benefits are not well defined.

GOLD MINE UNDER CITY

Johannesburg, the largest city, is big, bustling, and modern—and built over a gold mine. It is earnestly stated that with initiative, dexterity—and a good map—one can walk for 70 miles in tunnels beneath this city. It is built on the highveld, 6,000 feet above sea level and its one million people enjoy a benign climate. Cape Town, 800 miles to the south on the coast, is the legislative capital and there we attended a session of Parliament. We were impressed by the speech of one member who was eloquent, obviously articulate, apparently well informed—and utterly unintelligible. He was speaking in Afrikaans.

Central and southern Africa are rich in natural resources. Zambia is the second largest producer of copper in the world; South Africa has a 600 year reserve of coal. Through the southern third of the continent there are gold, asbestos, chrome, high grade iron ore, and potential hydro-electric power beyond the considerable amount now produced.

Agriculture is productive and growing with corn, cotton, rice, tropical fruits, citrus fruits, cattle, and sheep so that the land can feed itself. So far, there is no oil and this must be brought in as crude or refined products. Because of lack of oil, railroads are run by steam or coal-generated electricity and gasoline for cars is rather expensive.

This rich, vast, and restless land is trying to get on with its growth and development but is tormented by problems that sometimes seem unsolvable. Some of these, perhaps of their own making, are compounded by the meddling of others. The meddlers include the Communists who make all the mischief they can by bringing in arms and propaganda; by pitting African against African as well as African against European.

Chinese and North Koreans have been especially diligent in their efforts to foment unrest although the Russians are not shirking their tasks. The Rhodesians and South Africans are polite about it but they feel the United States is meddling too, by joining the British in the sanctions and making other righteous noises about "one man, one vote" and majority government.

MAKING GOOD PROGRESS

Zambia and Kenya have African governments and seem to be proceeding well thus far. They have retained European advisers

and technicians of various kinds who appear to be dedicated to teaching the Africans greater skills. There are utilities, stores, transport systems, and other facilities among the fine buildings in their cities.

One does wonder how much of all this is still riding on the momentum of British organization. Some troubles are already appearing in both countries and, in the copper belt of Zambia, Africans are unhappy and agitating for the well paying jobs the Europeans hold even though the Africans are not yet qualified to fill them. In Kenya a week or two ago, President Kenyatta's police, in a dark of night raid, plucked up five opposition leaders—all active in labor affairs—and put them in the pokey. They were still there when we left Africa.

All members of our Study Mission strove mightily to learn about the people in the uneasy land for, in them, lay the key to the difficulties.

The Europeans, many of whose ancestors had come to Africa two centuries or more ago, consider Africa their home and they have known no other. Their intellect, initiative, money, and organization have developed Africa. Without them, Africa would still be the land of bushmen, cannibals, straw huts, and primitive life it was for all the centuries before the Europeans came. The coal, gold, diamonds, chrome, and other wealth would still lie undisturbed in the ground. The roads and railroads would be undreamed-of instead of steadily marching across the landscape.

EUROPEAN CONTRIBUTION

The African would still be living only his span of thirty-odd years instead of finding, in public and personal health measures, a longer and more nearly disease-free life. The European feels he has built these things and he does not intend to let them go but rather wishes to pass them on to his children. His government, if somewhat authoritarian, is stable and he looks with misgivings to the north—to Nigeria, Ghana, the Congo—with their chaos, murders, destruction, and recurring military coups since the advent of native control.

He does not wish to leave the land that is his home and he is afraid it is not yet time to relinquish control. He is distressed by the criticism directed at him from other parts of the world, from those he considered his friends, and he wishes earnestly that his side be known.

The African has his aspirations too. He sees about him better homes than his grass or mud hut and he wants them. He has access now to stouter houses than he had before but they are not as good as those of his European neighbors, in many instances. It is better to ride his bicycle now than to walk as he used to but it would be still nicer to have a car. And so it goes. Things are better for him than they were but he is impatient and wants more, faster.

He seems happy and carefree yet, at least some of his number must resent being carried in crowded trains from their work to their segregated township. While we were in Johannesburg, one of these trains was wrecked, killing four Africans and injuring more than a score of others. The rest erupted into a violent riot, trying—and nearly succeeding—to stone to death the engineer and setting fire to their train and another. This response to one mishap was far too exaggerated to be pure emotionalism and certainly bespoke the release of dangerously pent-up hostilities.

The Africans are considered by many to be a faceless, homogeneous mass, all alike and willfully held in bondage by white masters. If only they could be released they could step forth and suddenly, by some strange and instant magic, become skilled machinists, able lawyers, compassionate clergymen, talented physicians, wise judges and legislators. They would promptly join

together and work in peaceful harmony for the common good and welfare of their country. This is a pleasant dream but today it would be a nightmare.

LITTLE IN COMMON

In the Republic of South Africa there are nine Bantu nations with absolutely nothing in common except the color of their skins. Each has its own language and many dialects, unintelligible to all the others. Each has its own tribes, customs, chiefs, and an overweening suspicion and hostility toward all the rest. Witchcraft and superstitious taboos often guide their actions. Wives are bought and then may be returned later with a refund as unsatisfactory merchandise. One fellow was so fond of his mother that he bought her from his father as his own wife.

To hope, today, to weld all these superstitious, hostile, and diverse peoples into one self-governing nation is the height of wishful thinking. The sophisticated and civilized nations of Europe have tried for a thousand years to live together in peace. The periodic marching armies and shifting boundaries testify to their inability to do so. Yet they have among themselves far more in common than do the tribes of Africa. What is true in the Republic of South Africa is equally true in Rhodesia and Mozambique. The turmoil and distress in the new nations of northern Africa bear witness to the same problems.

The nations we visited are trying earnestly to bring order to their dilemmas. Mozambique has declared a multiracial nationality with citizenship for all while Rhodesia bribes its children with candy to come to school. Both ask only a very modest degree of educational and economic responsibility of those who are to share in the important matter of government.

NEED PATIENCE, SYMPATHY

South Africa is officially more inflexible in its apartness but privately recognizes change must come. In each country, responsible African leaders—not the radical and sometimes subversive elements—are helping in the steady ascent of their people. Perhaps, thus far, the pace has been too slow to satisfy the so-called liberals in the world. Perhaps the solutions offered are not perfect but seldom, in the field of human endeavor, does one find perfection.

One can only hope that wise and moderate counsel will prevail on both sides and that white and black will find somewhere the strength and patience to endure the tensions that beset them. One hopes that the people of Africa will resist those who seek change through the violence and ugliness of revolution and will work for the peaceful transition of evolution. Toward this vast and tormented continent, one's strongest emotion is, not impatience and carping criticism, but sympathy, deep and abiding.

POSTSCRIPT

Our journey home began in Johannesburg. We flew up the west coast of Africa and landed, after midnight, at Lagos, the capital of Nigeria. There had been an exacerbation of political turmoil in that country, and we were confined to our plane. Two African soldiers came aboard and gave us all the beady, suspicious eye. They then searched behind all of the doors—for what, we never learned. A distinguished-looking African and his striking and modish wife came aboard, and all the way north to Europe I could not escape a gnawing anxiety that perhaps he was a fleeing politician into whose luggage some ill-wisher had tucked a bomb. We were undisturbed, however, and duly arrived in Frankfurt.

The names of several North American cities appear on the accompanying maps of southern Africa on which I have traced our route. Those names are placed the same distances south of the Equator that the cities they designate lie north of it. For example,

the placement of the name "Atlanta" shows that Cape Town is approximately the same distance south of the Equator that Atlanta, Georgia, is north of it. Thus winter, as we experienced it in South Africa, was by no means frigid. Flowers were blooming in profusion, and though nighttime temperatures at Cape Town were in the 40's, everywhere the daytime temperatures were between 65° and 70° F.

The Place To Go Is Idaho

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, U.S. News & World Report this week contains an excellent article on the many small- and medium-sized cities in the Nation which remain unaffected by the deterioration and blight which has so sadly afflicted the largest of our cities.

One of these medium-sized cities is Boise, the capital of Idaho, and one of the most pleasant places to live in this country. Quoting one of Boise's leading citizens, R. V. Hansberger, president of Boise Cascade Corp., the U.S. News & World Report article correctly points up the fact that Boise is a city where human values assume a more important aspect than in larger cities where congestion and blight combine to discourage many residents.

Boise and other smaller cities throughout the country are the models we should turn to for the pattern of the future. Encouraged by progressive leadership such as that displayed by Mr. Hansberger, they are planning now in order that they may continue to offer the best in urban living in the future.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHERE IT'S STILL PLEASANT IN THE UNITED STATES

(NOTE.—In recent days, as violence flared in U.S. cities, the world lost sight of the real America. Outside teeming urban areas, most Americans live peacefully, in quiet, orderly communities. An increasing number of U.S. leaders say it is time to quit piling people into cities and to start spreading out in this spacious land.)

So many people in high places are wringing their hands over the problems of U.S. cities that the real picture of America is becoming more and more distorted.

The fact is that the great majority of Americans live in communities where it is safe to walk the streets at night, where one can enjoy life and trust his neighbors, where schools are not deteriorating, where traffic is not snarled endlessly, where air is breathable, where race war is not threatened, and where there is no talk of burning down the community.

If those who are stewing so much about the problems of the cities would take time to look around America, they would see a land with elbow room to spare. A fight across this country from Atlantic to Pacific reveals vast open areas that are beautiful and unspoiled.

This view of America is borne out by facts. The 30 U.S. cities with population of more than a million in their metropolitan areas hold 38 percent of the country's population.

These cities occupy only 3 percent of the land in the continental U.S. between the two oceans, even when much wide-open space within their urban areas is included.

EASING FEAR AND FRUSTRATION

If big-city dwellers would drop down off the superhighways that carry them from one megalopolis to another, they would find thousands of communities where the quality of life is in sharp contrast to the fears and frustrations of big-city living. In these communities removed from the teeming urban areas, crimes of violence are the exception rather than the subject of daily headlines as in big-city newspapers.

Yet much of the nation's money and brains are devoted to stop-gap solutions of problems in megalopolis while the possibility of spreading population more evenly across a spacious countryside gets relatively little attention.

Billions flow from the U.S. Treasury to rebuild center cities, aid metropolitan schools, boost welfare benefits. Some mayors and big-city Congressmen talk in all seriousness of spending a trillion dollars on the cities over the next decade. That would mean outlays at the rate of 100 billion dollars a year—most of it from the Federal Government.

Thus far, heavy spending on U.S. cities seems only to have brought a greater and greater concentration of unemployable people into their crowded confines. At the rate of 500,000 to 600,000 a year they come, many of them completely unprepared for a useful role in big-city life. New slums spring up as fast as the old ones can be rooted out, or faster.

Now, a growing number of leaders in government and in private business are saying that it is time to try a different approach to urban problems. One of these is the highly regarded planner, Constantinos A. Doxiadis, who says: "I have not yet seen any city in the world where responsible officials can claim that the situation tomorrow will be better than it is today." Mr. Doxiadis suggests:

"Perhaps the cause lies in this very fact that we are pouring resources into the cities. The solution may lie in exactly the opposite direction, that of using resources outside the cities. When we have an organism suffering from great pressures, should we add pressures to it?"

An Administration official who takes a similar view is Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture. He warns that "there must be alternatives to big-city suburban living, or the pressure of people against resources and services in the megalopolis of the future will simply break it down."

A number of leading U.S. businessmen, too, have come to the view that there is really no valid reason why business and industry must concentrate into a few sprawling, ill-planned, congested, air-polluted urban areas.

These leaders point out that communication now is nearly instantaneous between any two points in the U.S. Jet planes can put businessmen any place they need to go in a matter of no more than five hours, even if it is from one coast to the other, and between many points the flying time is a matter of minutes. Superhighways knit the country together, providing efficient ground transportation.

America, it is pointed out, is a country where you can have a warm climate or a cold climate, seashore or lakeshore, coastal region or desert, or, as one corporation president declares, "mountains in your back yard."

The executive who feels his company is better off for its back-yard view of mountains is R. V. Hansberger, president of Boise Cascade Corporation. Over the past decade, his firm has expanded into nationwide operations but steadfastly maintains its headquarters in Boise, Ida., a small city with a

metropolitan-area population of less than 100,000. Says Mr. Hansberger:

"When people have to fight each other off subways in order to get home, and fight each other to get back on in the morning, human values and human beings just aren't very important. But when you have to travel sometimes many miles before you see another person, he's more important when you find him. This is why I believe that human values assume a more important aspect where the people are spread thinner, as they are here in Idaho."

Does Boise Cascade have trouble attracting topnotch people to its small-city headquarters? Mr. Hansberger answers:

"We find that the great majority of people tend to favor living in the smaller community—provided it isn't too small. This attitude is even more noticeable as the tensions and the frustrations of the big cities have grown in recent years. When we go after a man, we bring him—and often his wife—out here to see what we have to offer and how we live."

"We're about 40 minutes from a fine ski resort, and only about 10 minutes from water skiing in the summer. We can catch fish all around the place, and hunt, and camp and ride. It's just a very wholesome place for young families, and older families, too, for that matter."

"We don't have many Negroes or other minority groups in the community. We expect to have more in the future. Enough of us are aware of the problems that have built up in other cities that we hope—by planning now—to be able to do a better job of living in peace with one another. Our firm and others are hiring Negroes and expect to hire more in the future."

BUSINESS AT A DISTANCE

As for handling communications and travel, Mr. Hansberger explains:

"We've had little trouble compensating for the fact that Boise is a bit remote. There are two airlines that provide good jet service. And, to give our people more flexibility in moving back and forth between our operating units, we have a small fleet of aircraft that are used rather heavily. We have the latest in communications equipment, including computers in a number of points around the country wired together—talking to each other. And I'm sure the day is coming when we'll be using closed-circuit TV for conferences between two or more headquarters."

Even in communities much smaller than Boise, many firms are finding that manufacturing activities can be highly successful. W. B. Murphy, president of the Campbell Soup Company, which has been putting new plants outside of big metropolitan areas for the past 15 years, says this of his company's experience:

"A lot of firms have a blind spot in that they think you have to be in a big city to get electricians or mechanics. We have found that you can take farmers—men who can fix a pump or repair a tractor—and train them to be first-class mechanics. After all, a farmer has to be a millwright, a jack of all trades."

"At Paris, Tex., we took a green force and trained it to handle some of the fastest metal-working machines. These machines were can-body makers and aluminum presses. Others were intricate electrical devices such as electronic sorting machines and automatic controls and computers. When the people are through work there for the day, they can be on the golf course in eight minutes, or back on the farms where many of them still grow crops and raise livestock in their spare time."

"We have one plant in Tecumseh, Neb., employing 750 people. This is a town of only 1,500, but we have no trouble drawing workers from the surrounding countryside. In rural areas, where traffic is no problem, you can draw a work force from a radius of 35 to 40 miles."

A NUDGE BY GOVERNMENT

Another industry executive who reports advantages of decentralizing operations is David Packard, chairman of the board of Hewlett-Packard Company, which has headquarters in Palo Alto, Calif.

"I think that the U.S. Government might give some thought to providing incentives to encourage decentralization," says Mr. Packard. "I am not sure how effective it would be, but it is worth a try. Certainly, the things they are doing to solve city problems don't seem to be working."

Hewlett-Packard, in recent years, has located two manufacturing plants on the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains in Colorado—one at Colorado Springs, a city of around 100,000, some 70 miles south of Denver, and the other at Loveland, a town of around 15,000 about the same distance north of Denver.

"Our experience has been very satisfactory," says Mr. Packard. "We have no difficulty attracting top-level talent to the Colorado locations. A few people feel out of the swim, so to speak, at Loveland, but most greatly enjoy the skiing, hunting, fishing and other recreational opportunities in the areas. Actually, the Loveland plant has great *esprit de corps*, and is one of the happiest situations anywhere in the company."

Summing up, Mr. Packard says:

"Some firms feel they must be right in the heart of things, or they seem to feel out of touch. But if my viewpoint prevails, Hewlett-Packard will never locate either a plant or offices in the central part of a large city."

One example of the way in which modern communication has all but done away with the problems of living and working outside of metropolitan areas is seen in this area of Colorado. Hewlett-Packard is one of seven firms in the State taking advantage of a plan called "SURGE" to offer college-credit courses—some at the graduate level—to its employees.

"SURGE" is sponsored by the Colorado State University at Fort Collins. Video tape is used to record engineering courses as they are taught in the classrooms on campus. The tapes are then distributed to the seven firms where they can be screened on closed-circuit television at times convenient for the employees.

A point stressed again and again by those with experience both in big cities and in the countryside is that people function more efficiently when they are not beset by the frustration of megalopolis. Says Leonard C. Yaseen, chairman of the board of the Fantus Company, a Dunn & Bradstreet subsidiary with a nationwide plant-location service:

"The small-town boy outdistances the big-city boy every time. This is not necessarily a matter of union vs. nonunion plants. It is a matter of attitude toward work in big cities vs. that in smaller towns where people are used to tackling a day's work for a day's pay."

Mr. Yaseen gives this specific example:

"We have one client with a plant in a big city and a new one in a small community. Both plants have the same machinery and both make the same product. All employees are on a piecework basis. But the plant in the country outproduces the one in the city by one third. Why? The answer is that in the city you have a built-in attitude of job protection—don't produce too much, because it might hurt Joe who is a slow worker."

PROBLEM-SOLVING AT LUNCH

In Mr. Yaseen's view:

"The problems of the cities are not being solved. The planners are falling on their faces. So we are going to continue to have congestion, high taxes, high distribution costs, expensive utilities, heavy freight charges, and masses of unskilled job seekers."

"By comparison, the problems of small towns are easily corrected. For example, sup-

pose you need a new street to gain access to your plant site. In a big city, it might take years to get through the red tape. In a small town, you can often get the matter taken care of by talking to a few people over lunch." Agriculture Secretary Freeman, who keeps hammering away at the advantages of America's wide-open spaces, recently told the American Institute of Planners:

"Outside the standard metropolitan statistical areas [as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau], there are some 300 identifiable nonmetropolitan complexes made up of primarily farming, recreation and other 'open' country dotted here and there with villages and small towns where people live and trade and are tied together by small cities that are growing and moving forward."

Of these 300 areas, which are scattered all across the U.S., Mr. Freeman said:

"I believe there is more fertile ground for domestic peace and tranquility in these areas than in the cities. There is not the crowding. Not the pressure of one people against another. Not the indifference and impersonality. Not the deep-running bitterness you find in so many of our cities."

The fact of the matter is that towns and cities of 10,000 to 100,000 are shown by official Census Bureau data to be the fastest-growing population centers in America.

As just one example of what is happening all across America, take a look at Burlington, in the northwestern corner of Vermont. Here you find the type of appeal that is attracting business, industry and people.

Burlington's setting on the shores of Lake Champlain, with the Green Mountains rising to the east, is a natural attraction. The growing popularity of skiing and other winter sports has turned the long Vermont winters into an asset as far as many people are concerned.

Like many small cities, Burlington had been considered remote. Development of an interstate highway has lowered that obstacle to development. So have jet airliners that bring Boston and New York City within an hour's flying time.

Here, as elsewhere, the presence of a college—the University of Vermont—has drawn the attention of industry. As a matter of fact, the great majority of U.S. colleges are in smaller communities. An official of the U.S. Office of Education estimates that at least 2,000 of the nation's 2,200 four-year colleges are outside large urban areas.

With all its attractions, Burlington has been growing fast. Population of the city and its bedroom communities in Chittenden County, now around 85,000, has shot up by nearly 40 percent in little more than a decade. All this is in sharp contrast to Burlington's situation before the city fathers got together to form the Greater Burlington Industrial Corporation in 1954. This agency began to promote the city's attractions, established an industrial site at nearby Essex Junction and put up a building on speculation that some industry would move in. In 1957, International Business Machines, one of the big U.S. companies that have decentralized operations into many parts of the U.S., took a lease on the building and began operations with a payroll of 500.

A year later, IBM was so happy with its Vermont facility that the company bought the building and site and began to expand. In 1964, this plant became a prime producer for IBM's 360 computer system. There now are 3,100 on the company payroll and expansion to 3,700 is planned by mid-1969.

REVERSING THE TREND TO MEGALOPOLIS

The IBM operation has had a multiplier effect throughout that part of Vermont as smaller manufacturers have expanded to handle subcontracts for the bigger firms. At the same time, other space-age industries have discovered the advantages and the attractions of this New England community.

The publisher of the "Burlington Free Press," J. Warren McClure, says this of his city's growth:

"I think the basic reason is megalopolis. People are trying to get away from the congested urban areas in this day and age when they want to enjoy life more. We are giving them that opportunity."

Figures compiled by Agriculture Department officials indicate that the migration from countryside to megalopolis in the U.S. finally has begun to slow. In the first half of this decade, growth of population in counties outside of metropolitan areas was at twice the rate of the 1950s.

From 1962 through 1968, the number of new jobs in small cities and in the countryside increased at a rate higher than the national average and was double that for the 1950s in the small cities and the countryside.

This, in the opinion of many of the nation's leaders, is a hopeful sign for America's future. Mr. Hansberger, the president of Boise Cascade, puts it in these terms:

"I was talking to a man who has seen a great deal of this country in his lifetime and one of the points he made that I can't forget is that there are a great many successful people on Wall Street, and in big corporations, who started out on a farm or in a small community. He said this trend to urbanization is bad for the nation because it is drying up the source of discipline that has helped to make this country's industry what it is. We think that, by keeping our people in an area like Boise, close to nature, that we are helping our children develop a good deal of the discipline that will help them and the country in the years ahead."

An aide to Agriculture Secretary Freeman, Assistant Secretary John A. Baker, stated the problem this way in testimony before President Johnson's riot commission on Nov. 2, 1967:

"For each 10 boys now growing up on a farm, only one can find a decent livelihood as a farmer in the years ahead . . . We can either provide jobs for these nine boys in rural America, or they will be in our cities tomorrow burning down our buildings because we have been unable to develop a better rural-urban balance of economic opportunities and population patterns."

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Speaker, the East Side News is one of the Nation's distinguished weekly papers. It serves a large and heterogeneous audience on the East Side of New York City. Like all decent Americans, Mr. Abraham Schlacht, publisher of the East Side News, was deeply pained by the recent assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King. Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD Mr. Schlacht's compassionate editorial on Dr. King:

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.: A CHAMPION OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND NONVIOLENCE
(By Abraham Schlacht)

American hearts are filled with sorrow over the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., a man who gave his all to the service of his fellow-man.

He was in essence a rare champion who had stood ready to die for the things he believed in.

That such a good man whose feelings overflowed with tenderness and compassion

should have perished in the manner in which he did truly defies common understanding.

No assassin's bullet can eradicate the heritage he has bequeathed to the nation and to the world.

Millions of people everywhere who had followed his turbulent career perceive now more than ever that the course he had valiantly pursued was the right one, the only one, for any people or nation to accept as the solution for social, economic or political ills.

It is indeed regrettable that our country we love so much was slow in accepting his principles of non-violence and civil rights.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was an extraordinary personality, a great American, a great crusader for human brotherhood, a Nobel Prize winner, a great advocate of high spiritual values, who preferred to be called simply "a major drummer in the march for social justice."

Evils, whatever their ugly disguises, were inherently repugnant to his natural concepts of thinking.

From early childhood, he had resented and resisted every species of oppression and discrimination.

He had always felt that his people with whom he had been reared had been callously mistreated, exploited, and trodden upon.

Until the time of his assassination, he had lifted his clarion voice for the American people to stop and listen that his race demanded common justice and common equality.

It is deadfully unfortunate that our nation has waited so long in coming to its senses following his tragic death.

We fervently pray that the search for freedom, of which he was a true exemplar, will proceed irresistibly forward, for we sense within our bosoms a new wave of understanding which is sweeping in all majesty across the heart-strings of our land.

This change affords new zest and hope for America's future.

In the name of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., the American people must close ranks and help erase the injustices of our disturbed society which have long been festering and which have wrought so much hardship and tears.

The Congress of the United States, as well as all state and local Legislatures, must respond to the crisis forthwith with all necessary measures to assure proper recognition and protection for his long-suffering people.

Let us, then, hallow his memory for the many things he consistently strove and exemplified, in his protest marches, in his sermons, in his public addresses, and in his numerous writings.

Let us, therefore, erect appropriate memorials, whatever their form or nature, in the nation's capital and in the principal cities of our land.

Only in this manner can his life's work be perpetuated, and future generations will recall and contemplate the intellectual and moral grandeur of this man, and the wisdom of his sublime teachings.

Schuyler Colfax Honored

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, March 23 marked the anniversary of the birth of an outstanding and prominent Hoosier, Schuyler Colfax. This remarkable man, a journalist by profession, rose through years of dedicated public service in In-

diana to the speakership of the House of Representatives and eventually to the Vice-Presidency of the United States.

Journalism and politics were not the full scope of Schuyler Colfax's many activities. In addition, he was an active member of the Odd Fellows fraternity and has been credited with the single-handed creation of the Rebekah Degree of Odd Fellowship.

Mr. President, a recent issue of the International Rebekah News contains an excellent tribute written in commemoration of this outstanding American. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the International Rebekah News, March 1968]

A BIOGRAPHY OF SCHUYLER COLFAX, FOUNDER OF THE REBEKAH DEGREE

The date of March 23 marks the anniversary of the birth of the man responsible for his untiring efforts in organizing and establishing the Rebekah Degree. Originally established for wives, and later for mothers, daughters and sisters of Odd Fellows, and still later for ladies of good character interested in joining hands with Odd Fellows in helping to make this world a better place in which to live.

Schuyler Colfax was born New York City on March 23, 1823, several months after the death of his father. In 1834 his mother was married to George W. Matthews. At the age of 10, Schuyler Colfax left school and started work in his stepfather's store. Later the family moved to Indiana settling at New Carlisle in St. Joseph County. He continued as a clerk and during his spare time took up the study of journalism which enabled him to contribute articles to the county paper.

After his step-father retired from business, Colfax took up the study of law. When Mr. Matthews was elected county auditor and moved to South Bend, Indiana, Schuyler was appointed deputy, which office he held for eight years.

He still continued his work in journalism. In 1845, with a partner, purchased the South Bend Free Press, changing its name to St. Joseph Valley Register, which became the most influential paper in that part of Indiana.

Schuyler Colfax was a born leader. In 1842 he was active in organizing a temperance society in South Bend and about the same time reported the proceedings of the State Senate for the Indianapolis Journal. He held many responsible positions, serving as secretary of the Chicago Harbor and River convention in 1847 and of the Whig convention in Baltimore in 1848. The next year he was elected a member of the convention to revise the constitution of the state of Indiana.

He was elected to Congress in 1854 and was re-elected continuously up to 1868. During the years of service in the House he served as chairman of many important committees and introduced many reforms. He was elected Speaker of the House in 1863 and was twice re-elected and gained the plaudits of both parties by his skill as a presiding officer; often under very trying circumstances as his tenure as Speaker was the latter years of the war between the States, and the Reconstruction period that immediately followed.

In May, 1868, the Republican National convention meeting in Chicago nominated Schuyler Colfax on the first ballot as the vice president candidate with General U. S. Grant. The Republican ticket being successful in the November election, he became Vice President and thus President of the Senate on March 4, 1869, the only man to preside

over both Houses of Congress until Vice President Jack Garner in the 1930's.

His later years were spent in retirement in his home at South Bend, Indiana and in delivering public lectures. Several of his speeches are preserved among collections of the world's finest orations. At his death which resulted from a heart attack, public honors were paid to his memory both in Congress and in Indiana.

Here are some of the details of the life of Bro. Colfax, Fraternalist.

He was initiated into South Bend Subordinate Lodge No. 29 February 18, 1846, and soon after became a member of the Encampment branch. He rose steadily in the ranks and became Representative to the Grand Lodge of the United States now the Sovereign Grand Lodge where his merit and abilities soon brought him recognition. His services in the Sovereign Body were marked by industry and enthusiasm, he being placed on many important committees.

At the session of 1850, as chairman of the Committee on Legislation, he had the opportunity offered him by which he became famous as the author of the Rebekah Degree. The committee rendered an adverse report on the proposed establishment of such a degree, but Bro. Colfax submitted a minority report favoring it and such was his eloquence and the manifest merit of the idea that his minority report was accepted, and he was appointed the chairman of a committee to prepare a Ritual. Our Rebekah Ritual of today follows very closely his work as shown in the original ritual he almost singlehandedly prepared. Thus, at the 1851 session of the Sovereign Grand Lodge, his efforts were approved and the Rebekah Degree of Odd Fellowship came into official being.

Bro. Colfax never lost his interest in the work of Odd Fellowship, nor in the degree which he helped to create. To him is credited the compilation of the Rebekah Ritual, and it should be the aim of all officers of Rebekah lodges to present this beautiful degree in the most impressive manner humanly possible.

Bro. Colfax remained faithful to Odd Fellowship throughout his life. It was on a business trip in January, 1885, at Mankato, Minnesota, he expired in the depot of that city shortly after arriving. He was identified by the local Odd Fellows and taken by them to the home of a physician where the body lay in state for several hours and then sent to his home in South Bend with an escort of Odd Fellows.

EXCERPT ON SCHUYLER COLFAX FROM "SCHUYLER COLFAX: THE CHANGING FORTUNES OF A POLITICAL IDOL"

"In the fall of 1851 Schuyler Colfax was engaged in another activity outside the journalistic field. Having been an active member of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows for some years, a connection which likely aided him politically, he became a leading spirit in establishing the Degree of Rebekah, the ladies' auxiliary of the Order. At the session of the Grand Lodge of the United States in Cincinnati, 1850, Colfax was appointed chairman of a committee to consider the matter. He previously had suggested the idea of a ladies' degree. A majority of the committee was opposed, but the Grand Lodge adopted the minority report which he made. In the words of one writer, the degree 'was suggested and originated by Schuyler Colfax . . . by whom also it was written.' Brother Colfax deserves, as he has received, the sincere thanks of the Fraternity, for this ornament to the building which our fathers framed." The above is an excerpt from the biography "Schuyler Colfax—The Changing Fortunes of a Political Idol" by Willard H. Smith and published by the Indiana Historical Bureau.

Resolution Memorializing the Congress To Pass Legislation To Establish a National Cemetery in Rhode Island

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, in all of New England, which has almost 1½ million veterans, there is no national cemetery, while in the South Atlantic region, which has a little over 2½ million veterans, there are 24 national cemeteries or one cemetery for every 124,000 veterans. Because of this glaring inequity and the great contributions made by the veterans from Rhode Island, I introduced a bill in the 89th Congress for the establishment of a national cemetery in Rhode Island.

I am very pleased to note that the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island has passed a resolution expressing their support of this legislation, H.R. 5649. I will include this resolution, memorializing the Congress to pass my bill, H.R. 5649, in the RECORD following my remarks.

Let me also take this opportunity to remind the Members of this body that this inequity has existed for much too great a time to permit any further delay in taking action on this matter. While too much time has been allowed to pass concerning this inequity, very little time remains in which to act in this 90th Congress. Let us now act expeditiously and favorably on this matter.

The resolution referred to follows:

RESOLUTION S. 620

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass H.R. 5649, a bill to establish a national cemetery in Gloucester, R.I.

Whereas, Congressman Fernand St Germain, United States Representative in Congress, First District, Rhode Island, has introduced H.R. 5649, a bill to establish a national cemetery in Rhode Island; and

Whereas, Rhode Island, one of the most densely populated states in the country, has no national burial facilities; and

Whereas, Adequate and proper burial facilities for Rhode Island's honored veterans are badly needed and earnestly desired; and

Whereas, In every other region of the country there are at least four national cemeteries, but in New England there are none; and

Whereas, It is grossly unfair that the New England area which gave birth to this nation and particularly Rhode Island, the first of the original American colonies to formally renounce allegiance to Great Britain, remains without a national cemetery; and

Whereas, The historically rich State of Rhode Island, which has contributed so much to the greatness of this nation, should be permitted a national cemetery within its boundaries; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the general assembly does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to pass H.R. 5649, a bill to establish a national cemetery in Gloucester, Rhode Island; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be and he hereby is authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the senators and representatives from Rhode Island in the congress of the United

States in the hope that they will give this matter their personal attention.

Attest:

AUGUST P. LA FRANCE,
Secretary of State.

Arson Continues in District of Columbia

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an article entitled "Arson Probed in Seven More Fires," published in today's Washington Evening Star.

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

ARSON PROBED IN SEVEN MORE FIRES: TWO ARE ARRESTED IN LOOTING INCIDENT

Seven fires of suspicious origin, most of them relatively minor and in areas hit by rioting more than two weeks ago, were reported in Washington last night.

District arson squad investigators, probing 16 such blazes since Sunday, were preparing a report this morning for Public Safety Director Patrick V. Murphy on which of the fires will be classified as arson cases.

At the scene of a minor fire at National Capital Housing Authority storage garage in Southwest Washington, District police apprehended a 13-year-old boy and were seeking two other juveniles. Another 13-year-old was charged Monday in connection with two earlier arson cases elsewhere in the city.

TEAR GAS HOLDUP

As the rash of suspicious fires broke out again last night, police said five holdup men tossed a tear gas canister into a 7-Eleven store at 4660 Nichols Ave. SW after ordering customers at gunpoint into the rear of the store and taking \$150 from the cash register and safe. Firemen brought an exhaust fan to the scene of the 9:25 p.m. holdup to clear the tear gas from the store.

Police reported only one confirmed instance of looting yesterday, at Murphy's variety store in the 3200 block of 14th Street NW. Police, aided by a canine corps dog, made two arrests at the scene.

The first of last night's suspicious fires was reported at 6:57 p.m. at Hoffman's Used Furniture Store, 2447 18th St., NW., where fire officials estimated damage to the building at \$300, plus minor damage to contents. The fire spread from trash in a storage room to some gas meters, igniting gas and spreading the fire to parts of the first floor.

At 8:09 p.m., a dozen pieces of fire equipment responded to an alarm at Levin's Sales Exchange, a pawn shop at 1303 H St. NE, that had been looted during the rioting. Damage to building and its contents was estimated at \$2,000 by fire officials.

CHURCH STORE FIRE

Five minutes after that alarm, firemen put out a blaze involving furniture and clothing at the rear of the St. Vincent de Paul Society store at 1346 U St. NW. Total damage was estimated at \$600.

At 8:57 p.m., fire caused an estimated \$1,000 damage at the rear of a previously burned and unoccupied High's dairy store at 332 H St. NE, fire officials said.

The housing authority storage garage fire, at 1338 First St. SW, occurred at 9:28 p.m. and damage to the garage and building material was estimated at \$200. Police believe the boy who was arrested and his companions

poured kerosene from a construction lantern on some closet shelving in the garage, then put a match to it.

A vacant brick home at 1330 Farragut St. NW was burned out by fire about 10 p.m. Firemen fought the blaze in the two-story house for half an hour before it was brought under control.

NEIGHBOR SNUFFS BLAZE

Officials said a rear door at a television shop at 326 Kennedy St. NW was discovered burning about 10:30 p.m. by a neighbor who put it out without fire department help.

The incident at the Murphy's store on 14th Street NW occurred about 1:30 yesterday afternoon, police said. Believing they saw unauthorized persons in the basement of the store—which still reeked of tear gas—police entered and arrested James A. Gibbs, 28, and Willis Swain, 27, both of the 1400 block of Park Road NW.

Police said Swain was bitten on the right wrist and arm by a Canine Corps dog. Swain was treated at D.C. General Hospital, they said.

Peaceful Nuclear Proliferation

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, made an excellent and timely address at a meeting of the South Carolina-Georgia Nuclear Council and the Joint Council of Engineering and Scientific Societies of the Central Savannah River Area on April 15 in Augusta, Ga.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the Savannah River plant in Aiken County in my congressional district. We are pleased over the great feeling of optimism there about the future role of the atom for peaceful uses among the Atomic Energy Commission personnel and the dedicated personnel of the great Du Pont Co. which operates the Savannah River plant.

The Columbia State, of Columbia, S.C., one of the South's great and outstanding newspapers, carried a splendid editorial tribute to Dr. Seaborg on April 18. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues and to the people of our country:

PEACEFUL PROLIFERATION

Its primary function is still the production of materials for nuclear weapons. But the Atomic Energy Commission's Savannah River Plant near Aiken is involved also in peaceful uses of the atom and, for this reason, is increasingly important to the industrial development of South Carolina and the Southeast.

In his address Monday night in Augusta, AEC Chairman Glenn T. Seaborg referred to "peaceful nuclear proliferation." He noted, by way of example, that the capacity of nuclear power stations in the South Carolina-Georgia area alone soon will exceed the existing production capacity of all such power plants in the United States.

Nationwide, nuclear power stations now have a combined capacity of 2,800,000 kilowatts. By 1975, South Carolina and Georgia will have a 4,000,000 kilowatt capacity.

Dr. Seaborg looks toward the day, not too distant perhaps, when giant, nuclear-powered industrial complexes will spring up wherever nuclear power is produced. These complexes might be compared to the atom itself, with each power producer forming a

nucleus around which are grouped industrial satellites.

The Du Pont Company, which operates the AEC's Savannah River Plant, furnishes an illustration of how rapidly events may move in the field of atomic energy. Its Savannah River Laboratory has required five years to produce only 10 pounds (almost the entire world output) of curium-244, potentially one of the most important radioisotopes. With the anticipated proliferation of nuclear power plants, however, Du Pont scientists ultimately may produce this isotope by the ton.

The far-reaching potential of Dr. Seaborg's peaceful proliferation is difficult to comprehend and equally difficult to exaggerate. We stand on the threshold of a new era—a Nuclear Age and, quite possibly, a Golden Age as well. When this new day dawns, a large part of the credit will go to Dr. Seaborg's commission, the South Carolina-Georgia Nuclear Council and others who are engaged in converting a grim destroyer into a benefactor of mankind.

Airport Crisis

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this Nation faces an airport dilemma of huge proportions, as I have said many times in the past year. Last August the Aviation Subcommittee held hearings to determine the scope of the problem, and in January of this year the subcommittee issued an interim report on the subject. One of the principal conclusions of that report was that a national program to finance airport construction is essential, and must go forward soon if we are to be prepared for the crush of air traffic which lies ahead.

What we need now are practical and constructive proposals from government and from the aviation industry so that we may initiate such a program as soon as possible. Mr. Stuart G. Tipton, president of the Air Transport Association of America, in a recent speech outlined a new proposal for airport financing that has the support of the scheduled airlines.

I commend the airline industry for its efforts in attempting to meet this problem head on. I urge the other segments of the aviation industry to come up with constructive proposals also. Time is short. The airport problem is a national problem which must be cured and cured soon. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Tipton's address before the Cleveland Traffic Club on April 24, 1968, outlining the airport proposal.

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

AIR TRANSPORTATION IN THE NEXT DECADE

It is a pleasure to be here today, to again have the opportunity of meeting with some of the men responsible for the growth of this great industrial city, and to discuss the growth, the problems and the exciting future of air transportation.

It has been nearly 10 years since I last spoke in Cleveland. Back in August, 1959, I spoke before your Rotary Club on the sub-

ject "Cleveland, A Progressive City in the Air Age".

At that time, I discussed the very successful "partnership for progress" between the airlines and Cleveland. This partnership has continued through what is called the "jet age" and I am sure will continue into the foreseeable future of supersonic and hypersonic transport.

What I would like to do today is to review the progress made by your city, and by the airlines, in the last 10 years. Then, I plan to look ahead for the next decade and tell you some of the opportunities, and the problems, that will be ahead for both the city—and air transportation.

But first, let us take a quick look backward and see how close the history of aviation and Cleveland has been over the years.

Cleveland Hopkins Airport, today one of the largest municipal airports in the world, was opened in July 1, 1925, at a time when there were only a handful of airports.

Less than a year later, the United States scheduled airline system, as we know it today, was born when a Ford Tri-Motor lumbered into Cleveland from Detroit with a handful of letters—the first flight of a private contractor under America's first air mail act.

The first air traffic control tower in the nation was opened in 1929 and in that same year—in Cleveland—the first automatic pilot was used on a plane.

By the end of World War II, Cleveland was being served by five certificated scheduled airlines. Today there are eight operating 180 flights daily out of Cleveland Hopkins Airport. Most of the flights are jet-operated.

Today more than 6,000 passengers a day enplane at Cleveland Hopkins Airport—in 1967 that meant more than 2,222,000 passengers, an increase of 222 per cent in 10 years!

Future growth will probably exceed the phenomenal growth of the past 10 years.

