

to be popular from a humanitarian standpoint. Those who would fight to preserve the Constitution and persuade the people take steps to amend the Constitution, rather than to accomplish their immediate goals by statute, are to be highly commended.

I thoroughly agree with the able Senator from Florida. I feel that if there had not been in the past 15 years some fights made in the Senate that have been made, there would have been a greater deterioration and a greater erosion of the Constitution.

Furthermore, I was terribly disappointed last week when the former Vice President, Hubert Humphrey, ruled that section 2 of rule XXII and section 2 of rule XXXII were unconstitutional, but that the rest of the rules were not. I know of no authority for a Vice President or any other Presiding Officer of the Senate to substitute his judgment for the entire U.S. Senate and to hold that certain parts of certain rules to which he personally objects are unconstitutional.

Section 2 of rule XXII provides that two-thirds of the Senate are required to cut off debate. Section 2 of rule XXXII provides that the rules of this body shall continue from one Congress to the next, until the rules are changed as provided by the Senate itself.

I abhorred the former Vice President's ruling. I deeply regretted it. I know of no authority that the Vice President has to make such a ruling. It goes in the face of the precedents followed by all the Presiding Officers who have ever presided over this great deliberative body in the history of the Nation. Going back 180 years, no person who has presided where the distinguished Presiding Officer sits today as the Acting Vice President has ever ruled in such a way. In my judgment, the former Vice President's ruling was wisely overruled by the Senate.

I hope that the Senate will now see fit to keep the present rule; namely, that two-thirds of the Senators present and voting are necessary to stop debate. We know that cloture can be obtained, as it has been obtained on many issues, if the public opinion of the country so warrants it. That public opinion will be reflected in the views of Senators.

I feel very strongly about this matter, because every section of the country must be protected. This is the only body in the Government that can protect the country. The House of Representatives cannot protect it. A Member of the House can speak only for a minute or 5 or 10

minutes, perhaps. In the Senate, we are privileged to have unlimited debate. If any proposal is calculated to hurt the people of any State or any region of the country, or to be in violation of the Constitution or to be against the interests of the public, the Senate is the place where views can be aired and the matter taken to the country, because the Senate is the only place in which unlimited debate, as we know it, can be carried on. It is really not unlimited debate, because two-thirds of the Senate can stop it at any time it wishes to do so.

Why change a rule that has served the Nation well, that has served to protect the public and the principles of this great country?

I hope that when the Senate votes on this question again, it will see fit to follow the same course it followed a few days ago, namely, to preserve rule XXII, section 2, and rule XXXII, section 2, in order that this great body which we know as the Senate may continue to be in the future the great deliberative body that it has been in the past.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank and compliment the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. If he has completed his remarks, I am ready to yield to the acting majority leader, so that he can move to recess the Senate.

RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 22, 1969, at 12 meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 21 (legislative day of January 10), 1969:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Elliot L. Richardson, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of State.

U. Alexis Johnson, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

Richard F. Pedersen, of California, to be counselor of the Department of State.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

David Packard, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Robert F. Froehike, of Wisconsin, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Robert C. Seamans, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of the Air Force.

John H. Chafee, of Rhode Island, to be Secretary of the Navy.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

George A. Lincoln, of Michigan, to be Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

J. Phil Campbell, of Georgia, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture.

Clarence D. Palmby, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Rocco C. Scilliano, of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

James D. Hodgson, of California, to be Under Secretary of Labor.

Arnold R. Weber, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Geoffrey H. Moore, of New Jersey, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, for a term of 4 years.

Elizabeth Duncan Koontz, of North Carolina, to be Director of the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Lee A. DuBridge, of California, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Patricia Reilly Hitt, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

James E. Johnson, of California, to be a civil service commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring March 1, 1971, vice John Williams Macy, Jr., resigned.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMISSIONER

Walter E. Washington, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term expiring February 1, 1973. (Reappointment.)

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Paul W. McCracken, of Michigan, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate, January 21 (legislative day of January 10), 1969:

UNITED NATIONS REPRESENTATIVE

Charles W. Yost, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LET'S GET UP OFF THE FLOOR

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Pete Hamill is one of the most readable writ-

ers in that very readable publication, the Village Voice.

He recently called upon his audience to recover from the "pox that was 1968" by changing some bad habits which became apparent last year. His criticism of the left is constructive and thoughtful. We all know the excesses of the right are as grievous. I hope they have as articulate a critic.

The article follows:

LET'S GET UP OFF THE FLOOR

(By Pete Hamill)

The pox that was 1968 is behind us, the bodies have finally gone cold, and the New Year looms, virginal and gray. If 1969 is anything like its predecessor, we might as well just cut our throats right now. But even with Nixon and Lodge and Hickel and the other members of the Lawrence Welk audi-

ence who shall govern us, there still remains some hope of survival. The big problems might be out of our hands for four years, but it does seem to me that on smaller matters we might have some chance of straightening ourselves out. The following are some suggested beginnings.

1. *An absolute cleaning up of the language.* I mean that all of us should try to use the American language with greater accuracy and precision. For example, in the way we talk about race. A black racist should be called a black racist. If George Wallace is a white racist, then Rap Brown is a black racist. Personally, I would like to see that blurry noun "militant" eliminated from the language. But if rewrite men continue to use it, then it should be used across the board. If a black yahoo like Sonny Carson can be described as a militant, then we should also use the word to describe white yahoos like Rosemary Gunning, Vito Battista, and Albert Shanker.

It would also help if we reduced or eliminated those phrases which no longer have even general meaning: "groovy," "imperialists," "up tight," "white power structure," "piece of the action," "pig" (as applied to all enemies, especially cops), "participatory democracy," "Uncle Tom," "guerrilla" (followed by words like theatre, politics, journalism, painting, etc.), "soul" (followed by food, music, brother, etc., or used alone to connote some exalted sense of self missing in others), "honky," "community control" (as a slab of letters on a page, without elaboration). I realize that this would make it almost impossible for some citizens to talk, but perhaps we would then be forced to talk with some precision about what is happening to us. If the years of Johnson, Rostow, and Rusk have taught us anything, it is the viciousness of the sloppy use of language.