Later this year, the nation's first high speed airport-to-downtown rapid transit system will open. With it, downtown Cleveland will be only 20 minutes away from the airport. Such a system may be the solution to the airport access problem and, for this reason, the eyes of the transportation world are focused on the project. And when the system opens for business, I hope it will get the whoop-te-doo it deserves.

The "shape" of the future also includes world travel. Ten years ago, Cleveland became a true international seaport with the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Only a few weeks ago, the CAB examiner in the important Transpacific case named Cleveland as a mainland terminal for direct service to Hawaii and the Far East. Cleveland is also being considered as a terminal in the Transatlantic cargo case.

In anticipation of the growth in traffic that is bound to come, a group of airline and civic leaders with a strong touch of vision are now meeting once a month to discuss plans for a new airport to serve the planes of the future—the new subsonic jet designs and the supersonic transports.

The growth of air transportation has not, of course, been limited to Cleveland. The past 10 years have been years of spectacular growth for the airline industry.

This is the 10th year of what airline people call the Civil Jet Age and over that period traffic has gone up 135.7 per cent, from 56 million passengers in 1958 to more than 132 million last year. While the United States is growing by about 7,000 citizens a day, the airlines are adding more than 40,000 passengers a day.

In 1959, new capital spending by the airlines was a small factor in the economy. Today, air transport is the seventh largest industry in the country in volume of capital expenditures. This year alone, the airlines will take delivery of almost two aircraft every working day of the year at an average

cost of \$6.5 million per plane. Another way to look at this is to put this in terms of new plants. The average price of a typical new factory is about one-half million dollars. The airlines are building 12 new factories every day.

In just the last four years, the U.S. scheduled airlines bought 219 freighter jets at a cost of \$1.6 billion—an investment that has produced a vastly improved freight transport system in terms of speed, capacity and service. The result: shippers—for the first time in meaningful numbers and with regular cargoes—are discovering air freight.

In the last 10 years, the airlines have become the number one form of public transportation between cities. In 1958, the airlines accounted for about 35 per cent of all public inter-city traffic. Today, that figure is about 66 per cent and still on the rise.

All of this growth has been accompanied by improved passenger services and lower fares. In the past five years, average airline fares have dropped 13.2 per cent while the cost of living has increased more than seven per cent.

Yes, the airlines today are far and away the fastest growing major industry in the country. But what about tomorrow? And next year? And the years beyond that?

The answers are, I think, exciting. The best is yet to come. As Charles F. Kettering, inventive genius of General Motors once said, "Human ingenuity is boundless. It is nonsense to think we have reached any limit of mechanical progress."

Kettering was right but predicting the future can be a risky business. For example, a 1937 study of some note totally missed not only the computer, but atomic energy, antibiotics, radar and jet propulsion. Yet, nearly all of these had been around in principle, waiting for development.

Herman Kahn in his book *The Year 2000*, says that in 1957 it would have been impossible to convince a "scientifically knowledgeable audience that a Polaris submarine missile system could have been produced in a decade. Nevertheless, by 1967 no less than 41 Polaris submarines were operational, meaning that six major, seemingly insurmountable problems had been solved.

Without venturing into the unknown decades ahead, however, let us take a look at what is already possible with present day airline technology. In fact, what the airlines already have on the drawing boards.

In the next 10 years, three entirely new and different types of aircraft will be introduced. By the end of next year, jets with a capacity of 350 to 450 passengers will be in operation. Around 1972, the tri-jet will come on the scene. And scheduled for 1975 are the SST's. Supersonic aircraft, flying at speeds of 2,200 miles an hour will cross the Atlantic in an hour-and-a-half and add new dimensions to travel growth.

In terms of equipment, we are on the brink of the most exciting era in air travel history. In terms of traffic, the path is clear and continues upward:

By 1975, the airlines will be flying 330 million passengers, more than three times today's level.

By 1972, the airlines will be flying 10 billion ton miles of cargo, three times today's level.

These figures will give you some idea of the magnitude of growth and the technological progress that lies ahead. Obviously, growth is an asset on the ledger. But this growth causes serious pressures on the air transport system.

To meet this growth, the airlines have committed themselves to an unprecedented capital expenditure program. In the five-year period 1968-1972, the 12 major U.S. airlines will spend more than \$10.5 billion. The industry as a whole will spend several billion dollars more in the next decade for flight and ground equipment and operating property.

But there are other pressures. The growing traffic has to be handled, reservations must be made, baggage must be located and tickets must be issued.

As a start on the baggage problem, the airlines are developing a multi-million dollar automatic baggage system which will completely automate and speed up the delivery of baggage to the passenger and between airlines. The system will take luggage from planes and by means of "memory units" keyed to respond to passenger baggage claim checks, will send the luggage within three minutes on a high-speed track to any of dozens of locations around the airport and its parking lots. The need for such a system was vividly demonstrated when one airline's first stretched DC-8 flight landed at Miami and disgorged 535 pieces of luggage. The Boeing 747 will carry twice as many pieces.

The airlines are also in the process of developing an automatic ticketing system which passengers can operate themselves and which will provide tickets and confirmed reservations in 80 percent less time than it takes today. For example, if technology can match our ambition in the early 1970s, a passenger may go to a shopping center and insert a plastic credit card in a vending machine, press a button to see if there is a seat on tomorrow's flight to Chicago, and if the answer is affirmative, punch another button and have a ticket drop into his hands—confirmed, recorded and ready to use.

One of the key elements of the aviation system which needs immediate expansion is the air traffic control system. The Federal government owns and operates the system and is entirely responsible for it. Last summer, President Johnson called upon the Department of Transportation to come forward with a program which will improve and expand the airways system. The aviation industry hopes that the department will come forward soon because the en route delays to both passenger and airline are expensive and are mounting. Air traffic control is a priority item and government should get on with the job with all deliberate speed.

Forty years ago, the government took on the job of running the air traffic control system. It is their responsibility to operate that system just as it is their responsibility to deliver the mail. Because so much is dependent upon the air traffic control system, there should be no temporizing at this point.

The pressures of growth have other aspects, of course. Clearly air transportation cannot expand unless airports expand along with all the other elements of aviation. Most people today take the speed, convenience and reliability of air travel for granted. For businessmen on the move, air travel is a vital part of life. But unless the problems of airport congestion are solved, the assets of air travel may disappear. Right now, there is hardly a commercial airliner in the country that does not get delayed at least once a day at an airport.

The problem is evident. The entire airport structure also stands in need of immediate expansion. The Secretary of Transportation, Alan Boyd, estimates that this improvement program will cost some \$6 billion.

The growth in air transport is obvious. The expansions and improvements required are just as obvious. A great infusion of capital is needed to allow for the expansion. A large part of the funds will be derived from airport users, primarily air carriers and their passengers. A portion will come from airport earnings, especially from large hub airports such as Cleveland's Hopkins Airport, which are successful, going concerns.

But where does the rest come from? The big bulge? That is the problem we must solve soon. There is a definite limit to what the airlines can do. Our earnings are already in a squeeze. On one side the cost of labor

and materials is up, and on the other, the yield realized from the passenger and the shipper is down. And, on top of the squeeze, is the very real need to pay for the billions of dollars of new aircraft that have been ordered to meet the requirements of the seventies.

With this in mind, the airline industry has come up with a proposal that it feels will fill the demand for the capital bulge the airport expansion program so sorely needs.

The proposal calls for the establishment—by the Congress—of an Airport Development Trust Fund, similar to the present Highway Trust Fund. It would be set up within the Treasury of the United States and would be administered by the Secretary of Transportation.

The Trust Fund would be maintained from the proceeds of a 2 per cent tax on airline passengers within the United States. For passengers departing the United States to foreign points there would be a flat fee of \$2 per trip.

This fund would then set about in a very meaningful way to expand the airport system. Both the big, air carrier airports—such as Cleveland's Hopkins—as well as the smaller ones—such as Burke Lakefront—would be eligible for financial assistance. The smaller airfields—such as Burke—serve a vital purpose as reliever airports; that is, they relieve the major airports of the general aviation traffic, which does not need to land there, giving Cleveland and other major cities a much better overall pattern of air service. To the extent that smaller airports are opened by public agencies, and are reliever airports, they would be eligible for financial assistance.

Eligible projects—for which financing would be provided—include the construction, alteration and improvement of airfield facilities.

The financial assistance would take the form of paying up to 75 per cent of the debt service costs of airport bond issues. It would also provide for short term loans for planning, land acquisition and for the start of construction on urgently needed projects pending approval of a long term program of financial aid.

It is a good proposal and one which we hope will be adopted as soon as possible. It is clear that there must be Federal leadership if we are to have an airport system designed to meet the nation's demands for air transportation of the next decade.

The proposal meets three major tests of a truly national airport program: (1) it provides capital funding without dipping into the general treasury, (2) it is available to all communities served by airlines which meet the few, simple requirements, (3) it aids the major users of the airports, commercial air carriers and general aviation alike.

I had said at the outset that I would talk about the next 10 years. Very briefly and, very generally, I have done so. I have pointed out that we need ample, efficient flying equipment. That is the airline responsibility and we are meeting it with a multi-billion dollar investment of our own.

We must have a good airway traffic control system and I pointed out that this is the responsibility of the Federal government. All of aviation hopes that the government will come forward soon with a solution.

I have talked about airports and said that the responsibility is shared with the local government, the users and the Federal government, whose concern it is to have a national system.

I have pointed out a way in which the Federal government and the airport operator can co-operate in the development of an airport system which will meet the requirements of the next decade. The program is vitally important. We must not let it wait.

A Time for Strong Leadership

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, Nishna Valley High School in Hastings, Iowa, recently conducted its National Honor Society initiation and induction. It was my pleasure to be present for this occasion, and to hear an address by Mrs. Bertha Thorson, a very talented and respected member of the faculty of this fine school.

At a time when America is crying for leadership, I felt the remarks made by Mrs. Thorson were particularly appropriate. They come from a dedicated teacher who has shown by example what leadership means, and the success and talent of her students show this influence—under her guidance numerous honors have been bestowed upon Nishna Valley High School.

I commend to my congressional colleagues Bertha Thorson's remarks on the need for strong and effective leadership in our society:

To be asked to speak with you this evening made me very happy. When this organization was established in our school in 1960 and we received our charter, five people assisted in setting up the Constitution and establishing a ritual to be used for the purpose of evaluating new members and installing probationary members into full membership. I was pleased to be among those chosen five, and I have served until this year as co-sponsor of this organization. It is still close to my heart.

The people present here on this platform know that it was not easy to become a member of this organization. Lack of scholastic attainment has kept many otherwise deserving people from membership. Lack of achievement in the fields of citizenship, leadership, and service or any one of these qualities has kept good scholars from membership. Membership in any organization which keeps its standards high is a prized possession. One places little value on anything which can be had for the taking. The torch which is the emblem of the National Honor Society is indeed well chosen. Today when mediocrity seems to be taking over the world, achievement needs to hold aloft its torch to light the world to a new era of hope and accomplishment.

In thinking of the four principles of the National Honor Society, it was hard to choose among them for a topic around which to build an address.

No one knows better the value of citizenship than the person who has lost it.

No one appreciates service more than a person badly in need of help.

No one appreciates scholarship more than the student who gets that long-awaited letter from the college of his choice telling him that he has been accepted as a student.

However it seems to me, that none of these qualities could be brought to the peak of achievement without the quality of leadership.

One must have some of the qualities of leadership to be a good citizen; no deed of service is ever done without a leader to give direction and planning, and everyone knows you must have qualities of leadership to want to excel scholastically. The mediocre are always too ready to pull down to their level the student who does not possess self-direction.

The qualities of leadership fostered by this organization are needed sorely by our country. When America became a nation after 1776, it seems that every colony was blessed

with a multiplicity of great leaders. It was not so much a question of where to find a leader as it was to choose one from many candidates of the finest quality. In today's presidential race it seems to me that those dropping from the race will leave those willing to continue without any competition in the primaries. Our economy is based upon the competitive system. Even Nature believes that the survival of the fittest is the surest means that the species shall continue strong and enduring. It is certainly not to the credit of our nation that no one remains to do battle with the candidates and prove the mettle of these survivors so we may be sure that our leadership is strong and is willing to fight to maintain their leadership. It seems to me that when the going gets tough, too many are only too willing to turn tail and seek cover.

Life in colonial America was harsh, and it was tough and go as to whether this experiment in government of the people, by the people were not to perish from this earth. The struggle honed the metal of its patriots to a fine edge and surely as I said before it produced a ratio of quality of leadership to the number of people being led that we have not seen since. Therefore, it would seem that life today is too soft, too plastic, to produce the high quality of leadership so necessary to this changing world.

We look with appreciation and a sense of awe at little Israel and the fight she is making to preserve her identity and integrity in the face of the jealousy of her less ambitious neighbors. We take renewed hope from watching this tiny nation fight—and win—with an intestinal fortitude which reminds us of our own pioneer ancestry, an ancestry which reminds us that America too fought against established privilege for the freedom which until their day had been little more than a dream of oppressed mankind. Now, in a day when too many people insult and abuse this very freedom and go unpunished, we should take renewed devotion toward the preservation of this commodity for which the Israelites are willing to shed their life's blood to preserve. No burning of draft cards, no demonstrations, no hippie movements, no Malcolm X's, no Rap Browns, among these people! Even their women bear arms and fight alongside their men so great is the determination of these people to preserve their country—a country they had not had for centuries. Left to the prey of any nation seeking a scapegoat, these Israeli nationals know the value of a nation and a diplomatic service to preserve and protect their rights when they are far from home in a unfriendly land. How else do you think a Hitler could visit such wholesale destruction upon a people unless they had no native land to protect their rights. Such brave cowards as Hitler like to pick on people who have no defense and no defenders.

These objects of God's wrath, these Israelites, became wanderers without a homeland when their leadership broke down and corruption and materialism destroyed their spiritual leadership. One thing, however, God promised them—any nation persecuting these, his chosen people, should be destroyed. You students of history, can you refute the fact that wherever the Jews have been persecuted that this nation has not fallen? Now, when at long last, they have a country, can you imagine them in less than two hundred years in the future ceasing to prize this dear-bought land? Well, I surmise, neither could Washington, Jefferson, Adams, and even John Hancock foresee the people of today who do not prize our freedom. This is one time when if these patriots could have seen the freedom bought with patriot blood being destroyed on a bonfire of burning draft cards they might have been unwilling to make the initial effort that gave us this land in the first place.

When you think of the hidden kingdom of the Mafia underworld, when you think of the Negro demonstrators, does it ever occur to you that the ancestors of these people did not fight in the Revolution? They remind me of the kid who eats only the icing off the cake, it's too much trouble and effort to chew the cake. But to translate a Swedish motto I have at home on a wall plaque in my kitchen: better coarse cake, than *nothing* to chew . . . and if we ignore these people who would destroy the fabric of the freedom and the government we so dearly bought in the past *nothing* is what we are going to have to chew—and sooner than we think!!!

In "Our Town" Thornton Wilder says through the character of the stage manager that every child born into this world is Nature's attempt to make a perfect human being. I would like to paraphrase that by saying that every student who comes into the National Honor Society is this organization's attempt to make a perfect leader for this beloved country of ours. It is meant to foster all that is good, discourage all that is weak, and strengthen the will to use the God-given powers they have inherited from their forebears to make this world a better place in which to live and never to cease in this attempt no matter where their future lives may lead them.

The torch has literally and figuratively been passed. Carry it proudly, carry it high, and never, never let it be extinguished in the dust of indifference.

Recalls Ernie Pyle

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, 23 years ago this month we lost a great American, Ernie Pyle. In a recent letter to the editor of the Cleveland Press, Mr. N. R. Calvo, commissioner of soldiers relief, Cuyahoga County, Cleveland, Ohio, recalls Ernie Pyle and how he was beloved by the men in uniform as well as the people back home to whom he reported the fighting.

Mr. Calvo is, himself, a U.S. Army veteran of World War II, commander of American Legion Post No. 74, Cleveland, Ohio, member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, life member of the Disabled American Veterans, and life member of the AMVETS. I believe my colleagues will be interested in his letter about Ernie Pyle, which follows:

RECALLS ERNIE PYLE

As American lives continue being lost in Southeast Asia, I think it fitting at this time to reflect on an American lost 23 years ago on Apr. 18, 1945. I refer to Ernie Pyle.

He was one of our greatest war correspondents; he was responsible in World War II for combat infantry and medics receiving an extra \$10 a month in pay; he was responsible for the wearing of overseas bars on the left sleeve of uniforms. He was beloved by the men in combat, as well as the people back home to whom he reported the fighting.

I could not say any better words than those of President Harry S. Truman, stating "no man in this war has so well told the story of the American fighting men as American fighting men wanted it told. He deserves the gratitude of all his countrymen."

Perhaps that is why, 23 years later, so many visit Punchbowl, the 112-acre National Memorial Cemetery on the Island of Oahu,

in the State of Hawaii and Ernie Pyle's grave. They daily place flower leis beside the plain granite marker. In a way, Pyle is still the link between the American war dead of World War II and the free men and women who come to Punchbowl's long rows of graves.

N. R. CALVO.

I Voted "No" on Open Housing

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in answer to a letter from a constituent who questioned my vote against the open housing bill, I wrote to him as follows:

In your zeal for open housing you would seem to advocate taking away the rights of many to redistribute them to the few. Describe this as human rights for the few, if you will, but the law has always been, in our country, that property owners have *personal rights* in property regardless. To me, that's pretty important and taking any of them away is no light matter.

This response was predicated upon a basic principle which I referred to on April 10, the day of decision:

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the landmark decision of *Shelley v. Kraemer*, 334 U.S. 1 (1948), the U.S. Supreme Court established the criteria that racially restrictive covenants on land are not enforceable if there is a willing buyer and a willing seller. The question then became one of exercising the right established. The issue before the House today on H.R. 2516 is whether this principle will be abandoned, thereby jeopardizing the basic common law concept of property rights. The decision should emphatically be in the negative.

Earlier, on April 8—when many of our cities were still reeling from the onslaught of arsonists and looters—I had voiced utmost concern over the ominous developments and expressed my sincere belief that *reason* requires *discipline* and that those who hope for problems to be solved with legislation and money, hope in vain:

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the chaos in our land—where will it end? That is the question on almost every mature American's tongue. What can be done about it? What should be done about it? Of course, there are many deep-seated ills in our society which require patient and unrelenting treatment. A great host of our problems stem from a serious deficit of spiritual and moral values, the lack of parental training and influence, and a permissive and indulgent philosophy which is alien to the American spirit. Those who believe that many of our most pressing problems can be solved by legislation and money hope in vain.

But the immediate crisis calls for decisiveness and action. Wishful thinking and hesitation will solve nothing. In fact these weaknesses have contributed much to the present grave and ugly situation.

If governmental authorities do not consistently act with determination to keep order and respect, this entire country—consisting overwhelmingly of peace-loving, law-abiding citizens, black and white, rich and poor—will be subjected to more acute tension, intensified risks, and terrible harm.

The point has been reached when we must—we must for everyone's sake—meet recklessness with resolve, and lawlessness

with authority. We must not avoid this responsibility nor abdicate this trust.

A permanent cure for the sickness which infects our Nation should be sought; but if emergency treatment calls for the use of a straitjacket, we must not be afraid to use it. The patient must not be allowed to harm himself and infect others because we are too tenderhearted to restrain, isolate, or treat him.

God give us the wisdom and the will to do our duty.

Those who have advocated civil disobedience have truly "sown the wind and they are reaping the whirlwind"—I could see it in the smoke beyond the Capitol from my office during that dreadful week and weekend. Just as no man should be beneath the law, no man can be above it. And neither open housing nor the still-planned Washington siege will heal our land.

Olympic Double Standard

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I brought to the attention of the House what I consider a double standard in this year's Olympic games.

South Africa has been barred because a number of Afro-Asian nations and the Soviet Union disapprove of South Africa's domestic politics.

I pointed out yesterday that the Soviet Union has conducted what amounts to a war of genocide against Russia's Jews. I said that if internal political considerations determine South Africa's eligibility, they should also determine Russia's and that Russia should therefore be barred from the Olympics.

Today I have sent a cablegram to Avery Brundage, president of the International Olympic Committee, calling either for reinstatement of the IOC's original invitation to South Africa or for expulsion of Russia from the 1968 Olympics.

I am including the text of my cablegram at this point:

TEXT OF CABLEGRAM FROM CONGRESSMAN JACK McDONALD TO MR. AVERY BRUNDAGE, PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE, LAUSANNE, SWITZERLAND

In view of Olympic Committee action against South Africa, I strongly urge that Soviet Russia be barred from the Mexico City games because of its long record of brutal physical and spiritual persecution of the Jews.

Politics, as you have said, should have no part in the management of the Olympics. However, when politics becomes involved, the same rules should apply to all. It is a matter of common knowledge and of history that the Soviet Union has for years been carrying out a systematic campaign against people of the Jewish religion in order to destroy the Jewish heritage. This persecution has been manifested in action Jewish religious training, cultural life and communal living. Russia's actions against the Russian Jewish population amount to a war of genocide designed to eradicate all vestiges of Jewish religion and culture. It is incon-

ceivable to me that the International Olympic Committee could act against one nation without acting against another that has committed crimes of such enormity against its own people.

On Tuesday, I addressed the United States House of Representatives on this matter. I therefore call on the Olympic Committee either to reinstate its invitation to the Republic of South Africa or to exclude the Soviet Union for its barbaric treatment of Russian Jews.

JACK McDONALD,
Member of Congress.

Pennsylvania Council of Republican Women Commend Senator Hugh Scott

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, each year women contribute more and more to the governmental and political processes of our Nation. Often they are inspired and encouraged by National, State, and local leaders. Because of outstanding efforts to achieve this worthy goal I commend the Republican leaders of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, particularly Senator HUGH SCOTT.

Of 20 delegates-at-large and alternates-at-large selected in Pennsylvania to the Republican National Convention, four are women. Yesterday, on April 23, Pennsylvania Primary Day, the 54 remaining delegates-at-large were elected and I am pleased to report that a proportionate number elected at the ballot box were women.

Senator SCOTT, a former Republican national chairman and U.S. Congressman for 25 years, has always supported representation by women in State and national affairs. In recognition of his efforts, the Pennsylvania Council of Republican Women drew a resolution in his appreciation.

I place the council's resolution into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE HONORABLE HUGH SCOTT, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Whereas, the Honorable Hugh Scott, United States Senator from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, recently exhibited his appreciation and respect for the efforts expended in behalf of the Republican Party by Republican women and in particular by members of the Pennsylvania Council of Republican Women, by exercising the influence of his office in support of the nomination and election of the following named women:

Miss Sarah Ann Stauffer to be Delegate-at-Large to the 1968 Republican National Convention. Miss Stauffer is our Pennsylvania National Committeewoman.

Mrs. Peter K. Honaman, Republican State Vice-chairman, to be Delegate-at-Large to the 1968 Republican National Convention.

Mrs. George J. Thack, President Pennsylvania Council of Republican Women, to be Delegate-at-Large to the 1968 Republican National Convention.

Mrs. Raymond T. Russell, Secretary Republican State Committee, to be Alternate Delegate-at-Large to the 1968 Republican National Convention.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Board of Directors of the Pennsylvania Council of Republican Women in regular meeting assembled, does hereby express to the Honorable Hugh Scott, United States Senator from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the sincere gratitude and appreciation of the Pennsylvania Council of Republican Women for the nomination and election of the above named women as Delegates-at-Large and Alternate Delegate-at-Large to the 1968 Republican National Convention.

Teachers-in-Politics Weekend

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, April 5 marked the beginning of Teachers-in-Politics Weekend and I am very much pleased to have this opportunity to acknowledge and pay tribute to our teachers and educators for their far-reaching contributions in and out of the classrooms.

I am pleased to note that this highly dedicated profession can boast a 90 percent voting record in the 1964 presidential election and a very large percentage of them were highly active in the 1964 and 1966 campaigns.

Teachers have recognized government's ever-increasing influence on our daily lives, and many educators are participating in local and State governments, where they have made excellent contributions.

I heartily welcome and commend them and look forward to having them actively participate on the Federal level, and especially commend them for their objectives to achieve better educational benefits for all of our youth, which I so wholeheartedly share with them and many interested Americans.

I have long recognized the need for teacher participation, particularly in view of the high percentage of our budget which is being spent on education, and believe our educators render a real, valuable service in sharing with us their wealth of ideas and intimate knowledge of the needs and aspirations of our youth.

No profession is better prepared, more knowledgeable, more dedicated to the educational problems of our society than the teaching profession. And no profession or calling is better equipped or motivated than teachers to grapple with and solve these problems. Their leadership in this field is indispensable; the country needs and appreciates it.

I look forward to their participation, and hope that it will, not only give them a better understanding of the functions and duties of government and help to foster student interest and understanding, but afford us in the public service the opportunity to learn from them.

We have entrusted to our teacher-citizens the responsibility of teaching the principles of free men and women and free government, and I believe that

with their active participation we can look forward to better school systems, better communities, better States and a stronger, better educated and better informed Nation.

I proudly associate myself with these high aims and enhanced services of our great teaching profession. I look forward to working with its members and its groups in continuing my own participation and labors, with their valued counsel and assistance, in moving forward toward the high goals in education and national betterment that we share in common.

A Stirring Eulogy

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on Sunday afternoon, April 7, 1968, Rabbi Frederic A. Doppelt, of the Achduth Vesholom Synagogue, in Fort Wayne, Ind., delivered an address in tribute to and in memory of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. It was only fitting that Rabbi Doppelt, an outstanding and compassionate community leader, be called upon to speak at the communitywide memorial march and service on the day of prayer proclaimed by President Johnson.

Rabbi Doppelt's remarks, reflecting the true spirit of brotherhood, express the hope that all of us will join hands and hearts in resurrecting Dr. King's dreams and ideals. I ask unanimous consent that this thought-provoking address be printed in the RECORD.

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

IN TRIBUTE AND MEMORY: MARTIN LUTHER KING

By mere length of time, his span on earth was only a mere handbreadth in the vastness of the universe. But when measured by the greatness of his soul and deeds, the life of Martin Luther King was a holy moment in the conscience of humanity which will abide as a living force unto all eternity.

This holy moment was snuffed out at a time when we of the House of Israel are approaching our glorious Festival of Passover and the world of Christendom is approaching its most sacred observance of Easter. We must never forget this singular time of his death because there was so much of both Passover and Easter in his life.

Like Moses of yore, Martin Luther King labored tirelessly and fearlessly to liberate the Negro from the bondage shackling him in our times and in our land, and he did wondrous things for his people and all of us in these United States; and like him too, he died before entering the Promised Land of freedom. Now he is free at last; and through his life all of us shall be free at last.

For at Easter time the message of Christianity proclaims the glad tidings that he need not remain dead and buried. Let us only join hands and hearts and roll away the stone from his tomb, and let there be a resurrection of his dreams and ideals. That holy moment in the conscience of humanity which lived in our midst as Martin Luther King will abide among us and work through us for the good of all of us. Amen!

The Atom and the Sea

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the ocean is the largest single geographical feature on earth. The exploration and utilization of this body is a most exciting and challenging new frontier, scientifically, economically, and politically.

The State of Florida, in general, and the city of Miami, in particular, with many natural advantages, have become champions in this new and urgently important field of oceanography. Both educationally and commercially Miami is competing aggressively to become the ocean science capital of the United States.

The above quotation is taken from a fine talk delivered at the seventh annual meeting of the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board on April 1, 1968. The speaker was my very distinguished colleague from Tennessee, the Honorable WILLIAM R. ANDERSON. Representative ANDERSON'S talk, "The Atom and the Sea" is particularly memorable in view of his former career as the first captain of the first nuclear submarine, the *Nautilus*.

I am most anxious to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives this informative and interesting speech:

THE ATOM AND THE SEA

(Address of Representative WILLIAM R. ANDERSON to the seventh annual meeting of the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board, Hot Springs, Ark., April 1, 1968)

It will be written of us—the Americans of the mid-20th Century—that by our scientific, political and economic commitments of these decades, we have decreed that man shall engage in whole new magnitudes of enterprise, in the sea, in the reaches beyond Earth, and in the minute worlds of atomic structure. The explorations upon which we have embarked—into the oceans of Earth and the vast cosmos beyond—dwarf all previous exploratory ventures of man. They will require tools, vehicles, motive power and environmental protection of a radically new nature. It is no coincidence that the new ventures are initiated in concert with the accelerating development of nuclear technology.

The three great scientific enterprises have been intertwined from the beginning—they enrich, stimulate, support and interpollinate each other. The three draw upon the same computer and systems-management technologies. Many of our most powerful and dynamic corporate creators are engaged in all three enterprises simultaneously. The three great scientific thrusts combined to produce the world's most advanced weapons system—the Polaris submarine missile system. Far more homely, but in some ways more promising, is a small new oceanographic study platform. An undersea radio isotope generator powers the anchored platform at its bobs unmanned in the open sea, beaming scientific oceanic data to Nimbus B weather satellites.

The space venture began, in many respects, as an out-growth of a quest for nuclear weapons delivery vehicles. The interrelationship of atomic technology and the space program is already well known and there is little that I could add by further discussion. But our Nation's oceanic undertaking is newer,

less well known, and I believe, a far more economically productive enterprise. The applications of nuclear power in our marine affairs will be enormous, various and profitable to all concerned.

Let me speak briefly of the seas and our purposes with them. The world ocean is the largest single geographical feature of our planet. It amounts to 324 million cubic miles of water which is in constant and complex motion from the surface to the greatest depths. Its great currents move immense quantities of heat from one part of the world to another; the very fact of the ocean moderates climates from the equator to the poles.

Topographically, the ocean's basic features are the continental shelves extending nominally to a depth of 600 feet, the continental slopes which plunge sharply to depths of 8,000 to 12,000 feet, and the outer reaches, the depth of which ranges generally from 12,000 to 16,000 feet. The deep ocean floor is variously characterized by broad plains, individual seamounts (some higher than Everest), the world's longest and most rugged mountain ranges, and deep trenches, one of which—the Marianas Trench—slices down to seven miles.

Chemically, the ocean contains in solution and/or in suspension virtually every element occurring naturally on Earth. The normal ocean (if there is such a thing) contains about 34 parts per thousand by weight of dissolved salts. This makes a fine electrolyte and a highly corrosive fluid, which is one of the main problems the ocean engineer faces. High pressures in the ocean's depths and high mechanical forces from the ocean in motion are others.

Biologically, the ocean is the most densely populated environment on Earth.

Consider that whatever level of social, political, technological and industrial order we have achieved, indeed whatever we have wrought, is the result mainly of our efforts in exploring and utilizing the physical assets of the less than a third of our planet's surface which is dry land.

Throughout history the ocean has been a chancy source of food, a highway for trade, a battleground, and a source of pleasure and recreation. But a new day is upon us. We have discovered that the ocean bears on our day-to-day living in ways we never suspected. It is potentially the largest resource of food for our exploding population, the largest resource of minerals with which to support the world's industries, the largest resource of energy, and, of course, it is the largest supply of water. It is mankind's largest dumping ground for the wastes of cities, and its strategic military values are becoming crucial.

Today there is no scientific or engineering discipline that is not, or will not soon be, applied in the ocean. Already the social and political sciences are becoming involved, and because of the ocean's growing economic and international significance, it presents a challenge such as the law has seldom encountered. It is a whole new world for the insurance underwriter. In fact, there is scarcely a thing we do in our land environment that we will not soon seek to do in the ocean.

It is worth noting that the National Oceanography Association, now two years old, has 650 corporate members. Within the past decade over 300 of the largest United States corporations have entered the marine research and development field. There are this year half a hundred international bodies concerned with one or another aspect of oceanography. The first university degree in oceanography was granted just over 35 years ago; today 64 universities offer curricula in the field, and a year and a half ago the Government initiated a well funded Sea-Grant College program. For us here in the South with two sea coasts and a vital eco-

nomical relationship with the ocean, it is of interest that Miami is competing aggressively to become the Ocean Science Capitol of the United States. That city alone houses 130 ocean-oriented corporations and several area colleges featuring strong oceanography and marine engineering specialties.

There is nothing in this accelerating interest in the sea that is of a temporary, mystical or voguish nature. The reasons man turns to the sea are soundly economic and military in nature. On the economic side, population growth is of such magnitude that already it outstrips man's ability to derive sufficient food from the soil. Simultaneously, the galloping growth of his industries is depleting known reserves of critical raw materials—both mineral and energy resources—to a point where, in many cases, exhaustion is both predictable and imminent.

If demands exceed landborn resources, these new technologies enable man to exploit the sea. While rising demand squeezes traditional supplies and pushes their prices up, a rapidly developing technology is pushing down the cost of working oceanic resources. Whenever these rising price and lowering cost curves cross, man turns to the sea. This happened several centuries ago with food, sponges, red coral, pearls and salt evaporated from seawater. More recently it has happened with petroleum, sulfur, magnesium, iodine, fluorine, coal, iron ore, tin, calcium carbonate, sand, gravel and others. We have to do here with the natural relationship of need technology and human capability. We are going to sea—the least known and harshest of all our terrestrial environments—and the nuclear community is deeply involved and critically needed.

The applications of nuclear energy in this Nation's growing oceanic enterprise are tremendously various. In general however, they can be divided into four major categories.

First, we propose vast exploratory and exploitative works undersea. The ocean is an environment in which conventional fuels cannot be used unless supplied with cumbersome, dangerous, and quickly exhausted supplies of oxygen. The conventional fuels themselves present serious handling difficulties in the conditions of motion, pressure, corrosion and buoyance prevailing under sea. Nuclear engines have already proved ideal as motive and generating power sources in military submarines. Sound, conservative oceanographic engineers tell us that undersea tourist aquatels, manned laboratories and mining and processing facilities are only a decade or less in the future. Nuclear power sources will be a must.

A small nuclear submarine for science, the NR-1, has already been launched. It will operate at a depth of 1,000 feet and utilize mechanical arms. Planned, later versions of this device will operate 20,000 feet down. These vessels will observe and track fish migration, investigate earthquake faults, drill sea floor cores for mining and structural purposes, and analyze subsurface currents.

Of very great importance is the utility of the small isotope generator. Applications are already numerous. In use are isotope powered underwater sound beacons for navigation, useful in the open ocean, as markers for narrow channels, oil well heads, storage facilities, mineral deposits at submarine disaster locations, and for many other purposes.

The A.E.C. Division of Isotopes Development encourages the development of oceanographic instrumentation. This comparatively young enterprise has already produced isotope-powered current meters, chemical analyzers, and geological sample scanners.

An Isotope engine developing four electrical kilowatts of shaft horsepower is under development for small research craft, unmanned oceanographic and acoustic drones, fish collecting devices and anti-submarine warfare purposes.

Under testing is a cold water diving suit in which the aquanaut is kept warm by water heated by thallium isotopes.

A second major area of nuclear application to oceanic affairs lies in the raw earth-moving power of nuclear explosions. The west coasts of Africa, South America and Australia have tremendous need of harbors which nature has not provided. There are canals and waterways to be made which would vastly increase human commerce and well-being.

In 1960 the chairman of the board of a large U.S. corporation made a fundamental policy decision for his company: Since the greatest critical need of man in the next decade would be fresh water, his company would begin working to produce large volumes of fresh water—including the development of methods for desalting seawater. His pioneering analysis proved to be prophetic.

In primitive living conditions a minimum of five gallons of water per day per person suffices, and millions of people today still must scoop this amount up from shallow pools or foul streams; some must haul it long distances.

But technological societies place an increasingly heavy burden upon resources that must provide water not only for drinking but also for sanitation, irrigation, production of power, and countless industrial operations.

Huge quantities of fresh water are needed by industry. For instance it takes 240,000 gallons of water to produce one ton of acetate, and 660,000 gallons to make one ton of synthetic rubber. From 75 to 100 billion gallons per day are required in the United States for irrigation alone. It takes 37 gallons of water to make one slice of bread, 3,750 gallons to produce one pound of beef, and 200,000 gallons to grow one ton of alfalfa.

For all these needs in the United States we presently require about 390 billion gallons of fresh water per day, or about 2,000 gallons per person. Moreover, water use is growing at the rate of 25,000 gallons per minute. So it is with good reason that even a water-rich country like ours views its future water needs and supplies with some anxiety. With the prospect of scores of other Nations following our pattern of mushrooming water use, it is clear that we must turn to the fabulous reservoir of the sea, and to nuclear energy for the processing.

The way is being opened now—technologically and economically—by the Bolsa Island Project in Orange County, California.

The project will consist of a sea water desalting plant with an initial capacity of 50 million gallons a day, and an ultimate capacity of 150 million gallons and nuclear power generating facilities with a total capacity of about 1,800 megawatts. The desalting plant will be by far the largest in the world and it will be the first large commercial water plant to use nuclear energy. When completed, it will supply enough water for a population of 750,000. The power plant will be one of the largest of its kind in the world and will meet the needs of nearly 2,000,000 people.

The total cost will be \$444 million based on 1965 prices.

The raw economic and technological forces have decreed that this is just the beginning.

The fourth nuclear application to our maritime affairs is that of ship propulsion. Here we have pioneered, we have opened a naval era as we once did with steam power; here we must not allow others to exploit our inventiveness ahead of us as we did with steam. The need for action is urgent and immediate.

We now have 929 ships in the active fleet of which 61% are now over 20 years old, requiring frequent repair and refurbishment to sustain sub-modern levels of performance. In short we have a partly remodeled remnant of the great battle fleet assembled for World War II.

In so far as there exists a global military equilibrium, unstable though it may be, it

consists on the one hand, of a preponderance of communist conventional and nuclear land-power on the vast Eurasian continent-opposed on the other hand by a far flung maritime alliance of rimlands and islands with its principal power emanating from the North American continent. The 41 Nation alliance system centered economically and militarily on the United States includes only three non-maritime members; *the whole thing hangs together by sea power*. Indeed, the United States cannot bring conventional military force to bear abroad on a large scale except by sea, and it is the use of sea power that has made her effectively the only global power. It is noteworthy in this regard that the decisive points of American military response to communist challenge—Greece, Turkey, Korea, Taiwan, Germany, Lebanon, Cuba, Congo, Santo Domingo, Viet Nam and Thailand are all at the water's edge; all were commitments of military force that could not be contemplated without certainty of naval supremacy.

The point of most crucial importance here is that if the present balance of world power is to be maintained, the forces opposing communist expansion clearly must retain that oceanic supremacy upon which their alliances were originally built. A balance of sea power with the Soviets would assure an extreme imbalance of world power.

Our Allies such as Britain, France and Japan which have traditionally kept strong naval forces are in a nadir of their sea power—in fact, these fleets are now operating only as instruments of local interest and as auxiliaries of the United States Navy. And, as has recently been brought to the public eye by our most respected journals, the communist forces are mounting a powerful military and political challenge to allied oceanic supremacy.

It is at this point that our battle fleet is overtaken by age, events and new technology.

The requirement is for new, flexible, high speed naval combat and land-war-support units, essentially capable of sustained, global operation without foreign bases, without the vulnerable, tell-tale tethers of the presently necessary tanker trains, possessing the generating power to operate the most sophisticated electronic surveillance, guidance and defensive devices.

In short we require the truly revolutionary advantages of nuclear naval forces.

By this I do not mean conventional ships merely fitted with nuclear power plants, nor naval task forces possessing one or two nuclear units, but limited in performance by essential non-nuclear units. I am talking about a new generation of naval instruments designed for and around nuclear propulsion manned by a complement of trained nuclear seamen, and enjoying the range of tactics and strategy permitted by the capabilities of nuclear propulsion.

We start with a nuclear technology in its infancy which yields a mobile naval fighting unit at least 20 per cent more effective, but only 3 to 6 per cent more expensive than that provided by oil power technology at its maturity. There is simply no further justification for delay.

Within the past year it appears that the Defense Department finally got the message. We are moving ahead with funding for three new nuclear-powered carriers and six other combat vessels. We can reasonably expect a sharp acceleration in the coming years.

Our merchant marine is in far worse shape than our Navy. Since 1951 the world merchant fleet grew by 62% while U.S. merchant marine shipping dropped 26%. With U.S. ocean borne trade now amounting to over \$36 billion yearly, U.S. shipping is carrying only 7.2% of it. Aside from security considerations, this amounts to a very heavy balance of payments outflow for shipping services.

Both the President and Congress have evidenced decisive concern this year.

The economic realities dictate the way in which we can revitalize our merchant marine and make it competitive. The new American merchant ship must be capital and technology intensive, lightly manned, very large, very fast, quickly turned around, and capable of a sustained, high ratio of at-sea to in-ports time. In short it must be highly automated, containerized, and of a size and speed—30 knots cruising speed at least—that make nuclear power the most feasible motive source.