2. *Liberals in general, and intellectuals in particular, should cease functioning as excuse-makers for people who hate them.* If Rap Brown calls me a honky or a racist —, I have no obligation to make excuses for him; my only obligation is to laugh at him, or to belt him. I certainly have no obligation to say: yeah, Rap, oh you're beautiful, Rap, oh please lash me again, Rap, baby, give it to me some more while I make out the check. The liberals who put up with this sort of racist crap are masochist jellyfish. I realize that Rap Brown is somewhat passe, but I use him as a symbol because I've seen him work: making brave speeches about burning everything down, then disappearing behind his bodyguards while other people are beaten, kicked, arrested, or shot. The Rap Browns hate liberals because they see the liberals they beat to (for a fee) collapse before Afros and shades faster than a French army collapses before the sight of guns. The Rap Browns have changed numbers of otherwise decent men into people who hate the sight of Negroes; the Brown gloat about this as evidence that all whites are secret racist dogs, and the liberals spend their time agreeing, and excusing Brown's filthy manners by rolling out all the history of the black man in America. The day the Rap Browns get black men into the Ironworkers Union, instead of into the cemetery, then we can believe in their sincerity about their brothers.

3. *As a footnote to the above, it should be made clear that criticism of blacks is not automatically racist.* Criticism equals racism is a beautiful piece of propaganda put forth by people who deserve to be criticized, and has paralyzed us for years. I can understand to some extent why blacks won't criticize other blacks, at least before whites (although there is no white equivalent of "uncle Tom," and no whites have spoken as much filth about people like Bayard Rustin as blacks have). Let us grant for argument's

sake that in revolutions there is some need for a united front. Still, if a black man is caught stealing from the poverty program, then he is breaking the law and should be put in the slam. To construct elaborate theories about how the white man's law should not apply to his colonial subjects and how the black man has the right to steal or rob because his great-grandfather was stolen from Africa and robbed of his freedom and his manhood—that is sophistry. The District attorney should not be called a racist because he arrests a thief or an embezzler. If Albert Shanker breaks the law (as he clearly did), he should be put in jail; the prosecutor should not be open to a charge of anti-Semitism. A thief is a thief; a lawbreaker is a lawbreaker.

Incidentally, the paranoia about "the white press" should really be described as that: paranoia. There are no conspiracies on newspapers to portray black men-as-raving maniacs, rapists, killers, dummies, or thieves. Paul Sann of the Post does not call Mike O'Neill at the News and Abe Rosenthal at the Times and set that day's line against the blacks. There are some serious inadequacies in the way race is covered, but they are the same inadequacies involved in covering everything else (crisis reporting, lack of depth and nuance, sheer dumbness, the fact that many editors don't even live in the city they purport to be covering). To stage a demonstration and then start beating the bejesus out of the people who come to cover the demonstration (most of whom are favorably disposed to your position) is not only paranoia, but stupidity.

4. *Stop the hypocrisy on inter-racial sex.* One of the great mysteries is why black women don't blow the whistle on some of their black brothers. Everyone in the Village knows this scene: the black cat sitting in the Village bar, a copy of Liberation in his pocket, wearing Afro and shades, practicing his best surly look, nursing a warm beer, and waiting for the first guilt-ridden white chick to tumble in the door. It doesn't matter that the girl is the ugliest white broad since Ilse Koch, or that she is sodden with whiskey, or has a bad case of the crabs. That particular black stud doesn't care. What matters is that she's white.

So, after seven or eight minutes of love talk ("white bitch" etc.), he takes her off and balls her badly on a 6th Street rooftop, and then comes back, muttering about the revolution, and has the nerve to threaten the lives of any black chicks he sees with white men. His manhood reinforced, he goes home, sleeps the sleep of the just, and spends the following morning writing an essay about black pride. Jesus. If blacks or whites have to take guys like this seriously, then we had better start erecting statues to Vincent Impellitteri, Richard Speck, and Simon Legree. They've all had an equally elevating effect on America.

5. *We should finally admit that no serious change in this country will ever be effected through —.* Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin and the Yippie kids who hang around them can be funny at times, and brave. But basically they are —. I cherish them for walking into HUAC meetings in costumes out of "Drums Along the Mohawk" but HUAC is an easy enemy; confronting the late Joe Pool is just not the same as taking over General Motors or Litton Industries, or destroying the welfare system. The Yippies are tap-dancers and — is therapy, not politics. You don't become a revolutionary by saying you are a revolutionary, and you don't storm the Moncada Barracks with your brains blown apart on drugs.

6. *We should make some small start toward relieving the paranoia of the cops.* God knows, I have plenty of reason to believe that

a lot of cops are slightly bughouse, and addled by racism and petty bigotry. But someone has to prove to me that you change them by calling them "pig" or by shooting random members of the force in the back from ambush. Cops, after all, are working class people; they want to be respectable and their ideas about respectability are about 40 years out of date. But if you despise a cop because his hair is short, you cannot expect him to love you when yours is long. I've met cops who are decent, many who are brave, many who are not brutal sadists. They have rotten jobs, but we hired them. And let's face it: we need them. Anyone who thinks that we could survive very long in New York without cops is an innocent. I realize that I sound like Norman Frank; but the fact remains that this is a violent, brutal city, and until the golden day when really basic change is effected in the society, it will remain brutal and violent. You don't start making basic change by eliminating people on the periphery, like the cops.

I don't think we have to start putting statues of cops on every third corner. But we could pay the cop a decent salary. We could pay him a bonus if he gets a college education (a lot of the worst cops are just ignorant). We could give the cop a sabbatical every six years or so, with pay, so he could walk around the world for a year without a gun on his hip (why schoolteachers should get sabbaticals and cops or firemen shouldn't is one of those abiding mysteries best left to some genius like Jacques Barzun). But perhaps we could begin by just once in a while saying good morning to a cop. Just for the hell of it. Just to recognize that we see him as a subject, not an object, a human being, not a uniform, a man, not a pig. (Of course, if he is a member of the TPF, you might get locked up; but until the TPF is finally abolished, it's worth a shot.)