We have broken the ice with regard to labor arrangements, public acceptance and port accommodations with the Savannah. It has been costly. We have also learned much in the ship's experimental operation that will improve the design and mechanics of future nuclear commercial vessels. Germany is already profiting by these lessons in her large nuclear powered ore carrier, the *Otto-Han*. Japan will be building her first nuclear cargo vessel soon. But we still retain a tremendous technological edge. We must not fritter it away.

Ten years ago the world's first central nuclear power station went into operation at Shippingport, Pennsylvania. In 1967 there were 15 operating central nuclear power stations with commitments placed for 61 more. In little over a decade we have gone from one nuclear submarine to almost 80 and in a very real sense we have just discovered the ocean. The South is richly endowed with both nuclear engineering and development resources—and oceanic experience and enterprises. It is no accident that Oak Ridge has just won a \$100,000 contract from A.E.C. to become the single central marine nuclear power technology repository for the Nation. By all means, let us fully exploit and contribute to the tremendously promising and powerfully growing new field of oceanic nuclear development.

The "Pueblo" Incident

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been 92 days since the Navy intelligence ship *Pueblo* with 83 Americans aboard was captured by the North Koreans on the high seas in an outrageous act of piracy. Ship and crew are still being held.

The Communists are issuing statements continuously concerning alleged "confessions" by the *Pueblo's* crew. We do not know how these statements are purportedly being wrung out of our military men. The American people can read and hear Communist propaganda every day. Yet our own Government remains silent. None of us can find out what efforts, if any, are being made to get back our ship and men.

Many concerned residents of my congressional district have written me expressing their indignation. In order that the President might know just how the people of the country feel about our Government's secrecy and inactivity, I am forwarding the letters to the White House.

It is lamentable that the Communists are being handed the opportunity to

propagandize the world through the weakness of the U.S. Government's approach to the *Pueblo* crisis. Our intelligence codes have been compromised. A fifth-rate nation has barbarously seized one of our military vessels—supposedly representing the military might of what the Defense Department likes to call the strongest Nation on earth. Yet nothing has been done.

I call upon the President to make a report to the public on just what is being done to set these men free and bring back our ship. It is obvious that, if negotiations are underway, they have not been fruitful. To allow this action to go unpunished and unrighted will just encourage other outrages against our people and equipment.

It is time to tell the American people the truth about the *Pueblo*, Mr. President.

Anarchy or the Rule of Law: A Simple Choice

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, the rising crime rate in this country over the past several years has been cause for grave concern to all of us in public life and the events of recent weeks give us further cause for such concern.

Mayor Daley's "shoot and maim" approach on the one extreme is countered by the insistence that the problem will go away if the police turn their backs on it. Neither approach will solve the problem. There is only one way to gain respect for the rule of law and that is to enforce the law.

What an imbalance of justice that thousands of prisoners in our penitentiaries are there because they put a torch to a building and yet our police are to execute arsonists without trial under the Daley technique or under the liberal concept, to overlook the crime during its perpetration.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to have respect for the law it must be enforced to its own full measure, or we have anarchy. I am reminded of a letter in my files which I received last November, which I am impelled to submit for the RECORD with the permission of the writer, but respecting his anonymity. My correspondent writes as follows:

HON. JAMES GROVER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The latest statistics that are found in the daily newspapers in regard to crime in America is astonishing to say the least. The way crime is spreading, it will be no time before it will be impossible to be safe even in such places as previously "unmarred" towns in this country. The non-sense reasoning that goes into the programs of handling the criminal element makes no sense at all. Hardened criminals of all kinds are let free because of some loop-hole in the law, police officers are being made to look like some sort of a blood-thirsty monster bent on destroying society by attempting to en-

force the law, which was supposedly his calling in the first place. It looks as though the police cannot even save the average person from himself, let alone a hardened criminal. The only real deterrent that a criminal really feared has been all but taken out of our society completely: the death penalty. Schools (public and private alike) are now appealing to the "goodness" in the students so that they can prevent riots and general disobedience, instead of using a punitive measure known to have controlled thousands of rebellious students over the years in years past, namely a sound thrashing. The neighborhood theaters are becoming, very rapidly, dumping grounds for filth movies, perversion of the worst kind, so called "adult" films, films that even a hardened pornographer would admit was good for the pornography business. Motorcycle gangs roam the streets terrorizing the citizenry; rape and mugging, holdups, burglaries, assaults are so common that most of them never are reported by the news media. In New York City alone the latest statistics show over 100,000 robberies of various nature and 1,700 rape cases, and that is for the first nine months of 1967! This is a national disgrace.

I am the father of five children, 3 boys and 2 girls. Never in the past has been my wife or I so fearful of their well-being as we have been in the latest few years and that fear is ever increasing. Fortunately, my oldest children are the 3 boys, one in the Air Force, one going into the Air Force, and the third still in high school. They have been models of good citizens, well-behaved children and obedient to us as parents and to God as their creator. My 2 girls now are my chief concern, one being 16 and the other 13. We live in a very nice neighborhood, but even here, the fear is high with our neighbors as well as us. When will we be a target? Is anyone safe at all? Believe me, Mr. Grover, I am definitely not a man driven to easy fears. I have been through too much in my life to fear very many things. But I do fear the insatiable growth of crime, dope addiction, and in general the destruction of the very heart of our society—our youth. Is this all part of a Communist plot to destroy us by destroying our very seeds for tomorrow's world? Is it a massive plot by the big syndicates to engulf us all in a society that is made up of mindless, disobedient beings without conscience to react to their whims and to pay endless tribute to them? Just what is it?

Of course there is a solution, I believe that part of the solution is being formulated by the latest development in the case of the young girl that was nailed to a tree down in Florida. Governor Kirk had the great courage to have these abominations (the perpetrators of the deed) tracked down and taken back to Florida to face justice. This is what it takes to turn the tide the other way. America cries out for men of courage in public office to seize the initiative from the criminal element and smash their activities in the hardest way possible, to have these misfits publicly displayed as Governor Kirk did through the news media (if I had my say, they would face a public flogging post), and to punish them to the fullest extent of the law, and if that law has been watered down by the professional social workers and psychologists who favor the "humane" treatment of criminals, then that law should be amended to incorporate measures to have the "punishment fit the crime".

In short, we need men of good moral character who think of America and the future of America before their own desires, men who will turn the tide of this flood before it surely engulfs us all. It is my opinion that men in your position as our elected representatives can do this by uniting together to bring about a solution and a rapid one to stave off this cancer. After all, it is for your protection as any one else. Perhaps you may have already sponsored a bill of this type, or one of

your colleagues may have. I know from past experience in getting acquainted with your record that you have sponsored many fine bills designed to help support the American traditions, and the general well-being of citizenry as a whole. I would be very interested to know if such a bill, and I don't mean the one the administration proposes as that is rotten with loopholes, such a bill that will really demonstrate to the criminal that the great Congress of the United States means business.

I love America dearly, as I am sure that you and the other members of the Congress surely do. To stand by and see the things happening that tear out the very soul of this great country that so many died for, is really heart-breaking. There are countless thousands, perhaps millions that feel the same way I do. People look for leadership, they want a man to give them the moral strength and example of purpose that many of our former great leaders demonstrated during perilous times of the past. I am more than convinced that we are facing the most crucial period in the history of this country. The public is sick of the type of leadership that has been demonstrated by recent leaders and want more than the small handout of information that is given them in regard to wars, spending programs that send millions (even billions) down rat holes with little to no regard to who will pay for these things in the years yet to come. No I am not a prophet of doom, but it would take a pretty shortsighted individual to not see that we are heading toward the brink of disaster.

Please do not think that I am without hope. As long as there are men such as yourself that are willing to serve in the way you do, we can have hope. It is just that real steps must be taken. If there is any way I can serve you in any capacity as a layman, I am at your call.

I am enclosing a picture of my oldest son. I hope you don't mind me taking this liberty, but I just want you to see the kind of man that is among the thousands of other good Americans that are willing to serve their country when called upon. My other son leaves for the Air Force on the 7th of December, 1967, with the same firm attitude that he is willing to serve. I think that if more publicity were given the youngsters that serve their country willingly in silence, rather than to the "hippie" type with their unshaven, dirty countenances spread all over the press, we would have at least taken one good step forward toward decency.

It is with a humble heart that I thank God that I live in a country that the right to communicate with one's elected representative still remains open to him.

With best wishes for your continued success and health, and may God bless you and your family, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

A CONCERNED CONSTITUENT.

Secretaries Week

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BROYHILL. of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity today, set aside as Secretaries Day, to congratulate the National Secretaries Association and its member organizations throughout our Nation, on the celebration of their 17th consecutive Secretaries Week, April 21 through April 27.

Secretaries Week was originated in 1952 by the National Secretaries Associa-

tion in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Commerce. It was always meant to be shared by all secretaries, regardless of their membership in the organization, but this year's observance marks the first time that men, who have recently become eligible for membership under association bylaws changes, will join in NSA chapter Secretaries Week activities. These projects include seminars, workshops, study groups, and participation in career days in cooperation with local school systems.

The theme for Secretaries Week, "Better Secretaries Mean Better Business," underscores one of the basic reasons that Secretaries Week was established; to serve as a reminder to secretaries of their responsibilities to their employers and to their profession. It also serves to bring recognition to secretaries for the vital role they play in business, industry, education, government, and the professions.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to congratulate all secretaries, and to pay special tribute to my own devoted staff, on this very important day.

An Affluent Society of Bankrupts

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, among the many newly publicized rights we now find a guaranteed right to go bankrupt.

Some of the public may feel the creditors—the merchants and like—are to blame for making credit so easy. Few have taken the time to analyze who pays for the stampede to bankruptcy—the buying public, of course. The bankrupt's loss is just added to overhead and the unwary public picks up the bill.

Then, of course, TV plays its educational role by teaching everyone to live equally—with the successful Joneses—whether they can afford it or not.

But who would believe that the once straight-laced, free enterprise publication known as the Wall Street Journal would turn into a bankrupt promotional manual. With a front-page explanation of the bankruptcy proceedings and praise at the use of Federal funds—taxpayers' dollars—used to subsidize bankruptcy.

Now, if only we could extend bankruptcy to beating Federal income taxes. Some may soon ask, Why discriminate against private enterprise and for Government programs?

Mr. Speaker, I include the front-page article of the Wall Street Journal for April 16, as follows:

BANKRUPTCY BOOM: MORE PEOPLE PETITION TO HAVE DEBTS ERASED AS SOCIAL STIGMA FADES—BOB LANG AND SAMUEL W. GET NEW START AFTER YEARS OF EXCESSIVE BORROWING—SURPRISED AT HOW EASY IT IS

(By Everett Groseclose)

NEW YORK.—To the old-fashioned moralist, bankruptcy meant ruin and disgrace. But to a growing number of today's Americans, it means something quite different.

To Robert S. Lang it means, among other things, the ability to buy his wife a \$220

washing machine and his son a \$4 toy racing car. He couldn't afford them a few months ago; payments on the debts he had run up to rent and elaborately furnish a new apartment in a high-rise building were swallowing nearly all the \$10,000 a year he earns in a city civil service post and a part-time taxi driving job. Before bankruptcy he says, "I wasn't getting any of my check. Now, I'm getting it all."

To Samuel W., a Puerto Rican ghetto dweller, bankruptcy means nothing less than the saving of his life. Deeply in debt after years of borrowing to stretch his \$5,000 annual earnings, unable any longer to arrange new loans to pay off his old ones, and about to lose his warehouse job because his boss was tired of being hounded by his creditors, he was seriously considering suicide a few months ago. "Before I took bankruptcy, I was in a hole and it was getting deeper all the time," he says. "But now I can start living again."

BOOM IN PERSONAL BUST

If these cases aren't entirely typical, it's only because there are too many personal bankruptcies these days for any to be typical. The 191,729 in the year ended last June 30 were up 9% from the previous year, triple the number 10 years earlier and 18 times as many as were recorded 20 years earlier. Moreover, most experts believe liabilities in personal bankruptcies now equal or exceed those in business bankruptcies, which once were far greater. "It's at least a 50-50 thing," contends an official in the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

A handful of these bankruptcies are begun by creditors who petition to have a debtor—generally a once-substantial businessman—forced to sell his possessions and pay what debts he can before all his assets vanish. But the overwhelming majority of bankruptcies voluntarily petition Federal courts (all bankruptcies are governed by Federal law) to declare them unable to pay and wipe out their debts.

Why are there so many more of them in a period of unprecedented general prosperity? At first there would seem to be as many answers as there are bankruptcies. The bankrupts come from all income levels and all occupations: housewives, secretaries, salesmen, dentists, lawyers all show up in court records. The immediate circumstances that triggered their petitions are equally diverse. Marital troubles, garnishment of wages, financially devastating illness and uninsured accidents all play important roles, and many small businessmen file for personal bankruptcy after their firms go bust.

LESS SOCIAL STIGMA

But there are some common denominators. One, most authorities—and many bankrupts—agree, is a weakening of the belief that debts should be paid no matter what the sacrifice, and a consequent lessening of the social stigma that once was attached to bankruptcy. "These days, bankruptcy doesn't mean a thing to the average guy," contends Robert Dolphin Jr., an economist at Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio, who has written extensively on the subject.

Some evidence: Relatively few bankrupts file under Chapter 13 of the Federal Bankruptcy Act, which provides court supervision of a debtor's finances and an extended period, usually three years, to settle his debts. "Most bankrupts hesitate to commit themselves to the very extensive supervision that goes along with Chapter 13," says Herbert Jacob, a political scientist at Harvard who recently studied the social attitudes of 454 bankrupts in Wisconsin.

Instead, the usual petitioner chooses "straight bankruptcy"—a proceeding in which his debts are cancelled after his property, if any, is sold. This might seem a drastic procedure to the home-owner, who would have to sell his house, his car and all but

his "essential" furniture. But to the person whose only major "asset" is his job, it can be relatively painless.

Bob Lang, for one, conceivably could have paid his \$9,869 debts over a three-year period under a Chapter 13 proceeding. But he chose straight bankruptcy, and disclaims any worry about what it might do to the social standing he once considered ultra-important (it was in part a quest for status that led him to attempt to maintain a high-rent, lavishly decorated apartment). "I don't give a damn any more," he says. "I'm not going to worry about my name."

Another thread winding through most bankruptcy proceedings is the ready availability of credit, even in periods of supposedly tight money, to almost anyone who has a steady job—and the temptation it presents to both the well-off Bob Langs and the struggling Sam W's to borrow until they are in debt deeper than they ever intended.

For Bob, credit appeared as the springboard to the Good Life. He hadn't thought about it until a color TV set in a neighborhood store caught his eye a few years ago. Applying for a loan to buy it, he found that his civil-service status, promising job security for the 20 years until his retirement, made lenders eager to sign him up. From then on, he says, "I was like a drug addict, except that I was a buying addict."

After buying the TV, Bob decided on a more impressive home. In early 1968 he moved his family out of a modest two-bedroom walkup that rented for \$150 a month into a three-bedroom unit in a new apartment tower renting for \$50 a month more. He signed a three-year lease and borrowed \$500 from Neighborhood Finance Co. for moving expenses.

A better home requires better furniture. So Bob bought \$1,200 worth, including a king-size bedroom suite, from R. H. Macy & Co., on a down payment he recalls as \$100. Not content, he signed a few days later for another \$1,500 of furniture from Gimbel Bros. Inc.

About the same time came a 1960 Rambler bought on a \$750 loan from Seaboard Finance Co. By then Bob was short of cash. But no matter; an \$800 personal loan from Bankers Trust Co. not only covered miscellaneous expenses but helped meet some of the payments on the other loans.

For a while. Before he realized it, says Bob, "I was paying out 90% of my check and living on 10%." He began falling behind, and after 10 months' occupancy concluded his dream home wasn't so great; he didn't get along with some of the people who were moving into the building.

The Langs retrenched to a one-bedroom place where Bob and his wife sleep in the living room—on huge sofas, bought for the high-rise apartment, that look startlingly out of place in their newly modest surroundings. But it was too late. Creditors were howling. And now they included the landlord of the high-rise, who held a lease still calling for \$3,253 in further rent payments.

A ROUTINE ACT

"I had seen small businessmen go bankrupt and then come back," says Bob. "I kept thinking it must be a routine act." And indeed, he had only to walk around the corner, up a flight of stairs and into a lawyer's office, where he filled out the necessary forms in two hours. Cost: \$300, including a \$50 filing fee.

For Sam, the ghetto-dwelling warehouseman, the road to bankruptcy was much longer but less complicated. For him, credit was simply a way to stretch his earnings to buy food for his wife and five children, meet occasional medical bills and cover other expenses that always seemed to rise faster than his pay. For instance, he says, his rent has increased to \$83 a month from \$39 over the 17 years he has been borrowing.

Sam began by borrowing from friends, but quickly graduated to finance companies.

Then he fell, like Bob Lang—but much more heavily—into a classic trap: Taking out new loans to pay off old ones, or, as he puts it, "a borrowing from Peter to pay off Paul."

The first "Paul" was Family Finance Corp., from which Sam says he obtained over 20 successive loans between 1951 and 1958. Then he fell behind, and the company demanded payment in full. Enter the first "Peter"—Domestic Finance Corp., which loaned Sam enough to pay off Family Finance with a little to spare. "The extra money was just to get me back on my feet," Sam says.

The new loan did more than that—temporarily. By paying off Family Finance, Sam restored his credit rating; he found he could not only borrow more money from that firm but patronize other finance companies besides. On a surprising scale, too; by the time he finally filed for bankruptcy, he owed \$3,460.

Sam at one point made a half-hearted attempt to consolidate his debts through a loan from First National City bank. But he could never get ahead enough to begin whittling down the total. "I just bounced from one (lender) to the other for a long time," he says. "I was always in hock up to my ears."

Sam nevertheless says he always intended to pay, and he might still be struggling to do so if a kidney ailment hadn't put him in bed for three months late on 1966. When he got back to his plastics warehouse, he found that Domestic Finance, which held a note for \$952, had obtained a garnishment on his wages. That nettled his boss, and when the other creditors began calling too "my boss just told me to go home until I could get it straightened out," he says.

A PRIEST'S REACTION

As a last resort before suicide, Sam went to his priest. "I told him everything and he covered up his head with his hands and said, 'Oh, my God,'" Sam recalls.

The priest gave Sam some pocket money and sent him to Mobilization for Youth Inc., an experimental self-help agency funded by the Federal Government. There, after only preliminary consultation with a staff lawyer, Sam decided on bankruptcy.

Relief from creditors was immediate—as it was for Bob Lang and is for nearly all bankrupts. A court cannot reject a petition for bankruptcy unless it finds the petition fraudulent—because the petitioner is concealing assets, for example. In that case, the petitioner not only is denied bankruptcy, he becomes liable to criminal prosecution. But in the usual case, a man becomes bankrupt "the day he files that petition—on the hour and minute," says a court source.

The later proceedings usually are cut-and-dried too. After a petition is filed, a court referee notifies the bankrupt's creditors. If the man has assets, the referee will arrange a meeting or series of meetings at which the creditors decide on how they will split up the proceeds from the sale of those assets. The creditors also are given a chance to object, at a hearing, to the cancellation of their debts; they may do so if they believe the bankrupt has not dealt honestly with them.

Frequently, however, there are no such complications—as in Bob Lang's case. His petition listed no assets beyond the household furniture the courts let a bankrupt keep (he had sold his car for \$50). And his creditors didn't even bother to show up at his hearing.

Bob was jittery when he saw "a whole courtroom full of people," but discovered to his relief that "they were all there working on other cases." When his case was called, the proceedings lasted less than half an hour. The referee, he says, simply showed him his petition and asked "if I had read and signed and understood it, I affirmed everything" and that was that; he walked out of court with nine debts totaling \$9,869 cancelled and free to spend his pay any way he chose—even to begin accumulating new assets immediately.

"In a way I was surprised at how easy everything was," he says.

Sam's hearing took a bit longer; Family Finance challenged the writing off of a loan, claiming that Sam hadn't informed them of the extent of his other debts when he signed the note. Even so, Sam found the proceedings far different from the nightmare visions of hours of grilling over his finances that he says had him "scared to death for a week" before his hearing. His lawyer, Michael S. Kelsner from Mobilization for Youth, told the judge Sam had made no intentional misstatement, but had signed a blank form that his wife later filled out. The judge decided the case in Sam's favor. The whole affair took an hour and a half.

TEMPTATION STILL

Both men are enjoying their new lives, with cash to spend for the first time in years; Sam says his family now is "eating steak three and four times a week, instead of beans and potatoes." Both he and Bob Lang also vow to have no more to do with credit—"now that I've broken the habit," says Bob.

But the temptation, if it is now being resisted, is still there—for Bob and many others. Many lenders, it's true, shy away from bankrupts. But others actually seek them out—knowing that they cannot legally file again for bankruptcy for six years, and so have no way of escaping garnishment of wages or other collection attempts.

Bob firmly believes he could "go down tomorrow and get all the credit I wanted—I just have a feeling." And Sam doesn't have to theorize. He hands a visitor a letter he got after his bankruptcy from Thrift Furniture Co., informing him, in raised gilt letters, that he had been "selected" as an "AAA-1 Honor Roll Customer" entitled to buy "up to \$100" worth of goods "with no down payment."

Jerry Tannenbaum, president of Thrift Furniture, says Sam's letter was one in a mailing of about 15,000 recently sent out. "Obviously, we weren't aware that he was bankrupt," says Mr. Tannenbaum. He adds that if Sam came into his store to make a credit purchase of more than about \$50, "we would go through our regular credit check and his bankruptcy would show up."

WILL BANKRUPTCY MARCHES BE NEXT FORM OF PROTEST?

Bankruptcy as a form of social protest hasn't yet caught on. But there are those who see it as the next step in confrontations between the poor and the economic power structure.

"If every poor person who is being gouged would file (for) bankruptcy it would be more devastating than any riot you ever say," declares Julius S. Hobson, who heads Associated Community Teams, a Washington civil rights group. For seven months he has been trying to organize "mass bankruptcy marches" of the poor into court to file petitions.

Mr. Hobson admits he not only has failed to organize marches, but has inspired only about 25 people to file individual petitions; to the poor the idea "sounds like an Alice in Wonderland thing and they just don't believe it," he says. But he intends to keep trying, and similar programs are being urged by civil rights and antipoverty groups in New York and some other cities.

Secretaries Week, 1968

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, today, April 24, is Secretaries Day. Since 1952, the National Secretaries Association, In-

ternational, has sponsored this day as part of Secretaries Week, celebrated during the last week in April. The purpose of this observance is to recognize the vital work performed by secretaries in business, government, and the professions, and also to remind secretaries of their responsibilities to their employers and to their calling.

The National Secretaries Association, established in 1942, was founded to promote the educational and professional standards of secretaries. Today, there are more than 24,000 members in 565 chapters. Each year, the organization selects the "International Boss of the Year" and the "Secretary of the Year," and organizes seminars, workshops, special projects, and other functions in observance of Secretaries Week.

Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of the House to this week, which honors the many dedicated professional secretaries. They deserve our congratulations and our thanks.

Hope for Peace in Cyprus

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, for many years the situation in Cyprus has teetered on the edge of catastrophe. Just last November, differences between the Greek and Turkish population raised fears of renewed warfare. President Johnson sent Cyrus Vance to serve as a mediator when Turkey threatened to invade the Cyprus Republic. Mr. Vance was successful. Recent actions by President Makarios have eased tensions to a point where negotiations are underway to resolve disputes.

It is therefore gratifying to read, in the New York Times of April 15, a report that relations have improved between the Greek majority and the Turkish minority on the island, at least in some areas. There is now hope that differences between the two populations can be resolved so peace can once again prevail on that troubled island.

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

CYPRIOTE GROUPS COEXIST AT FAIR—ETHNIC TURK PLAYS CARDS WITH GREEK NEIGHBORS

(By Eric Pace)

MORPHOU, CYPRUS, April 14—'Twas the feast of St. Mamas, the day of the annual Morphine Fair, and twangy Greek music filled the cafe where Hassan Mustafa, his mustache carefully clipped for the occasion, played a long and riotous card game with his Greek Cypriote friends.

"I am amusing myself," the 74-year-old Mr. Mustafa observed, flexing his mustache with a smile. "I was born here, and I like this place."

Mr. Mustafa, an orange grower, was among dozens of Moslem Turkish Cypriots who mixed amiably with throngs of ethnic Greek farmers at the fair, which honors the Greek Cypriote saint.

Prosperous farm villages around this town, which is 23 miles northwest of Nicosia, are overwhelmingly Greek—as is Cyprus as a whole—but the fact that hundreds of Turkish Cypriotes coexist tranquilly in the area gives hope that this Mediterranean island's ethnic troubles can one day be resolved.

HOPE FOR FUTURE SEEN

Peter Loizos, a social anthropologist doing field work on Cyprus for the London School of Economics, said that "the way the Turkish minorities keep living in these villages shows that restraint and trust can go a long way."

A Briton of Greek Cypriote extraction, Mr. Loizos said, "if the political climate cools off, there's no inherent sociological reason why the rest of the island can't return to mixed community life."

The current "troubles," as Cypriotes refer to them, began in 1963, when violence broke out between Greek and Turkish Cypriotes. The latter represent 20 per cent of the population of 620,000. Cyprus became independent of Britain in 1960.

About 20,000 Turkish Cypriotes fled from their villages when the Greek Cypriotes moved in to control them in 1963. Nearly all took refuge in all-Turkish communities or in Nicosia's Turkish quarter, which was fenced off from the rest of the city and until recently sealed off by police roadblocks.

ROADBLOCKS LIFTED

Last month, the roadblocks were lifted by the island's all-Greek Cypriote Government as a conciliatory gesture. The Government hopes to start negotiations soon toward linking the two communities politically. The Greek and Turkish Cypriotes have been engaged in periodic skirmishing over the last four years despite the efforts of a United Nations peacekeeping force.

The Greek Cypriote police kept watch over Morphou's teeming streets today but Mr. Mustafa and the other Turkish Cypriotes moved about in peace.

Quilts and mattresses made by Turkish Cypriotes were on sale in the courtyard of the church of St. Mamas although the people who sewed them stayed away.

Down the road, Mustafa Salih, a Turkish Cypriote farmer from Aya Irini, an ethnically mixed village nine miles from here, hawked disks of yellow cheese, intoning in Greek "kala halumnia," or good cheese. With the proceeds from his wares, he bought a record of songs in Greek.

WOMEN IN TURKISH STYLES

Swarthy from the sun, Turkish Cypriote workmen like Ali Hassan were virtually indistinguishable from the Greek Cypriotes. But their women, who wore Turkish-style fringed kerchiefs, gave them away.

"I'm very satisfied here," Mr. Hassan boomed to a Greek Cypriote interpreter as he strolled past the market stalls, where toy pistols and portraits of President Makarios hung.

According to Greek Cypriotes in Morphou, the last major violence in this area was in 1964 when Greek Cypriotes shot up a Turkish Cypriote roadblock on a highway west of here.

Since then, they say, calm has prevailed, although Turkish Cypriotes in Nicosia contend that Greek Cypriotes have stolen oranges from Turkish Cypriote orchards near the town.

One minor Greek Cypriote official, who owns an orange orchard here, said that Turkish Cypriote women "work in my orchard, and they try hard not to harm the trees when they pick the fruit."

"They work well—just like Greek Cypriotes," he added.

The "Pueblo": How Long, Mr. President?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 93d day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

Our Machine Is Dented

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the civil strife that we have just witnessed throughout our Nation, the American people have been subjected to a spate of self-righteous oratory about the need to preserve civil order at any cost. This concern for orderly progress is commendable; I only wish that it were accompanied more by concern about the fundamental causes of that strife.

As a white American, I must admit that I cannot fully comprehend the social barbarity that black Americans are forced to endure daily, even in the year 1968. White Americans will probably never reach any complete understanding since we learn of black degradation only through the verbal testimony of some Negroes. If our knowledge and understanding of the frustration, despair, and rage in our ghettos is limited, we must acknowledge a grave responsibility to give our full attention to those black Americans who can reach us with their words.

Dick Gregory has shown us that he can communicate with white America. In an address before Yale College's senior class dinner last winter, he tells it very much like it is, and in exceptionally moving terms. His address, which was reprinted in the Washington Post on April 14, 1968, and which deserves our closest attention, follows:

GREGORY REMEMBERS SELMA

(By Dick Gregory)

(NOTE.—The following is excerpted from Gregory's address to a Yale senior class dinner in the middle of his 32-day fast protesting the Vietnam war. The comedian began with a joke about his wife's cooking, then held the 800 seniors transfixed for an hour and a half. He was given a five-minute ovation at the end of his speech. The excerpts are reprinted from the Yale Alumni Magazine.)

I am not here to impress you tonight, only to inform you, and when we walk out of here I could care less about what you think of me. I have the one consolation of knowing that whenever we wake up—this year, next year, 20 years from now—you will always be able to say, Brother Greg didn't lie to us.

As far as I am concerned, the No. 1 problem confronting this country today is not the problem of air pollution, but the problem of moral pollution. You young kids who are going out to face the world immediately, you are going to have to face this problem like no Americans have ever had to face it.

Don't get me wrong, I am not here asking you to do a damn thing for colored folks; please understand, I am not asking you to do no favors for me. I couldn't give a damn less what you do with your life, but I am saying you had better understand what's going on to protect your own self, because older folks, black and white, have used up all the lies and all the tricks.

Now you are going to have to deal with this problem. And by that I don't mean solve it, but you'll have to understand it. You will have to become a little more honest than we have been, and even if you wanted to solve the problem, we are going to have to stop passing the buck and become totally honest,

and realize that America is the No. 1 racist country on the face of this earth, bar none.

Now, a lot of times when a black man says that, white folks get up tight. Well, if anybody get up tight just now, that's the racism in your own head. I did not say American white folks were the No. 1 racists on the face of the earth, I said America; and one day when we realize that black and white folks in this country are Americans, then maybe when you hear that statement you will realize that means black folks and white folks.

I don't know why this white society is so frightened to realize that colored folks are racists. Why not? We learned it from you. And we have watched you for 400 years.

YOUR SWEATY HAND

You should have been with us when we had to integrate the schools down South, going around to black folks' houses the whole months of July and August when most folks are on their vacation and making some extra money, convincing those black folks that we need their kids to integrate the schools.

The white folks are saying, "We don't want to integrate the schools," they're saying, "The schools are integrated and no colored folks will show." And so you finally get 12 families that are going to let you send their kids. You get out of bed and go to the headquarters, but you find that you haven't got 12 kids, you've got eight—four of them copped out overnight. So you go and you pick up your kids. I know, I was there.

It's a hell of a thing to go and pick up a 5-year-old kid, put him in the car, and you don't know if you are going to live or die that day. But you realize that all 5-year-old kids act the same, he acts the same way you were acting your first day in school—talking about playing in the sand and talking about chalking.

And then he asks you, "Where's mommy and daddy?" And you lie to him, you say they, well they'll pick you up one day.

And you pull up to the school and you see the policemen barricading it, and the sheriff says, "Where you going, nigger?" and you say, "I'm going to school," and he says, "You can't bring that damn car in here," and you park the car and you get out and you're walking down the street with a 5-year-old black hand in the palm of your hand and you're kind of embarrassed because the 5-year-old hand is steady and yours is shaking. The inside of your hand is soaking wet from sweat and none of it's that 5-year-old kid's, it's all yours, because about 50 feet away—where you've got to walk up those stairs and get into school—you see something and you know what it means.

A BRICK IN THE MOUTH

You're not only being attacked by the mob, but by the police, and the first thing you know you land in the gutter with that cracker's foot on your chest and a double-barreled shotgun on your throat saying, "Move, nigger, and I'll kill you," and you're scared, man, you're scared to death.

Then you realize today is your turn to die, and you stop being so scared and you start relating with reality and you look around and you see the FBI taking pictures that will never show. You know what I'm talking about, don't you?

Then you remember that there's a 5-year-old hand missing out of your hand, and as you lie there in the gutter with that rifle at your throat you turn your head to try to find that 5-year-old kid, and you find him just in time to see a brick hit him right in the mouth.

Now, let me talk to you peace people for a minute, and Lord knows, I love you, but you run around demonstrating about napalm and atomic fire—you've never lived till you see a brick hit a 5-year-old kid in the mouth, and then see how the kid can't even react

like a five-year-old kid should react after being hurt. He can't run to the adults because they're spitting on him and kicking at him.

Then they snatch you out of the gutter and put you in the wagon; the last sight you see is a white mother lean over that little kid and spit on him and stomp at him, but filled with so much hate she misses.

That evening you get out of jail on bond—only to find that you've got to get out of town because that black father that you convinced when you showed him the article in the New York Times where the President says he's not going to put up with non-sense—law and order are going to prevail this September—that black father you convinced that nobody is going to harm his kid, that someone was going to protect him, that's the one that when he looked at his 5-year-old kid's mouth hit with that brick, he got his double-barreled shotgun and he's been at SNCC headquarters all day looking for you. He's going to kill you because you promised; he ain't going to kill them crackers, he's going to kill you—sc now you get out of town.

THE HUNGRY MIND

That's what Stokely Carmichael and Rap Brown have been through for six years, when you didn't even know there was a movement. They don't give a damn about what you think now, because they know damn good and well, baby, if you went through the same treatment they went through, half of you would have committed suicide and the other half would be burning this damn country down to the ground.

Today in America, black folks have a full stomach but a hungry mind, and a hungry mind will not tolerate the things that an empty stomach did. Empty stomachs deal on smell, and hungry minds deal on sound, and all at once this country doesn't sound right to us any more, whether you like it or not.

We don't want to hear about progress. We know who has made progress in this country. When white Americans came to this country, they came here as individuals; they say white folks started off plus five. When black folks came to this country, we came in slave shackles, we say we started off minus five.

Now, let's balance it up today. White folks are still plus five and black folks are plus four. We moved nine digits to your none. You don't even qualify to judge progress in this country.

A SLAVE'S PRAYER

I've got six black babies at home, and every time my old lady gets pregnant I realize how much progress we've made. Every time I look at my old lady's black belly getting big, I see nothing but progress, because I remember that just 100 years ago in the slave tent when that black pregnant slave woman stepped up to her black slave man and said, "Honey, I'm pregnant," those two black slaves fell on their knees and prayed to their God that their unborn baby would be born deformed. You try making that prayer one day just for kicks and see how you feel.

They had enough wisdom, though, when they get on their knees and prayed to God: "Please let this baby be born with a limb missing or a hump in his back or maladjusted, Lord, because we are dealing with such a vicious red-necked cracker that if this baby is maladjusted he'll never be sold."

And one day she rushed back up to her man with tears of joy saying "Look honey, the Lord's answered our prayers, does his head look funny, I think he's going to be maladjusted." And those two black people fell back on their knees, praying tears of joy to their God thanking him for a maladjusted baby, a baby that could never be sold into slavery.

Well, I've got six black babies at home that me and my old lady never had to pray for nothing, let alone a maladjusted baby.

That's all the progress we're going to give you.

How many of you read where Henry Ford 3½ weeks ago hired 6000 Negroes? Any of you read that in the paper? Did you also read that they didn't have to take the tests when they hired them?

Now, you know for 25 years the sociologists in this country and all over the world have been telling America that it is the test they give that keeps us out of work. Don't ask me about caviar on a test when you have kept me in a damn ghetto all my life.

The top educators could not get this country to knock out the tests, but Henry Ford, head of one of the largest corporations in the world, hired 6000 niggers in two days, and why do you think he hired them—because of non-violence? You damn right know it wasn't. The fire got too close to the Ford plant. Don't scorch the Mustangs, baby.

You all are running around talking about how much riots hurt. Man, do you realize how long it would have taken us under peaceful channels to have 6000 black folk hired?

AN ALIEN TONGUE

The Puerto Ricans had a riot in Chicago two summers ago and everybody ran around saying riots hurt. That's because you are so dumb and ignorant you don't even know what's going on in this country. We explained to you the Puerto Rican situation in Chicago for ten years.

The Puerto Ricans said give us some Puerto Rican cops, which is a legitimate gripe—how would you like living in a community that spoke nothing but Spanish dealing with a police department that understood nothing but English and, Lord knows, we don't pay the police enough to understand that. How would you like it, you and your loved ones living in a community that spoke one language and the cop, your helper, spoke another one?

Here, four years ago in Chicago, two Puerto Ricans, patriots I guess you would call them, saw two of their Puerto Rican brothers sticking up a white filling station and they rushed around the corner like good citizens are supposed to do to report it to two white detectives. But because they spoke Spanish, the white detectives thought they were being attacked and shot one of them in the back and beat the other one unconscious. All they were doing was trying to save my brother sticking up your brother.

How would you like living in a community that spoke Spanish and you come home one day and there's your loved one lying on the floor, scalded halfway to death because the hot water tank blew up on her, and you rush out to get help and start speaking Spanish to an English-understanding cop? Maybe then you would understand some of the problems these people are talking about while you are so damn busy living up on your end of town. You want your town segregated, you better check and find out what that polecat's going through or you're going to be in trouble.

Every year they go down and say we need Puerto Rican cops and the city fathers say, now, wait, the law of Chicago says in order to be a cop in Chicago you must be 5 feet 9 inches tall. When you have laws like that, you don't need to have anything against Puerto Ricans.

So for some unknown reason, the summer of '66, the Puerto Ricans came out on the street and tore up that city for three days—I don't want anybody telling riots hurt—I guess what nobody told you is the third day they lowered the standard two inches. I am just damn glad the Puerto Ricans didn't throw bricks in Chicago for 75 days, man. Two inches for every three days, man, we would have had little short midgets on the Chicago police force.

A MELLOWING KICK

You see, America ain't nothing but a cigarette machine now: you can't communicate with her.

You know if you're running through the airport and put 40 cents in the cigarette machine, pull it and you don't get cigarettes, that's a funny feeling when you can't talk to that machine. You go up to the ticket counter and you say, "Look, I just put my money in the cigarette machine," and the girl says, "Look, I work for TWA, I just write tickets, I have nothing to do with that machine." You sa-, "Well, look miss, somebody tell me." She says, "Well, look, go back and look at the little mirror there, you see yourself and there's a little message to tell you what to do if you blow your dough."

And you go back and there it is. "Welcome to Hartford, Connecticut. In case of problems with this machine, call Giddings Jones, Kansas City, Missouri." Now you hear the last call for your flight and you stand there looking at that cigarette machine that you can't relate with and that's got your 40 cents and your flight's leaving, so you do the normal thing—you kick that machine—pow.

You don't get no money, but you see that old dent in it and you feel pretty good. You go on down there and get your plane feeling, well, you feel mellow. Let me tell you something, when you kick that machine, if that machine had kicked you back, you would have canceled your flight and taken that damn machine outside and torn it up in little pieces.

Now, let's see if this is funny. America is a cigarette machine to us. We didn't put 40 cents in it to get something that was going to make us sick. We put 400 years of our lives in that machine, baby, to get something that was going to make us well, and, we didn't get nothing, man, and we went to every ticket counter and they kept sending us to Kansas City, so in the form of Detroit, Watts and Chicago we kicked that machine and in the form of the National Guard and the police that machine kicked us back, and we're going to do the same thing you would. We say, cancel the flight, we're going to break this machine up in little bitty pieces, that's what we say.

THE TRUE SLAVERY

A free man is nothing but a man with no fears. If a man fears me living in his neighborhood, eating in his restaurants, dating his daughter, going to his schools, he's my slave whether he wants to be one or not. And he's more my slave than my ancestors ever were to his, because when my forefathers broke that chain off the black ankle and split to Canada, they were free.

Once you become enslaved in your head, you never get free. A white cracker from America can go to Moscow, Russia, man, and see a nigger with a white woman, and he goes crazy because he takes his enslavement with him all over the world.

I go all over, but this is the first time I've talked to a group where 98 per cent is fixing to be dumped into the system, and that's why I feel it's so extremely important.

I'm very bitter, and I'm very angry. I don't hate America. I don't go for "isms." I imagine if I was born in Russia, I'd probably be fighting just as hard to clean Russia up, but this is my home and I don't intend to go anywhere.

But I do see all the mistakes that we left on you, and I hope that you will rectify them. It's a hell of a thing to ask you, but I hope you will for the benefit of the whole world, because the Constitution of the United States is a good piece of paper.

No one has ever made it work right yet, and I say, let's do make it right. We might decide to tear it up after we do it, but let's first make it right.

What Would Teddy Do?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, in these times when America, the world's most powerful country, has firmly established herself as a "paper tiger" nation, it is refreshing to hear a voice crying out against concession and compromise.