7. *We should immediately do everything possible to pass a new Lyons law.* Under the old Lyons law, which was repealed some years back, city employees had to live within the city limits. Then the law was repealed, the city employees fled to the suburbs, and the result has been near disaster. If a cop wants to be a cop and live in Oyster Bay, that's perfectly all right; just let him join the Oyster Bay P. D. But if he wants to be a cop in New York City, then, by God he had better live in New York City. No one should have the right to affect the lives of people in a community in which he does not live; at present, large numbers of New York cops are functioning like Spain's Guardia Civil. They are what Charles Monaghan describes as "Hessians," taking the money, without the responsibility of paying taxes, improving the city, sharing its pain and its secrets. Anyone who lives with the barbecue-in-the-backyard life style just can't begin to understand 112th Street, the hippies, blacks, or anything else we're made of. And there is something terribly wrong when someone like Albert Shanker can disrupt our city when he doesn't even live here; he should have no more right to close our schools than he has to affect the foreign policy of Canada. The same goes for Rhody McCoy, who lives on Long Island. If they are truly concerned about our schools, let them live among us. Otherwise, to hell with them. (Insular? Sure. But if we keep exporting the middle class, then we're doomed.)

8. *We should stop cheering the Romantic Revolutionaries every time they call for blood.* At Columbia, and in a few other places, SDS did a good job of exposing the smugness and hypocrisy (not to mention the corruption) of the people who run our institutions. But we part company on the issues of spilled blood. Talk of heading for the Adirondacks with machine guns is romantic nonsense at best, and Minuteman lunacy at

worst; this is just not Cuba, or Bolivia, or Vietnam.

I remember one brave revolutionary in Chicago, who wanted to broadcast a tape recording from a loudspeaker on a high floor of the Chicago Hilton. The tape would tell the kids in Grant Park that the revolutionary was in the hotel, that they should storm the place and join him. Naturally, the kids would have been slaughtered by Daley's thugs and the National Guard. Naturally, that is what the revolutionary wanted. Naturally, he had no plans to really be in the hotel. I suppose that was a pretty clever revolutionary tactic. (The plan was never put in effect; too many objections from softies.) But personally I'm tired of the sight of blood. I've seen enough blood in the past few years to last me a lifetime; some of the blood I saw last year ran right through America, and the wounds haven't stopped hemorrhaging. For a year, we could do without the sight of blood; it would be even better if "intellectuals" would cease being enthralled at the prospect of seeing it spilled.

If I seem to have spent more time here talking about the sins of the left rather than the right, it is because the left these days seems more riddled with sloppiness, intellectual arrogance, cant, and self-deception than the right. It's easy to laugh at the right, because their shibboleths are so clumsily transparent. But the cliches of the left are more sinister, because the left should be the best hope for this country. If its basic emotions are hate and contempt, then it will get nowhere (consider the posture of Mr. Clean, Eugene McCarthy, so blinded by hatred for the Kennedys that he found it an easy matter to vote for a drunken lout like Russell Long in the contest for Senate majority whip). Above all it should be the duty of the left to talk straight, without clotting its rhetoric with gooey slabs of prose glop, and without accepting every example of paranoid rubbish as revealed truth.

ERNEST PETINAUD'S 64TH
BIRTHDAY

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, every 4 years the Nation celebrates Ernest Petinaud's birthday by having a big parade down Pennsylvania Avenue. Yesterday was Ernest's 64th birthday, and the parade was fittingly followed by at least 10 parties.

Mr. Speaker, this is exceedingly proper, but I do not see why we cannot have a parade every year. Ernest Petinaud certainly merits it. As *maitre d'* of the House Restaurant for the past 32 years, Ernest Petinaud has performed his duties with perfection; some Members have been known to regard his performance as somewhat miraculous. He is one of the most gracious, urbane, and charming men ever to have graced the halls of the Capitol. He is always helpful, and has a manner to make everyone feel at home.

But more than his great service, beyond the call of duty, has been his great friendship over the years. I am honored and delighted to be a friend of Ernest Petinaud. I value his friendship. He is a good, kind, and knowledgeable man. He

is never at loss for a kind word, a thoughtful act.

Ernest Petinaud has represented the courtesy and dignity of the Congress for 32 years, both in Washington and abroad. We could find no greater ambassador.

I wish him many, many more happy birthdays.

A TRIBUTE TO THOMAS J. "STONEWALL" JACKSON, HERO OF THE CONFEDERACY

Hon. ROBERT H. (BOB) MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1969

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no questioning the military brilliance of Thomas J. "Stonewall" Jackson, a son of Clarksburg, W. Va., and, in company with Robert E. Lee, one of the two outstanding heroes of the War Between the States.

The history of military service contains few examples of military capacity equal to that demonstrated by this remarkable man. Orphaned at the age of six, he set his sights on a military education and, by dint of hard work and perseverance, obtained an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. Though woefully deficient in previous training, he fought his way to 17th place in his graduating class, to the utter admiration of his classmates and teachers.

As a first lieutenant and brevet major in the war with Mexico, he was honored for gallantry in action at Contreras, Churumusco, and Chapultepec. Retiring from the Army, he secured a teaching position at Virginia Military Institute, where he remained until the outbreak of the war in 1861.

Thomas J. Jackson was a strongly religious man, and he entered the War Between the States in the solemn belief that the Almighty was clearly on the side of the Confederacy. He never wavered in this assumption, which carried him to glory unsurpassed.

At First Manassas, he attracted attention by nobly resisting the impact of a Federal assault on Henry House Hill. A fellow officer, noting his performance, declared to his men:

There is Jackson, standing like a stone wall. Let us determine to die here, and we will conquer.