The Guthrie Center Times, a weekly newspaper published in Iowa's Seventh District, has reminded its readers in an editorial what America used to be like under the "walk softly and carry a big stick" policy of President Theodore Roosevelt.

Using the strength of Teddy Roosevelt as an example, the editorial points out the weakness of America today and suggests that a change is long overdue. The editorial follows:

WHAT WOULD TEDDY DO?

People under the age of 50 cannot recall Teddy Roosevelt as president. In history he is given credit for being a man with a mind of his own, a man who guided the country through international intrigue and domestic misunderstanding with a policy based on "walk softly and carry a big stick."

What would Teddy Roosevelt do if he were alive today? It is interesting to speculate about this because Uncle Sam has had to do some mighty soft walking lately but it seems to lack a big stick.

Take the case of the ship, Pueblo, now in North Korea's possession around 2½ months. Threats have come out of that little country stipulating what the USA must do—or else.

Take North Vietnam. During a truce period (Tet) the Viet Cong and North Vietnam struck the most savage blows of the war—in fact, the worst in almost three decades of war in that area. Losses in life for Americans were not so heavy but material loss will go into the hundreds of millions.

Take protestors for civil rights. They ignore the rights of others as they demand rights for themselves. In some cases they have indicated that they cannot be depriving others of rights since some of the rights of others are unlawful.

Consider the collegians who demand that visits of armed forces and munitions recruiters to campuses be stopped. They are belligerent in their claims that such people have no right recruiting college men and women—in other words, they would deprive those who desire to serve, the right to hear about what the armed forces and the legitimate industries of this nation have to offer.

How about those loudmouths who get up when prominent speakers are to talk and create such disturbances the speaker finally gives up? The protests are against what the scheduled speaker has to say, therefore they would deny him the right to say it.

Then there's our "friend" in France, General DeGaulle. How would Teddy deal with him? We have a notion the general would be told to start putting up some of the money France owes the US or shut his face.

We like to think if Teddy had been around Cuba might still be "on limits" for American tourists, a free and happy nation instead of one under rigid control of Communist bosses.

There are all sorts of conceptions of what Teddy might do, if he were just available. However, once you mention such a thought someone is sure to come up with the fact

that Teddy lived in a different age and what was once done can no longer be done. To that we say: Times might change but it's doubtful if Teddy would.

Besides, with all the troubles we have as a world power, isn't it just possible that with strong leadership such as Teddy provided we might have fewer problems today if his type of man had continued to hold office? Don't tell us we would be in any deeper than we are now with our present policy!

Well, there is no Teddy Roosevelt and there are problems. Perhaps somewhere in the political pot that is bubbling over there is a man who will be elected who will act like the President of the strongest nation on earth, act with a firm conviction if the right of this country to do what it sees as the right and build up confidence of his own people and people of other lands in this government of ours.

As it is, we are despised where we have helped much. Our efforts to cater to the whims of every little two-bit nation right up to the other world power have led us deeper and deeper into involved situations from which we are finding it difficult to escape.

Teddy, we miss you. Since you can't come back, however, it may be necessary to borrow a few ideas from you. It is possible you marched to a different cadence than the one leaders hear today—and it's also possible the leaders today are listening to the wrong cadence.

Surely a change is worth considering. We don't need our communist-line agitators stirring up a lot of trouble and we don't need to handle them with kid gloves. The rights they demand for themselves are being sought through channels which would deprive the rest of us some of our rights.—C.E.G.

W. Marvin Watson, Postmaster General

HON. RICHARD WHITE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I learned with great pleasure of the enthusiastic and unanimous approval which the U.S. Senate gave to the appointment of my longtime friend and fellow Texan, W. Marvin Watson, to the position of Postmaster General.

I had known Marvin Watson in Texas, and knew of the high regard in which he was held throughout the State. When I came to Congress 3 years ago, it was a source of strength to me, as a new Congressman, to know that this able and conscientious public servant was a right hand man to the President. I am sure a great many of my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, have found that relations between the President and the Congress were made smoother and more pleasant because of the work of Marvin Watson.

The Post Office Department touches the lives of more people than does any other department of Government. It is a part of our daily lives, and W. Marvin Watson is the right man to head such a department. With the interest of the people at heart, with confidence in the future of our Nation, and with the ability to work with others to accomplish his high purposes, W. Marvin Watson will justify our faith and confidence, and will be one of the great Postmasters General of our history.

I wish him every success.

Financial Disclosure, 1967

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, with the hope that the recently approved House ethics code will be strengthened to provide for an open disclosure of the sources and the full amount of each Member's yearly income, I am again this year voluntarily submitting to the public a statement of my personal finances. I think the voters would benefit if all candidates for Congress in the 39th District of New York would make open financial disclosures for 1967.

THE 1967 FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD D. McCARTHY

As of December 31, 1967, my assets consist mainly of two homes one in Buffalo and one in Bethesda, Maryland. I estimate my equity in these at \$16,000.

My personal property consists of a 1965 Ford automobile, miscellaneous personal property including furniture and clothing with a total value of \$12,000. In addition, I have cash and other family assets of \$8,000.

Aside from mortgage debts on both homes, I have no major outstanding indebtedness. All gifts valued over \$8.00 were returned. I have no other business except that of 39th District Representative. During 1967, I took no trips outside the United States at government expense.

My income in 1967 was as follows:

Salary	\$30,000
Rent from home in Buffalo.....	1,410
Articles written for publication....	535
Total	\$31,945

Itemized listing of expenses incurred in the conduct of Congressional duties which were not paid by the federal government:

Travel:	
To, from, and within the 39th District	\$2,005.57
Round trip to Vietnam.....	1,851.40
Total travel.....	3,856.97
Buffalo office equipment expenses.....	400.50
Washington office expenses.....	368.64

Printing:	
"Washington Report" mailed to every household in the district	772.00
Guide for visitors, "What To Do With Children in Washington"	446.00
News reprints.....	119.44
Total printing.....	1,337.44

Subscriptions to newspapers and periodicals	423.84
TV films, recording, and photography	62.00
Dues	52.50
Tickets for political dinners, luncheons, and program patrons expenses	1,117.26
Miscellaneous (small contributions, flowers, and so forth)....	387.72
Total expenses.....	8,006.87

No member of my family serves on my paid Congressional staff.

Members of Congress receive annual allowances for stationery, stamps, telephone, telegraph and for their Washington and home offices. They are also reimbursed for one trip to and from their home districts for each month that Congress is in session

plus one round trip at the beginning of each session. However, for me, and I assume I'm like most members in this respect, the allowances are not sufficient to cover expenses actually incurred.

My 1967 taxes (Federal, State of New York, City of Buffalo, Erie County and Montgomery County, Md.) totaled \$4,912.70.

Congressman Shriver Delivers the Principal Address at Christening of the U.S.S. "Wichita" (AOR-1)

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague and good friend from the Sunflower State, the Honorable GARNER E. SHRIVER, of Kansas, recently delivered the principal address at the christening of a very important new naval vessel, the U.S.S. *Wichita* (AOR-1).

The ceremony took place March 16 at the Quincy Yard, General Dynamics Corp., Quincy, Mass., one of the Nation's great shipbuilding facilities.

The choice of Congressman SHRIVER as principal speaker was especially appropriate, inasmuch as he bears impressive and important credentials as a long-time representative to both State and Federal legislative bodies from the distinguished city for which the new ship is named.

Moreover, Congressman SHRIVER has an abiding interest in the U.S. Navy, stemming from his distinguished World War II service as both an enlisted man and an officer.

The new *Wichita*, a replenishment fleet oiler, is the first of a new class of Navy supply ship. She is 659 feet long, will displace 37,360 tons when fully loaded, will be capable of 20-knot speeds and will carry a crew of 389.

Congressman SHRIVER, in his remarks, aptly describes the importance of the new *Wichita* to our fleet, and it is my pleasure to include them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LAUNCHING ADDRESS U.S.S. "WICHITA" (AOR-1)

(By GARNER E. SHRIVER, Member of Congress, Fourth Congressional District of Kansas, Quincy Yard, General Dynamics Corp., Quincy, Mass., March 16, 1968)

We are here today to launch into a career of valuable service with the United States Navy this important ship the U.S.S. *Wichita*. It is the second ship to bear the name, *Wichita*, and like its predecessor, I am confident this great ship will distinguish herself in the service of the Navy and our great country.

The new *Wichita* is the lead of a class of new replenishment oilers which will provide "one stop" replenishment service to the United States fleet. Here at Quincy you are building six of these supply ships, and we are proud that the *Wichita* is the first to be launched.

To you, the workers and builders of this General Dynamics shipyard, I say "Well Done." Today's ship requires highly skilled workmanship, and that is what has gone into the building of the *Wichita*. I am sure each of you feels a personal sense of satisfaction as you see the results of your labor—and you

can be proud of what you are doing in behalf of the freedom and security of America.

It is highly appropriate that Mrs. Mary Lou Yeager is sponsor of this ship. She represents a distinguished Navy family with deep roots in the State of Kansas. Mrs. Yeager is the wife of Lieutenant Howard B. Yeager who currently is on duty with the Naval Supply Systems Command in Washington. Her father-in-law was the late Vice Admiral Howard A. Yeager, who had a distinguished naval career of 39 years. Admiral Yeager and his wife, Mary Jean Bailey, were both native Kansans. They lost their lives in a tragic fire in their quarters at Great Lakes, Illinois, a year ago this week. We know that Mary Lou Yeager will give *Wichita* the spirit, the heart, the integrity and the grace every good ship must have.

It is a high honor for me to participate in this colorful and historic launching ceremony for several reasons.

First, it brings back the memories of my years of military service in World War II as a naval officer with the United States fleet in the Pacific. Of course, I still carry a warm spot in my heart for the Navy. Like many servicemen during those war years, I had time to reflect upon what I would do with my life when Peace was restored. It was during that time that I charted for myself a course which has resulted in a career of 20 years in the public service.

Second, I am proud to be here today because *Wichita* is my hometown, and it is an important part of the 4th Congressional District of Kansas, the District I represent in the United States Congress.

Wichita is the largest city in Kansas with a population of over 280,000 people. It has long played a vital role in the defense of our country. Although *Wichita* is almost at the center of the largest wheat-growing state in the nation, it is the "Detroit of the aviation industry". During World War II, 10 percent of all warplanes for the nation were built in *Wichita*. Today, it continues to build planes, helicopters and other weapons for the war in Vietnam—but it also manufactures business and commercial aircraft which are known around the world.

The good people of *Wichita* are proud and pleased that this fine ship will carry around the world the name of their City which is already known the world around.

I know that Commissioner Walt Keeler, who is here as the official representative of the City of *Wichita* and City Commission, shares in these sentiments of pride and pleasure. His presence in Quincy demonstrates the genuine interest of the people of *Wichita* in this great ship.

Most of all, I am honored to be here today because we are to witness the launching of a fine new ship which is much needed by our Navy, and which will bear the proud name of a distinguished Navy cruiser that gallantly served our country from 1935 to 1947. The first *Wichita* earned 13 battle stars and other awards during operations in World War II.

She was decommissioned on February 3, 1947, after long and faithful service. The name of *Wichita* was stricken from the Navy Register on March 1, 1959. It was not forgotten. Today, nine years later it returns to the list as this modern supply ship. It is capable of providing one-stop replenishment for destroyers through either modern transfer-at-sea techniques or helicopters operating from their landing-launching platforms.

The *Wichita* will supply the fleet with fuel and furnish other needed provisions including torpedoes and guided missiles.

How appropriate it is that she will bring the fuel which is so vital to fleet operation. I am confident the *Wichita* will carry some of this petroleum from Kansas which is the seventh largest oil-producing state in the nation. And a good portion of that industry is headquartered in the City of *Wichita*.

Yes, the U.S.S. *Wichita* will help give our fleet the mobility and flexibility which is so essential, and the means for sustained naval action whenever and wherever needed.

Once again America is involved in a difficult and costly war far away from our shores. We all hope and pray for a successful and early conclusion to the war in Viet Nam.

Meanwhile, until peace is restored again, we are learning that even though we live in a nuclear age, we must at all times be prepared for conventional warfare on land, on sea and in the air. We are learning that missiles are not an effective substitute for either ships, airplanes or the infantryman.

Our experiences in Viet Nam also tell us that we cannot afford to settle for a second class Navy or a second class Merchant Marine. In spite of the great increase in military airlift capacity in recent years, only two percent of the materials needed in Vietnam go by air. The other 98% goes by sea.

There are certainly valid economic, political and military reasons for America to maintain superiority of the seas. There also is the effort of the Soviet Union to establish itself as a world sea power in a real sense. We have witnessed the Soviet capability to sustain a major effort half way around the world in Cuba. And, there is evidence of a strong Soviet naval presence in the Middle East.

The preservation of our freedom and security requires seapower—and there is a growing recognition of this among many members of the Congress. Here at General Dynamics you know the needs and you are helping to meet them.

History tells us—and the present state of the world underscores it—that the realization of our hopes for peace, security and freedom will be imperiled unless through adequate measures for the national defense, we continue to provide the shield behind which democracy and free enterprise can flourish irrespective of any present or future military threat to our nation's security.

Freedom today does not come cheaply or easily. It never has in our country's history. The protective shield behind which we live and prosper is expensive.

Americans have demonstrated throughout our history they are willing to make the necessary sacrifices and pay the price for the freedoms we all enjoy.

This new, fast working ship, the *Wichita*, will soon be a part of America's shield of freedom and security on the high seas. We hope and pray that she will serve in an era of world peace.

Congratulations again to General Dynamics Corporation and all the men and women who built this ship so well. We congratulate the United States Navy on the forthcoming acquisition of a new and important unit which will take its place in the armada of free men. And I congratulate the future complement of officers and enlisted men who will serve with pride on this new ship.

I know that we all join in wishing for this ship, the U.S.S. *Wichita*, smooth sailing and happy and successful voyages in behalf of our wonderful America.

Baltimore Marine Dies at Khesanh

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, L. Cpl. Eugene M. Johnson, Jr., a young Marine from Baltimore, Md., was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this fine

young man, and to honor his memory, by including the following article in the RECORD:

CITY MARINE CORPORAL DIES WHILE PATROLLING KHESANH

A 19-year-old Marine from Baltimore was killed while on patrol in Khesanh, South Vietnam, the Department of Defense reported yesterday.

He was Lance Cpl. Eugene M. Johnson, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Eugene M. Johnson, Sr., of 520 North Fulton avenue.

Corporal Johnson was killed April 7 by a missile wound in the head, according to his mother, Mrs. Mary E. Johnson.

She said he wrote in a letter dated April 3 that he had just arrived at the base and was waiting to be sent out on a mission.

A June, 1966 graduate of City College, Corporal Johnson enlisted in the Marine Corps in August, 1966. He was sent to Vietnam last November.

In addition to his parents, he is survived by two brothers, Ronald E. and Jeffrey Johnson; a sister Miss Michelle Johnson, and his maternal grandmother, Mrs. Geneva Holman, all of Baltimore.

The Price of Silver

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, since July 14, when the Government ceased selling silver at the monetary price of \$1.29 per ounce, the silver market has been the victim of widespread speculation. The New York price for the white metal has fluctuated violently from a low of \$1.65 to a high of \$2.39 per ounce; today, the price is \$2.29. This has caused price increases for products having silver as their basic raw material. These additional costs have been a burden on the taxpaying consumer because he has had to bear the brunt of the price increases.

A degree of stability was apparent in the market after the Government began sales on a competitive-bid basis. Unfortunately, this stability was short lived as the monetary crisis began to build up last fall. Since then, the speculator has dominated the market; this condition continues even today.

The recent announcement by the Treasury that the Government has begun melting the .900 fine silver subsidiary coins could again bring stability to the market. In its April 18 issue, the American Metal Market carried a fine article by its editors, Michael C. Jensen. This article is based on an interview with Mr. John B. Stevens, president of the Silver Users Association and executive vice president of the International Silver Co., the largest consumer of silver in the manufacture of silverware. International Silver Co. is an outstanding business concern, and I am glad the company is in my district.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the question of the extremely high price of silver is of concern to every taxpaying consumer since everyone in some degree uses this important metal, whether in his photographic products, electrical appliances, dental and medical supplies, silverware and jewelry, or in the many other items which require silver in their manufac-

ture. I, therefore, place the American Metal Market article in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that my colleagues and other interested parties may read a very clear and concise analysis of the silver situation:

[From American Metal Market, Apr. 18, 1968]
TREASURY MELTING OF SILVER COULD MEAN STABLE PRICES

(By Michael C. Jensen)

MERIDEN, CONN.—Within a year and a half it is conceivable that the price of silver could drop to \$1.65 an ounce and stabilize there.

That is one conclusion the president of the Silver Users Assn. draws from the announcement that the Treasury has begun melting down silver coins at a fairly rapid rate.

John B. Stevens, who is also executive vice president of the International Silver Co., agrees that there could be many a slip between now and 1970. And, obviously, as a large commercial user of silver, it would be in his interest for the price to come down from its present high level of over \$2.20 an ounce.

All this notwithstanding, however, the arithmetic of Mr. Stevens' argument seems sound.

Here's how he postulates the possible price drop:

The key to the supply-demand equation is the enormous amount of silver in private hands in the form of dimes, quarters and half dollars. Until the Treasury allows private holders to melt down this silver and sell it at market prices, it will stay off the market.

On the other hand, when private owners are allowed to melt it down, it will hit the market and allow prices to drop.

When will this happen? Probably not until the silver is needed, says Mr. Stevens, and that won't be until the government begins to run out of its stockpile of silver which it has been regularly depleting by weekly sales through the GSA program.

So it should be easy to figure out when the shortage of government silver will begin, shouldn't it? Just take note of the size of the weekly sales and extrapolate to the total amount of government stockpile.

But, it isn't that easy. For one thing, the government has been making its own collection of dimes, quarters and half dollars in preparation for melting them down. And this silver will presumably be available for sales to users. It's been known for some time that the government was planning to melt these coins, but now melting has started. Already there have been about one million ounces melted, and the Treasury is working up to a melting rate of two million ounces a week.

Since it is known that the Treasury already had about 246 million ounces of silver in coinage, and plans to have 250 million ounces by June 30; and since its other holdings include 265 million ounces (that's 100 million ounces above the stockpile requirement of 165 million ounces), a little simple arithmetic shows that there will be a total of about 350 million ounces available for disposal.

Not all of this can be sold, however, since some must be reserved for new coins—about 15 million ounces yearly. Since silver sales by the government have been running about two million ounces weekly, it doesn't take a slide rule to see that in three years, the government could be just about out of silver except for its stockpile. These figures flow easily from Mr. Stevens, but his key to the year and a half from now price drop is that the silver users would like to see the government lift the private melting restrictions at least a year and a half before Treasury silver hits rock bottom. That would be in the fall of 1970. So much for timing.

Where does the \$1.65 price come from? Simple, says Mr. Stevens. It's the value of the

silver content of the coins as the amount of silver is valued by the face value of the coin (plus a few added costs). In other words, a stack of coins with one ounce of silver content, is worth just about \$1.65 after all the necessary steps have been taken to make that silver usable. Here are some figures: The actual silver content is \$1.38 per ounce. Add two to three percent for loss of silver through wear on the coin. That gives you about \$1.42. Add twelve cents to collect, sort and pack the coins. That makes \$1.54. Then add another five cents for smelting. That brings it up to \$1.59. Finally, plug in five to 10 cents for profit and you get a total of \$1.64 to \$1.69. Like many silver users, Mr. Stevens thinks speculators are keeping the silver price at its high level, and there is plenty of the metal around.

"There doesn't seem to be a shortage of supply as long as the government continues its stockpile sale," he says.

However, he cautions that the price of silver hasn't come close to becoming stabilized.

"And I can visualize it going higher temporarily," he said, "under the pressure of speculation. The greatest reservoir of silver is in the subsidiary coinage. There's over one billion ounces reclaimable there," he asserted.

Some silver observers caution that a lifting of the ban on private melting won't automatically be a panacea to silver users. They warn that much of this subsidiary coinage is falling into the hands of a relatively few large speculators who would be able to feed it into the market slowly, thus preventing any sharp fall in the price. Mr. Stevens acknowledges this possibility, but thinks it is overstated. And he looks hopefully toward 1970.

Secretaries Week

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, the 17th annual observance of Secretaries Week, sponsored by the National Secretaries Association, International, will be April 21 to 27 1968, with Wednesday, April 24, highlighted as Secretaries Day. In the April issue of the Secretary, the official monthly magazine of NSA, several famous people were queried to get their honest opinions of secretaries for this occasion.

From the White House, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson's statement reflects empathy for the secretarial profession. The First Lady wrote:

Although I have never been a practicing secretary, the shorthand course that I took in college always has been helpful to me. Typing and shorthand are useful tools for anyone, and knowing how valuable they can be, I have urged my daughters to perfect these skills.

When I first met my husband, he was serving as secretary to a congressman. Later when he was a member of Congress and serving in the Pacific during World War II, the responsibility for running his office fell to me. I learned to appreciate the good, thoughtful letter and the value of a dedicated and talented staff. Over the years, we have been fortunate in having secretaries of great ability and imagination. How appropriate that we set aside Secretaries Week to honor the resourceful and energetic members of this profession. I salute these young women on their vital contribution to business and government.

Eugene McCarthy Stood Up for Labor

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the Machinist includes an insightful analysis of the position that Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY has consistently taken in behalf of labor. This article expresses a great deal about MCCARTHY the man, as well as his approach to an issue that continues to be important in our society, and I am sure it will be of interest to many. I insert this article into the RECORD today, as follows:

[From the Machinist, Apr. 25, 1968]

EUGENE MCCARTHY STOOD UP FOR LABOR

In August, 1966, as pressure was building in Congress to break the great airline strike U.S. Sen. Eugene McCarthy of Minnesota tried to stem the anti-union tide.

He arranged for some of his colleagues to meet in the Senate Office Building late one afternoon to hear the union side of the dispute directly from IAM representatives.

On the Senate floor, he warned that Congressional strikebreaking proposals were hurting chances for a settlement.

"If, for another week or so, we stopped what we are doing, and let the airlines and the Machinists get together, they would come to their own settlement," he told the Senate.

McCarthy's pleas failed to carry the Senate. But his prediction came true a few days later. The House of Representatives temporarily removed the strikebreaking threat and gave the parties a chance to reach their own settlement.

Eugene McCarthy began fighting on labor's side in 1947 as a supporter of Hubert Humphrey, then Mayor of Minneapolis and leader of Minnesota's unique Democratic-Farmer-Labor (DFL) Party.

A soft-spoken college professor of economics, McCarthy had no previous experience in partisan politics. Nevertheless, he became a DFL candidate for Congress and won the seat from an incumbent Republican.

McCarthy has been winning elections ever since.

His current race for the Democratic Presidential nomination is based largely on his opposition to the war in Vietnam. He calls the war "morally indefensible" and "against the national interest."

Although many trade union members will disagree vigorously with his Vietnam position, they will find little disagreement with his labor record in Congress.

MCCARTHY AS CONGRESSMAN

McCarthy served in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1949 to 1958. On 56 key issues compiled by THE MACHINIST during those ten years, McCarthy voted "Right" from labor's point of view all 56 times.

Though he authorized few major bills in the House, McCarthy worked consistently to improve unemployment compensation and to better the conditions of imported Mexican farm laborers.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, he pressed for changes in the nation's tax laws, seeking to make them fairer to wage earners and family farmers. McCarthy was an early sponsor of a proposal to close tax loopholes for the rich while raising personal income tax exemption.

Soon after he arrived in Washington, McCarthy became a leader of Democratic liberals in the House. He organized them into

a group known jokingly as McCarthy's Marauders, but more formally as the Democratic Study Group. The group remains active today on behalf of liberal causes.

MCCARTHY AS SENATOR

In 1958, McCarthy moved to the U.S. Senate after challenging and upsetting Republican U.S. Sen. Edward Thyne. In the ten years since, THE MACHINIST has listed 50 key Senate votes.

McCarthy voted "Right" from labor's viewpoint on 41 of these votes and "Wrong" twice. He was absent for seven of the key votes.

One of McCarthy's principal campaigns in the Senate has been to update the federal-state unemployment insurance system. His bills have sought to raise both the amount and the duration of benefits, to extend coverage to millions now excluded and to set new federal standards. His latest proposal, introduced last fall, also would end the arbitrary denial of unemployment compensation to employees involved in labor-management disputes.

McCarthy has been a leader over the years in efforts to repeal Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, the section that encourages states to prohibit the union shop and make the open shop compulsory.

Speaking on the Senate floor during the 1966 debate, McCarthy strongly defended the union shop:

"If both sides agree that a union shop is beneficial to the operations of the business and that it is helpful in solving disputes and securing a better relationship, why should state law be permitted to intrude and tell both management and labor, The law forbids you to bargain and reach agreement on this point?"

McCarthy spoke eloquently, asking repeal of Section 14(b) "in the interest of better labor-management relations, in the interest of consistency of law and primarily in the interest of fairness." But the repeal campaign, like others before it, died, the victim of a Senate filibuster.

McCarthy has long been famous, not only for his eloquence, but also for his wit. In 1960, when his Presidential ambitions first came to the surface, he touched himself as a likely Presidential prospect because "I'm twice as liberal as Humphrey, twice as bright as Symington and twice as Catholic as Kennedy."

Nowadays, on the Presidential stump, McCarthy uses wit more sparingly.

"It is a lot easier to be funny when the opposition is in power," he told a reporter recently. "Also, the times are different and the issues are changed. Vietnam is such a somber subject."

Committee on Banking and Currency Hearing Schedule

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Banking and Currency met today in executive session and decided to hold hearings on various bills now pending before the committee.

It was decided, in anticipation of legislation forthcoming on the International Monetary Fund's special drawing rights proposal, that hearings would be held on this legislation beginning May 1 through May 3 if necessary.

The committee also decided that hearings would be held on H.R. 16064, a bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act with respect to the scope of the audit by the General Accounting Office, on May 6 and 7.

Mr. Speaker, this statement should serve as formal notice to anyone wishing to testify on this legislation to please contact in writing the House Committee on Banking and Currency if they desire to be heard on the above subjects.

Lyndon B. Johnson: The Consumer's President

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, an article, in the April 15 edition of the New York Times describes the work that Mr. David Schoenfeld is doing to promote the establishment of consumer education courses throughout the country from kindergarten through the university level. Mr. Schoenfeld's official title is Director for Consumer Education of the President's Committee on Consumer Interests. Miss Betty Furness is Chairman of the Committee. Without building up a big bureaucratic staff, Mr. Schoenfeld has been traveling around the country persuading and convincing schools and other organizations that consumer education is a vital part of preparing people to deal with the modern world. This one little activity is symbolic of the fact that President Johnson, working with the Congress, has done more for the consumer than any President in history. The consumer in America is in for a new day in the years ahead. The 89th and the 90th Congresses can take a bow for this, and so can President Johnson. In order that all Members may read of this interesting new approach to consumer problems, I insert the article in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 15, 1968]
U.S. AIDE TEACHES CONSUMER LORE—HE HELPS MISS FURNESS TO PROMOTE EDUCATION
(By John D. Morris)

WASHINGTON, April 14.—Betty Furness, President Johnson's special assistant for consumer affairs, is relying largely on a brawny, brainy former college wrestler to develop and direct an expanded consumer education program for her office.

David Schoenfeld, 44 years old, six feet tall and weighing 215 pounds, has been on the job since Jan. 1 and hopes to have the program well under way within a few months.

So far, he has spent most of his time touring the country and making sales talks to educators, businessmen and other community and state leaders.

"Basically," he explained in an interview, "my job is to promote consumer education."

One of his main goals, he explained, is to promote the establishment of consumer education courses "from kindergarten through the university level."

CITES FAVORABLE REACTION

Another, with equal priority, is for schools and other community organizations to pro-

vide consumer education for adults, with special emphasis on teaching low-income and elderly persons.

The reaction to his sales talks, he said, has been "100 per cent favorable." Surprisingly, he added, he has sometimes found businessmen to be more interested than educators.

"The intelligent, ethical businessman wants an educated consumer," he remarked.

Mr. Schoenfeld's official title is director for consumer education of the President's committee on consumer interests. Miss Furness is chairman of the Cabinet-level committee, which functions something like a board of directors for Federal consumer activities.

His abbreviated definition of consumer education is "the preparation of the individual for the art of everyday living so that he gets maximum utilization and satisfaction from his income."

MULTITUDE OF SUBJECTS

This covers a multitude of subjects from buying food, clothing and other necessities to combating fraud and deception. Budgeting and money managing, purchasing and maintaining an automobile, renting an apartment, buying a house and determining the cost and value or shortcomings of consumer credit are among the many other topics.

Mr. Schoenfeld, teacher of economics and consumer education at Lincoln High School, Yonkers, N.Y., for the last six years, was a part-time consultant to Miss Furness and her predecessor, Mrs. Esther Peterson, for three years before taking his present full-time job. Miss Furness succeeded Mrs. Peterson last May.

At Lincoln High School in 1962, Mr. Schoenfeld set up what Mrs. Peterson and others have described as a model consumer education program. A novel aspect of the now thriving program is the blending of practical consumer matters into courses in standard subjects.

For example, a mathematics class may work on problems of credit, interest rates and banking. Or an English class may analyze the meaning and nuances of words used in commercial advertisements.

Aside from continuing his promotional travel, Mr. Schoenfeld plans to establish his office as "sort of a clearing house" for information on consumer education.

COMPILES BIBLIOGRAPHY

He is now working with the American Library Association on a comprehensive bibliography of books and other teaching materials. He also plans to establish guidelines for courses and curricula in schools and universities and for adult education programs.

He said he expected to cooperate with labor unions, the United States Office of Education, the Office of Economic Opportunity and various other public and private groups.

Sales, rentals and exchanges of books and other teaching materials such as film strips and charts are some of the cooperative ideas he has in mind.

At present, his staff consists of a program assistant, Mrs. Olinda Brown, and a secretary, Mrs. Helen B. Johnson. He has the authority to hire four more professional assistants and hopes to do so by July at the latest.

Mr. Schoenfeld was a member of the intramural wrestling team at Brooklyn College, where he earned a bachelor of arts degree in economics. Friends report that he also excels in archery, swimming, fishing and bridge.

He holds a master of business administration degree from the University of Southern California and has done further post-graduate work at Manhattan College, City College of New York and New York University. He was born in New York City, is married and has four children.

Anti-Semitic Actions in Poland

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of concern has been expressed over the antisemitic statements and activities of the Communist dictatorship in Poland.

In order to set the record perfectly clear, so that we understand that anti-Semitism is a tool of the Communist government and does not reflect the feeling of the people of Poland, I insert into the RECORD the statement unanimously adopted by the board of directors of the Polish National Alliance, the largest Polish fraternal organization in which it vigorously condemns the anti-Semitic activities of the Communist dictatorship in Poland. The president of the Polish National Alliance, Mr. Aloysius Mazewski, emphasized in releasing the document that the "anti-Semitic outbursts in the Communist press and governing circles in Poland is an attempted coverup for ideological, social, and economic bankruptcy of the Marxist-Leninist system."

The statement reads as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE REGARDING ANTI-SEMITIC ACTIONS OF COMMUNISTS IN POLAND

At a meeting held Friday, April 19, the Board of Directors of the Polish National Alliance adopted the following statement in appraisal of anti-Semitic declarations and actions of the Communist dictatorship in Poland:

1. It is our considered opinion that the anti-Semitic, or more precisely, "anti-Zionist" actions of the Gomulka regime stems from the Communist Party's attempt to cover up the bankruptcy of the economic, socio-political, and cultural sophistries contained in the Marxist-Leninist system.

It also is the result of the communist regime's subservience to the Moscow directive ordering the Warsaw communist regime to give unqualified support to the Arab states in the Near East crisis, contrary to the preponderant sympathy of the Polish people for the State of Israel. To justify the political and economic support extended to the Arabs, the communist regime of Poland felt compelled to invent an anti-Semitic issue.

2. These communist anti-Semitic outbursts have been precipitated last March by thousands of college and university students who demonstrated for freedom of speech. The fact that these demands were made by Polish youth born, raised and educated under the communist system, was a telling blow against red tyranny and contributed to the growing uneasiness and frustrations of the red regime in Warsaw.

Thus, in a sense, the current anti-Semitic action in Poland should be reduced in reality to anti-Semitism within the Communist Party which represents an infinitesimal portion of Poland's population. (In a nation of 32 million people, the Communist Party has less than a million members, the majority of whom are either bureaucrats without any loyalty, seeking advancement, or opportunists of a lesser breed.)

3. We call to the attention of our American journalists, commentators, and historians the fact that referring to Poland as "the land of traditional anti-Semitism" in their appraisal of current events in Warsaw, is unfair and unfounded.

Since the Statute of Wislica of 1347, Poland has provided a haven for Jews persecuted and tyrannized in other European countries throughout the centuries.

When over three million Jews in pre-war Poland enjoyed complete protection of law, tolerance, full freedom of higher education and opportunities, access to professional positions and comparatively high prosperity, the allusions to "traditional anti-Semitism in Poland" sound hollow and attest to anti-Polish prejudices or misinformation.

Approximately 100,000 Jews were saved by the Poles during the German reign of terror and genocide in Poland, when giving aid and comfort to the Jews meant summary executions.

Eloquent symbol of Poles' aid and compassion toward their Jewish compatriots, is presented today in Jerusalem by trees planted along the Avenue of the Righteous. Each tree is permanently marked with a plaque bearing the name of the person who in the years of the Jewish tragedy extended a helping hand to the Jews facing annihilation; each rescuer's nationality is memorialized on these plaques, and the most frequent word that appears on them is "Poland."

Could these acts of brotherly love and compassion on the part of the Poles, and of recognition and appreciation on the part of Israel, be construed as "traditional anti-Semitism" in Poland?

4. The anti-Semitism rampant within the ruling Communist Party in Poland does not reflect the tolerance and historical ties that bind the Poles and the Jews in the bond of mutual respect and understanding. It speaks, rather, of the power struggle among the communists and their sympathizers and gives eloquent testimony to the ideological and economic failure of Communism and its blind intolerance of civil freedom and democratic processes.

We take note, that his statement is being issued on the very day when the whole civilized world pays homage to some five million Jews exterminated during World War II by Nazi Germany.

Paying homage to the Jews martyred by the Nazis we also salute tens of thousands of Poles who disregarded their personal safety in coming to the assistance of their brethren, and millions of Poles who died in German concentration camps and the battles for freedom and dignity of man.

ALOYSIUS A. MAZEWSKI,
President P.N.A.

ADOLF K. PACHUCKI,
National Secretary P.N.A.

WALTER L. DWORAKOWSKI,
Censor for Supervisory Council P.N.A.

Rubber Capital of the World

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, Akron has justifiably been called the rubber capital of the world. The founders of the rubber industry chose well, for here they found not only the physical advantages but the skilled manpower that has maintained the leadership that has retained for Akron the supremacy in this important industrial field.

This great industry has brought the Akron community other advantages besides financial rewards. The top of the crop of industry-minded young men were attracted to this burgeoning industry.

The rubber industry has been ever mindful of the future and trained these

young men so that one day they could assume the executive leadership of these great companies. The far-seeing founders of these manufacturing organizations had a great love for the Akron community and instilled these same feelings in their young executives.

Today those former young executives are the leaders of these companies and join with all of us in promoting the welfare of the Akron community.

The present chairman of the board and chief executive officer of the B. F. Goodrich Co., J. Ward Keener, is a fine example of this great policy. He started with this great company over 30 years ago as research analyst and progressed through the years until he reached his present position.

Mr. Keener, nationally recognized as one of America's greatest industrialists, has devoted a great share of his time to governmental and civic affairs. Today he is a member of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy and also serves as a member of the Balance-of-Payments Advisory Committee to the Secretary of Commerce. He also has recently been appointed to the board of directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.

J. Ward Keener serves our Akron community well. He has joined with his fellow Akron industrialists in working to make Akron an ever better community. We are particularly indebted to him for the financial assistance that he has given to the 404-acre Opportunity Park. Eventually this great project will be worth over \$200 million and will give employment to over 15,000 people.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are indeed grateful to J. Ward Keener for the many benefits that he has brought us.

Just this month, Nation's Business, the country's oldest and largest business magazine, issued a special edition entitled "200 Years of Business Leadership." In this edition, they had asked Mr. Keener to prepare a story on the future of the rubber industry. I am certain that Mr. Keener's views will be of interest to my colleagues. The Nation's Business article follows:

FUTURE OF INDUSTRIES—RUBBER
(By J. Ward Keener, chairman, the B. F. Goodrich Co.)

"Ceiling unlimited—visibility fair" is an apt way to describe the opportunities for continuing growth in the rubber, plastics and chemical industries.

Because these materials and the products made from them are basic to many of our leading industries—automotive, transportation, construction, appliances—their success is closely linked to the progress of our nation's economy.

The major markets we serve and the industries of which we serve and the industries of which we are a part have been growing about 50 per cent faster than the United States total domestic activity, and we believe this relative rate of growth will be maintained through the foreseeable future.

We are optimistic about the long-term outlook for the nation's economic growth, with gross national product reaching \$1 trillion in the next few years and about \$1.3 trillion in 1975.

The demand for rubber will continue to increase. In the United States, even as our population grows, the per capita consumption of rubber will rise. Ten years ago, our

nation consumed nearly 21 pounds of rubber for each man, woman and child. Today the rate is over 23 pounds. In 1975 we expect it to be between 26 and 27 pounds per person.

This means that total new rubber consumption will increase from about 2.4 million long tons in 1968 to about 3.1 million in 1975. Of this, about 81 per cent will be synthetic rubber, compared with about 76.5 per cent today.

Plastics and chemicals will grow at an even faster rate. Our current forecasts indicate the use of vinyl plastic materials increasing at a rate of 10 to 12 per cent a year, nearly doubling the 1967 production of more than two billion pounds by 1975.

The horizon is clouded, however, by serious problems which must be met and managed over the next few years.

The specter of a huge federal budget growing out of irresponsible fiscal policies casts a shadow over the entire business and economic scene.

If we are successfully to meet the balance of payments problem, we must slice through the fog of government-imposed stop-gap restrictions, encourage direct investment abroad and curb the government's appetite for spending abroad.

Businessmen are confronted with labor union unrest, rapidly rising labor costs, tax increases, high interest rates and pressures on profit margins.

Consumers are facing further increases in the cost of living, higher taxes of all kinds and another rise in their payments on social security.

Possible strikes in major industries, developments in the Viet Nam War and the ultimate size of the 1968 federal deficit will play major roles in shaping the pattern of economic activity in the months to come.

But the long-term outlook continues to be up with the ceiling unlimited.

Escalation at National Airport

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, a story recently appeared in the Washington Post which indicated that one or more airlines are considering a proposal to expand National Airport by extending its main runway into the Potomac River. The purpose of this expansion, according to the article, is to allow the airport to accommodate the massive jumbojets and airbuses now in the development stage.

The Federal Aviation Administration, which must approve such plans, has been opposed to such plans in the past. I approve their judgment in this respect, and have written to urge that they consider this proposal in the light of these remarks.

I for one have serious reservations about such a proposal. Anyone who lives in the metropolitan area is already painfully aware of the problems created by the existence of jets at National Airport today. The noise problem is substantial and obvious; the air pollution caused by jets landing and leaving is visible and smellable, and the water in the Potomac is contaminated by the same source. What would be the effects of the proposed runway expansion and increased jet operations we can only imagine. And this is the source of my problem with these plans—we have no way of know-

ing what the total effect of this proposal would be. I am prepared to give generous odds to anyone who wants to bet that serious consideration has been given to the long-range effects of such a program upon the ecology of the region—animal, plant, and human.

The congestion at National Airport is already incredible. The airport facilities are presently being expanded by the airlines, and the effects of this expansion will no doubt ultimately result in greater use of the terminal and more congestion. The last thing that is needed is to begin to bring in two to four times as many passengers per plane as are now arriving. For the airlines this may be good business—for the consumer-passenger, it is not.

I am not recommending at this time that National be closed to jets. I do feel, however, that any expenditure of funds authorized or made now by the Federal Government on Metropolitan Washington air service be devoted to the development of an adequate rapid transit system which will permit Dulles to operate at something approaching the capacity for which it was built, rather than for increasing traffic at National. If Dulles were adequately available, the need for jet operation at National would diminish, perhaps even disappear. This, it seems to me, is the responsible action to take—not to create a massive capital investment in the expansion of jet facilities at National which will make it that much harder to justify the transition to Dulles when the proper time arrives.