Shortly afterward, the tide turned and the precipitous Federal retreat began. Overnight, the fame of "Stonewall" Jackson spread.

When the Federal forces assaulted the York Peninsula, in 1862, en route to Richmond, Jackson led an extraordinary raid against Federal positions throughout the Shenandoah Valley. Four Federal armies under Generals Banks, Fremont, Shields, and Milroy, pursued Jackson in the hopes of stopping and destroying him. But Jackson evaded them effectively, then turned and struck them down, one at a time, in one of the most masterly military operations of record. By so do-

ing, Jackson forced the Federal authorities to recall troops from the Richmond campaign, thereby destroying its effectiveness and compelling ultimate withdrawal from the York Peninsula. Before the Federal forces left, however, Jackson rejoined the main Confederate Army, in front of Richmond, and assisted in driving back the bulk of the enemy force.

At Second Manassas, Jackson was again brilliant, and was largely responsible for the defeat there sustained by Federal General Pope.

At Antietam, where General Lee was held to a draw by General McClellan, Jackson's personal decision to attack a Federal force threatening the main body of the Confederate Army was probably responsible for saving the day for the Confederates by permitting the successful recrossing of the Potomac, without interference.

In the battle of Fredericksburg, Jackson was again the personification of a "Stone Wall." At Chancellorsville, following some of the heaviest fighting of the war, he was accidentally shot by a Confederate picket. After fighting gamely for his life, he passed away May 10, 1863. It was Sunday and Jackson had often said he wanted to die on Sunday. A true believer to the end, his last words were simply:

Let us cross over the river and rest under the shade of the trees.

The Confederacy grieved for its fallen captain. Even the Federals mourned the loss of a great American.

It is not often that greatness wins the recognition of everyone, friend and foe alike, but so great was "Stonewall" Jackson that even this occurred.

He was, indeed, a man of the highest caliber. He shall be remembered so long as honor, valor, and spiritual dignity prevail.

"HOPE"—A SHIP AND A SYMBOL

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 21, 1969

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the hospital ship *SS Hope* is entering the final weeks of a medical teaching and treatment mission to Ceylon and will return to the United States in mid-March. The ship has visited eight nations in as many years and, at each stop, has helped to build firm foundations of good health and good will.

Hope's remarkable adventure has been warmly praised in an editorial appearing recently in the *Hudson Dispatch*, Union City, N.J. The editorial will be of interest to my colleagues, and I ask that it be inserted at this point in the *RECORD*.

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

"HOPE"—A SHIP AND A SYMBOL

To whatever land the sleek, glistening white ship *S.S. Hope* may sail she always de-

parts regarded as the best messenger of goodwill any country might have sent to another nation. In the eight years of her existence, she has visited a different port of call with each change of the calendar. S.S. *Hope* and crew have given so much of themselves, they have been acclaimed on three continents as a symbol of what her name portends.

The ship costs \$5,000,000 a year to operate. The money is raised through popular subscriptions and the annual fashionable cotillion ball which this year will be held Sunday night in the grand ballroom of the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York. Debutantes from throughout the metropolitan area will be introduced. The first six cotillions, a highlight of the winter social season, raised more than \$150,000. Last year approximately \$29,000 was realized and it is anticipated another sizeable sum will be raised this year to augment the work of the hospital ship.

During its short history more than 1,000 Americans have volunteered service aboard the craft and there is a long list of doctors, dentists, technicians and nurses eagerly awaiting a turn at serving oppressed and suppressed humans somewhere in the world. More than 10,000 major operations have been performed aboard the *Hope* and some 100,000 persons were treated and more than 4,000 medical personnel trained. Approximately two million others benefited through immunization, examinations and other services.

When the S.S. *Hope* enters a port, she remains in harbor for about 10 months, a symbol of American concern for suffering. Thus far she has visited Indonesia, Vietnam, Peru, Colombia, Ecuador, Guiana, Nicaragua and Ceylon.

Administering to the needs of the unfortunate is not without its barriers. Distrust, skepticism and condescension are among the moods the ship crew must overcome before it really can begin the purpose of the mercy trip—teaching, training and treating natives.

Once the purposes are understood the S.S. *Hope* becomes the most glorious site in a port where medieval methods of medical care still exist and the populace is less literate than is good.

It has been written about the courageous crew, medical and technical personnel and the ship that by comparatively small expenditures the S.S. *Hope* has lighted a tiny, inexpensive candle in the darkness. Imagine America's image, to say nothing of the world's health, if a thousand ships of *Hope* moved upon the waters of the earth for the alleviation of the ills of mankind. The possibilities of peace in a healthy world stagger the imagination.

The "ripple on a pond" action *Hope* creates spreads over wide areas as those tutored by America's Good Samaritans disseminate their invaluable knowledge among the heretofore neglected peoples.

COMMISSION ON AFRO-AMERICAN HISTORY AND CULTURE

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 21, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on January 15 I introduced S. 14, a bill to establish a Commission on Afro-American History and Culture. The Commission would study proposals in the general area of black studies, and of the dissemination of information on the role played

by Afro-Americans in American history.

William Raspberry, of the Washington Post, has written an article suggesting Washington, D.C., as the ideal site for a center on black history. He makes the point that researchers could also take advantage of the National Archives, the Library of Congress, the Howard University library, and the Association for the Study of Negro History and Culture, which are located in the District of Columbia.

This idea is but one of many which should be seriously considered. This country needs a body which is responsible for investigating and determining the merits of such ideas and reporting to the President of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Raspberry's article entitled "Washington Called Ideal Site for a Center on Black History," which was published in the Washington Post of January 17, 1969.

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

WASHINGTON CALLED IDEAL SITE FOR A CENTER ON BLACK HISTORY

It is possible to disagree profoundly with the tactics some black students are using to force college administrations to institute black studies courses. But there can be no denying that American history has been, to a really shameful degree, a history of white America only.