If the airlines are so anxious to spend money on facilities which will justify their use of larger and faster jets, let them spend the money on the rapid transit system—a facility which will permit them to continue operations without hazard or adverse environmental impact upon those who are forced to live in the core of the city.

How many other cities are forced to endure jet operations within 2 miles of their business centers? How many other governments have their daily operations interrupted regularly by the scream of aircraft rising over their heads? Why us?

The kind of step that the airlines are contemplating should be very carefully considered before anything further is done. I would be the last person to speak out against imaginative and forceful action being taken, but I do feel that we should first have some idea where it is that we are going.

The Washington Post carried an editorial on this subject on April 18 which is highly relevant and cogent. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

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

NIGHTMARE AT NATIONAL

An airport is more than just a place at which airplanes can land, and it is long past time for the airlines to begin to act as if they recognize this. Yet, some airline proposed in a recent secret meeting that National Airport be expanded so that it could accommodate the next generation of jets, ignoring all the facts of airport life except

convenience. The idea is so out of keeping with what ought to happen to National that if the other airlines do not squelch it promptly the Federal Aviation Administration must.

The thought of the 490-passenger jumbojets and the 250-passenger airbuses lumbering over residential areas, plopping onto a ledge of concrete built out into the Potomac River, and disgorging hordes of people into an already overcrowded area can best be described as a nightmare. The only reason for such an idea ever surfacing is that some airlines don't want to face up to the fact that the future of air travel here is inevitably linked to Dulles Airport. The sooner that fact is accepted, the quicker solutions can be found to the problems that flow from it.

Instead of proposing to increase the noise level over the Potomac and the congestion at an airport where congestion is already a major problem, the airlines ought to be talking about speeding up and reducing the cost of transportation between Dulles and downtown, setting up helicopter service, building a downtown terminal to handle the passenger flow, establishing suburban terminals to spread the passenger load, and selling the relative convenience of Dulles when it is compared to airports in other major cities. But airlines have not been noted for their ingenuity in solving the problems of passengers. Indeed, one of the outrageous proposals thrown out at a recent airline meeting was to eliminate the mobile lounges at Dulles and, like all the other major airports, require that passengers scamper down miles of corridors to reach their airplanes.

Someday, perhaps, airlines will begin to think of passengers as people, not pack animals, and of airports as important factors in an urban community, not just isolated stage coach stops. When that happens, it may occur to them that airports ought to be friendly neighbors, concerned about the total impact they make on life in a city.

Key Interest Rates at Highest Level in 100 Years

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a number of key interest rates are currently at their highest level in 100 years, since the time of the Civil War. Many of them are higher than the credit crunch in the late summer and fall of 1966. If the current rate of inflation continues, interest rates may well go higher. The combination of inflation and high interest rates has as its chief victims the lower income groups as well as important industries such as farming and home construction. This country needs healthy economic growth, which inflation and increasing interest rates undermine.

So that the Members might see the extent of the current interest rate situation, I am placing several interest rate tables—published in "Historical Statistics of the United States" put out by the Commerce Department—in the RECORD.

KEY INTEREST RATES

The highs of each series for which late March data is available are shown in parentheses. As can be seen, half are at their highs and the other half are relatively close to the previous high.

BOND YIELDS AND INTEREST RATES: 1960 TO 1968
[Percent per annum]

Period	U.S. Government security yields			High-grade municipal bonds (Standard & Poor's) ⁴	Corporate bonds (Moody's)		Prime commercial paper, 4 to 6 months	FHA new home mortgage yields ⁵
	3-month Treasury bills ¹	3- to 5-year issues ²	Taxable bonds ³		Aaa	Baa		
1960	2.928	3.99	4.02	3.73	4.41	5.19	3.85	6.16
1961	2.378	3.60	3.90	3.46	4.35	5.08	2.97	5.78
1962	2.778	3.57	3.95	3.18	4.33	5.02	3.26	5.60
1963	3.157	3.72	4.00	3.23	4.26	4.86	3.55	5.46
1964	3.549	4.06	4.15	3.22	4.40	4.83	3.97	5.45
1965	3.954	4.22	4.21	3.27	4.49	4.87	4.38	5.46
1966	4.881	5.16	4.65	3.82	5.13	5.67	5.55	6.29
1966—March	4.626	4.94	4.63	3.72	4.92	5.32	5.21	-----
April	4.611	4.86	4.55	3.59	4.96	5.41	5.38	-----
May	4.642	4.94	4.57	3.68	4.98	5.48	5.39	-----
June	4.539	5.01	4.63	3.77	5.07	5.58	5.51	6.32
July	4.855	5.22	4.75	3.94	5.16	5.68	5.63	6.45
August	4.932	5.58	4.80	4.17	5.31	5.83	5.85	6.51
September	5.356	5.62	4.79	4.11	5.49	6.09	5.89	6.58
October	(5.387)	5.38	4.70	3.97	5.41	6.10	6.00	6.63
November	5.344	5.43	4.74	3.93	5.35	6.13	6.00	-----
December	5.007	5.07	4.65	3.83	5.39	6.18	6.00	6.81
1967—January	4.759	4.71	4.40	3.58	5.20	5.97	5.73	6.77
February	4.554	4.73	4.47	3.56	5.03	5.82	5.38	6.62
March	4.288	4.52	4.45	3.60	5.13	5.85	5.24	6.46
April	3.852	4.46	4.51	3.66	5.11	5.83	4.83	6.35
May	3.640	4.68	4.76	3.92	5.24	5.96	4.67	6.29
June	3.480	4.96	4.86	3.99	5.44	6.15	4.65	6.44
July	4.308	5.17	4.86	4.05	5.58	6.26	4.92	6.51
August	4.275	5.28	4.95	4.03	5.62	6.33	5.00	6.53
September	4.451	5.40	4.99	4.15	5.65	6.40	5.00	6.60
October	4.588	5.52	5.19	4.31	5.82	6.52	5.07	6.63
November	4.762	5.73	(5.44)	4.36	6.07	6.72	5.28	6.65
December	5.012	5.72	5.36	4.49	6.19	(6.93)	5.56	6.77
1968 January	5.081	5.53	5.18	4.36	6.17	6.84	5.60	6.81
Week ended:								
1968—Jan. 13	5.080	5.48	5.12	4.35	(6.20)	6.86	5.63	-----
Jan. 20	5.072	5.52	5.18	4.34	6.14	6.79	5.63	-----
Jan. 27	5.068	5.55	5.20	4.30	6.12	6.80	5.60	-----
Feb. 3	4.846	5.54	5.15	4.23	6.12	6.80	5.50	-----
Feb. 10	4.957	5.61	5.17	4.30	6.11	6.80	5.50	-----
Feb. 17	5.040	5.56	*5.13	4.36	*6.10	6.79	*5.50	-----
Mar. 29	5.13	(5.79)	5.41	(4.61)	6.19	(6.93)	(5.75)	-----

¹ Rate on new issues within period.
² Selected note and bond issues.
³ April 1953 to date, bonds due or callable 10 years and after.
⁴ Weekly data are Wednesday figures.
⁵ Data for first of the month, based on the maximum permissible interest rate (6 percent beginning October 1966) and 30-year mortgages paid in 15 years.

*Not charted.
 Sources: Treasury Department, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Federal Housing Administration, Standard & Poor's Corporation, and Moody's Investors Service.

SERIES N 185-187.—SHORT-TERM INTEREST RATES—OPEN-MARKET RATES IN NEW YORK CITY: 1890 TO 1945
[Percent per annum]

YEAR	Stock exchange time loans, 90 days ¹	Prime commercial paper, 4 to 6 months ¹	Stock exchange renewal call loans ²	YEAR	Stock exchange time loans, 90 days ¹	Prime commercial paper, 4 to 6 months ¹	Stock exchange renewal call loans ²
	185	186	187		185	186	187
1945	1.25	0.75	1.00	1917	4.62	5.07	3.43
1944	1.25	.73	1.00	1916	3.25	3.84	2.62
1943	1.25	.69	1.00	1915	2.85	4.01	1.92
1942	1.25	.66	1.00	1914	4.37	5.47	3.43
1941	1.25	.54	1.00	1913	4.64	6.20	3.22
1940	1.25	.56	1.00	1912	4.16	5.41	3.52
1939	1.25	.59	1.00	1911	3.22	4.75	2.57
1938	1.25	.81	1.00	1910	4.03	5.72	2.98
1937	1.25	.94	1.00	1909	3.26	4.67	2.71
1936	1.16	.75	.91	1908	3.24	5.00	1.92
1935	.56	.76	.56	1907	6.49	16.66	7.01
1934	.90	1.02	1.00	1906	5.71	6.25	6.54
1933	1.11	1.73	1.16	1905	3.82	5.18	4.44
1932	1.87	2.73	2.05	1904	3.10	5.14	1.78
1931	2.15	2.64	1.74	1903	4.84	6.16	3.71
1930	3.26	3.59	2.94	1902	5.05	5.81	5.15
1929	7.75	5.85	7.61	1901	4.24	5.40	4.00
1928	5.86	4.85	6.04	1900	3.94	5.71	2.94
1927	4.35	4.11	4.06	1899	4.19	5.50	5.08
1926	4.60	4.34	4.50	1898	3.31	5.34	2.18
1925	4.23	4.02	4.18	1897	2.68	4.72	1.75
1924	3.64	3.98	3.08	1896	4.83	7.02	4.28
1923	5.14	5.07	4.86	1895	2.82	5.80	1.88
1922	4.53	4.52	4.29	1894	2.30	5.22	1.07
1921	6.15	6.62	5.97	1893	5.08	7.64	4.57
1920	8.06	7.50	7.74	1892	4.80	5.40	3.08
1919	5.83	5.37	6.32	1891	4.83	6.48	3.42
1918	5.90	6.02	5.28	1890	5.31	6.91	5.84

¹ Averages of weekly prevailing rates.
² Averages of daily quotations.

³ Includes one or more interpolated items.

Model Cities

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the crucial problems confronting this country today is what can be done to cure the blight and decay of vital sections of our central cities.

A giant step forward toward solving this problem was enactment of the Model Cities Act, of which Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, and I were coauthors.

This act has aroused hope in cities from coast to coast that, at long last, it will be possible to mount a unified attack on the total problems of some endangered neighborhoods.

This hope is running high, among other communities, in my home city of Cleveland.

Cleveland failed to qualify for model cities planning assistance last year, but has now renewed its application. I am hopeful that the new application will receive the approval of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

I would like to present the text of an eloquent editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer, which excellently expresses the model city situation as it pertains to Cleveland, and also contains a final paragraph which sums up the choice confronting every city in the country.

The editorial, which appeared in the Plain Dealer of April 16, 1968, reads as follows:

MODEL CITIES, SECOND ROUND

Yesterday came the deadline for cities applying for model cities grants in the second round.

Last year Cleveland's application went in late. This time Cleveland made it under the wire. That is one improvement over last year's performance, when Cleveland failed to win a grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Another improvement: This time Cleveland's application contains an ingredient which HUD has indicated is virtually essential. That ingredient is "resident involvement."

The new Cleveland proposal starts with a "Constitutional Convention" at which residents of the model neighborhood area themselves will select their own policy spokesmen to sit in on the planning.

And still another improvement is embodied in the new proposal. Last year the area designated for a model was fuzzy and too general. This time the area is sharper. It is from E. 55th to E. 79th Street, from Superior Avenue N.E. to Kingsbury Run or Kinsman Road S.E.

Cleveland has many more reasons to hope it will win a grant this time. HUD has shown itself better disposed toward Cleveland since Mayor Carl B. Stokes took office and Mayor Stokes has fielded a more representative team to prepare and to deliver the application to HUD's regional office in Chicago.

The one-year grant asked for is \$396,663. Funds from Cleveland's school board, the city and other sources will bring that up to \$507,233.

Planned, coordinated improvement should prove a better way of salvaging neighborhoods than a patchquilt of programs, each doing a fraction of the job.

Ingredient: Cooperation—A Story of Voluntary School Consolidation

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, because this is both a time when our educational needs are increasing and the urgency of fiscal responsibility calls for frugality, the Congress will find interesting an article published in the April edition of the Arkansas Journal of Education. Based on material supplied by Mrs. Dorothy Cooper and Mrs. Imogene Holmes, the article outlines the expanded educational opportunities now available to all the high school students of Cross County, Ark.

Entitled "Ingredient: Cooperation" the article pertains to the new Cross County High School serving Vanndale, Hickory Ridge, and Cherry Valley, where Arkansas taxpayers are getting more educational mileage out of their millage.

The article follows:

INGREDIENT: COOPERATION—A STORY OF VOLUNTARY SCHOOL CONSOLIDATION

(NOTE.—Story prepared from material submitted by Mrs. Dorothy Cooper and Mrs. Imogene Holmes, co-sponsors of the annual for Cross County High School.)

When the new Cross County High School held open house last fall, 1500 guests from the community toured the new school building. Parents of the children who had formerly attended school in Cherry Valley, Hickory Ridge, and Vanndale visited classrooms that offered a wide range of educational opportunities not available to them before consolidation of the three districts.

In this building they found a foreign language laboratory, art room, agriculture room, band room, music room, mathematics laboratory, home economics room and outside a football stadium. These facilities witness the addition of courses in advanced mathematics, geometry, business math, home economics I, II, and III and French I. The curriculum is further enriched by courses in biology, bookkeeping, driver education, speech and band. These new courses are offered in addition to the basic English, algebra, general science, civics, world history, American history, geography, agriculture, physical education and courses in chemistry, typing, shorthand and general business.

In addition to new facilities, the school enjoys an improved science laboratory, an expanded library, an adequate cafeteria with modern kitchen equipment, and a large gymnasium to accommodate an expanded athletic program as well as a complete physical education program.

The new Cross County High School employs eight more teachers than in the three separate schools before consolidation. A total of 27 professional staff members work under the leadership of Superintendent Grover Cooper and high school principal Jack Holmes. The elementary schools in the district are supervised by John Dunsworthy, formerly at Cherry Valley School. Professional leaders of the school give credit to the Cross County Board of Education for their devotion and foresight in improving educational opportunity for the youth of the community.

Members of the staff feel that the most significant improvement of opportunity lies in the increased curriculum offering. Teachers are able to teach in their certified field. All teachers in the system are teaching in the field for which they are trained. The high school has a full time principal without other

duties to perform and the district has the services of a full time elementary supervisor. The school enjoys the benefits of a full time guidance counseling program and complete facilities to carry on the program of studies. For the first time they are able to offer a physical education program for every child.

No less important than these additions, the teachers say, "We have not only added extras to our curriculum, but we have also expanded our basic programs." *Ingredient-cooperation* is working for the benefit of several hundred girls and boys at Cross County High School.

How Do You Keep Federal Agencies Honest?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, for quite a few of us here in Congress the idea of Federal intervention or control automatically conjures up a carload of misgivings. These fears are not unfounded, for year after year cases of Federal abuse of power and waste of taxpayers' dollars recur with monotonous regularity. This is not to say that all Federal officials are ogres, because I believe the vast majority of them try sincerely to do a creditable job. Tending to the Federal store is a vastly important job, and encouraging qualified people to enter Federal service should be our day-to-day goal.

However, one can appreciate the necessity for congressional oversight over Federal agencies when one of these agencies assumes powers never delegated to it by Congress. It would appear that some officials allow the weight of the Federal club to intoxicate them with unrestricted power. The day might well come when Congress, in instituting a new Federal agency, will automatically penalize with a jail term those officials who willfully abuse citizens and organizations by an unlawful use of their Federal authority.

Take the case, for instance, of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission which Congress created in 1965. According to Senator PAUL FANNIN in an article in the March 1968 issue of *Nation's Business* the EEOC is guilty of "misuse of power, violation of the spirit and letter of the law, disruption of labor-management-union relationships."

Like Senator FANNIN, I certainly believe there is a need for equal employment opportunities for the disadvantaged. This is not the issue here. The question is how far can a Federal agency be allowed to deviate from its true function in usurping and wielding ungranted powers.

I include the article entitled, "Does Washington Force Racial Bias?" by Senator PAUL FANNIN, in the *RECORD* at this point:

DOES WASHINGTON FORCE RACIAL BIAS: THE EEOC ALREADY WIELDS UNPRECEDENTED POWERS OVER BUSINESS AND, LAWMAKER WARNS, NOW WANTS STILL MORE

(By PAUL FANNIN, U.S. Senator from Arizona)

Jimmy Lee never got his promotion. His skin is the wrong color. Jimmy had to stand

aside and let someone less qualified be promoted in his place because the federal government threatened to cancel contracts with his employer unless someone of another race got Jimmy's job.

Jimmy Lee is white.

His case is not uncommon—not since the advent of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The names here are changed to protect the individuals, but the circumstances and details are shockingly real.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission came into being in mid-1965 as a result of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The five-man Commission was created to prevent unlawful employment practices. Instead it has undermined some of the most basic relationships between employer and employee. Now it seeks more power of enforcement to spread its influence even wider. I don't think it can be trusted with more authority.

EEOC's record is clear: Misuse of power, violation of the spirit and letter of the law, disruption of labor-management-union relationships. Let me be plain. I'm not against equal employment opportunities. I'm against granting EEOC, or anyone else, arbitrary powers over workmen and their jobs.

So-called civil rights groups have wrapped themselves around this EEOC issue to the extent that any discussion of the problem immediately brings forth the cry of "racist."

To my mind there is no more basic right than that of a man to provide for himself and those he loves with the smallest interference possible from government. That's what is involved in this issue.

I am disturbed that the EEOC has associated itself with extremist groups. One of the EEOC's former consultants (Timothy L. Jenkins) bills himself as a member of the staff of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee—an associate of H. Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael.

If this is the kind of person insuring equality of employment opportunities—then I want to be very careful about granting any additional powers.

The Commission got off to a rather shaky start under the chairmanship of Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr. who assured me, and other members of the Senate Labor Committee, that he would devote his full time and resources to the job. He wrote a letter to Senator Javits of New York stating that he had asked specifically for a two-year appointment, taking him beyond June 1, 1967, so as to allay any fears Senators Javits and Winston Prouty might have that he would quit to go pollicking.

"I will have to leave the day-to-day political activity to such eminent practitioners of the art as you, Congressman Lindsay and Governor Rockefeller," Roosevelt said.

Ten months later he quit to run for the governorship of New York. It was a bad beginning.

PICKING A TARGET

During its first year of operations the EEOC singled out the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Co. as a likely target for its maiden effort. The company is located in the South. A defense contractor—the nation's sole supplier of capital ships—it had a well-developed program of apprentice training.

Jimmy Lee and other old hands at the shipyard heard news that the EEOC boys were knocking on doors, soliciting complaints about the company. They didn't think much of it. Of the 22,000 employees, 41 said they were willing to complain. It later narrowed down to only four. Armed with this "evidence," EEOC notified the company it was in violation of the Civil Rights Act and sat down to negotiate an agreement to stop the alleged discrimination.

Because it is a defense supplier, Newport News had already signed an agreement to

take "affirmative action" in eliminating discrimination.

Soon the full array of federal power was focused on one company.

The Department of Justice notified the company it was holding up a pending case awaiting outcome of the negotiations.

The Office of Federal Contract Compliance under the Department of Labor notified the company all its defense contracts would be suspended pending the outcome of the talks.

The Defense Department was made a party to, and inspector of, the enforcement proceedings.

Small wonder that Newport News Shipbuilding "voluntarily" agreed to the compact which Commission spokesmen called a "landmark" case and a "model" for future agreements.

Jimmy Lee was soon to find out that his career in the shipyard, despite the fact that he belonged to a union, was out of his hands. He had exchanged the quiet of the southwest Virginia hills for the roar and excitement of heavy industry and progressed right out of high school through the shipyard's training program. He thought he was ready to go somewhere. He was next in line for promotion to quartermaster. But he had reckoned without the EEOC.

SETTING BLACK AGAINST WHITE

The agreement between EEOC and the company substituted favoritism as a goal. And in the words of one veteran welder, "did everything possible to set black against white."

Jimmy found that a preferential promotion list had been created with 100 Negroes on it. This list had to be exhausted before he could be promoted. Any exceptions to the order of placement had to be cleared with the Commission.

Jimmy got mad.

Others got mad, too. One of Jimmy's friends who had gone through the apprentice school with him says, "They've ruined the school. It used to be there were more boys wanting to get in than they could take—boys who couldn't go to college, but wanted more training. Now they've lowered the requirements so much the teachers are quitting. They've converted the dormitory space back to offices and are having trouble getting enough to fill out the class."

Bone-cracking violence erupted at the main gate of the yard last summer and a score of people were injured. What caused these passionate outbursts in a placid town where the shipyard had operated for 81 years without disturbance?

Listen to these words in the EEOC agreement pertaining to enrollment in the apprentice school:

"The ratio of Negro to white apprentices in any given year should approach the ratio . . . of Negro to whites in the labor area."

And this about promotions:

"Vacancies will be filled by qualified Negro employees."

And this about training opportunities:

"Employees in predominantly Negro departments shall be given the first opportunity to enter training programs in which they are qualified to enter."

Do you wonder that Jimmy Lee and his white friends got mad?

One of the first to protest the agreement was the union representing the 22,000 employees. Their position in employee representation had been entirely preempted.

Co-managers of the independent union, one a white and the other a Negro, have both been very critical of the EEOC's action.

At one time the union threatened to sue the Labor Department unless it set the record straight on the number of raises and promotions. The Labor Department claimed 3,890. The union and the company both contend raises amounted to about 155 as a result

of the agreement, and 250 Negroes put on preferential promotion lists.

"Any time the Secretary of Labor will claim 3,890 promotions under an agreement that actually produced 155," said one of the union leaders, "I've got a lot of reservations about whether he should be Secretary of Labor."

The unions have a right to be upset about extending the powers of EEOC. The pattern of agreements emanating from the EEOC offices generally bears these four stipulations directly relating to union interests:

WOULD YOU FLY IN THIS ROCKET?

First, most of the EEOC agreements call for abolition of job seniority arrangements in labor agreements. They generally take plant seniority as the only nondiscriminatory yardstick. The practical effect is that a sweeper, for example, who has been in the plant a long time, must be promoted to the next supervisory opening in the rocket assembly shop, regardless of his training or job preparedness.

The commission attitude is, "You must try him, even if he isn't trained."

How would you like a trip to the moon on one of those rockets?

Second, special treatment must be given to Negro employees who are found to be unqualified in their training or advancement.

Third, the EEOC generally calls for an end to all testing. It makes no difference if it is related to the job—the test must be "culturally validated." Ask any sociologist if you can culturally validate a test with less than a 100-man sample equally divided as to race and job experience.

Fourth, and most important to unions, the agreements usually call for a unilateral change in any union contract which is in conflict with any of the above proposals.

POSES LEGAL PROBLEM

This creates a nice legal question.

Does an employer have the right to break one law (the Taft-Hartley protections of collective bargaining agreements) and subject himself to NLRB action in order to obey the orders of the EEOC?

One company tells me it spends over \$1 million a year just trying to be in compliance with the multitude of often contradicting decrees handed down by government anti-discrimination agencies.

One federal agency, in existence by executive order, is taking a completely dictatorial attitude with defense contractors. It is the Office of Federal Contract Compliance (OFCC) which hands down ironclad regulations to those doing business with the government.

The really frightening thing here is the lack of Congressional restraint upon their operations, plus the fact that there is no appeal from an OFCC ruling. All this is even more fantastic when considered in the light of what the law actually says the Commission may and may not do.

Congress debated loud and long on the question of having an EEOC in the first place. There are plenty of statements on both sides of the aisle where both supporters and detractors agreed on things the law would not do.

Everyone agreed that setting employment quotas is not the right way to go about eliminating discrimination. Languages specifically prohibited hiring or firing, promoting or holding back, just on the basis of race to fill out a percentage quota. Yet practically every agreement coming out of EEOC has some mention of the local area's Negro population and relates the employer's performance to that quota.

Setting quotas, while probably the most frequent violation the EEOC commits, is not its only sin. Congresswoman Martha Griffiths of Michigan spoke out plainly on the floor of the House after the EEOC had been in operation for about a year.

She roundly castigated the Commission for failing to enforce the antidiscrimination provisions in regard to sex and said:

"These EEOC officials are completely out of step with the President, the rest of the Administration, the courts and, indeed, the country as a whole."

She charged the executive director of the Commission with saying the sex provision of title VII was a "fluke" and "conceived out of wedlock." Mrs. Griffiths reminded the Commission that "they took an oath to uphold the law—not just the part of it that they are interested in."

You can get a better idea of the haphazard, hot-eyed approach to the law taken by representatives of the Commission if you'll follow this chain of events that occurred during an actual case. Names, places and dates have been changed.

HOW EEOC OPERATES

Joseph Bedford operates a small manufacturing concern in the Midwest. He was on vacation last June when Jefferson Rank, a Negro, came in to ask about a job. So far as can be determined, he received courteous treatment from the receptionist in the personnel department, was told there were no openings at present either for employees or trainees, but offered an employment application to fill out and leave if he cared to. He didn't.

Now it's February and Mr. Bedford gets a call from his receptionist that a Mr. Sperlin of the EEOC is waiting to see him. He meets Mr. Sperlin and is promptly served a charge of discrimination dated the day before. It is signed by Jefferson Rank and sworn to before Mr. Sperlin. It's the first time Joe knows he's been charged with an unfair discrimination practice alleged to have happened last June.

Upon request he shows Mr. Sperlin around the plant and lets him talk to the personnel people. The manufacturer finds out he should be keeping records of applications, terminations, promotions, raises and the like for 180 days. He'd been throwing them away after 90 days. So far that's the only EEOC regulation he's been found negligent in. However, even if he had been keeping records for the stipulated time, Jefferson's application would not have been on file, since almost 270 days have passed.

Mr. Sperlin asks Negro employees if they are treated the same as white employees. He asks if the canteen areas or restrooms are segregated. Asks if personnel like working for their supervisor and Mr. Bedford. When they say, "Yes," he says, "Oh, that's too bad. I like to find people who aren't happy in their jobs."

Mr. Bedford contains himself. Mr. Sperlin leaves saying he has found nothing wrong except the record-keeping time limit. Joe Bedford sighs.

Seven and a half weeks later he gets an EEOC decision. It finds an unfair employment practice occurred in June, the charge filed in September and served on him in February.

The Commission is squeezing the law a bit. A three-month limitation on making a charge is written into the law. It's supposed to be signed and worn to. So the Commission says under questioning from Mr. Bedford's attorney (by now he's decided he needs one) that they've "adopted" the attitude that a written complaint fulfills the requirements of the law even though it was not sworn to. Just like that—change the law.

A couple of months go by before an EEOC conciliator makes contact and arranges a meeting. Now it's a little over a year since Jefferson Rank first entered the manufacturer's reception room.

Mr. Bedford and his attorney face the conciliator. Most of the agreement he wants Joe Bedford to sign is standard civil rights language—but there are some real stunners.

THE LIST OF DEMANDS

EEOC wants Mr. Bedford to hire Jefferson Rank as a trainee and pay him minimum wage back pay from the time of his alleged application.

EEOC wants him to employ, train and accept the applications of the next 75 Negroes referred to him by a civil rights organization. The figure is determined by taking the percentage of Joe's work force that's Negro and comparing it with an (inflated) percentage of the area's Negro population in the labor market.

EEOC wants Joe Bedford to agree to hire Negroes for the next five white-collar jobs. And he must upgrade at least three Negroes to supervisory positions within three months of the agreement.

On top of this, for two years Mr. Bedford has to report, quarterly, to the Commission everything he's doing that pertains to both his white and Negro workers. He can't promote anybody who is not a Negro unless he gets prior EEOC approval. All refusals of Negroes to take higher jobs must be documented in writing and sent to the Commission.

Mr. Bedford and his attorney managed to trim some of the rough edges off these demands, but he signed an agreement—even though he had done nothing wrong. The plant is located in a town that has lots of militant civil rights activity and he decided he didn't want pickets pounding on his door.

Whether Mr. Bedford got off lucky or not, we don't know. If proponents of additional enforcement teeth for the EEOC get their way, he probably did.

Reasonable negotiations would be harder to come by. The Commission will get the power to enforce its decisions based on "evidence" which it chooses to credit.

Could the same thing happen to you as an employer, or employee?

It not only could—it probably will. Under the proposed setup for EEOC, the practical effect would be presumptions of guilt. An examiner's "evidence" is deemed to be conclusive. You'll have to prove yourself innocent. The roles of policeman and judge are combined, and a single EEOC employee could conceivably issue his own cease and desist orders.

We've probably made a mistake in describing EEOC desired enforcement powers as "NLRB-like." The National Labor Relations Board has an independent General Counsel who must apply to the courts for authority to issue cease and desist orders. Under the new setup, EEOC appeal procedures would be practically useless. The NLRB was originally set up along the lines proposed for the EEOC. The ensuing mess was atrocious and the present limitations on the NLRB were devised.

Granting cease and desist powers to the EEOC, as the present legislative proposal would do, will deprive you of your day in court. The Commission may find you in violation, issue an order for you to cease and desist.

No testimony need be taken. No independent investigation to establish "substantial evidence" of violation need be conducted. The full power of the Commission may be delegated to a single Commissioner, or even to an individual employee.

This amazing concentration of power is without precedent.

The Commission has made much of the plans it has for submitting all types of job employment "patterns"—quotas on a large scale—to the computer. Already it has held a fishing expedition down South into the textile industry and received criticism from conservative and liberal alike.

The EEOC trotted out the familiar percentage figures again and flogged the industry, causing the liberally oriented *Charlotte Observer* to comment editorially:

"If the larger purpose was actually to get

something accomplished about equalizing employment in textiles, we are persuaded this was not the best way to go about it."

TRIAL BY HEADLINES

EEOC's public forum in New York in January, headed by Chairman C. L. Alexander, produced much more heat (and headlines) than light.

Blue-chip corporations were disdainfully put under the public microscope and, of course, found lacking as EEOC denunciations about "tokenism" and other catch phrases flew through the air.

At one point Mr. Alexander asked the president of one of our major airlines how many pilots were Negro. When told that only one out of 420 stationed in New York was, the EEOC spokesman demanded, "Are you satisfied with that?"

I would like to ask that Commissioner if he would care to fly on a plane in which the crew had been selected by race rather than ability? I'll take my flight crews promoted on the basis of skill.

The discouraging thing is that, even for those who have no civil rights ax to grind and would genuinely seek to live up to the Commission's wishes, it becomes impossible under the present approach, for the rules are changed so often.

If you get your total work force in balance with some particular percentage figure, then you find your managerial staff is out of line. Should you get that taken care of, the base of your percentage population figure is changed to make your quota still higher. It's a game nobody wins.

Let there be no mistake, I am for equal employment opportunity. But in substituting favoritism, we are not correcting anything.

Thomas Jefferson said, "All men are created equal." We cannot then come along with legislation and make some men more equal than others.

THE OUTLOOK

What is our legislative situation now? Senator Clark of Pennsylvania has introduced a bill that would give broad enforcement powers to the EEOC or an individual employee of the Commission. Basically these would be the same type powers residing in the National Labor Relations Board, with only limited appeal.

The bill is cosponsored by Senator Javits of New York. It is before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee on which I serve.

It is almost impossible to keep the bill from seeing floor action, unless the public really expresses itself to the Congress.

If people become aware of the strong influence that militant elements will have over their businesses and their jobs should this bill pass—then we can muster the strength to stop its extension.

Otherwise we are forging another link in the chain that can ultimately enslave this republic.

Representative Walter S. Baring, of Nevada, Announces Result of Questionnaire

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I have just tabulated the results of a questionnaire that I sent to 77,000 Nevadans. I am proud to report that I received slightly greater than 12 percent return.

In addition to the numerous notations written in on the questionnaire itself, I

received close to 1,000 letters in which my constituents gave additional comments and opinions.

Rather than use percentages, the re-

sults of my questionnaire show the actual vote count.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues will find the results of how the people in

the State of Nevada feel most interesting, as they are based on a statewide poll rather than an individual district.

The questionnaire follows:

QUESTIONNAIRE

	Yes	No	No opinion		Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you approve of the President's Vietnam policy?.....	1,175	7,400	437	11. Do you support the proposed travel tax?.....	2,488	6,189	335
2. Do you favor stepping up bombing attacks in North Vietnam?.....	5,965	2,265	782	12. Do you favor proposed Federal guaranteed annual income regardless of whether recipient works or is capable of working?.....	463	8,096	453
3. Do you favor a bombing halt?.....	1,825	6,346	841	13. Which authority do you believe should have the prime responsibility in carrying out and designing programs to combat crime in cities:			
4. Do you favor pulling out of the Vietnam war?.....	3,048	5,245	719	Local authorities.....	6,305		
5. Do you favor keep fighting to get negotiated peace?.....	4,546	3,407	1,059	State authorities.....	3,730		
6. Do you favor military steps necessary to close Haiphong?.....	6,040	1,794	1,178	Federal authorities.....	1,349		
7. Do you favor an all-out attack on North Vietnam?.....	5,184	2,881	947	14. Do you favor wiretapping in the investigation of organized crime?.....	6,204	2,181	627
8. Do you approve the Government's handling of the U.S.S. Pueblo seizure?.....	993	7,531	488	(Optional—Sex: Male, 5,263; female, 2,736. Party preference: Democratic, 3,425; Republican, 3,673; Independent, 1,131.)			
9. Do you favor promoting trade with Russia and its satellites?.....	2,287	6,292	433				
10. Do you support the proposed 10-percent surcharge tax?.....	1,275	7,377	360				

A Poignant Reminder of the First Forgotten Americans

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, America is facing up to the challenge of a great country by taking time to examine the weaknesses of our structure. In our great race to build this prosperous and powerful country, it was convenient to forget the faults of our character. Now, when our national character is at stake, we cannot ignore the numerous contradictions of the philosophy to which we credit our strength, our belief in the freedom of man.

Not without pain can we read history's documentation of our treatment of the American Indian—and we are prone to rationalize that the fate of a free nation demanded some sacrifice.

The following letter to the editor of the Maine Sunday Telegram serves to remind us of an obligation which yet remains unfulfilled. Never before have I read such a poignant reminder of the injustice inflicted upon these forgotten Americans. In hopes that it will arouse the heartstrings of understanding lying dormant in yet too many Americans, I commend this letter to the attention of my colleagues. Then, may we get on with the task of repairing, rather than rationalizing, the weaknesses in the structure of the American dream. America's future depends upon it.

The letter follows:

AMERICA IS BURNING

Our beloved country is aflame. Aflame with the fire of hate and violence. What has happened to a land—given by God—and once so serene and beautiful? Beauty no longer exists. Beauty is marred by fires burning in our cities. It is marred by the minds of men who advocate racism and marred by leaderless minorities who lash out with violence as a final desperate alternative.

This great land taken by force from my people is now immersed in an internal strife of its own doing. The American Indian of today looks and watches the beloved land of his birth with pain and great sorrow. Our Fathers fought valiantly against the first intruders of another land. They fought

but finally yielded to overwhelming tactics and superior arms. Over the years, some of us accepted the ways of life of the new and dominating society. Yet there are some of us who never will accept nor ever find the heart to forgive for injustices inflicted against us.

And today, America burns. Its very "conscience" burns and shows. And we can only look with great pity.

PETER A. MITCHELL,
Passamaquoddy Tribe,
Pleasant Point Reservation.

Olympics Become Political Games

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, now that the International Olympics Committee has replaced sports with politics—a youth meeting for competitive ideology instead of competitive athletics—South Africa is again forced into leadership of the free world.

The South Africans now have no choice but to host games for the sons and daughters of the free world.

If the Olympics are now lowered to the programed wishes of Communist and tribal states, those of the free world interested first in sports are entitled to a free men's Olympics to protect our youth from exploitation by the Communist subsidiaries of its athletes.

To any interested in a free people's Olympics in South Africa, why not wire Mr. Frank Braun, president of the South African Olympic Games Association at Johannesburg, South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I include the UPI release from Lausanne, Switzerland, following my comments:

NEW VOTE VIRTUALLY ASSURES BAN OF SOUTH AFRICA FROM OLYMPICS

LAUSANNE, SWITZERLAND.—World pressure brought upon the International Olympic Committee has virtually eliminated South Africa from appearing in the 1968 Olympic Games at Mexico City next October.

The nine-man executive board of the IOC voted Sunday to recommend the exclusion and it was certain the 36 votes necessary to legalize the proposal would be collected with ease.

More than 40 countries, including Russia, have gone on record as saying they would boycott the games if South Africa was allowed to compete.

The executive's decision was unanimous, despite the dismay expressed by IOC President Avery Brundage of Chicago, who had campaigned for South Africa's inclusion and arrived in Lausanne from a visit to Johannesburg last week.

Two South Africans, swimmer Karan Muir and sprinter Paul Nash, will suffer most from Sunday's decision. On current world form, they were thought to have excellent chances to win medals.

EXPRESSES SHOCK

In Johannesburg, Frank Braun, president of the South African Olympic Games Association, expressed shock at the executive's decision but said he still thought his country's chances in a re-vote were "good, but obviously not as good as last time. We still will find in the outcome that we have lots of friends."

Braun said that he wasn't sure of the details of the meeting but that if another vote is taken "it will be a shocking miscarriage of justice and will turn the IOC into a laughing stock."

"This means every time countries opposing South Africa in the IOC don't like something, they just have to shout."

South Africa's loss could be America's gain. World record sprinter Tommy Smith now may reconsider his decision not to participate. He was one of several Negro athletes who had announced they would boycott the games in protest of South Africa's inclusion.

AFRICAN HAPPY

The happiest man in Lausanne was Jean-Claude Ganga, secretary general of the Supreme Council for African Sport. He had made a determined bid to have South Africa excluded and he shook delegates' hands and expressed his thanks on behalf of "all Africa."

The IOC trouble started shortly after a decision was reached Feb. 15 at Grenoble to readmit South Africa to the games following her suspension in 1963. The Afro-Asian nations threatened to boycott Mexico City.

No sooner were the Winter Games concluded than the Supreme Council of African Sports met at Congo Brazzaville and unanimously elected to boycott the games. The movement gathered strength, especially after the Russians joined the outburst.

MEXICO DISTURBED

Mexico also was disturbed, since the games promised to be the smallest on record after the host nation had invested millions of dollars in building new stadiums and other necessary equipment.

This led to General Jose De Clark Flores, IOC vice president, and Ramirez Vasquez,

head of the organizing committee, to visit Chicago last month and persuade Brundage to call an emergency session of the board.

Among the executives, the Mexicans received firm support from Russia's Constantin Andrianov and Italy's Giorgio De Stefani. The rule book appeared the greatest ally with De Stefani, a lawyer by profession, making the best use of it.

There was all manner of speculation as the nine men sat in secret session for two days at the 18th century Chateau De Vidy by the shores of Lake Geneva.

It came as a surprise when it was announced that the decision to keep South Africa out was unanimous because it was thought the three English-speaking members—Brundage, Lord Exeter of Britain and Lord Killanin of Ireland—would side with South Africa.

The following cable, signed by Brundage, was sent to the 71 voting members of the IOC, who only a few weeks ago had agreed to South Africa's participation:

"In view of all the information on the international climate received by the executive board at this meeting, it is unanimously of the opinion that it would be most unwise for a South African team to participate in the Games of the XIX Olympiade—therefore the executive board strongly recommends that you endorse this unanimous proposal to withdraw its invitation to these games. This postal vote is submitted under rule No. 20. Please reply immediately by cable to IOC Lausanne."

All the replies were expected to reach Lausanne within 10 days, when South Africa officially would be out of the games.

South Africa, which had given assurances she would send a mixed team to Mexico aboard the same aircraft and in the same uniform, now must wait until 1970 to show whether she will ever be allowed back into the movement.

POLITICAL DECISION

Brundage maintained the decision was a political one, despite his insistence of the past few weeks that "the Olympic movement is concerned only with sports and not politics." He said he was personally sorry.

Gen. Clark said, "I am very happy with the decision. I am sure it will unite even further all of the IOC."

Ramirez paid tribute to Gen. Clark's work, to the IOC and Brundage, who he described as "a friend of Mexico."

Andriano was only "partially satisfied" with the decision, while Lord Exeter admitted "the political situation swayed."

Mass Exodus by Farmers Continues

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the agricultural problem of low net income still plagues the Nation. While the amount of money that we spend for food continues upward, farmers receive only a minute share of this increase. As a consequence, many farmers are trying to move to other occupations.

A group of cooperative leaders in the western part of the Sixth Congressional District have recently compiled a listing of those farm auctions as advertised in five newspapers between the period of January 12 and April 1, 1968.

This list consists of 110 farm auctions

and is the largest number of such auctions known for this period of time for this area.