Take a simple matter like the treatment of slavery in the history textbooks. A reader is certain to come up with a far less realistic view of what slavery was all about and what it meant to Negro slaves than he would get from, say, William Styron's *The Confessions of Nat Turner*, whatever the shortcomings of that book.

Our history books have largely been public relations tracts, and for the most part it hasn't been good PR. To deal honestly with this country's treatment of its dark-skinned minorities.

Much of the dishonesty, no doubt, has been unintentional. Most of the historians have been white, and they have tended to view history through white eyes. In addition, most history texts rely on secondary sources, with the result that errors and distortions are perpetuated.

It also must be acknowledged that people write history textbooks in order to sell them. And since school administrators, most of whom are white, learned their history from distorted texts, they are predisposed to accept many of these distortions as fact. And so they order similar works for their own classrooms.

Having said that, it must be observed that much of the so-called black history now being pushed is almost as badly distorted as what it attempts to correct. That might not be so bad if the two distortions resulted in a balanced view of our history.

A more likely result, however, is a good deal of skepticism toward both white history and black.

To say that the history books are distorted is not to say that they must remain that way.

It strikes me that the increasing disposition of private foundations to fund innovative approaches to contemporary problems and the growing interest of black students in their own and America's history could be fruitfully combined.

The foundations, or the Federal Government for that matter, could make available

money for a sophisticated center—perhaps in Washington—where black students from all over the country could have the opportunity to do some first-rate historical research.

Washington could be the ideal location, since the researchers would have access to the National Archives, the Library of Congress and Howard University's excellent library.

Washington also is the headquarters of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, which for years has been trying to fill in the gaps in American history with little staff or money for research. Perhaps the Association under its director, Charles Wesley, a former college president, could be the nucleus of the research center.

The combination of interested scholars, access to primary information sources and money, it seems to me, could produce a truly excellent history of black Americans—not as pro-Negro propaganda but as unvarnished presentation of facts.

Such a history would be of value not just to black people who want to feel better about themselves, but to all people who want to know what this country is about and how it came to be that way.

It also could be expected to have a profound impact on the general history textbooks—both because it would exert pressure on other historians to tell it as it was and because it would provide the means for doing so.

JOSEPH McCaffrey SPEAKS TO THE POLICE ACADEMY

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1969

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, Joseph McCaffrey, one of Washington's most distinguished news commentators has made many sound recommendations toward improving the Nation's Capital and making our city a better place in which to live. Recently, Mr. McCaffrey had the opportunity to address the graduation class of the Metropolitan Police Academy and in my opinion, his comments merit the attention of my colleagues.

One of the major issues during the fall campaign was crime and disorder and lawlessness in the streets of our cities. While it is my hope that the new Congress, with the cooperation of the new administration will be able to do something about the crime menace in our cities, I believe it is just as important for all of us to support our law-enforcement officers. Too often the everyday acts of courtesy, help, and cooperation which our dedicated police officers perform for the benefit of all our citizens is accepted matter of factly.

I believe Mr. McCaffrey's address to the police graduating class appropriately reminds us that too often we forget that the policeman is our friend and time and time again risks his life in our behalf.

Mr. McCaffrey has performed an outstanding public service in taking the time to speak to these new young officers and to reassure them of the support and cooperation of all law-abiding citi-

zens who sincerely want to see law and order prevail throughout our land.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF JOSEPH McCAFFREY BEFORE THE METROPOLITAN POLICE ACADEMY

I am delighted to be invited to take part in your graduation.

This is a proud day for you, as it should be.

I want to say a few words of praise for your Chief, John Layton.

He is one of the best.

Despite unjustified and unjustifiable criticism he does what any good leader should do, he stands by his men.

In this day when attacking—both physically and verbally—seems to be the popular sport, the Chief has had to endure an amazing amount of malicious, perverted criticism from—I was going to say people who should know better. But probably they don't.

You have picked police work as your career.

You were not drafted into this job.

Any one of you probably could have chosen another field, and no doubt, an easier field.

But you are willing to accept the challenge offered by law enforcement.

Then you must also accept the criticisms which are so popular today.

Because today in our society, the policeman is caught in the middle.

The population explosion has crammed Americans together in cities which have not been able to provide all of them with proper housing, proper education, and proper medical care.

This has caused bitterness and frustration which, unfortunately, many times is unleashed at policemen because they are the nearest symbol of authority and the closest person on hand who can be identified with what we now call the establishment.

The population crush has also increased the aggressiveness of many men and women: the need to assert ones self the need to fight off every one else in the effort to survive.

You take to the streets, then, at a time when more people have more guns than ever before in our history, and less hesitancy about using them than ever before.

Why, Jesse James wouldn't last one Saturday night in this town.

If he survived, he'd turn himself into Boys Town to hide.

What happens today makes the Wild West look like the Mild West.

But as provocative as times are today this should not, and does not, give a hunting license to any man who legally carries a side arm.

Despite the rise in criminality, and the increasing degree of danger a policeman now finds himself faced with, the real role, the traditional role of the policeman has been that of a helper.

There is not a day that goes by in this city, and every other city in the nation, where every man on the beat doesn't do a half dozen things to help his fellow man.

This concept was more pronounced when this city was smaller, when it was easier for the men on the beat to know the people and—most important—for the people to know him.

Today we are a fluid, transient city, and a much more impersonal one than years ago.

Kids were more careful to stay out of trouble in those days because it wasn't easy to get to the far reaches of the city where they weren't known. In their own neighborhood they knew that if they even hinted at getting into trouble, it would be reported back home, but those built in controls have long since been removed.

This, too, has made the lot of the policeman much harder.

The policeman is much more of a stranger to the citizens than he was a generation ago, and his role as a helper is now not as well

known, and certainly not as well known as it should be.

I think it is interesting that those local citizens who are now publicly proclaiming themselves to be anti-police are taking this position because they think that the helping role of the men on the beat and the men at the station house has not been helpful enough. They really want the police department to be turned into a massive social service organization.