Pace Magazine Covers the Jim Jones Story

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the enterprising and refreshing monthly, Pace, has just gone to press with its June edition, and a feature story deals with the outstanding career in public service of James R. Jones, 28-year-old Deputy Special Assistant to President Johnson.

The Jim Jones story is well known to all Oklahomans, who are proud of his dedication and achievements in public service.

I believe the Pace article, as written by Editor Robert J. Fleming, will be interesting reading for all. The full text follows:

JIM JONES OF THE WHITE HOUSE

(By Robert J. Fleming)

(NOTE.—At Pace press time the White House announced that Jim Jones had been named special assistant and appointments secretary to the President.)

It is 8:25 a.m. All is quiet in the press lounge in the West Wing of the White House. An Andrew Weyth painting of a makeshift wooden cross in open countryside looks down on empty green leather chairs. No correspondents are yet on the scene and at the end of the room the Stewart portrait of George Washington, flanked by the Stars and Stripes and the Presidential flag, seems strangely lonely.

Along the corridor connecting the West Wing with the White House proper, in the third office from the President, sunlight filters through the high window. Soft piped music comes from a brown box on the sill. Eight framed photographs are on the wall. A young man features in most. The inscription on one reads: "To Jim Jones—with appreciation for his diligence, competence and loyalty." It is handwritten and signed "Lyndon Johnson."

"Mr. Jones' office . . . Mr. Jones' office . . ." chants Donna Moloney, 23, an attractive brunette, as she picks up the first of the day's phone calls that will probably add up to 200 by nightfall.

A young man of medium height strides into the room, his hand outstretched. "Hello, I'm Jim Jones," he says with a smile. The workday of the 28-year-old deputy special assistant to the President has begun.

Jones is impeccably dressed. His black tie is monogrammed JRJ. Seated in a high-backed leather swivel chair, wearing round horn-rimmed spectacles, he confronts a large file of papers. A miniature wise old owl watches from the desk penholder set.

After tackling the immediate issues presented by the papers, Jones turns to the list of phone calls steadily being compiled. Every incoming call is noted on phone sheets. Jim picks them up in a steady stream between his own priority outgoing calls. The process could be likened to a fast ping-pong game. . . . "OK Donna, on the first page I'll take everybody except Avery and Grant."

"Hi, Governor. How are you? Are you going to be in town this week? I was thinking of Friday. Could you come in and visit with the Boss? . . . Friday, 5:30."

A man comes in with two pink telex messages. Jim looks them over, hands them to Donna. "Get these to the President by special messenger."

Some of the papers on the desk carry a red tab. "This means 'in a hurry to get an answer,'" he explains.

As he shuffles files Jones mumbles under his breath, "More paper goes through here . . . We should invest in a paper factory."

. . . "What? . . . That's fine but I don't think the Senator ought to dictate to us on whom we will appoint where."

An older man comes in with an armful of papers. A fast exchange takes place and he's gone as quickly as he came. "That was Bill Hopkins. He has been executive secretary to every President since Herbert Hoover. That's 32 years."

For a moment the telephone is quiet. "Can we visit between calls?" Jones asks.

"Yes, I'd be glad to tell how I came to the White House."

The phone interrupts again. "Mr. Meany, did Secretary Rusk get in touch with you? The President hasn't any time today. But if it's one of those things that's a must you're always welcome. . . . He'd like you to discuss it with Mr. Rusk first, though."

Each day Jones must go over the President's schedule, move his calendar along, work up scenarios, notify official visitors, provide briefing information, and, as Jim puts it, "make sure all the pieces fall together on anything the President does." He coordinates with Marvin Watson, special assistant to the President, whom Jones aided until named to his present post by the President last January 18.

Jim has accompanied President Johnson on all foreign trips since 1965 except for the funeral of Chancellor Konard Adenauer of West Germany. In October 1965 he made preparations in Mexico City for the President's first trip out of the U.S. Last December the Presidential party attended the funeral of Australia's Prime Minister Harold Holt, visited Thailand, stopped in Vietnam, refused in Pakistan and was received by the Pope at the Vatican. "All in 112 hours," Jim remembers.

Mementos of these trips have a special place in his one-bedroom apartment located in the southwest area of Washington in the same ultramodern building where Vice President Hubert Humphrey lives. Gifts include a silver box from the King of Thailand and two medals from the Pope which are specially treasured by Jones, who is a Catholic.

Framed photographs of Jim with the President decorate the walls. In his bedroom hangs a glass case displaying ten pens used in signing legislation passed by the 89th Congress, 1965-66. "The Boss" had handed them to him.

Souvenirs of his last trip to Puerto Rico are a suntan and the memory of a game of golf with the President "where I broke 100 for the first time, playing way over my head."

Jones travels regularly to the Texas White House where he is in charge of the President's office. He breakfasts at 6:30 a.m. in the ranch-house kitchen. At 7:15 he goes to the President's bedroom with overnight cables from Washington, special pouches and memos. Watson normally remains in Washington while Jim is with "The Boss" at the LBJ ranch.

It was in Texas that Jones got his first big test in speech writing. "He tossed the State of the Union message at me. I had no expertise, no real experience. We funneled the President's thoughts to Washington and their views came back to the President. The final drafting started on Sunday, January 14, and we finished Wednesday, the 17th. Four days of refining, honing and fitting in ideas, working with the President and Cabinet officers. I was tremendously grateful he would show that confidence in me."

Jones' two secretaries, Donna Moloney and

Sally Snyder, 24, worked with him on the State of the Union address. Recounts Donna. "We usually kept at it until 11:30 p.m. and we had chances to go to the President's office." Framed copies of photographs taken of the girls during the speech assembling hang above their desks. They are inscribed with a personal salutation from the President.

In Washington "an early night" for Jim means going home at 7:30 p.m. He alternates with Marvin Watson in staying late to prepare the President's night reading, a substantial pile of material for the Chief Executive to review before going to bed or in the early morning. "The President really wants to know what's going on," Jim points out. The night reading is assembled from carefully culled items, submitted by White House assistants, Cabinet and Agency officials. It could and does include some personal letters from ordinary citizens, newspaper clippings, magazine articles and memos. "But," says Jim, "if you put anything in a memo you had better be darned sure it is right. The President has a passion for correct facts. I've had a speed-reading course and I don't think he has. Yet he can read and comprehend a memo and discover whether there's a mistake in it faster than anyone I've known."

Jones thinks the President is often misunderstood. He sees his boss as a family man and a father. "It's hard for me to make a separation between this and his official life. I think of him as a human being."

"If you speak in superlatives, people call you a yes-man. But you can't work for someone you don't respect. He has that peculiar habit of tossing challenges to you. You seldom do the same thing twice.

"It's not that you don't tell a President he is wrong. You can make suggestions and present alternatives. Yes-men don't last long. The President loses confidence in them.

"He has to make very lonely decisions. You would like to help, but he has to do it."

The road that took Jim Jones to the White House began in Muskogee, Okla., where he was born on May 5, 1939. His father's family was Irish. His mother's parents came from Germany. Jones credits much of his success to his early upbringing. "I came from a relatively poor family but Mother had stern resolve and determination. My father, being Irish, was more of a dreamer. When I got a B in school, he would tell me I was capable of an A."

Today Jim's 73-year-old father is retired from his job as a clerk at the Muskogee post office and has started his own catering business. His mother works at the Veterans Administration regional office. A brother Joseph P. Jones, 35, is an engineer with Douglas in Los Angeles. His sister, 36, has eight children and is married to a carpenter in Muskogee.

Jim's first great love was journalism. At 5, he started a paper for kids in the community. "The first advertisement came from the grocery store where I bought my bubble gum."

When he was 11, his parents took him to an American Legion-sponsored dinner. The after-dinner speaker was Ed Edmondson who was then Muskogee county attorney. "Everyone pretty well knew he would run for Congress on the Democratic ticket," Jim recalls. "Afterwards, I went up and introduced myself. I told him I was active in sports, knew most of the kids in town, and would he like to hire me for his campaign?" Edmondson took him on at \$15 a week. His first chore was to deliver messages by bike, hire kids to put up campaign signs and speak for Edmondson on a radio program.

At 15, Jones got into the newspaper business as a high school correspondent for the Muskogee *Morning News* which was then the second paper in town. They were losing money. The higher salaried reporters were

laid off and Jim became sports and wire-service editor.

Not long after, he covered his first murder. It was a Saturday night. An old man had been shot in the face by his wife at Goose Neck Bend, not far out of town. She had pulled the trigger at point-blank range and Jim was the first reporter on the scene.

The same evening down at the hospital Jim had another taste of tragedy. A man had lost his wife and 2-year-old daughter in a highway collision. A second child was in critical condition in the emergency operating room. Vividly recalling the circumstances, Jim says, "At 15 I had to give solace and what comfort I could to a man twice my age. The story which I phoned in a few minutes later was a scoop."

Jones was exposed to raw life working with the *Morning News* and it laid the foundation for a future in politics and a perspective on life.

"At an impressionable age I saw society from the country-club set to the poor Negro living on the north side of town. I was able to see that all was not perfect with the 'high' and that all was not wrong with the 'low.' I had to put ideas on paper and get to the heart of the issue. Some awfully good newspapermen trained me and I became acquainted with key politicians."

In 1956 Jones was elected Governor of Oklahoma Boys State. Following the appointment, John Criswell, city editor of the Muskogee *Phoenix*, wired him a job offer. The *Morning News* collapsed and he found he was the only staffer hired by the *Phoenix*. "I learned newspapering politics from John Criswell," says Jones. Criswell is now treasurer of the Democratic National Committee.

It is now 12:30 and Sally Snyder is on the job with Donna. The tempo is increasing. Sally handles incoming calls on the extra four-line telephone. Donna takes the paperwork which Jim steadily gives her as he operates his own 39-button phone console and makes notes.

"Hello, is the Congressman in? Jim Jones at the White House calling."

"The Immigration Department says the visa is coming through soon for that family to enter."

Jones grabs a word with Donna. "I should get up to the Hill today but I don't know if I have the time.

"Send a letter to Sheriff Bill Hauck of Bexar County, Texas—'The President wanted you to have this autographed picture.'"

Sally comes from Freeburg, Pa. "I think the population is about 500," she laughs. She was 17 when she arrived in Washington and got her first job with the FBI. Last year a friend told her Jones was looking for another secretary. "Yes, you could call us executive secretaries but we're really 'Girl Fridays.' Jim keeps both of us running. We enjoy watching him work. He's a dynamo."

Donna graduated from Marymount College, Arlington, Va., where she took a liberal arts secretarial course. Her husband is special assistant to the treasurer of the Democratic National Committee. "I don't think anything else would ever satisfy me if I had to leave the White House," she admits.

Both girls have gone on Presidential trips to assist Jones. "We type up the President's itineraries, head-table guest lists, etc. There are lots of 'crash projects.' Everything has to be done instantly."

The lively strains of *Alexander's Ragtime Band* are coming from the Raymer loud-speaker on the windowsill.

"He has decided to visit the meeting of the National Council for the Aging at the Marriott. We had better get a man over there."

"Add to my telephone list Frank Melvin; reference—transferring elk from Yellowstone National Park to New Mexico."

"Oh, my gosh," remembers Jim. "I still have to pay my taxes."

"Sir, could you hold just a minute?" Sally asks a caller as the pace increases.

Jones suddenly flushes red. "Well, that's out," he barks into the phone. "We never do that for anybody..."

The color fades away as he tells the next caller, "As far as I know you're the only reporter the Ambassador is seeing. Glad it worked out."

Picking up the phone again, Jim inquires, "Is 'he' gone? This is Jim."

There is a lull. "Shall we visit awhile?" he suggests.

Why does he dub his boss "him" in conversation? "Because coming from Oklahoma and being kind of young you might get the idea I'm a name-dropper."

How much authority does Jones have as deputy special assistant to the President and what are his guidelines?

"You learn a little, after a while, of what he wants. Your work is strictly to be an extra eye, ear or arm. I don't create any power structure of my own.

"But sometimes when you call up and ask someone to do something they don't know if it was your idea or your great-aunt's or the President's. In any case they can't afford to discount that it might come from the President.

"With power you've got to exercise a great deal of caution and responsibility. What I do should be a reflection of the President, to complement what he is doing."

The schedule for the next day has to be lined up. Jones dictates:

"11:15 a.m.: videotaping of Red Cross speech in the Fish Room.

"11:30 a.m.: signing of the Transportation Bill in the Cabinet Room.

"12:30 p.m.: John Macy, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, to discuss personnel matters.

"1:00 p.m.: Senator Thurston Morton. Should this be 'on the record'?"

"5:00 p.m.: Sargeant Shriver, 'off the record.'

"7:00 p.m.: House Committee Chairman, 'off the record.'

"7:30 p.m.: Radio and Television correspondents' dinner. The President has been invited for 'a drop-in visit.'

"OK, let's prepare scenarios (procedural outlines drawn up for each White House public ceremony).

"11:30 a.m.:

Guests arrive in Cabinet Room. President arrives, proceeds to podium.

President speaks, etc."

He picks up a large file of papers and shakes them into place. "I've got to try and take all this back-up and work it into a schedule for next week.

"You try to know everything that's going on in the news at the particular time and make the President's schedule as timely as possible." Jones points out that the President naturally confers with a lot of people off the record but it's important to have on-the-record occasions.

"Take John Macy, for example. He's always newsworthy because when he sees the President it usually results in appointments which are news."

The phone buzzes again. Jim leans back and grins. "I want to check about those clubs we used last Sunday in Puerto Rico. What kind of business could we do? I've never had new clubs in my life. They're really nice."

Jones turns to Donna and changes the subject abruptly. "Write thank-you letters to my hosts at the Democratic luncheon in Tulsa (there were eight). 'Hope we'll have a constant dialogue.'" Donna takes it from there.

"Tell Colonel Albright to edit the off-record voice tapes of the President so he can go over them. I've got to go up front," says Jim as he walks over to the President's office.

From his earliest days in Muskogee, Jones has been a tiger for work. At high school he was president of his class, played baseball, tennis and was on the debating team. He worked a 30- to 50-hour week for the *Phoenix* as well as carrying a disc jockey show at WBIX. He had a *Tulsa World* paper route but "I finally got a bit run-down and had to give it up."

Jones attended the University of Oklahoma at Norman from 1957 to 1961 and obtained his BA in journalism. While on campus he was president of five organizations and joined the Lambda Chi Alpha fraternity. He produced a State Capitol radio program, represented the *Tulsa World*, free-lanced for several magazines, was assistant to Harold Keith, sports director for the University, and was sports writer and part-time desk man for the *Oklahoma City Oklahoman*.

In the summer of 1961 his old boss, now Congressman Ed Edmondson, asked Jim to come to Washington to be his legislative assistant. Evenings he attended law school at Georgetown University and in June 1964 graduated with an LL.B. A second lieutenant in the Army Reserve, he was told to report for active duty in November.

During the summer months of 1964 Jones volunteered his services to the Democratic National Committee. He was asked to head up advanced planning for the Lady Bird Special campaign train which was to tour eight southern states in four days. While handling the train arrangements he met Mrs. Johnson and attracted the attention of her press secretary, Liz Carpenter, and others in the party.

In November 1964, Jim went on active duty at Ft. Benning, Ga., where he volunteered for a Vietnam assignment. During that time Liz Carpenter sent a note to Jack Valenti, then Presidential assistant, saying Jones might be a good man "to have on board" at the White House. Later, while attending a specialist school at Ft. Holabird, Md., Jim received a phone call: "The White House is calling. It is Marvin Watson." He wanted to see Jim.

He went up to Washington where Watson, who had succeeded Valenti, asked him if he would like to come to work in the White House. Jim replied, "It would be challenging. I couldn't think of anything better."

At the White House he was assigned to the military aide's office and completed his two-year military service requirement as assistant to Watson. In November 1966, he officially became staff assistant to Watson and held that post until his appointment as deputy special assistant to the President in January of this year.

Jones works a six-day week. Sunday he keeps to himself. "I don't answer phone calls except from the President or Marvin Watson—only priority conversations."

He keeps three bicycles in the basement and with friends often rides 15 to 20 miles along the C and O tow path. Last summer Jones could sometimes be seen riding his bike through one of the large Negro sections of the town. He wanted quietly to find out people's problems at first hand and on several occasions joined a pickup baseball game.

"You have to be very careful with your private life in this job. You suddenly are not just Jim Jones, private citizen, anymore. Everything you do is open to the public."

Often in mid-afternoon Jones will suddenly leave his desk and head for the back door of the White House. "It feels good to get out in the fresh air and walk around the block." Passersby are unaware that this fast-moving young man from Muskogee, Okla., is a top Presidential aide.

Back in his office he is again on the telephone. "Is it as victorious as they claim?" he asks an unknown caller. "How do they explain it?"

"... Have we got an analysis of Gavin's report in the Saturday Evening Post?"

Jim is ticking off names on a list. "Calls I've still got to get to. But we'll deal with

them later. Let's go to the Hill and see Ed Edmondson."

En route back to his office Jim does some talking about politics. "Every decision a politician makes is on a 'gut' issue and the results are there for everybody to see. In politics you can't camouflage mistakes like you might in a company board room or a law office."

Jim stays late. He moves in and out of Marvin Watson's office where the President's night reading is being prepared. Sally handles the phone through the evening but the call list is pretty well cleaned up.

Outside in the West Lounge all is quiet. The pressmen have gone and even young Abraham Lincoln, seated on a log with his gun and his dog in the form of a small statue, looks relieved.

At 9:45 p.m. a White House car is waiting at the door for Jim. The black Mercury turns into Pennsylvania Avenue. "Car 26 headed for the Southwest section of town," whispers the chauffeur into a mike.

Jim says nothing. Finally as the car passes the Washington Monument, he observes, "It's been a heavy day. It's hard to think much . . . I'll get home and put my feet up and watch the Jonathan Winters show. You know, I think the majority of college students are more interested in doing something for their fellow man they they were 20 years ago."

"We have a responsibility to be participants rather than spectators. I know answers are not easy all the time but hope is there. I have a deep commitment to Government service. I expect to go back to Oklahoma to practice law . . . at least for a while."

The car is moving now along the Potomac. It is a moonlit night and Jim will be home in a few moments.

"You know," he says, "there are thousands who could do this job better than I. That is why I have to work twice as hard."

At Jim's home the phone keeps ringing until late into the night and the Jonathan Winters show goes unwatched.

Remarks of Reed Larson, Executive Vice President, National Right To Work Committee

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I include in the Extensions of Remarks the text of an address by Reed Larson, executive vice president, National Right To Work Committee, Washington, D.C., at the Oakland Lions Club meeting at the Hotel Leamington in Oakland, Calif., on March 27, 1968:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY REED LARSON, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Back in the early 16th Century, the Spanish Conquistadores bestowed the name California on an imaginary island near the earthly paradise told about in a romance of chivalry written by Montalvo in 1510.

I am here today to tell you that neither California, nor any of our other states will remotely resemble an earthly paradise if paid union bosses complete their current scheme to force more than 11 million public employees into compulsory unionism.

How would you like to have a portion of the hard-earned money you pay in taxes turned over to the big international unions to help finance union political activities,

organizing drives, lobbying programs, six-figure salaries of some union officials, and a host of other union pet projects with which you may or may not agree?

Of course you wouldn't like it.

This is not an idle question. This situation is closer than you think—and it's bearing down on us at breakneck speed.

Union officials with the help of some politicians who receive campaign support from union treasuries are making fantastic progress in a massive, coast-to-coast, community-by-community program aimed ultimately at locking every public employee—national, state, and local—into a compulsory contract that will force 11.9 million government workers to pay dues into union treasuries in order to keep their jobs. The amount of money at stake is astronomical.

As of January, there was a total of 11 million 929 thousand public employees in this country of which 2,703,000 are Federal employees. Some simple arithmetic will quickly disclose the reasons behind the union hierarchy's attempt to collect forced tribute from public employees.

If every public employee were under compulsion to pay union dues of \$5 a month, the take would amount to \$700 million a year. Even if they paid only \$1.50 a month, the paid union bosses would rake in at least \$150 million a year.

The stakes are enormous and the union bosses are at work.

You may be saying to yourself that the fellow Larson is an alarmist, he's exaggerating, that this union grab for more power and more wealth is an impossibility—and I can understand why you might feel that way.

Most of us just see a small part of the whole picture—a bit here—a bit there—and it doesn't look so ominous.

Besides, you in California have an especially enlightened state policy in protecting state employees from compulsory unionism. The California Labor Code says state and local employees can join or not join labor organizations.

For the lawyers among us that ruling is contained in West's California Government Code Annotated, Chapter 10, Division 4, Title I, Sections 3500-3509 (1961).

But this safeguard will be facing an increasing attack by those who have a personal interest in fattening the income of union treasuries. It's happening in other states. It can happen here.

Most Americans are puzzled, frustrated, and confused by the mounting waves of strikes and even violence in disputes affecting public employees—firemen, teachers, hospital employees, garbage collectors, and many more.

Behind these disputes are a variety of issues, some of them undoubtedly involving legitimate employee grievances. But underlying much of the unrest is the agitation of paid union organizers who, now seeking new fields to conquer, are ready to syphon off dollars from the paychecks of public employees, through compulsory dues check-off on every government payroll.

Government employees do not want to be forced to join an international union. Just before I came out here this week I met with the President of the National Federation of Federal Employees, one of the oldest and most respected unions. It represents more than 30,000 U.S. Government workers and prides itself on being a completely voluntary organization. It is aware of what the international union bosses are trying to do.

He said that the organization of Federal employees by international unions will, and I quote: "handicap the legitimate and proper organizing activities of many independent unions of Federal employees which are not plagued by the quarrels which so afflict the affiliated unions."

"The introduction into the Federal service of various bare-knuckle type organizing

methods, taken from private sector unionism, has had widespread adverse effects."

He told me of beatings, distribution of scurrilous literature and name calling, all of this new to government employee unionism.

"Many members of Federal employee unions do not relish the gutter tactics, and are urging their unions to follow the high rather than the low road," this long time government employee union head concluded.

As waves of strikes began hitting public employees around the country in recent months, our organization launched a thorough study of the extent to which compulsory unionism was involved, either directly or indirectly. I can tell you that the results have even shocked us—and we thought we knew what was going on.

Here are some of the things we found, and new information flows in every day.

Just six days ago, 300 tons of garbage were piled high in the streets of Scranton, Pennsylvania, as union bosses tried to blackmail city officials into forcing all city garbage collectors into paying dues to the Machinist Union in order to work.

Just seven weeks ago the City Marshal of the little town of Berlin, in New Hampshire, was slapped down by the New Hampshire State Supreme Court when it ruled that he and two brother officers had to join the union to hold their police jobs. The population of Berlin is 17,000 and the City Marshal who knows just about everybody in town didn't think he needed a union to represent him before the city fathers. But the court ruled otherwise and now City Marshal Paul Tremblay is a compulsory member of the AFL-CIO.

We've all heard about the big garbage strike in New York City. Now Victor Gotbaum, Executive Director of the AFL-CIO union which conducted that strike has revealed his real objective. He is demanding an "Agency Fee" contract under which more than 200,000 city employees would be forced to either pay tribute to the compulsory union or face the loss of their job. This attempt is going on right now.

In upstate New York the Civil Service Employees Association was forced to go to court to break a strangle-hold imposed on them in an agreement reached last summer between Rochester City officials and the AFL-CIO. The agreement resulted in an order from the City that all present and new city employees, except those in a few selected categories, must join the union, submit to payroll check-off of union dues, and maintain their membership in the union or face dismissal.

In Michigan we discovered that right now, out of 79 municipal employee contracts, 19 are compulsory union shops, there are 9 compulsory agency shop contracts, there are 24 compulsory maintenance of membership contracts, and only 27 of the 79 contracts fully protect the right of the employee to join or not to join a union. And these are municipal employees, paid with tax dollars, and forced to use the public tax dollar to support unions which many of them do not want.

Oakland County Sheriffs in Michigan are forced to join the union or lose their jobs, so are two lady clerks who worked for the Grand Rapids Police Department until the unions stepped in. Two long-time women clerks who refused to pay compulsory dues to an AFL-CIO union they did not belong to, or the equivalent amount to a scholarship fund that benefits them not at all, were fired. The City's Civil Service Board reinstated them. Then the City Manager fired them again. Now their case will be argued in the Kent County, Michigan, Circuit Court, concerning the validity of the compulsory check-off provision of union contracts.

And don't forget, these aren't auto workers, they are school teachers, police officers, public employees, paid with public money.

Don't take my word for it. In a September 1966 interview with *U.S. News and World Report*, Jerry Wurf, president of the same American Federation of State, County, and Municipal employees asserted that "in a number of very important instances, like Michigan State University, we even got a union shop."

The questioner asked: "In what states is this happening?"

Wurf replied: "It's happening in Michigan, Wisconsin, Delaware, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island—a whole flock of states."

Later in the same interview the exchange went like this:

Questioner: "When your people went on strike, were they violating the law?"

Wurf: "Oh, yes."

Questioner: "Did they win the strike?"

Wurf: "Yes. They always do."

The danger is clear.

The failure of the union movement to gain in membership since the end of World War II has led to their shifting their targets from industrial organization to governmental organization whereby they can provide not only economic but direct political pressure.

The loser in this is, as always, the employee himself. It is ironic that in our country, a country which is dedicated to individual liberty and freedom, we are now saying that you have to pay tribute to a private organization in order to work for a public agency. Again, money in taxes is being taken from the public and paid to private organizations.

Many people find it hard to understand how under the protective civil service regulations which guarantee job protection, salaries, vacations, and pensions, union organizers are able to induce public employees into their unions. The answer is rather simple. The union officials have been successful by bringing political pressure on public administrators. Once approval is given by a public agency to organize its employees, it is a short step until supervisors are "encouraging" employees to join the unions, and then it is but a slimmer step to compulsory unionism for all. This is a vicious cycle, which if not stopped, could forge a compulsory union power strong enough to dictate the total political destiny of our nation.

And as a New York State Supreme Court Justice commented when he ruled on the jailing of the garbage strike leaders—"This is where democracy stops and anarchy begins."

The late President Kennedy recognized the danger involved in the unionization of public employees when he insisted that his Executive Order 10988 authorizing the unionization of Federal Employees, also protect the right not to join. That Order includes the following provision in Section 1-A which reads:

"Employees of the Federal government shall have, and shall be protected in the exercise of the right, freely and without fear of penalty or reprisal to form, join, and assist any employee organization or to refrain from such activity."

This section can properly be called the Federal Employees' Right to Work Law.

As long as Executive Order 10988 remains in existence compulsory unionism will not exist for Federal employees. But its days may be numbered!

Now look what's happening.

The Union bosses took a beating in 1965 when they tried to have the protective clauses of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act repealed through regular legislative processes.

They know that they can't win with the present climate in Congress. So their target has become Executive Order 10988, which indeed is an order, and independent of the will of the people.

To accomplish this a Presidential Review Committee on Labor Management Relations was appointed by President Johnson last September and chaired by Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz. We don't have to point out where Secretary Wirtz stands when it comes to forcing employees into unions. He is the Johnson

administration's most avid promoter of compulsory unionism.

The Labor Management Review Commission is instructed to prepare recommended changes in the Kennedy Order concerning unionization of Federal employees. That report is expected within a month. And most observers believe that President Johnson will immediately accept its recommendations, including concessions to compulsory unionism, and issue them as Federal policy at once. When that is accomplished it will require Congressional action or a reversal by the President himself to undo the damage, so it looks to us, and to many others, like the skids have been greased for a first big step toward forcing Federal employees to pay dues to labor unions they may not want to join.

The tip-off came on October 23rd last, when AFL-CIO President George Meany testified before the Commission and brought the compulsory unions' master plan into focus. He asked the Administration to sanction a system whereby non-union Federal employees could be forced to pay the equivalent of union dues into union treasuries. According to the wording of Meany's proposal, compulsory dues payments could be imposed on all employees in government bargaining units in which as few as ten percent of the employees had voluntarily joined the union.

And who is on the Commission to say no? Not Labor Secretary Wirtz, not Presidential Assistant Joseph Califano, Jr., a hand-picked member of Johnson's staff; not Postmaster General O'Brien, one of the President's most trusted political masterminds; not Defense Secretary and Presidential confidant Clark Clifford; maybe Chairman John Macy of the Civil Service Commission, because he knows under compulsory unionism we will have no more civil service; and just perhaps Budget Director Charles Zwick who knows that any semblance of financial responsibility disappears when the salaried union officials gain compulsory dues support.

The Commission is meeting behind closed doors these days, but every once in a while a puff of smoke comes out and a trial balloon goes up.

The message seems to say, to those wise in the ways of interpreting Washington maneuvers, that the Commission is trying to package a procompulsory unionism recommendation so that the concept gets its foot in the door of Federal policy and the President can act on compulsory union's behalf, without seeming to do so.

It appears that the Commission is casting about for the spoonful of sugar that will make the compulsory unionism medicine go down Federal employees' throats through hamstringing 10988. It may even take, observers say, a form that will require employees to "donate" a part of their salary, equivalent to union dues, to a third charity.

This in effect is a sneaky way of upholding the idea of compulsory unionism and paving the way for another bite of apple a couple of years down the line.

We think the most likely move by the Commission will be a subtle and seemingly innocuous rewording of the present policy by failing to reassert protection of the employees' "right to refrain." And the will of the people as far as compulsory unionism for Federal employees is concerned, is well-known in Washington.

Since the beginning of the present, 90th Congress, 80, count them, 80 identical or near identical bills concerning employee-management relations in the Federal Government have been introduced in the House of Representatives and one has been introduced in the Senate.

Each of these bills will destroy the present Federal policy which protects an employee's right to refrain. Congressional leaders know the bills have very little support beyond the sponsors themselves.

None of these bills has received any serious

attention from the Congress. They are all bottled up in Committee.

We see this as evidence that union officials are not at present capable of using their overt powers to influence the Congress to pass legislation aimed at compulsory unionization of Federal Employees.

So they are eyeing the back door—beaming their political power in the direction of President Kennedy's 1962 Executive Order 10988 in the hope they can destroy Federal employees' "Right to refrain" from supporting unions.

If union officials succeed in doing no more than obtaining from President Johnson a new executive order which eliminates the protection of the "Right to Refrain," they will have taken a big step towards locking Federal employees into compulsory unionism. And they will have done it the easy way with the omission of a few key words, the key words that will quietly ease the latch off the door and pave the way for the realization of the notorious ultimatum of compulsory unionism: "Pay up or get out."

But this need not happen. That's why we are sounding the alarm. We intend to alert the people of this country, and we urge you to help, so that the people will not let union officials steal the freedom of the individual through mass compulsory unionism.

We must let the voice of the American public be heard loud and clear, in town meetings, at the county level, in the State House, the Halls of Congress and yes, in the White House. It is one voice that politicians understand. We must urge that President Johnson retain that part of Executive Order 10988 which protects the Federal employees' "right to refrain" from supporting a union.

And then we must go a step further, and see that the right to refrain protection is extended to every public employee whether on State, County, or Municipal level.

Commandant Merna Addresses Daughters of American Revolution

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, one of my most outstanding constituents is Mr. James E. Merna, who is the commandant of the Prince George's County detachment of the Marine Corps League. Mr. Merna has invited strong leadership and devotion in programs designed to demonstrate to our servicemen in Vietnam, those who were injured and returned, and those who come home after serving there that we care about their sacrifice and patriotism.

Mr. Merna was honored recently to address the 77th Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution. At this point in the RECORD, I insert Mr. Merna's speech and commend it to all my colleagues:

OUR MEN IN VIETNAM: THEY'RE DOING THEIR PART ON THE BATTLEFIELD, LET'S DO OURS ON THE HOMEFRONT

(Remarks of James E. Merna, New Carrollton, Md., Originator and Chairman of "Operation Appreciation" and "Operation Remembrance" before the 77th Continental Congress, National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Constitution Hall, Washington, D.C., April 18, 1968)

President-General Mrs. Sullivan, General Nickerson, distinguished guests, and grand ladies of the Daughters of the American

Revolution. Thank you for the honor of inviting me to be with you tonight to participate in the Patriots' Night program of your 77th Continental Congress.

I have been asked by your President-General to say a few words about Operation Appreciation. I would like to address my remarks to the highlights of this program in the context of a broader subject, "Our Men in Viet Nam: They're Doing Their Part on the Battlefield, Let's Do Ours on the Homefront."

Perhaps many of you have seen or heard of an article in this month's Reader's Digest by former President Eisenhower entitled, "Let's Close Ranks on the Home Front." In this article, President Eisenhower speaks out against those critics of the war in Viet Nam, who, in defiance of both common sense and their country's best interests, preach discord and rebellion.

He asks each one of us, "What has become of our courage? What has become of our loyalty to others? What has become of a noble concept called patriotism, which in former times of crisis has carried us through to victory and peace?" My dear ladies, who amongst us ever thought that such questions would have to be asked of the most powerful and richest Nation in the world, a Nation long renowned for its reputation of sticking together when the going got rough?

I would like to make one point clear. No one has to tell the Daughters of the American Revolution anything about patriotism. You have lived it faithfully and practiced it arduously for more than three quarters of a century in the same noble spirit as your illustrious forebears. The initials "D.A.R." and the word "patriotism," as everyone knows, including Joan Baez, are synonymous. One is the sine qua non to the other. Through your resolutions and actions, the D.A.R. has always given unqualified support to the military efforts of our Nation.

I would like to cite from my personal knowledge one small though important example of home-front support and cooperation between the military and the D.A.R. Last September I had the privilege and honor to escort your President-General Mrs. William Henry Sullivan, Jr., to Bethesda Naval Hospital for a "cheer-up" visit with wounded U.S. Marines just back from the fighting in Viet Nam.

On prior occasions I had escorted to the hospital for similar visits certain other prominent personalities. One outstanding group was the Washington Redskins Football Team. Another big hit with the patients was an ex-major league baseball player named Joe Garagiola, currently a star on NBC's "Today" Show. Judy Garland was another performer who generously accepted my invitation to visit the war veterans at the hospital.

I must confess I initially had some misgivings when I first met your President-General last September as we began our tour of the wards at Bethesda Naval Hospital. I had some inner doubts only because I wasn't sure how she would be accepted by the patients. To my knowledge, Mrs. Sullivan didn't particularly know too much about the rugged game of football, no one could possibly tell funny and hilarious stories about baseball like her Scarsdale, New York neighbor Joe Garagiola, and she wasn't noted, as far as I knew, for possessing any exceptional singing and dancing talents like Miss Judy Garland.

Now you may possibly be asking yourselves, "Well just how did this visit of Mrs. Sullivan with some rugged combat-tested Marines go over?" I can best describe the encounter in a single word—magnificently! Mrs. Sullivan was an immediate hit with the Marines. They took to her right away—like a devoted son to his mother, the same as our combat servicemen did four months later when your President-General visited with them in the field and in the hospitals in Viet Nam.

You may be interested to know that as a result of Mrs. Sullivan's visit to Bethesda Naval Hospital and because of her devotion to our men in uniform and the cause for which they are serving, the doors right here in Constitution Hall have been thrown wide open to hospitalized servicemen. Many an enjoyable hour has been spent here by our recuperating servicemen from Walter Reed Hospital and Bethesda Naval Hospital attending concert performances and the like. I trust these doors shall always remain open to them.

And that, dear ladies of the D.A.R. is all that Operation Appreciation is about. It is simply a home-front support program providing aid and recreational assistance to hospitalized Viet Nam Veterans. Its purpose is to show these deserving Americans that they have not been forgotten—and that their great personal sacrifices in defense of freedom are appreciated.

Operation Appreciation began almost two years ago, in May 1966, sponsored by my General Douglas MacArthur Post, Catholic War Veterans, USA. Since that time, wounded Marines at Bethesda Naval Hospital have been treated to 42 outings and events. These have ranged from taking the patients to all of the major sports events such as baseball, football, basketball, boxing, wrestling, stock car races, tennis matches and soccer games to such diverse social events as the theatre, concerts, crab feasts, fire-house parties, society lawn parties, a Congressional Reception on Capitol Hill, and an Embassy Party.

When we take the patients on these outings, and we have had as many as 150 patients at a time, many on wheelchairs, stretchers, and the like, we don't just have them sit inanimate at a ball game or the theatre, for example. We try to make arrangements to take them behind the scenes, into the locker room after a baseball game, for instance, to meet such stars as Brooks Robinson of the Baltimore Orioles and Gil Hodges formerly with the Washington Senators. Or back stage after a performance of "Barefoot in The Park" to meet Miss Myrna Loy and the entire cast. One surgeon at the hospital remarked of Operation Appreciation, "It's better medicine for the patients than anything I could prescribe."

One of the most active supporters of our program has been one of your very own members—the wonderful Mrs. Marjorie Merriweather Post, in completely unheralded fashion. She's never let us down—always wanting to know how she can help.

It is imperative more than ever that each of us continue to do something constructive for our hospitalized servicemen. According to the latest Department of Defense casualty records, more than 122,000 American servicemen have been wounded in Viet Nam. More than 57,500 were wounded seriously enough to require hospital care. In 1968 alone, more than 22,000 Americans have been wounded. This is more than the total strength of an entire Marine Division.

And these are not just plain statistics. These are human beings—our fellow Americans. I visited some wounded Marines included in these statistics a week ago Sunday at the U.S. Naval Hospital in Philadelphia. I went on Ward K—the amputee ward—and talked to quite a few of them—Marines like "Butch" Joeckel, 20 years old from Colmar Manor, Maryland, who won the Bronze Star in Viet Nam but lost both legs as the result of an enemy mine, and the Ross brothers from Middletown, Connecticut—one lost an arm and an eye—the other lost a leg. One is 18 years old—the other 19.

Each of these Marines, and the hundreds and hundreds of other wounded Marines that I have met and talked to over the past two years have something in common. None of them have any regrets about what happened to them—and they have indeed paid a terribly high price. Their only regret is that they weren't able to finish their job. To this

day, they remain the strongest supporters of this Nation's commitment in Southeast Asia. What a paradox it is indeed that those of us at home who feel the heat of battle least, complain the most.

Let us not forget those who paid the supreme sacrifice. As of last month, more than 20,000 Americans have been killed in Vietnam. The Prince Georges County Detachment of the Marine Corps League, which I am currently serving as Commandant, recently announced a program called Operation Remembrance. We are in the process of raising funds to build a Memorial in honor of all servicemen from our County, from each branch of the armed forces, who lost their lives in Viet Nam. To my knowledge, this will be the second of its kind in the Nation—the first was recently dedicated, I believe, in Springfield, Oregon.

But these 20,000 Americans came from every state in the Union—from practically every major city as well. We need outstanding organizations such as the D.A.R. with your 185,000 members strong from each of the 50 states and overseas as well, to help see to it that Memorials of some type are dedicated in honor of each of these 20,000 American heroes. They deserve nothing less.

Finally, let us not forget our men in uniform who, though they may not have been called to make the supreme sacrifice, may not have been wounded in action, may not have been decorated, but who nonetheless courageously heeded their Nation's call to duty—and served their 12 or 13 months' tour of duty in Viet Nam or wherever else their country needed them.

I am referring specifically to the average American serviceman of whom we can all be proud—the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who didn't scheme legally and illegally to dodge the draft—they didn't extend their schooling, take draft-exempt jobs, plead family hardship, remain on the farm when they otherwise wouldn't, pretend injury or mental problems, buy forged documents, burn draft cards, or desert to places like Canada or Sweden.

I suggest that we need badly another program for these returning servicemen and veterans. It might be called Operation Welcome Home. We could let them know that their Nation is proud of them—that we truly appreciate their efforts.

As General Nickerson knows only too well, today's returning servicemen do not return to the parades and brass bands that greeted him and many thousands upon their return home from World War II, or that I remember greeting us at the dock at San Francisco when we marines returned home from Korea.

No, unfortunately, as Vice President Humphrey told a VFW audience here in Washington earlier last month, "the loudest sounds you may hear are those of our democracy debating its course at home and abroad."

We need to welcome these servicemen and veterans back into our communities—to let them know that we are proud and happy to have them back with us—and we need to help them adjust to civilian life again.

One of their most important and pressing needs is employment. They need jobs. Government figures show that some 750,000 American servicemen will be released from active duty in 1968. Each of us can help by talking to these men as soon as they return—by finding out what kind of work they are interested in—and then calling their special abilities to the attention of our public officials, community leaders, employers, and friends.