I would be the first to say that probably the great majority of the men in the department could do a great deal of good as sociologists, but a police department is not established for this work.

A police department's role in society is to help maintain obedience to the law. It can only "help" maintain such obedience because the real job of obeying the law rests with each of our citizens.

There was never a police department big enough to play a man-to-man defense with every citizen in an effort to force him to stay within the law.

There are citizens today who feel that some of the laws are unfair, are unjust. The place for them to seek redress is not by public confrontation with a policeman or a battalion of policemen. We have courts of law, and God knows, we have plenty of lawyers.

The policeman is neither responsible for the system as it is constructed today, nor is he capable of changing it. If it is changed, and his role in it is changed, then he will adapt to these changes.

But these changes will come about orderly—or not at all.

When you go into the streets you will find that everyone is a believer in freedom. In too many cases it doesn't matter if this desire for freedom is in conflict with the laws and the conventions of society. If it is, then there are those who opt for freedom, scorning the laws.

In the last book they have written Mr. and Mrs. Will Durant have two sentences about freedom which I would like to pass on to you. In *Lessons of History* they say man has always sought freedom, and he has tried to structure his government so he will be assured of freedom.

But too much freedom, they point out, freedom in the "absolute" means chaos, and this is what many in this country today are flirting with under the guise of freedom: chaos, anarchy.

And you, those of you who leave here today for assignments in this great city, will be faced with this fanatical drive for personal freedom.

What I have been saying may be too depressing.

I certainly don't want to stand up here and talk about things that will make you hand in your badges on the way out.

So let me turn the page, and point out to you that when law enforcement is evenhanded, fair and honest, when it is balanced for both the white and the black, when it operates as it should as the strong right arm of justice, then 99 per cent of this community is behind you.

Even though, perhaps, there are moments when it seems as if the shrill voices of that other one per cent seem to be louder.

This department, as it has developed since the early days of former Police Chief Robert V. Murray, and has continued to develop under John Layton, is one of the best departments in the United States.

It is a police department you are privileged to belong to.

It is a department you will be proud to serve.

Police work, during the next 20 years, will see many changes, and you will be a part of these changes.

For generations we have taken policemen and police work for granted.

Now, with the change in our social structure, and the rise in crime, we are facing up to the fact that police work must have the help of research, of science, that more money must be spent both on policemen and police departments.

The concept of the police department will change with a greater concentration on community activity.

Take advantages of these changes, prepare for them by taking courses in police work at American University or Maryland—or take general courses at any of the local area schools.

There are two things you'll realize as you get older. You have to keep exercising; you have to keep learning.

If you neglect the first, you may not be around long enough to regret it.

If you don't neglect the first, and then pass up the second, you'll wonder why you are still around. Because when you stop learning, you stop growing and you stop enjoying, whether you are a plumber, a policeman or a politician.

You are stepping out now on a great career.

You bring to it your most precious possession, your self respect.

No matter what any one says, he can not strip that from you.

Today you not only have your own self respect, you also have *our* respect.

Guard both well.

We are proud of you.

So walk tall.

Be proud.

And may I now as a citizen salute you, all of you, and wish each of you a fine, rewarding career.

God bless you all!

AGRICULTURAL POTENTIAL OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER REGION

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1969

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to bring to the attention of my colleagues a newspaper article that accurately describes the great agricultural potential of the Columbia River region. This article was written by Mr. Tom Zinn, county extension agent in Gilliam County, Oreg., and appeared in the January 10 edition of the *Condon Globe-Times*.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of interbasin water diversion has come before the House several times in past years. You will recall that several times during the spirited debate on this issue, I pointed out that the long-range water needs of the Columbia River region are just now being discovered. I hope that all my colleagues will read Mr. Zinn's article which underscores so well what we from the Pacific Northwest have been saying for some time about the great potential of this area.

I insert the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

IRRIGATION WATER FROM THE COLUMBIA RIVER SETS THE STAGE FOR A "SLEEPING GIANT" IN GILLIAM COUNTY

(By Tom Zinn)

Agriculture, the largest industry in Oregon, constitutes more jobs than any other

single or combined industry that this State has to claim.

In the Willamette Valley this industry is intensive with a large variety of crops being produced. In Eastern Oregon, the sleeping giant is beginning to awaken.

The potential is there and far greater than any other area of the state. What stirs the giant is ranchers, investors and water, and such a combination weaves an intriguing spell in these impatient days.

In the Mid-Columbia Basin along the south side of the Columbia River lays the giant. Rich fertile soils of depths to 30 feet in some areas; a growing season exceeding 200 days in length in some areas; a transportation system including a super highway, excellent barge facilities, and railroads. In addition a source of power from the new John Day Dam sets the stage for one of the greatest agricultural developments in the history of the State of Oregon.

This Basin, although one of the Pacific Northwest's major producers of wheat and livestock, is still really something of an agricultural "sleeping giant." There are estimates that possibly 500,000 acres of grain and sagebrush land in Wasco, Sherman, Gilliam, Morrow and Umatilla counties can be profitably irrigated from the Columbia River and other water sources. Only about 66,000 acres of cropland were being irrigated in the five counties in 1964. That figure is more now because additional wells for irrigation have been drilled in Umatilla and Morrow counties in the past 4 years. About one-half of the 1964 irrigation total is in the Umatilla Irrigation Project which dates back to about 1905.

Interest in moving Columbia River water to the broad expanse of land above the river to wheat and cash crops like sugar beets and potatoes has been mounting in recent years. The first to try it on the Oregon side of the river were Ray Dunn and William McClanahan, who are irrigating in the neighborhood of 1,000 acres of potatoes near Umatilla on both sides of the Morrow-Umatilla county line. They are lifting water to elevations less than 400 feet above the river. Other larger private projects are being considered.

One plan—under study by a group of Sherman County Farmers who organized N. E. Sherman Irrigation, Inc., several years ago to investigate the feasibility of irrigating some of their wheat land with Columbia River water—contemplates irrigating 47,000 acres and lifting the water as high as 1800 feet. Wheat farmer Gordon Hilderbrand of Wasco heads up this group.