At a Marine Corps League dinner dance in Arlington, Virginia Saturday night, I heard a Marine Corps General say, "If all of us at home had supported our efforts in Viet Nam in the past few years and months, this war would have been over by now." Speaking was Lieutenant General Lew Walt, the former Senior Commander of 125,000 U.S. forces in

Viet Nam, a leader like General Nickerson, both of whom are more familiar with Khe Sanh and other places in Viet Nam than we are with our own back yards. General Walt went on to say, "All we need to win is a complete backing here at home."

In conclusion, as we pay tribute tonight to the Patriots of '68, let each of us dedicate ourselves to accomplishing the ultimate for those who accomplished so much for us with so little concern for themselves.

Our men in Vietnam are doing their part on the battlefield—let us do ours on the homefront!

A Time for Unity

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the highly respected newspaper, *Newsday*, carried an editorial last week entitled "A Time for Unity." The main points of the editorial can be neatly summed up in the first two sentences:

President Johnson's dramatic renunciation of a second term and his curtailment of the bombing of North Vietnam opened the way to the current delicate contacts between Washington and Hanoi. The President's domestic critics should now give him a chance to explore this small opening toward peace.

All the President's critics have had ample opportunity to express their views on the handling of the Vietnam problem. The criticism has ranged all the way from thoughtful and responsible discussion to thoughtless and irresponsible acts. In the light of the President's completely selfless moves which resulted in the recent peace overtures, we must take a new look at what we do and say.

As the editorial states, referring to President Johnson:

He should be given the strong backing of all Americans in the days ahead as he seeks an honorable transfer of the confrontation between the two sides from the battlefield to the conference table.

I insert this thoughtful and balanced editorial in the RECORD:

A TIME FOR UNITY

President Johnson's dramatic renunciation of a second term and his curtailment of the bombing of North Vietnam opened the way to the current delicate contacts between Washington and Hanoi.

The President's domestic critics should now give him a chance to explore this small opening towards peace. He must proceed cautiously. Contacts with Hanoi are so precarious that even slight interference from parties outside the bargaining could upset the balance. Hanoi has put great emphasis on its propaganda campaign. The leaders of North Vietnam, therefore, are aware of what is being said in the U.S. This is no time for reporters who have been given guided tours of North Vietnam or other self-styled experts on the intentions of Hanoi to sound off.

The President's determination to approach these negotiations as a statesman has been amply demonstrated. He startled the nation and the world with his decision to forego a second term and to de-escalate the bombing. This is a time for such statesmanship.

We must not let the frustrations of the moment blur the significance of what is happening between Washington and Hanoi because of the President's initiative. The failure of the two sides to agree on a site for

preliminary talks looms large at the moment as a threat to the whole move toward negotiations. But the implications of these initial contacts are broad. More is involved than merely the choice of a city. Decisions made now, if they seem to reflect weakness, could affect bargaining positions later, and both sides know this. The President has acted dramatically and forcefully to bring us this far. He is now engaged in tough and extremely delicate preliminary moves. He should be given the strong backing of all Americans in the days ahead as he seeks an honorable transfer of the confrontation between the two sides from the battlefield to the conference table.

Operation Appreciation

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Operation Appreciation is a homefront support program of aid and recreation for hospitalized Vietnam veterans. The originator of that program, Mr. James Merna, commandant of the Marine Corps League, recently described Operation Appreciation and suggested a further Operation Welcome Home to help returning servicemen adjust to civilian life, at the Patriots' Night program of the Daughters of the American Revolution's 77th Continental Congress. As the father of a ranger and paratrooper who led a platoon in Vietnam and was wounded twice, I believe that this address will be of interest to all Members, and I place it in the RECORD at this time:

OUR MEN IN VIETNAM: THEY'RE DOING THEIR PART ON THE BATTLEFIELD—LET'S DO OURS ON THE HOMEFRONT

(Remarks of James E. Merna, New Carrollton, Md., originator and chairman of "Operation Appreciation" and "Operation Remembrance" before the 77th Continental Congress, National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Constitution Hall, Washington, D.C., April 18, 1968)

President-General Mrs. Sullivan, General Nickerson, distinguished guests, and grand ladies of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Thank you for the honor of inviting me to be with you tonight to participate in the Patriots' Night program of your 77th Continental Congress.

I have been asked by your President-General to say a few words about Operation Appreciation. I would like to address my remarks to the highlights of this program in the context of a broader subject, "Our Men in Viet Nam: They're Doing Their Part on the Battlefield—Let's Do Ours on the Homefront."

Perhaps many of you have seen or heard of an article in this month's Reader's Digest by former President Eisenhower entitled, "Let's Close Ranks on the Home Front." In this article, President Eisenhower speaks out against those critics of the war in Viet Nam, who, in defiance of both common sense and their country's best interests, preach discord and rebellion.

He asks each one of us, "What has become of our courage? What has become of our loyalty to others? What has become of a noble concept called patriotism, which in former times of crisis has carried us through to victory and peace?" My dear ladies, who amongst us ever thought that such questions would have to be asked of the most powerful and

richest Nation in the world, a Nation long renowned for its reputation of sticking together when the going got rough?

I would like to make one point clear. No one has to tell the Daughters of the American Revolution anything about patriotism. You have lived it faithfully and practiced it arduously for more than three-quarters of a century in the same noble spirit as your illustrious forebearers. The initials "D.A.R." and the word "patriotism," as everyone knows, including Joan Baez, are synonymous. One is the *sine qua non* to the other. Through your resolutions and actions, the D.A.R. has always given unqualified support to the military efforts of our Nation.

I would like to cite from my personal knowledge one small though important example of home-front support and cooperation between the military and the D.A.R. Last September I had the privilege and honor to escort your President-General Mrs. William Henry Sullivan, Jr., to Bethesda Naval Hospital for a "cheer-up" visit with wounded U.S. Marines just back from the fighting in Viet Nam.

On prior occasions I had escorted to the hospital for similar visits certain other prominent personalities. One outstanding group was the Washington Redskins Football Team. Another big hit with the patients was an ex-major league baseball player named Joe Garagiola, currently a star on NBC's "Today" Show. Judy Garland was another performer who generously accepted my invitation to visit the war veterans at the hospital.

I must confess I initially had some misgivings when I first met your President-General last September as we began our tour of the wards at Bethesda Naval Hospital. I had some inner doubts only because I wasn't sure how she would be accepted by the patients. To my knowledge, Mrs. Sullivan didn't particularly know too much about the rugged game of football, no one could possibly tell funny and hilarious stories about baseball like her Scarsdale, New York neighbor Joe Garagiola, and, she wasn't noted, as far as I knew, for possessing any exceptional singing and dancing talents like Miss Judy Garland.

Now you may possibly be asking yourselves, "Well just how did this visit of Mrs. Sullivan with some rugged combat-tested Marines go over?" I can best describe the encounter in a single word—*magnificently!* Mrs. Sullivan was an immediate hit with the Marines. They took to her right away—like a devoted son to his mother, the same as our combat servicemen did four months later when your President-General visited with them in the field and in the hospitals in Viet Nam.

You may be interested to know that as a result of Mrs. Sullivan's visit to Bethesda Naval Hospital and because of her devotion to our men in uniform and the cause for which they are serving, the doors right here in Constitution Hall have been thrown wide open to hospitalized servicemen. Many an enjoyable hour has been spent here by our recuperating servicemen from Walter Reed Hospital and Bethesda Naval Hospital attending concert performances and the like. I trust these doors shall always remain open to them.

And that, dear ladies of the D.A.R. is all that Operation Appreciation is about. It is simply a home-front support program providing aid and recreational assistance to hospitalized Viet Nam Veterans. Its purpose is to show these deserving Americans that they have not been forgotten—and that their great personal sacrifices in defense of freedom are appreciated.

Operation Appreciation began almost two years ago, in May 1966, sponsored by my General Douglas MacArthur Post, Catholic War Veterans, USA. Since that time, wounded Marines at Bethesda Naval Hospital have been treated to 42 outings and events. These have ranged from taking the patients to all

of the major sports events such as baseball, football, basketball, boxing, wrestling, stock car races, tennis matches and soccer games to such diverse social events as the theatre, concerts, crab feasts, fire-house parties, society lawn parties, a Congressional Reception on Capitol Hill, and an Embassy Party.

When we take the patients on these outings, and we have had as many as 150 patients at a time, many on wheelchairs, stretchers, and the like, we don't just have them sit inanimate at a ball game or the theatre, for example. We try to make arrangements to take them behind the scenes, into the locker room after a baseball game, for instance, to meet such stars as Brooks Robinson of the Baltimore Orioles and Gil Hodges formerly with the Washington Senators. Or back stage after a performance of "Barefoot In The Park" to meet Miss Myrna Loy and the entire cast. One surgeon at the hospital remarked of Operation Appreciation, "It's better medicine for the patients than anything I could prescribe."

One of the most active supporters of our program has been one of your very own members—the wonderful Mrs. Marjorie Merriweather Post, in completely unheralded fashion. She's never let us down—always wanting to know how she can help.

It is imperative more than ever that each of us continue to do something constructive for our hospitalized servicemen. According to the latest Department of Defense casualty records, more than 122,000 American servicemen have been wounded in Viet Nam. More than 57,500 were wounded seriously enough to require hospital care. In 1968 alone, more than 22,000 Americans have been wounded. This is more than the total strength of an entire Marine Division.

And these are not just plain statistics. These are human beings—our fellow Americans. I visited some wounded Marines included in these statistics a week ago Sunday at the U.S. Naval Hospital in Philadelphia. I went on Ward K—the amputee ward—and talked to quite a few of them—Marines like "Butch" Joeckel, 20 years old from Colmar Manor, Maryland who won the Bronze Star in Viet Nam but lost both legs as the result of an enemy mine, and the Ross brothers from Middletown, Connecticut—one lost an arm and an eye—the other lost a leg. One is 18 years old—the other 19.

Each of these Marines, and the hundreds and hundreds of other wounded Marines that I have met and talked to over the past two years have something in common. None of them have any regrets about what happened to them—and they have indeed paid a terribly high price. Their only regret is that they weren't able to finish their job. To this day, they remain the strongest supporters of this Nation's commitment in Southeast Asia. *What a paradox it is indeed that those of us at home who feel the heat of battle least complain the most.*

Let us not forget those who paid the supreme sacrifice. As of last month, more than 20,000 Americans have been killed in Viet Nam. The Prince Georges County Detachment of the Marine Corps League, which I am currently serving as Commandant, recently announced a program called Operation Remembrance. We are in the process of raising funds to build a Memorial in honor of all servicemen from our County, from each branch of the armed forces, who lost their lives in Viet Nam. To my knowledge, this will be the second of its kind in the Nation—the first was recently dedicated, I believe, in Springfield, Oregon.

But these 20,000 Americans came from every state in the Union—from practically every major city as well. We need outstanding organizations such as the D.A.R. with your 185,000 members strong from each of the 50 states and overseas as well, to help see to it that Memorials of some type are dedicated in honor of each of these 20,000 American heroes. *They deserve nothing less.*

Finally, let us not forget our men in uniform who, though they may not have been called to make the supreme sacrifice, may not have been wounded in action, may not have been decorated, but who nonetheless courageously heeded their Nation's call to duty—and served their 12 or 13 months tour of duty in Viet Nam or wherever else their country needed them.

I am referring specifically to the average American serviceman of whom we can all be proud—the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines who didn't scheme legally and illegally to dodge the draft—they didn't extend their schooling—take draft-exempt jobs—plead family hardship—remain on the farm when they otherwise wouldn't—pretend injury or mental problems—buy forged documents—burn draft cards—or desert to places like Canada or Sweden.

I suggest that we need badly another program for these returning servicemen and veterans. It might be called Operation Welcome Home. We could let them know that their Nation is proud of them—that we truly appreciate their efforts.

As General Nickerson knows only too well, today's returning servicemen do not return to the parades and brass bands that greeted him and many thousands upon their return home from World War II, or that I remember greeting us at the dock at San Francisco when we Marines returned home from Korea.

No, unfortunately, as Vice President Humphrey told a VFW audience here in Washington earlier last month, "the loudest sounds you may hear are those of our democracy debating its course at home and abroad."

We need to welcome these servicemen and veterans back into our communities—to let them know that we are proud and happy to have them back with us—and we need to help them adjust to civilian life again.

One of their most important and pressing needs is employment. They need jobs. Government figures show that some 750,000 American servicemen will be released from active duty in 1968. Each of us can help by talking to these men as soon as they return—by finding out what kind of work they are interested in—and then calling their special abilities to the attention of our public officials, community leaders, employers, and friends.

At a Marine Corps League dinner dance in Arlington, Virginia Saturday night, I heard a Marine Corps General say, "If all of us at home had supported our efforts in Viet Nam in the past few years and months, this war would have been over by now." Speaking was Lieutenant General Lew Walt, the former Senior Commander of 125,000 U.S. forces in Viet Nam, a leader like General Nickerson, both of whom are more familiar with Khe-sanh and other places in Viet Nam than we are with our own back yards. General Walt went on to say, "All we need to win is a complete backing here at home."

In conclusion, as we pay tribute tonight to the Patriots of '68, let each of us dedicate ourselves to accomplishing the ultimate for those who accomplished so much for us with so little concern for themselves.

Our men in Viet Nam are doing their part on the battlefield—let us do ours on the homefront!

Gov. Ronald Reagan Addresses Women's National Press Club

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Ronald Reagan is one of our Nation's most articulate and preceptive leaders.

As Governor of California, he is the chief executive of our largest State. The problems confronting us in California are not peculiar to California; they are the problems of America; they are mirrored 50 times within our Nation's boundaries. Governor Reagan has infused excitement and brought confidence and dedication to the function of problem solving at the State level.

This is clearly reflected in a recent talk by the Governor before the Women's National Press Club here in Washington. Governor Reagan addressed himself to the universal problem of public welfare and his efforts toward "ghetto busting." I commend his speech to every thoughtful, concerned public official in our Nation. His philosophy, his proposals, his objectives are worth the earnest consideration and examination of every citizen of every community.

I insert Governor Reagan's speech in the RECORD, as follows:

I've crossed the path of many of you a number of times during the last year along the "mashed-potato circuit." And since you all read each other, it's hardly a secret that I've been going on at great length and even greater detail about the nuts and bolts side of the government of California. And some of you who've been assigned to cover what must have seemed like the pilot and all of the reruns must think by now after listening to me on a number of occasions that California kids grow up wanting to play "bookkeeper and budget."

Now, it's true that we've devoted a great deal of time and attention to restoring fiscal stability and effecting economies to insure the solvency of our state. We've instituted modern business practices. We've reduced the number of state employees. We've eliminated unnecessary office space, and we've streamlined operations generally.

We have in fact reduced government costs by tens of millions of dollars. Not, as some have charged, because we're not responsive to the needs of the people, but precisely because we are responsive to those needs. Public officials are elected to solve problems, and when they fail to keep a hand on the cost of the nuts and bolts, the problem-solving machinery of government grinds to a halt. We've made a start in reducing both the size and cost of government, but at the same time we've made a start on some of the most vexing programs and problems confronting not only Californians but also, I'm sure, all Americans in all of the fifty states.

How can it be that our affluent society, capable of producing goods and services in the amount of some eight hundred billion dollars a year, with an unfulfilled demand for skilled workers, at the same time can add tens of thousands of people each year to the welfare rolls, until the percentage who are living on public subsistence is greater than at any time in our history, even including the days of the Great Depression?

Well, we believe that it's possible, very possible, that the approach itself to welfare as we've known it in these recent decades could have something to do with this.

In the last ten years, while our state's population was increasing 39 percent, the cost of welfare in constant dollars in California went up 247 percent. As a state, we rank third in poverty and first, in the last few years, in the amount of federal poverty funds that are assigned there. Some of us out there think that welfare has at last revealed itself to be a colossal failure, just as charity is a failure unless it makes people independent of the need for it.

As presently constituted, welfare's great flaw and weakness is that it perpetuates poverty for the recipients of welfare, institu-

tionalizes their poverty into a kind of permanent degradation. We think that it's time that we re-orient and re-direct welfare so as to stop destroying human beings and instead to start saving them.

We're trapped in a multiplicity of regulations and an administrative nightmare, imposed by federal regulations and red tape, that are an inseparable part of the federal grants and aid.

Fortunately, however, there are some loopholes. We discovered that we are permitted here and there to experiment, and so with the permission of the government in Washington, we've launched a pilot program in the area of welfare. We've taken all those multitudinous agencies that are dealing with this one particular problem and in one community, Fresno, we have put all of these programs into one. It is one coordinated effort under one director and we're going to feed the recipients of public subsistence into one end of this combined effort.

At a certain check-point, those who cannot provide for themselves, those who, whether it's through age or disability, must depend on the rest of us, will drop out of that program into this permanent subsidy to the public. We hope that in so doing and in streamlining this, we'll be able to prove that we can provide not only some of the necessities but some of the comforts that make life worth living for those unable to care for themselves.

It is ridiculous to find that there are eighteen separate categories of people on welfare. What does it matter why people are dependent if they are dependent? Our obligation is plain and simple: to provide for them, and we can do this by welfare in one considered effort.

But the rest of those people will continue on through the screening programs of job training, analysis of their problems, and eventually through job training, out the other end into private enterprise jobs. Jobs with a future. In other words, we are going to attempt to break the dependency cycle of welfare and make people independent of it. Perhaps in a year-and-a-half or two years, we will have the information to come to Washington and lay our findings before the government and ask for the flexibility to apply this on a wider basis.

We have at the same time in our state, doubled the number of physically and mentally handicapped who have been rehabilitated in the last year and placed out in useful employment.

We'll have a summer employment program for youth, aimed at the disadvantaged. It'll involve the independent sector and the local communities in a program to provide useful and gainful employment. The state government also will be involved. We've been able to make 3,000 jobs available, some are vacation replacements but many will have actual training jobs leading to permanent employment in public service.

But one problem overshadows all the others, and last night the cowardly hand of an assassin laid that problem on America's doorstep.

Whatever your opinion of Martin Luther King, whether you approved or disapproved, our nation died a little last night also.

It started dying and his murder began with our first acceptance of compromise with the law.

That compromise ranges from our indifference when some would apply the law unequally to some of our fellow citizens, to those who today, black or white, say it is up to us as individuals to decide which laws will be obeyed and which laws broken.

And it includes those in government, unless and until they have the courage to say the law will be enforced and will be enforced equally and applied to all men on an equal basis.

The time has come for all of us to make

a choice. Either we reaffirm our faith in man's ability to meet his fellow man in a spirit of good will with a determination to eliminate their differences peacefully, or we turn savage. We who are white must accept the responsibility for rendering the night-riider and his more gentlemanly ally, the friendly neighborhood bigot, impotent.

And those good, responsible people who make up the vast majority of the black community, must repudiate the bigots in their midst. Any other path leads only to the jungle, where those who are outnumbered die.

The President's Commission Report accuses us, you and me, all of us, of white racism. It's a stigma we'll live with from now on in our communities and with our fellow citizens unless we prove they're wrong.

You and I know that many of today's problems are the result of prejudice—prejudice that has divided mankind from his very beginning. We know too, that there are those today who continue to spread poison of bigotry and we can't ignore them any more than any of us should ignore those others, those millions of others who are determined, and who have been working ceaselessly over the recent years, to make sure that no American ever again will have to tell a child that that child is denied some of the blessings of this land because in some way he is different.

And that's where you and I come in. We can take an interest and we can make a difference. We can insure equal rights and equal opportunity and equal treatment for all our citizens. We can do this by becoming involved in this great problem.

During the past few weeks, I've been traveling up and down the state of California. I've been going into small meetings, without fanfare, with no press coverage, because that wasn't the purpose of the meetings. I've been quietly meeting with leaders of our minority groups in communities throughout California, and when I say leaders, I don't just necessarily mean the names that you are familiar with that appear in the public print as leaders. I mean those people who are dealing at first hand with the problem in their own neighborhood. Most of the time I've listened to their grievances, their suggestions, their hopes, and their hopelessness.

There's no standard pattern to these meetings. In some, I've met with great bitterness, and in some, I've heard suggestions and information about our own efforts to find solutions. I've learned how our educational system has failed them, how in too many instances we're passing, particularly the student from the minority area, passing the student from grade to grade simply because he's reached the end of the term and not because he's learned anything. And at the end of the line he's handed a certificate or a diploma and it's meaningless, because there's no knowledge that goes with it.

He's unable to even read the directions at the beginning of a job training program.

I've learned how our economic system has failed to extend its bounties, as it should, to all who are willing to make an honest effort. I've heard their disillusionment with government programs, promising an instant tomorrow, but designed too often with political opportunism and expediency in mind.

I've been charged, of course, with being opposed to the humanitarian goals because I've vetoed some of those poverty programs. You know, the law permits the governor to veto the programs and being totally inexperienced, I hadn't discovered that you weren't expected to, so I did. For example, in Ventura County of California, there was a program that on the face of it sounded very sound. It was to put 17 of the hard-core unemployed to work clearing the open-park lands that we have acquired. It sounds all right. But I vetoed the program when I learned that more than half of the budget was going to provide seven administrators to make sure that the seventeen got to work on time.

But that is nothing, compared to one of the programs in Chicago. Eight hundred and seventy-two thousand dollars granted to one of those political gerry-built organizations that was to teach basic reading and arithmetic to dropouts. An inquiring reporter went down after a time to see how the class was coming and he interrupted a crap game.

It was explained that it was recess and then he said, "How are we doing?" Well, take the faculty, who weren't paid an excessive amount, but who also weren't worked an excessive amount. One of them was in jail for murder, one was in jail for conspiracy to commit murder, three were out on bond awaiting trial for rape, one was out on probation for a burglary conviction. And the director said it was too soon to determine whether the program had been a success.

But these teachers were paid, in addition to their salaries, five dollars a head for each dropout they brought in, and since they were able to offer a dropout forty-five dollars a week plus a family allowance, they found that the best place to pick up an easy five dollars was at the nearest school where they were talking the kids into dropping out and coming over.

Now, this is our fault. Our willingness to accept politics as usual, our easy tolerance for wrong-doing in government, as if this is just standard practice, and we should not feel any urge to get angry. And yet, in these meetings, I found responsible, fine men and women of our minority communities, following disappointment after disappointment with a patience that is hard for us to comprehend, scrounging for contributions, trying to keep some of the more effective programs going, after some whim on the part of the government planners had cancelled or reduced them. These people, these people I met with, some of whom confessed they were threatened if they came to such a meeting, they are standing between us and those revolutionaries who believe the only answer left is the last hopeless gesture of the torch and the club.

Our meetings will continue with these people, but there will also be meetings with others, with leaders of the business community, with leaders of our labor unions, with educators, and with our own department heads in government.

Those of you who have heard me speak know that I have spoken with some pride of the personnel, the type of people who accepted appointments in our administration in California, people unlike the usual political appointees, people who have taken those jobs at a great personal sacrifice.

But you also know that I have never mentioned these people in any division, as to whether they belong to one particular group or another, or where they came from. For, in the first place, that is because I just can't help but believe that appointments should be made, neither because of, nor in spite of, race or religion or ethnic background. And, second, because I am sensitive to any appearance of grandstanding or trying to take bows for something that we should be doing just normally.

But now, after meeting with those good citizens, I think that it is time that they have a few symbols. Something to encourage them and to cling to, and I am going to tell you that my pride is even greater in the people who are working in our administration because we have the greatest number, the greatest percentage, of members of the minority communities in policy-making and executive positions in our administration than has ever been true in any administration in the history of the State of California. And we have appointed more than seventy Negroes and Americans of Mexican descent to our draft boards throughout California.

Soon after I was elected, I chose an industrialist, Chad McClellan, who mobilized private industrialists in Los Angeles to go into the Watts area two years ago, right after the

riots, to provide jobs for the hard-core unemployed in that area and I asked him to take this on a voluntary, statewide basis and he has done this.

Today, more than 20,000 industrialists in sixteen of our communities, cooperating with the job-training programs, the state and the federal governments, are actually placing the hard-core unemployed in these private enterprise jobs.

The liaison in charge of this from government's end is my Lieutenant Governor Bob Finch.

Now, I don't mean to oversimplify, but I have a belief that jobs are the most important part of this problem. Regardless of all the social problems, regardless of all the things we love to talk about, of equality or opportunity or anything else, the ghettos' walls are economic. It does no good to pass legislation as window-dressing that opens doors if the people you're opening those doors for haven't the price of admission, can't buy the ticket to get in. Of the 17,800 unemployed in the Watts area who were put into jobs by the Chad McClellan program, almost immediately 30% of them moved out of that neighborhood, proving what the walls consist of in the ghettos.

We have learned something else from these meetings. In spite of the liberal stance of too many of our labor leaders, management today is way ahead of labor with regard to solving this problem.

I know something about employment and I know after 25 years as an officer and a leader of my own union, something of the responsibility of the union to its members when there are not enough jobs to go around.

But I know also, that when less than 3% of the union membership in California comes from our minority communities, there is something wrong and that isn't good enough.

The apprenticeship programs, for instance, are slow to take those who are darker-skinned or who have Spanish surnames. I know, too, California law requires that we as a state do business with equal opportunity employers and I know that that law is going to be enforced to the letter. We are checking our own civil service regulations. We do not believe that 99.7% of California's jobs require a high school diploma.

In education, we are exploring the possibility of premium pay for the good teachers so that they will be encouraged to take on the hardest jobs where there is the greatest need for their skills. When the physical facilities are needed for youth programs, athletic programs, adult meetings, when Archie Moore, the former champion out in San Diego, has almost two hundred youngsters and he is bringing them up and teaching them self-respect and he has to do it in a little storefront, why should the schoolhouse door be closed at four in the afternoon? Why shouldn't we use those physical facilities and the playground and the meeting room for programs of this kind for the balance of the day and over the weekend and through the summer?

I'll tell you now that I heard no pleas in these meetings for forced bussing or for unnatural integration of children into schools far from their homes. Over and over again, from the people themselves, the plea was for good schooling and discipline in the schools their children are now attending, and, believe it or not, they told me they wanted more education aimed at jobs, at vocational training.

They said to me, "It just isn't true that everybody has to have a college degree to be happy."

There were points in which we were not in agreement.

I hold with government's right to enforce rules guaranteeing that those who do business with the public have an obligation to serve all of the public.

I endorse a law that bans restrictive covenants with regard to housing and I believe that that same law should apply to those who are in the business, the large-scale business of marketing tract homes.

But though I deplore and detest the evil sickness of prejudice and those who practice it, I cannot believe or bring myself to believe that we should open the door to government interference with regard to the individual's right to the disposition of his own personal property, because once that door is opened, government has been granted a right that endangers the very basis of individual freedom, the right to own and the right to possess.

There is a definite limit to what can be accomplished by law or legislation. Inevitably, and this was true in every meeting, we came to the point where the only obvious solution was the responsibility that lies with each one of us, our willingness to become personally involved, willingness to express our disapproval of those who are motivated by prejudice, even while we defend at times their legal rights to indulge in that sickness.

The industrialist must do more than write a memo encouraging the employment of Negroes. Sometimes, we have learned, a memorandum doesn't reach the shop steward or the foreman. We have discovered that if we are to continue with this program of providing jobs, the head of the company, the "top banana", must keep going down clear to the bottom every once in a while to remind them that this is his personal concern, and that it is his wish that they do something about it in each one of these plants and industries.

We have learned in government that many times the policy stops when it leaves our office and gets down to the firing line.

How do you think we feel when we have sent out the word down to our state employment offices and then we find in one of those offices that a man, an instructor, took a young Negro boy in to fill out an application and as they left, having filled it out, in one of our California offices, he asked the boy if he would put certain things down that he thought would be helpful and the boy said he forgot? "Well," he said, "Let's go back in and add them." And he went back ten minutes later and they couldn't find the application. On a hunch, he walked over to the nearest wastebasket, and they found the application.

School administrators must go out of their way to encourage, and prod, and arm-twist promising minority students, students who don't think that they have a chance of a scholarship and going to college and moving on.

It isn't enough simply to put a little notice up on the board saying that examinations for scholarships are available. They have got to take a personal interest and see that those individuals have their chance.

Yes, all of us have to spend a little less time trying to be our brother's keeper and start trying to be our brother's brother. We are embarked on such a course in California. Not because of any talk of a long, hot summer or a long, hot any-other-period of the year; this is not a crash program.

We are doing what we're doing because it is morally right to do it and it's a good thing to do.

The funny thing is, it is good from every angle. It is good business. Industry in America today needs men and women. It is crying for them to fill skilled jobs and here we have a community filled with men and women who need only the skills to fill those jobs. The alternative is to perpetuate poverty, keeping them on the dole at our expense. With jobs they become productive citizens, sharing the burden of government with the rest of us and making it easier to solve the rest of the social problems. If we can raise our minority communities to just the aver-

age level of purchasing power of the rest of the majority community, we have a potential market for our free enterprise system that is equal to or even greater than the foreign market, whose loss threatens our prosperity at this very moment. That French philosopher so often quoted by all after-luncheon and after-dinner speakers, De Tocqueville, came to this country a hundred years ago, searching for the secret of America's greatness and finally found it. He said America is great because America is good, and he said if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great.

Now, I am sure that some of what I have said has sounded very strange to some of you, coming from one who has in the kindest words been termed a conservative and by some has been charged with being willing to eat his young.

It shouldn't sound so strange, though. There is a Democratic state legislator out there in California, a black American, who represents the Watts area, Bill Green. He is a liberal, and he says, "One thing California and the nation have to realize is that the black community and the conservative community are coming much closer together. Liberals tend to intellectualize the question out of existence."

Well, now, I personally deplore the use of such labels as conservative, moderate, or liberal, or any other. I prefer to think that we are coming to a realization that those who look only to government for the answers have failed for some years to recognize the great potential force for good among those who instead have placed their faith in the doctrine of the individual.

We are dealing with individuals. Each one of them—they are not a mass problem. Each one of them is unique as we are unique and each one of them is uttering the same cry. It has been uttered by mankind since the very beginning. That cry from within that wants him to be recognized as having human dignity and independence. The American dream that we have nursed for so long in this country and neglected so much lately is not that every man must be level with every other man. The American dream is that every man must be free to become whatever God intends he should become. The restoration and the perpetuation of that dream is the greatest challenge confronting every one of us today.

Reaction to President Johnson and His Decision Not To Seek Reelection

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the article that follows was written by Mike Royko of the Chicago Daily News, commenting on some of the reaction to President Johnson and his decision not to seek reelection.

It was reprinted in the Sunday magazine section of the Shawnee, Okla., News-Star on April 21 by Ross U. Porter, editor and general manager.

In times like these, when there is a great deal of emotionalism and extremism being displayed in some quarters, it is refreshing and thought provoking to see an article of this kind. I think it is worth sharing:

MAYBE HE WASN'T THE BEST, BUT WERE WE?
(By Mike Royko)

There are those who screamed with a vicarious joy when President Johnson, in that slow,

sad way of his, said he was not running again.

There were others who reacted with sullen cynicism, asking what his angle was.

The white racists said "good." The black racists said "good." The super-Hawks said "good" and the Doves said "good." And most of all the young said "good."

They were all so busy being jubilant in this strong man's terrible moment that many didn't listen to the serious thing he told them.

The President of the United States told the people of the United States that they are so divided against themselves he dares not take part in a political campaign for fear that it could get even worse.

But they answered, many of them, with one last jeer of contempt and hatred.

It figured. Unrestrained hatred has become the dominant emotion in this splintered country. Races hate, age groups hate, political extremes hate. And when they aren't hating each other, they have been turning it on L. B. J. He, more than anyone else, has felt it.

The white racists, those profoundly ignorant broads who toss eggs at school busses, blamed him for the very existence of the Negro. To them he was a nigger lover.

The black separatist could find no insult too vile to be used on him. To them he is a white racist. That he launched some of the most ambitious civil rights legislation in the nation's history means nothing in a time when black scholars say Abe Lincoln was the worst kind of bigot.

The super-Hawks complained that he wasn't killing the Viet Cong fast enough.

The Doves portrayed him as engaging in war almost for the fun of it.

And the young, that very special group, was offended by him in so many, many ways.

For one thing, he was old. They might have forgiven him that if he had at least acted young. But he acted like a harassed, tremendously busy, impatient man with an enormous responsibility. Just like their old man.

He offended them by failing to pander to them, by not fawning over them and telling them that they were the wise ones, that they had the answers, that they could guide us. He didn't tell them that because that fact was, he was the man charged with running the country, not them.

He isn't at all like Sen. Robert Kennedy. Bobby tells it like it is. He tells them how wonderfully wise and profound they are.

L.B.J. offended others by engaging in an "unjust" war. Their collective conscience rebelled against the "unjust" war. So they portrayed him as the eager murderer of babies. Just how many of these conscience tormented young men are more tormented by the thought of being routed out of bed at 5 a.m. by a drill sergeant than by the thought of a burned village, we'll never know.

And he offended many by his lack of style and wit, his sore-footed, hound-dog oratory.

So the abuse he took from all was remarkable. Presidents, like all politicians, have to take abuse. It is within the rules of the game to criticize them, to spoof them, to assail them.

But there may not have been anything in our history to compare with what has been tossed at President Johnson in the last four years.

A play that says he arranged the murder of John F. Kennedy has been a hit with the intellectuals, and those who think they are.

A somewhat popular publication of satire called the Realist printed something so obscene about him that I can't find a way to even hint at it.

High government officials were hooted down when they tried to represent the Administration point of view on campuses, those temples of free speech.

Every smart punk grabbed a sign and accused him of being in a class with Adolf Hitler or Richard Speck. The nation's nuts vowed to come to Chicago during the convention and turn it into anything from an outdoor orgy to a historic riot as their contribution to the democratic process.

He needed more personal protection than any President in history. That can't feel very good. But it was necessary. We have people who burn cities and many others who go to movies and howl with glee at the violent scenes.

If you live in a big city you see the hate that threatens it. He lived in the whole country and looked at it all. And he couldn't see a way to unite it.

Maybe he wasn't the best President we might have had.

But we sure as hell aren't the best people a President has ever had.—From the Chicago Daily News.

Los Angeles Representative Edward R. Roybal Makes His 17th Report From Washington to the Residents of California's 30th Congressional District

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important responsibilities of a Representative in Congress is to keep his constituents fully informed about his activities on their behalf in the Nation's Capital.

For that reason, I would like to include in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of my 17th report from Washington to the residents of the 30th Congressional District of California.

In addition to my regular series of Reports from Washington, I have also sent out 12 special reports designed to cover all other major items of legislation considered by Congress, events of national and international significance, and particularly, those matters of immediate concern to the Metropolitan Los Angeles and southern California area.

My 17th report from Washington follows:

CONGRESSMAN ED ROYBAL, REPRESENTATIVE, 30TH DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA, REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

CONSUMER CREDIT PROTECTION

As one of the original Congressional sponsors of the Truth-in-Lending bill, I am happy to report success in obtaining an overwhelming 382-4 vote of approval in the House for this measure to ban hidden finance charges, and to protect the Nation's private borrowers from deception and fraud by requiring loan companies, financial institutions, and retail merchants to make full disclosures of total credit costs on all cash loans, department store revolving accounts, and other forms of consumer credit and installment purchase contracts.

The strongest consumer legislation ever voted by the House, the bill is now in conference to work out differences with an earlier version passed by the Senate.

PROSPECTS FOR PEACE

We all hope and pray that President Johnson's peace initiative of limiting the bombing of North Vietnam will prove to be the key turning point toward starting meaningful

negotiations to get the conflict in Vietnam away from the battlefield, and bring it to the conference table.

Moreover, the President's surprise decision not to seek re-election, in the interest of promoting domestic unity and achieving world peace, has been recognized as a magnificent act of personal courage and self-sacrifice—unprecedented in American history.

By removing himself from the political arena, the President hopes to reduce the growing internal divisions in the country, and increase the chances of establishing the basis of a just and lasting peace with freedom in Southeast Asia.

V.A. TO RESTUDY HAZARD PARK HOSPITAL SITE

During a recent conference in my Washington Congressional office, Veterans Administrator William Driver personally agreed to order a re-examination of several alternate construction sites which I suggested as being suitable for the proposed new Hazard Park Veterans Hospital, with a view toward establishing the feasibility of relocating the hospital nearby—on other than park land.

I was delighted to receive this kind of cooperation from the VA, because I have been deeply concerned by what I consider to be a grossly discriminatory Hazard Park land exchange scheme with the City of Los Angeles, that would have deprived a low-income, high-population area of East Los Angeles of this desperately needed public park and recreation facility.

The contemplated property trade between the VA and the City would have given most of Hazard Park to the VA for use as a hospital site, in exchange for federally-owned property near affluent Westwood, in order to provide land there for development of a new West-side City park in the Bel Air/Brentwood area.

Though I am fully in favor of building the veterans hospital, I simply cannot understand the necessity of sacrificing and bartering away one of the few remaining community recreation sites still available to residents of the Hazard Park area—just to subsidize a multi-million dollar park project in West Los Angeles.

But, with united community support, I think we can win this fight to save Hazard Park!

LATIN AMERICAN NUCLEAR TEST BAN

I was honored at being selected as the House of Representatives' member of the official U.S. government delegation sent from Washington to Mexico City to witness the signing of the historic Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America.

In my work on the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have long advocated such regional non-proliferation agreements as one of the best ways of stopping the spread of nuclear weapons throughout the world, and of reducing the terrible danger of nuclear war.

EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW

Judge Philip Newman, one of the most outstanding jurists on the Los Angeles County Municipal Court, and a member of the National Advisory Committee for the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity's legal services program, explains how this program, with the active support of such professional organizations as the American and California State Bar Associations, is making a significant contribution toward achieving the goal of equal justice before the law for every citizen.

In the highest traditions of our system of jurisprudence, the legal services program is a nationwide effort to provide all Americans with the full protection of the law.

By improving the administration of justice here at home, I believe this program can aid the cause of an orderly, lawful, and peaceful society in this country, while pro-

moting our ultimate objective of peace throughout the world.

MEDICAL RESEARCH: KEY TO BETTER HEALTH

Six-year-old Rosemary Woods, the 1968 National Cystic Fibrosis Poster Child, makes a very appealing request for our help in providing funds for urgently needed research programs to find the cause and cure of this dread childhood disease, which today claims more victims than polio, diabetes, and rheumatic fever combined.

Cystic Fibrosis Care, Research, and Training Centers have been established at the UCLA School of Medicine, and at Children's Hospital, USC Medical School. For information on how you can contribute to the fight against cystic fibrosis, contact the Greater Los Angeles Chapter of the National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, Room 303, 139 S. Beverly Drive, Beverly Hills. Phone: 275-1660.

AMERICAN CIVIL RIGHTS MARTYR

The tragic, senseless, and brutal assassination of Martin Luther King, Nobel Peace Prize Winner and world famous apostle of non-violence, has shocked the conscience of the country he loved so well.

There is little doubt that Martin Luther King will go down in American history as an honored martyr for the cause to which he had dedicated his life: the peaceful reconciliation of all the various racial and ethnic groups living together in this, our "one Nation, under God".

What he worked and, ultimately, died for, was what most Americans also want—an end to injustices as old as the nation itself, an end to poverty and ignorance and hatred, full equality of opportunity, and a meaningful share in the future of America for all her citizens.

The landmark Civil Rights Act of 1968, passed initially by the Senate on an overwhelming 71-20 vote, and then by the House with a substantial 250-171 bi-partisan majority, is, in my opinion, a positive and constructive effort to heal some of the critical divisions and conflicts that exist today—and build for ourselves and our children a better America where each person is judged as an individual, and not according to his race, or religion, or color, or creed.

Supported by both California Senators, as well as by the majority of our State's Representatives in the House, this measure includes federal protection for the exercise of a person's civil rights, strong anti-riot and related firearms control provisions, a fair housing section that eventually will cover some eighty percent of U.S. housing, and a long-overdue "Bill of Rights" for American Indians.

SERVICE ACADEMY EXAMS

I am again asking all young men from the 30th District who are interested in competing for 1969 nominations to the Air Force, Naval, Military, or Merchant Marine Academies to plan to take the U.S. Civil Service Commission's special Academy Designation Exam scheduled to be given in Los Angeles on July 9, 1968 (a make-up exam will be held later in August). For more information, contact our District office on 688-4870.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT

City Councilman Tom Bradley, a key leader in the fight to eliminate urban blight and improve conditions in the Los Angeles metropolitan area, discusses his work with the newly-formed nationwide Urban Coalition while in Washington to confer with federal officials on a variety of new programs designed to benefit residents of the country's major population centers.

Such personal interest and active cooperation from local officials is essential to the success of recent programs enacted by Congress to help meet the growing crisis in the nation's cities.