Another potential private irrigation undertaking in the Columbia Basin North Gilliam Irrigation Project—has been studied for several years now by some Gilliam County Ranchers, spearheaded by Marion Weatherford, of Arlington, prominent Oregon grain and cattle raiser. This plan considers moving Columbia River water as high as 800 feet to about 25,000 acres in what is known as the Shuttler Flat area south of Arlington. The gently sloping land is covered with reasonably deep fine sandy loam soil. Wheat often responds to the average annual precipitation of nine to ten inches with 30 to 45 bushels per acre.

Delivering Columbia River water to grain in rotation with such crops as alfalfa, sugar beets, potatoes, peppermint is economically feasible in both projects, according to studies the two groups contracted recently with Cornell, Howland, Hayes and Merryfield of Corvallis, an Engineering Firm.

Other private irrigation developments in the Basin are being talked about.

The Bureau of Reclamation earlier this year started a \$41,000 preliminary investigation into the possibilities of a 300,000 acre irrigation project along the south bank of

the Columbia, stretching east and west from the Umatilla River to the John Day River.

There are many factors contributing to the irrigation interest in the Columbia Basin. Slack water navigation on the Columbia for inexpensive movement of produce to Portland is probably one. The close supply of power to run the pumping plants is likely another. So is the exciting possibility of irrigating crops with the water that may be used to cool nuclear power plants slated for construction along the Columbia. This intriguing aspect of Columbia River irrigation potential for Oregon was thoroughly reported by Oregon State University's Arthur S. King in the June 6, 1968 issue of *The Oregon Farmer*, "Irrigation-Nuclear Power-Partners In The Future?"

Oregon State University in cooperation with interested ranchers and commercial agriculture are sharing in the applied research initiated as a result of the possibility of irrigating these dry-land wheat lands along the Columbia river.

The Oregon State University Extension Service and the Experiment Stations are conducting a series of experiments on irrigated crops so that information can be available when the Giant awakens.

Experiments conducted in Sherman and Gilliam counties are in their second year. In Gilliam county experiments on irrigating wheat will continue with its third year.

Supervisor of the Experimental applied research project in Gilliam County for 1968 was Thomas G. Zinn, Gilliam County Extension Agent. Art King and James Vomocil, Extension Specialist in Corvallis were responsible for engineering the project this last season.

A field day scheduled in July and the completion of the results of the project this last year are laying some important ground work for future irrigation development in the wheat fields and sagebrush in Oregon's Columbia Basin.

What King, Vomocil and others are trying to do with the Shuttler Flat experimental project is to find practical answers that will make an all-out commercial venture less risky. Bankers are likely going to want to see some records of crop performance if and when irrigation plans move off the drawing boards into the fields. Too, much of the data used in predicting costs and returns for irrigating this land from the Columbia is based on irrigated cropping in Washington's Columbia Basin Irrigation Project.

The information gained from the continuation of the Shuttler Flat project will assist in determining the validity of long range financing and will aid processing plants and other marketing outlets in obtaining advance information on the cropping potential of the Mid-Columbia area when high-lift irrigation projects become a reality.

One particularly significant problem that has been uncovered on Anderson's Shuttler Flat irrigation plots is the soil's reluctance to accept water. It came as a surprise to King. "I thought this land would take all the water we could give it. Even where subsoiling was tried and substantial improvements in penetration of the water were observed, the soil still only takes about one-quarter inch of moisture per hour," King said.

Observers on a field day in July 1968 saw a tremendous variety of crops under irrigation on about 15 acres in Gilliam County.

All the crops looked healthy and vigorous. Some of the visitors were comparing the sugar beets and potatoes favorably to what they have seen in Washington's Columbia Basin.

There are four varieties of potatoes, including Norbold, Kennebec, Netted Gem and Red Lasota; peppermint; sugar beets; Sudan

grass; six varieties of dry beans; spring rape; perfection peas (for freezing); Alaskan field peas (for soups and canning); crambie, safflower and sunflowers. Also under irrigation were about 5 acres of alfalfa and 5 acres of wheat.

Why all the oil seed crops? "Some could be a good crop early in the season," said Norman Goetze, OSU extension farm crops specialist. Noting that Oregon livestock producers import much of their protein supplement, Goetze speculated that the by-product feed value of these crops in itself could make an important economic contribution.

"Irrigated alfalfa can not be overlooked as an excellent irrigated cash crop," King said. He cited the thousands of acres in Washington's irrigated basin that are producing alfalfa hay for dairies in Western Washington and Oregon. It's one of their most profitable crops, he said.

WHEAT

Wheat is getting its share of attention in the Shuttler Flat irrigation experiments. Wheat is a crop these Eastern Oregon ranchers know how to grow. They have the equipment to grow it; and they have a market.

Four plots of wheat were included in this experiment this year with varying amounts of fertilizer and water. All four plots were seeded Oct. 28, 1967 at the rate of 100 pounds per acre with 7 inch drill spacing. All received 4½ inches of water in October prior to planting and 50 pounds of phosphorus per acre.

Plot 1 a total of 216 pounds of nitrogen and 16.6 inches of water were applied throughout the season. The yield was 79.1 bushels per acre with a test weight of 57 pounds.

Plot number 2 had 114 lbs. of nitrogen and a total of 5.5 inches of water. The yield was 73.7 bushels per acre with a test weight of 61 lbs.

Plot number 3 had 205 lbs. of nitrogen per acre applied and 9 inches of water. The test weight was 56 pounds.

Plot number 4 had 40 lbs. of nitrogen applied per acre 13.5 inches of water and yielded 89.2 bushels per acre with a test weight of 60 lbs.

POTATOES

Four varieties of potatoes were tested on the experiment this year. The varieties were Norgold, Kennebec, Russet and Red Lasota. Norgold yield was 18.7 tons per acre, Kennebec was 36.6 tons per acre. Russet was 24.5 tons per acre and Red Lasota was 24.4 tons per acre.