NATIONAL KIDNEY TRANSPLANT PROGRAM

I have been greatly encouraged by the strong support I've received for my bill, H.R. 14909, to establish a National Commission on transplanting human organs, and to implement a comprehensive treatment program to aid victims of chronic kidney disease.

This measure would provide a thoroughgoing review of the full range of medical, legal, social, economic, technical, and humanitarian problems—and opportunities—which the Nation faces as a result of the astoundingly rapid progress of medical science toward making transplantation of human organs, and the use of artificial organs, practical alternatives in the treatment of disease.

In addition, H.R. 14909 has been enthusiastically endorsed by the National Kidney Foundation as a major step forward in organizing a nationwide kidney care and transplant program—based on the outstanding pioneer work of leading institutions in this field, such as the UCLA and USC Medical Centers, Wadsworth Veterans Hospital, and the Los Angeles County Hospital.

MIDDLE EAST SETTLEMENT

Greeting Major General Yitzhak Rabin, new Israeli Ambassador to the United States, at a welcoming ceremony held recently in Washington.

I had previously met General Rabin, who commanded Israel's armed forces during the famous 6-day war last June, while serving as Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee Special Study Mission, which conducted an extensive survey of the Middle East only a few months before the outbreak of hostilities.

Perhaps more than anyone else, Ambassador Rabin understands the difficulty of getting discussions started to explore for agreed terms for an enduring peace in that volatile area of the world.

Student Reporters in Vietnam—IX

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, our current halting efforts to find a path toward negotiations in Vietnam makes it all the more imperative for us to be fully informed about what is going on in that unhappy land. The task of informing the American people about Vietnam is now brilliantly being done by many hundreds of journalists now in Vietnam. I am proud to say that two of these important journalists are student reporters from the Queens College Phoenix, currently in Vietnam.

The reports of Lee Dembart and Ralph Paladino have been a consistent source of enlightenment for me. Their most recent dispatches deal with such varied and important topics as Vietnamese student politics, refugees, drugs and prostitution, and American troop morale.

The articles follow:

(By Lee Dembart)

SAIGON.—In the United States, being a student leader is like being second banana at a burlesque show: the customers listen patiently, but the attraction is something else.

Not so in Vietnam. While American student bigwigs often find themselves talking to few if any of those they are supposed to lead, their Vietnamese counterparts are usually

in quite the reverse position; tremendous demands are placed on their time, energy, and thinking by fellow students who look to them for guidance on a variety of issues from the war to religion to politics to classwork to social service.

There are other differences. Student leaders here tend to be considerably older than those in the States. Because the university system allows the student to stay in school almost indefinitely, and many do to avoid the draft, it is not uncommon to see student organizations being led by people in their late 20's.

Whether age brings with it sophistication is a different matter. It is easy to be misled by the way many students here can tick off the names of secondary American officials—like Nicholas Katzenbach, Chester Bowles, and Thomas Kuchel—and compare it with how much most American students know about the Vietnamese government.

They know the names of American officials because, as one student said, "When you finish talking about the Americans in Vietnam, you have finished talking about the power in Vietnam."

Student leaders here work in a variety of organizations and interest groups that far surpass the traditional newspaper-student government complex that accounts for most of what is called student leadership on many American campuses.

They wield a tremendous amount of power and influence and tend to be exceedingly careful about using it. This in contrast to American students who have relatively little influence but insist on bandying it about on a moment's call.

Curiously, students here, unlike those in other underdeveloped countries, seem to resist the temptation to become mouthpieces for a party line. Since the party line espoused by others is usually Marxist or quasi-Marxist, and such a position would be practically a capital offense here, there is good reason for their abstinence.

During the past two weeks I have spent several afternoons and one or two evenings talking with a number of Vietnamese student leaders. Almost to a man, they prefer French to English, not only because they consider themselves better able to converse in French, but because they consider French to be the cultured language.

In fact, there is a widespread and deep feeling among educated Vietnamese that the French have an unbroken and unbreakable hold on everything that is culture. When asked about the current status of French theater or literature, for example, they respond, "And what do you Americans have that is so good?"

Despite the shifting relationship between the Vietnamese government and the students—from complete suppression as recently as two years ago to an uneasy tension now—the students preferred to speak anonymously. Even then they remained not altogether convinced that their young American questioner was what he claimed to be—a reporter for a college newspaper in New York.

Nonetheless, they spoke candidly and incisively about a variety of Vietnamese issues.

The major preoccupation, of course, is the war. "There has been war here as long as I can remember," said one 28-year-old student. "Since I was a child I remember fighting. It is no good. I want to have a family, but I don't want my children to live their lives in war."

But they recognize that ending the war is not as simple as declaring it ended and laying down the arms. One student from nearby Hau Nghia province, an area which even the American Embassy admits is VC controlled, pointed out that military action represented only the part of the iceberg above the surface.

How, he asked, was the Vietcong infrastructure to be overcome? It has, he said, a vice-like grip on rural people who know little of the Thieu-Ky government and have learned not to rely on Saigon for support.

Told that the Americans were aware of the problem and were asking the same question, he scoffed. "At night you go back to your Beverly Hills houses and we must contend with the VC," he said.

Added a young Buddhist student: "We are not sure that we know how to deal with the Communists, but we have a much better idea of how to do it than you do. They are our people."

Not all of the students adopt this approach. Since the days of Ngo Dinh Diem who started the practice, political leaders have made sure to establish or support student political groups that will remain loyal to them. Today's political leaders are no exception.

Said one member of a group generally held favorable to Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky: "The government is our only hope for national unity. It must be supported."

The view was expressed by others who are not closely tied to government leaders. They point to the relative freedom and quality of the National Assembly, the government's legislative branch, as evidence of the government's good intentions and merit.

In fact, support for the present government seems to be growing within the student community. All university students here have just completed two weeks of required military training, and while many grumbled, most viewed it as a necessary evil and went along.

And last month, following the Tet offensive, a surprisingly large number of students enlisted in the army, more than had enlisted during the entire six-month period that preceded it. True, a large part of that enlistment came as a result of the government's crackdown and threatened crackdown on student draft dodgers and the general amnesty that was declared for them if they would enlist, but most observers here consider the number significant nonetheless.

"Some of my friends who signed up with the army told me they had no choice," explained one student leader. "They said, 'If we do not support this government, our country has no future.' Maybe they are right and maybe they are wrong. At least they did something."

Anti-Americanism is quite prevalent, although usually hidden. While a good part of it is a result of the bombing and other military activity, most anti-American feeling results from smaller scale but highly personal incidents.

"Americans are very arrogant," said one of the leaders of a large Catholic student organization. "I see the GIs teasing old men in the street and pushing little children out of their way. Is that how one acts in the United States?"

Others repeated the charge, and some noted that while they understood that the Americans didn't mean to offend anyone, many Vietnamese did not. "But no one says anything because we know that the Americans are in charge here," said one student.

"The worst part of that American aid," explained another, "are the words that are written on everything you give us: 'A gift of the people of the United States.' Why do you write that everywhere?"

Talk of the American aid programs leads quickly to talk of corruption, the two concepts being inextricably linked in the minds of Vietnamese, if not in fact.

"Not all officials want to steal," said a 26-year-old Buddhist student. "But if they don't, their relatives will think there is something wrong with them. Most people think the only reason to have a job in government is for the money you can make."

Understandably, it is difficult to find a student who is a Communist. I found none, although I heard of several who were described as having "suspicious associations." None of them were willing to talk.

Many students are anti-Communist not only because it is very dangerous not to be,

but also because they truly have no love for the Communists, their methods, or their system. They are seriously frightened of a Vietcong takeover both for its short- and long-range prospects.

Its short-range prospect, they explain, would be a tremendous bloodbath in which anyone who had sided with the Americans or the Thieu-Ky government would be executed. This is a serious fear among Vietnamese students, especially the Catholics.

The long-range prospect of a Vietcong victory, they continue, would be the kind of Communist regime now controlling North Vietnam. Most student leaders who would talk about the subject at all said that while they had great respect for Ho, they had little regard for the economic, political, or social situation that now characterizes Ho's country.

Asked how they knew what was going on in the North, they refused any comment other than a smile and a cryptic, "There are ways."

For the most part they are seriously concerned about building a nation and want to get on with it as soon as possible. It is for that reason that they are both against the war and yet willing to work with the government toward ending it.

It also explains the great interest now in social welfare projects. As one student leader said, "If we are prevented from doing the job on a large scale, at least we can do it on a small scale. And there are many people who need our help."

(By Ralph Paladino)

QUANG-TRI PROVINCE.—The numbers game so successfully played with dead Viet Cong becomes an impossible task with regard to Vietnamese refugees. The dead are unquestionably dead and are not apt to go anywhere. The Vietnamese refugee may be anything or anybody, a problem compounded in a country where a system of population registration is only in a very rudimentary phase. The refugee often arrives one day and leaves the next, leaving behind only his number on a refugee count.

As a result, there is no really meaningful figure available at any one time on the numbers of refugees that exist in this refugee-filled country. The Tet offensive has destroyed so many homes and frightened so many people out of their villages and hamlets, often for only two or three days, that figures change daily as people return home, move in with relatives or simply leave for somewhere else. An American Aid official in Quang-Tri province says the figures have about the same accuracy "as a random guess in a Count-the-Jellybeans contest."

Here in the northernmost province of I Corps, the current estimate is that about 20,000 refugees have been forced from their homes in the area around the DMZ and the town of Khe Sanh by the Communist offensive there. They are being housed in the area near the city of Cam-Lo and the sprawling support base for Khe Sanh at Dong-Ha.

It is no easy task to house an influx of 20,000 new people, especially in a country where efficiency is too rare to even be expected. The entire operation has fallen by default to local American military commanders and U.S. Aid officials. Considering the scarcity of resources available for the refugees, what has been accomplished is almost a miracle. Using any other criteria than this, though, the situation is not good.

Of the roughly 20,000 refugees in this area, about 6,000 are Bru Montagnard tribesmen, and the remainder are Vietnamese. The problem of Montagnard-Vietnamese relations has been neatly solved here by setting up separate quarters for each. The great majority of the Bru live in large arm tents, squeezing as many as possible into one tent. The quarters are much less than sufficient and many of the tribesmen have to sleep in makeshift shelters or under the stars. The

Vietnamese have it a little better, but have at least begun to build their traditional houses. A general lack of building materials hampers the effort and in some cases has brought it to a standstill.

But the problem of food dwarfs even the housing problem at Cam-Lo. A week ago, 100 truckloads of supplies arrived from Quang-Tri city with shipments of tents, tin plates, bone meal, rice, salt, and bulgur (enriched) wheat. It was not nearly enough and the supplies of not-very-popular bulgur wheat are long gone. No one knows when the next convoy of supplies will arrive from the Province capital, although some are trickling in from American AID sources in the meantime. The diet of the refugees can only be termed bare subsistence, with a good percentage of even that small amount coming out of garden plots that have recently begun to bloom.

Water is a serious, though not crucial, problem. The wells are inadequate for the increased population and the river is as much as a mile away from some refugees. A pumphouse is being built, but construction has been delayed because the area in which it was being built is considered insecure. The pumphouse will probably have to be moved upriver, but until then, the river is far away.

While the area once employed most of its residents, there are now too many people and too few jobs. The only work available is usually with American forces filling and loading sandbags, crushing rock for road use, doing laundry trucked down from local military bases, or working in the area's various compounds. But even with this great deal of make-work, there are still too few jobs. Money is scarce, and so nearly all the refugees have only what is given to them by the American and Vietnamese Aid officers.

This lack of work shows itself in other ways. The people have nothing to do from day to day except lounge around, eat when they can, sleep or just smoke their banana leaf cigarettes. This is the same trait that characterizes refugee camps all over the world; a sense of apathy and unchanging boredom. A few women wash their children at the well, men sit and stare into space, some women cook, even the children's play is desultory and inactive.

When a truck arrives and needs unloading, the entire community arouses itself and comes over to help, but in a few minutes the job is done and the men wander back to their shade and their pipes.

Fortunately the health of the refugees is holding up well. Malnutrition is not yet a problem and none of the common tropical illnesses—cholera, plague, or small pox—has broken out. The medical teams that enter the villages daily have little to do except treat the usual run of bad feet, scratches, and infections.

The Saigon government promises all refugees 5,000 piastres (\$42) and a plot of land measuring at least 30 feet by 50 feet. While it has been nearly two months since Khe Sanh was evacuated, the money and land have not yet been distributed. The government estimates it will take at least three more months for the red tape to make distribution possible.

A few families have been loaned privately owned land that was not being used. Considering that most of the refugees plan to leave Cam-Lo and return home whenever conditions permit, this has proven to be a satisfactory solution to the problem of land distribution without stepping on powerful toes. But even this is not enough for the thousands of families in need of land in an area where the land is simply not available.

One small village of refugees in the area does show what can be done even with scarce resources if the people have dynamic leadership. Father Phan-Van-Co is a Catholic priest and a village chief who is himself a refugee from the North. In 1956 he and 6,000 of his parishioners left North Vietnam and settled in Danang and Quang-Tri city. Co

then settled in the DMZ. In the eight years he was there, he built six churches, four schools, and two hospitals. A number of Viet Cong attempts at his life caused him to flee to the South again.

Co is a popular and progressive leader. In the last six months he has built a small orphanage and a school (which doubles as a church on Sunday), where, with the help of three nuns, he teaches 300 of the village children in a town with 1500 residents. Co makes no secret of his pro-American sentiments. While other village leaders avoid all contact with Americans for fear of reprisal, Co visits the American compound often, and Americans are frequent guests in his small home.

The priest is a small, dark man in his middle forties who speaks both French and English though haltingly. Seldom was it necessary for him to turn to the interpreter to clear a point or grasp for an English word.

His most urgent concern at the moment is seeing that there is enough to eat for his villagers. The problem would have been already solved with the coming of the new crop, except that a defoliation accident has set the harvest back for at least three months. American planes accidentally released a small amount of defoliation chemical upwind from the village, killing most of the budding crops. Fortunately, not enough was dropped to hurt the land itself for any length of time.

Co is well versed in the fine American Army act of scrounging, and it is a result of this that the village is in such good condition. He will often hitch a ride with a military convoy to Quang-Tri city and there harass local Vietnamese officials into releasing supplies to him. A few minutes with the commander of the American motor pool, and he has enough trucks and drivers to take the goods home. In addition, he has taught the villagers (after being taught himself) how to bake bread with the sufficient stocks of flour available and how to make bulgur wheat palatable to them. And everywhere in and around the village there is something growing.

When Co was asked how much of this aid actually comes from the Vietnamese government, he only smiled a little. "There is much red tape," he says, "and they are very slow." He explains that if he is to get help from the government he must go after it himself.

"It is not that they do not want to help, they are just inefficient." (the last word after a conference with the interpreter) "Many village chiefs," he says, "do not care enough to go out and get help, they expect it to come to them. But these are my people, and Christ said 'Feed thy Sheep'."

And unlike the majority of Vietnamese leaders, Co is a good shepherd.

(By Ralph Paladino)

Every war in American history has had its illegal wares, meeting the needs of the soldier far from home. Until Vietnam the largest selling one had been prostitution. In Washington, D.C. during the Civil War, the number of prostitutes in the capital rose from 300 to over 5000, and in their time, Manila, London, Tokyo, Berlin, and Paris have served as American whorehouses.

No less is true of the Vietnamese cities today. But unique to American war experience, Vietnam has added a second illegal "vice"—marijuana or con xa as it is called in Vietnamese, ostensibly to be stamped out at every opportunity, and with the same degree of failure.

The "problem" is little discussed in official military newspapers and reports. In fact, the "problem" is probably the wrong word. The tens of thousands of American soldiers here might prefer "blessing," a few commanders, "disaster." In either case, marijuana has become as much a part of the Vietnamese war experience as prostitution has ever been in other wars, and even more so because it is not limited to the troops lucky enough to be serving in the

rear lines, to the cities, or to other off-post areas of the country. Unlike a prostitute, pot is profitable, hideable, and cheap.

Prostitution in Vietnam follows the classic pattern of prostitution in all war-torn nations, with the added problems caused by a lack of sophistication and elementary hygiene. Prices reflect not only living standards in this poor nation, but the considerable demand of 500,000 unattached males in a country of only 16 million people, and generally range from 300 piastres (about \$2.55) for a "short timer" to 1000 or more, with prices climbing for quality and quantity.

Since the Tet offensive, a severe clamp has been put into the living standards of most city prostitutes. The bars generally are closed, the curfew mostly enforced. But among both GI's and prostitutes there is no lack of ingenuity.

The bars now open early in the afternoon, often serving only soft drinks to avoid police interference, and every waitress and bar girl plies her trade. For a price, they are yours for an hour or a night. Most hotels will add the charge to your room bill, along with the added cost of a double room. But for the most part, outside of Saigon, sex has become a daytime activity in Vietnam.

A lucky or clever combat soldier can complete duty early enough in the afternoon to get downtown in time to spend a few dollars and still be back before curfew or for a 7 p.m. formation. Few GI's risk being busted by spending a night off base, especially outside of the major cities.

Whorehouses go under many disguises now that bars are declared closed (and this is enforced outside of Saigon). On the road from Fourth Division Headquarters in Pleiku, are dozens of "laundries" advertising beer and soft drinks while you wait, the signs adding such oriental Americanisms as "Laundry, cleanly nicely," or worse. Young Vietnamese girls, ranging from 16 to 30, most fairly attractive at least from roadside distance, wave to passing soldiers. Other popular fronts include car washes and small black market stores.

Many soldiers are stationed in small groups of seven or eight men guarding bridges, roads, outposts, and power lines. Here they need not even travel to the cities, for the prostitutes will come to them, with the bushes serving well as a bed. But the good prostitute is wise to exercise discretion in her dealings with these outpost soldiers, for many a pimp has looked down the barrel of a rifle while his girl served the soldiers. It is wise not to offend the American sense of fair play with outrageous prices or harsh words.

But prostitution no longer travels alone in Vietnam. The local prostitutes have in most areas become the major suppliers of marijuana and opium to the American soldier and civilian. Add to this any often frequented bar, any whorehouse, most hotels, a majority of taxi drivers, and a lot of kids, and you have a full list of American sources for drugs and marijuana in Vietnam.

The Tet offensive has hurt supply lines somewhat in the northernmost areas of the country, especially around Hue and Dong-Ha, but prices are beginning to lower rapidly, though the Vietnamese greed for American money makes it unlikely that it will drop to pre-Tet levels.

Enough marijuana for 20 good-sized cigarettes in Hue may run about \$5, in Quin Nhon as little as \$2, and in the Delta marijuana is still often given away free with a drink or a girl. Very little pot is any less than top quality, although even here an occasional crook will cut his supply with tea or tobacco.

Assessing the extent of pot usage among the soldiers here is an almost impossible task. With absolute surety, it can be said to be more extensive than most military officials will admit or perhaps are even aware of. One company of the 101st Airborne Division near Hue can boast 90 per cent participation in

its pothead program. Groups are divided by rank for discipline purposes, and in one group of seven smokers, none were below the grade of E-6 (platoon sergeant). Pot parties went on every evening, usually revolving around quiet bull sessions. When everyone became sufficiently euphoric, or occasionally, when we ran out of pot, the party ended and the lights went out.

On the line, the same unit might drop to under 20 per cent participation. There are no tents to divide off into, supplies are scarce, and no one knows for sure whether the commander is a pothead. Most of the soldiers do not feel that pot lessens their ability to battle the Viet Cong.

On the lower extreme, some base units probably don't smoke at all. Although I did not run into any, I did find some where participation was among only two or three people.

But in very few units is it the fear of being caught that prevents anyone from smoking at will. One soldier only laughed when I asked him about it. "I was in this bar and went into the back with this slope chick. Things happened and she complained to the MP's that I kicked her. I had 14 grams and a couple of joints on me." He was only busted one grade for an offense that can bring as much as three years. "My CO was a pothead, see, and he had the job of recommending punishment, so he backed me."

Few GI's are prosecuted or caught by their immediate commanders, who usually will be young lieutenants or captains not far removed from them in age or attitudes. Usually prosecution is brought about by third parties, such as MP's, postal inspectors, or higher headquarters personnel. The maximum punishment of three years at hard labor is rarely imposed, and severity of punishment depends almost entirely on the attitude of the defendant in court (if the case gets that far) and the quantity he is credited with possessing. None of the prosecutions in Vietnam have been for selling the weed. Pot is too cheap and the soldiers too generous.

The Third Marine Division's Judge Advocate's office bragged of about three convictions a month for possession, with sentences averaging just under a year. The officers in the office swore to me that smoking was rare among Marines. The Army boasts of even fewer prosecutions on the court-martial level. While convictions are in the hundreds, users probably number in the hundreds of thousands.

Why do GI's smoke? Most soldiers are moderate, though regular users. Even with the almost unlimited quantities to which they have access, they can be expected to limit themselves to four or five joints or a couple of pipefuls at a time. In the field, where the pressure is most intense, use decreases. For the line soldier, smoking marijuana is much like the needed drink at the end of a long day, a way to relax, to ignore the dirt, the heat, to make the bugs more bearable, the hard cots softer.

All over the line, the use of pot fell into the same pattern: small groups of four or five individuals in quiet bull sessions. Alcohol has taken a back seat to the weed. In some units it is difficult to find anyone who even wants a bottle of liquor (although beer is always appreciated).

The effects of widespread smoking have been felt outside of Vietnam. The Australian government considered ending "R and R" trips Sydney because of the large amount of smuggling American soldiers were doing. Instead, they are now thoroughly searched upon arrival. GI's carry the weed home in their government-shipped baggage, in their pockets, or send it home in packages. Some are caught, but most appears to get through. One ingenious GI I talked to sent himself a gift, with pot acting as the packing material. Record players have been found stuffed with it, souvenir bowls and vases filled, and even letters to mom carry it to the states.

Surprisingly, most military officers minimize the problem even as they admit its existence. "It doesn't seem to do any harm," one major told me. "These are the best behaved troops I've ever seen," a company commander said. "I haven't had to bust one man for drunkenness in the eight months we've been here."

What does disturb some commanders is the increase in the use of narcotic drugs among the troops here. Opium use was common in most of the units I visited, if not widely consumed. I saw water pipes made from hand fire extinguishers that could be returned to their racks on the walls after use, as well as dozens of commercially available pipes. Most were used exclusively for opium.

Discharges for drug addiction seem to be on the increase although no figures are available solely for Vietnam. Sticks of marijuana can be purchased which contain large quantities of opium from many of the same sources as marijuana alone. If the trend continues, a severe crackdown on the use of marijuana will be the most likely result.

It is apparent that the widespread use of marijuana in Vietnam is making it acceptable to an ever larger percentage of people, even nonsmokers, in the under-25 population. Wholesale smuggling is probably bringing the drug into areas of the United States that heretofore had little contact with it. With this increased usage, pressure on drug authorities is likely to grow greater to legalize marijuana. But, as long as prostitution has been with us in wartime, it has never been legalized. How much more likely is pot to be?

(By Ralph Paladino)

It appears that for the second time in history, the American soldier is involved in a war he does not really understand or care about.

Korea showed clearly to the military the danger of placing even the most well-trained soldier in a situation where he could be subjected to severe enemy pressure without first giving him a clear understanding of the need for his sacrifice. It is more than just fortunate that Americans here are fighting a type of war in which prisoners are a negligible quantity, for there is developing in the military the greatest crisis of confidence it has ever experienced.

Commanders at all levels would deny that American troops in Vietnam display a lack of aggressiveness, and kill ratios would probably provide enough evidence to support their denial. But even the highest ranking officers will admit a reluctance to commit American troops to battle, except when absolutely necessary. A two-star general, a graduate of the City University of New York, said: "My policy is to withdraw my troops whenever they make contact, then clobber the enemy from the air with all I can get before I send them back in." Then more quietly, "Maybe I don't get all the Charles I should, but I keep a hell of a lot more troops alive."

Other commanders have told me what happens when their casualty rates go too high. "If we're lucky, we just get our _____." It is here in the lower echelons of command, among company commanders and platoon leaders, that the war has taken its greatest toll of belief and confidence.

The Army is suffering from its largest shortage of junior officers since World War II. Commissions can be had almost for the asking. Anyone with a Masters degree can receive a direct commission, and college graduates are begged to go to Officer Candidate School. Enlisted men are almost being ordered to apply for commissions to fill the thinning ranks.

Promotions come to the young officer with almost dazzling swiftness, and any officer who chooses to serve beyond his mandatory tour can expect to become a major after as little as six years of service. An Army lieutenant can expect to make captain in less than two years, down from over three in

pre-Vietnam days. An Air Force lieutenant's time-in-grade requirement for captain is down from four and one-half to three years, and yet the Air Force still suffers from an acute shortage of new pilots.

The effects of this rapid promotion are evident in the embittered older officers who took long years to get where younger men are reaching almost immediately. Also, these promotions have given the Army a sizable cadre of immature and inexperienced field grade officers.

This new nucleus of 26-year-old majors is having an effect on the enlisted grades also, for contrary to the popular myths of rank, it is age and experience that is most respected in the Army and not rank. The day has not come when a young lieutenant or captain can safely interfere with a 30-year master sergeant without receiving a few nasty wounds himself. The effect on discipline may not yet have begun to show, but it probably will be profound on all levels of command.

Nearly all the young officers I've spoken to have expressed their desire and intent to get out of the military as soon as their mandatory tour is completed. While this would not be unusual among the ordinarily large percentage who intended that all along, it is disturbing when it comes from many officers, including West Pointers, whose original desire was a career in the U.S. Armed Forces.

Out of eleven West Point graduates I've asked about future plans, seven intend to resign as soon as their tour is over. Considering what these men went through (and one has to have an intimate knowledge of what U.S. Military Academy life is like to know what they went through), and the time and expense involved in their training, one can understand the extent of the loss both to the individual and to the Army. For at one time, 90 per cent of all West Point graduates made the military a career.

The disillusionment and disgust over the way the war must be waged does not stop with the lower-grade officers. I have heard lieutenant colonels and majors rant and rave against their superiors and the Pentagon. "I'm practically expected to ask permission every time I want to kill a gook," one Army pilot said to me. An artillery officer pointed out the base perimeter that ran past his command area. "Look at those defenses. If we had the equipment we had in Europe, a gook couldn't get within 1000 yards without being killed. Now, we wouldn't see him until he crawled under the wire."

It is almost certain knowledge among most line officers that they will not be permitted victory that permeates their thinking on war tactics and towards the troops in their command. "We get orders for a sweep," says one commander in the 82nd Airborne, "but, hell, the war might be over tomorrow. I don't want any of my men killed, especially for this _____ place. I'll be damned if I'll do any more than I have to." A platoon sergeant in the Delta, after yelling to his troops, "Sure, we make a lot of noise. The VC here don't want any part of us; if I make enough noise, maybe he'll get the hell out of the way."

There are many reasons, many seemingly legitimate, for this attitude of despair and even apathy throughout the Army, some very personal, many professional. An Army officer has very little to look forward to in his future assignments as long as the Vietnam war continues. Many men are on their third tour here, and all can expect to return after only a year in either a European or an American base. And these now rapid moves from place to place, instead of the normal three years per assignment, can play havoc with family life. "This kind of assignment is all right once in a while, but I've only been with my wife two of the last four years," said one officer. Or as one Army captain said flatly, "I won't come back."

But it is more than just the personal reason. The conviction that the people do not care what happens here is all important.

Vietnam is not a nice place to the average officer. It is dirty, hot, bug infested, and worst of all, the people miss almost no opportunity to cheat the rich soldiers. Stealing is rampant. American troops work a twelve-hour day while Vietnamese troops knock off at 4 p.m. It is not the sort of country one wishes to die defending.

Most of the American military is convinced that given a free hand they could win a military victory here in a very short time. And they are convinced that they could do it in spite of the Vietnamese army and the Vietnamese people. They are professional soldiers, at least for their time in the Army, and like all professional men, they take pride in carrying on their jobs the best way they know how. And the best way they know how is to kill the maximum number of enemy at the lowest possible cost in friendly troops.

"We can win this — war with the troops we've got now and never go near the North," one Task Force commander told me. "Give us the go ahead and I could clean out this province in a month." And whenever they say it, something makes you believe they really could.

International Conference on Human Rights

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the International Conference on Human Rights is now meeting in Tehran, Iran. One subject that would surely be within its scope is the Communist persecution of human rights wherever governments are controlled by that ideology.

I insert into the RECORD a memorandum which has been directed to the attention of the International Conference on Human Rights by the United Organizations of Women From Central and Eastern Europe, headquartered in Philadelphia, Pa.

We must recognize that total peace and freedom in the world will not be obtained until communism is totally rejected and captive peoples now suffering under Communist suppression are given the opportunity of self-determination.

The memorandum follows:

MEMORANDUM TO GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES ATTENDING THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS IN TEHRAN, IRAN, APRIL 22 TO MAY 13, 1968

The General Assembly of the United Nations adopted and proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights on December 10, 1948, "as a common standard on achievement for all peoples and nations." Now, twenty years later, in the International Year for Human Rights, we women, organized into associations listed below, enjoying freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want which were proclaimed as fundamental human rights essential to the dignity and worth of human persons are mindful of the plight of the more than 150 million men and women in Central and Eastern Europe whose human rights are violated in great or greater measure.

We present this Memorandum to you as a participant in the International Conference on Human Rights to be held in Tehran April 22 to May 13, 1968, to call your attention to the following violations, article by article, of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Article 1. Equality in dignity and rights are denied to non-Communists in the Communist countries on the basis of social origin and birth in some, on national origin in others.

Article 2. The rights and freedoms which everyone is to be entitled to in the Declaration are denied on the basis of language, religion, political or other opinions, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

Article 3. Everyone does not have the right to liberty and security of person.

Article 4. Forced labor, which is virtual slavery and servitude, exists. In all countries under the Soviet regime, women are forced to do work detrimental to their health and well-being.

Article 5. Torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment and punishment are applied to achieve totalitarian conformity.

Article 6. Everyone is not recognized as a person before the law.

Articles 7 and 8. Judges are not bound by the laws the constitutions set forth, but by ordinances and decrees of the administration and by the "peoples' democratic order" which are determined by the Communist Party, according to its requirements at any given period. There is no effective recourse for acts violating the fundamental rights of the citizen to equal protection of the law.

Articles 9 and 10. Millions of people have been subjected to arbitrary arrests, detention or deportation, deprived of equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, before being sentenced.

Article 11. Those under arbitrary arrest are presumed guilty before a secret or *monstre* trial.

Article 12. The right to privacy, in family, home or in correspondence, is constantly violated and no law exists to give protection against such interference.

Articles 13 and 14. The right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state and the right to leave any country, including their own, are denied the citizens. The right to ask asylum from persecution is considered a crime or treason.

Article 15. Nationality rights have been revoked for criticism or opposition to Communist injustices. Soviet citizenship was imposed *en masse* upon people of occupied countries without their consent.

Article 17. Properties were confiscated without remuneration, and where there was resistance to relinquishment of property, arrests, mass deportations and even deaths resulted.

Articles 18 and 19. Freedom of thought, conscience and religion, opinion and expression, as is the right to seek and receive information and ideas through mass media from non-Communist countries, are prohibited.

Article 20. While the constitution seemingly guarantees the right of assembly, in reality no organization may exist, no assembly held, unless sanctioned and controlled by the regime.

Article 21. The will of the people is not the basis of the authority of the government. Everyone is compelled to vote in these countries. But they can only vote *yes* for the Communist-selected single list of candidates. They cannot vote *no*, nor can names be written into the ballots.

Article 22. Social security is meted out very discriminately.

Article 23. Free choice of employment and just and favorable conditions of work are limited to a small privileged class. Factory and agricultural workers lack even primitive sanitary facilities; trade unions, instead of protecting workers' interests, serve the interests of the Employer State.

Article 26. Discrimination in education is the rule. Education is aimed not to promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, or racial or religious

groups, but rather to teach them hatred for all except those in the Communist sphere.

Article 27. There are restrictions on the right to participate in the cultural life of the community. The restrictions demand conforming to Party directives. Writers have been persecuted and sentenced to long terms in jail and forced labor camps because they demanded rights guaranteed in their constitutions or because of free expression of opinion and independent thinking.

Article 29. The free and full development of individual personality is restricted because of the duties imposed by the community.

Having listed the violations of these human rights, it behooves us to call attention to the fact that, although the General Assembly adopted a resolution in 1952 entitled "The Right of Peoples and Nations to Self-determination," this fundamental right, which is a prerequisite to the full enjoyment of all human rights, has been denied to the peoples under Soviet rule.

Human rights could be greatly advanced during this Human Rights Year if Member States of the United Nations would carry out the moral obligations that the Declaration imposes and ratify and implement the Covenants and other Human Rights Conventions adopted by the United Nations.

On October 26, 1966, the General Assembly of the United Nations called for the urgent consideration of ways and means of improving the capacity of the United Nations to put an end to violations of human rights wherever they occur.

We request most earnestly that the violations briefly listed above in countries of Central and Eastern Europe be considered among those to be stopped in other areas of the world.

Respectfully submitted.

Baltic Women's Council; Byelorussian American Women's Association; Council of European Women in Exile, representing women from Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, and Yugoslavia; Federated Estonian Women's Clubs; Federation of Lithuanian Women's Clubs; Georgian National Alliance; Latvian Women's Association in New York; National Council of Romanian Women, New York; National Council of Women of Free Czechoslovakia; Women for Freedom, Inc.; World Federation of Ukrainian Women's Organizations, representing Ukrainian women's organizations in Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, Great Britain, Venezuela and the United States; and World Union of Lithuanian Catholic Women's Organizations.

New Evidence Develops on Vietnam Picture

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, further evidence of the fearful beating taken by our enemy in Vietnam during and following the January Tet offensive has come to light, and is reported in Joseph Alsop's column which appeared this morning in the Washington Post.

I believe there has been considerable misunderstanding in this country of the price the Vietcong and North Vietnamese paid in that desperate attack—a mis-

understanding which has been encouraged by some Americans. I would like to have Mr. Alsop's column of today appear in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 24, 1968]
NEW RED ATTACK ON SAIGON WOULD UNDERLINE TET FAILURE
(By Joseph Alsop)

LAIKHE, SOUTH VIETNAM.—Reluctant enemy acknowledgement of costly defeat is now conspicuously here in III Corps, where our First Division has its stamping ground. If there is another attempt on Saigon, one can predict with reasonable confidence that the desperate character of the enterprise will actually underline the fact of past defeat.

The sickness at home is so serious that the enemy's own documents are thought to be a huge joke, if they prove our soldiers' and our allies' success in the field. Yet facts are facts, hard evidence is still hard evidence, and it is best to begin with the captured directives from the enemy's southern headquarters, COSVN, which trace the rather grisly story. The first directive was issued on Feb. 1 after a meeting of the COSVN Current Affairs Committee on the night of Jan. 31, while the Tet offensive was still officially in full swing. As this paper is both long and well-drafted, the peculiar timing makes one suspect that it had been quietly prepared pre-Tet, in expectation of failure, by southern-experienced staff officers naturally skeptical of the immensely over-ambitious plan of Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, who had no direct experience of the southern war until a few months ago.

Like all enemy documents, it accentuates the positive for the benefit of the wretched lower echelons, speaking of surging victories of all sorts. But the heart of the paper, nonetheless, is the said acknowledgement that the offensive had already failed to attain its grand objectives: The general uprising, the collapse of the South Vietnamese Army by defection and in other ways, and the occupation of the cities.

In these bitter circumstances, all enemy units were adjured to attack and attack again, at no matter what cost, until the grand objectives were finally and fully attained. The same theme ran through a second COSVN directive, issued after another Current Affairs Committee meeting, less than a week later. Attacks on U.S. units were now excluded, however, as too costly.

The third COSVN directive, dated Feb. 21, then canceled the order for further attacks on the towns and cities, as impractically dangerous. Yet, it offered no surcease to the unhappy enemy GIs, since their units were still sternly commanded "to hang in" close to the towns and cities that had been their objectives.

The result was the kind of situation that Gen. Giap's able predecessor in command, the late Gen. Nguyen Chi Thanh, had found to be militarily untenable as long as two years ago, before the retreat to the border sanctuaries began. Here in III Corps, the result was a cruelly risky situation comparable to a military subway rush, in which further heavy enemy losses were unavoidable.

Such losses were unavoidable because all the enemy units, from divisions downwards, and all the U.S. and Allied forces were angrily charging about in this Corps area in a fattish oval centered on Saigon, with a long diameter of hardly more than 50 miles. For the enemy, it was far worse than the situation two years ago before Gen. Thanh ordered the retreat to the border sanctuaries; for our forces were much stronger and the near-in-VC base areas had all been Rome-ploughed or otherwise rendered near-useless.

The inevitable consequence was the continuation through March of losses for the enemy nearly as horrifying as those suffered in February. A fair though perhaps extreme example was a battalion of the 101st Regiment of the Seventh North Vietnamese Division.

Prisoners taken towards the end of March revealed that the battalion had begun the Tet offensive with 400 men. It had lost its battalion commander, executive officer and most of its staff. It had been reduced in strength to under 50 men. And it had lost all touch with regimental headquarters since the beginning of the month. In general, Giap's Tet failure and his subsequent obstinate refusal to admit that defeat, reduced all his units in South Vietnam to near-ruinous condition; and this was by no means compensated, except in the Delta, by intensified local press gangling.

The defeat was then belatedly acknowledged, when Giap at last permitted the scramble back toward the sanctuaries on the Cambodian border. This happened in all Corps areas. In II Corps, for example, at least five of the seven regiments of the B-3 front sought their usual sanctuaries some time

ago. Here in III Corps, the historic big units—the 9th, 7th and 5th Divisions—also moved out to lick their wounds in the same manner. And yet there is still the intelligence of a new attack on Saigon noted above.

It is only three or four days' march, it must be remembered, from the suburbs to the South Vietnamese capital. If the intelligence is correct, suicide squads of sappers will work with the historic big units, above listed, who were only in a supporting role at Tet.

But if we and our allies have reasonable luck, in the event of this attack, which is highly speculative, a renewed attempt on Saigon by outfits which have already suffered so terribly will be remembered in history as an act of desperation—although God knows how it will be reported at home.

Riot Insurance

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing, today, legislation designed to assist in meeting the mounting insurance crisis in our Nation's cities. The bill would provide relief to the inner city propertyholder who now finds it increasingly more difficult to obtain regular insurance coverage—if indeed he is able to secure any protection at all. Though guaranteed reinsurance, insurance companies would be insulated from the potentially catastrophic losses that can accompany large-scale civil disorders.

This legislation encompasses the recommendations of the President's National Advisory Panel on Insurance in Riot-Affected Areas, which was chaired by the distinguished Governor of New Jersey, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes. Its implementation would launch a frontal attack on a serious national problem through the cooperative efforts of private insurance industry, State governments, and the Federal Government.

SENATE—Thursday, April 25, 1968

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. William G. Kalaidjian, minister, Bedford Park Congregational Church, New York, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pause and look to Thee to bless this Senate session that Thy will may be done through the Members of this distinguished body, reflecting the highest hopes for a history that belongs to Thee.

Thou hast given our country blessings beyond our greatest dreams. We have richness in material goods and richness in human and spiritual values. Yet we confess, O God, we have not lived up to all that we should be nor to all that we can become.

May the shame in our Nation's home-life; the tragedy of child abuse and neglect, where more children will die at the hands of their parents than from all other childhood diseases combined, may

this disgrace and our disregard of law that desecrates our land and disgraces our humanity, be changed.

Our Heavenly Father, we acknowledge that we have failed Thee and we have failed the blessing of freedom in our land. We have too long neglected our basic responsibilities, turning from Thee, placing secondary things first and first things last. Help us to be turned around in mind and spirit that we may abandon the lesser gods of materialism and false values, replacing them with the power of Thy love. Help our Nation to love itself more, and its people to love one another that we may fulfill our mutual destiny in Thee.

Gracious Father of our land, like Moses led his people to a new land under the new Commandments; like Christ led His people from death to life eternal in the resurrection; help this U.S. Senate to redeem the environment of our Nation in Thy spirit. Help them to lead our land out of the wilderness of the cap-

tivity of illiteracy; help them to make our Nation more than an empty togetherness as we stand by seeing the liquidation of the treasures of our Nation's soul. As Thou dost call us to a better life, as the police of America patrol and watch our cities' streets, we pray Thy protection upon them; and we pray for the liberation of the social ills of our cities that make police necessary.

May the content of our character, the possession of religious values and the development of our divine-given talents become the basis for where we live, how we live and the kind of work we perform. Bless every race, creed, and national background of the American people, O God, and to Thy glory may the U.S. Senate guide us, in the name of Him who is the Lord of life we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the