The percentage of number one potatoes in each variety was lower than a commercial producer would desire for profitable returns. The lower percentage of number ones was largely due to irrigation timing and water penetration. The potatoes were of good quality and the total yields were very good.

SUGAR BEETS

Two plots of sugar beets were grown experimentally with plot one producing 29.2 tons of beets per acre and a sugar content of 16.86 percent. This plot produced 4.93 tons of sugar per acre. Plot number 2 produced 28.6 tons per acre with a sugar content of 16.3 percent. This plot produced 4.66 tons of sugar per acre.

DRY BEANS

Six varieties of dry beans were planted this year and the yields varied from 8000 lbs. per acre to 1400 lbs. per acre. The quality was excellent and these yields were extremely high.

The experiments, the data and the talk all lead to some exciting changes in a vast area that once produced only dry land grains.

But in a number of areas of these counties it is beyond the talk stage. Each year those

who will tour the area will see a number of wells and sprinkler equipment turning hundreds of acres into lush green wheat crops producing three and four times their dry land capabilities. In addition to wheat, one may see such crops as sugar beets, potatoes, peppermint, field corn, beans, and alfalfa. So the Giant is beginning to awaken.

CABINET RANK FOR US SHOPPERS?

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I will shortly reintroduce legislation to establish a Cabinet-level Department of Consumer Affairs. Last year, over 60 colleagues joined me in introducing this bill. This year I expect to have over 100 cosponsors.

One reason for the increasing interest in this bill is the evidence which is accruing slowly to the Special Inquiry on Consumer Representation, of the House Government Operations Committee, which I head. With each aspect of consumer representation we investigate, it becomes clearer that until the consumer has a Cabinet spokesman, with the staff and budget that implies, he will be only half safe from misrepresentation, fraud, and simple lack of knowledge on how best to spend his money.

Today, the first day of a new administration, the consumer sees most clearly what he needs. The limited consumer protection given by Betty Furness as a White House assistant has vanished. A Cabinet department would not be nearly so easily disposed of.

Jack Kelso, associate editor of *Changing Times*, summarizes the arguments for the new Department in the January issue in the article "Cabinet Rank for Us Shoppers?" which follows:

CABINET RANK FOR US SHOPPERS?

That's the idea behind a hardy proposal for a "Department of Consumer Affairs" in Washington.

Suppose that you are victimized in the marketplace so flagrantly that you deem it worth the attention of the U.S. government itself. Where would you turn for help?

Depending on your complaint, you could pick from no fewer than 33 federal agencies, departments, bureaus and offices, each with some "consumer protection" obligations.

You could lodge your protests with the President's consumer-affairs adviser, too, though that office has been primarily concerned with advising the President, congressional committees and other groups, not with offering personal help to shoppers. Even the action agencies with consumer concerns, from the Agriculture and Labor departments on downward, all have bigger fish to fry. For most of them, safeguarding shoppers is distinctly a sideline.

Some legislators and some voters are beginning to feel that the consumer will get a fair shake at the federal level only when some of the major scattered consumer-protection activities are pulled together into one new Department of Consumer Affairs. Then, they think, the consumer can swing his weight and enjoy full cabinet rank, just like

the farmer and the businessman and the laboring man.

One outspoken advocate of this approach is Rep. Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Dem.-N.Y., who got 58 congressional colleagues to cosponsor a measure to establish such a department in the last session of Congress. The bill died without action at the end of the session, but Rosenthal pledges to bring it up again this year.

Its passage would cause a major governmental upheaval. The new department would take over food grading and classification from the Agriculture Department's Consumer and Marketing Service; home economics and nutrition research from Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service; the price and cost-of-living reporting now carried on by the Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics; the Health, Education and Welfare Department's police work on packaging and labeling and HEW's functions relating to safe food standards.

It would break ground in other ways, too. DCA would go into the courts and before government regulatory agencies and departments to speak for the consumer on tariffs, milk marketing practices, gasoline imports, banking and a host of other pocketbook matters.

Its officials would handle complaints on such topics as exorbitant interest rates, home repair frauds, unsafe automobiles and household products, contaminated foods. When complaints were not directly under the department's authority, they would be passed on to the proper agencies elsewhere in the government.

An Office of Consumer Information would gather everything the government knows about purchasing such items as stoves, refrigerators, flashlight batteries, shoes, floor wax, mops, tires and so on and make that shopping know-how available to the public.

A semiautonomous unit called the National Consumer Information Foundation would run a voluntary product-testing program, under which manufacturers could submit their products to determine whether they lived up to their makers' claims for them. The official test results would be printed on information tags that companies could attach to their products.

The Institute for Consumer Research, which would do the actual testing, would also make recommendations to other government agencies on needs for research in specialized fields.

A permanent Office of Consumer Safety would run continuing checks on the safety of consumer products and publish warnings when it detected hazards. (The present National Commission on Product Safety is a temporary group exploring problems of this kind.)

Economic surveys and special investigations would be made to uncover other problems.

There's been opposition aplenty to this whole idea since the late Sen. Estes Kefauver of Tennessee proposed it in 1959. When Rosenthal introduced a similar bill three years ago, the outcry was long and loud from many groups in business and industry and from some government officials.

Business and industry argued that since everyone is a consumer, be he farmer, laborer or manufacturer, the specialized agencies of the government can deal best with specific problems as they arise. Further, no one can possibly know the viewpoint of consumers on such complex matters as transportation, banking, trade regulation, money markets and tariffs. And, they added, paperwork and red tape would increase costs for consumers.

Government spokesmen remarked that the Federal Trade Commission already has the power to do some of the things proposed for a Department of Consumer Affairs, but Con-

gress has not seen fit to provide the money for the FTC to do them. A consumer department might give other agencies the idea that they no longer had to consider the consumer interest.

Advocates of the proposal countered that consumers, despite their many faces and roles, are an identifiable group that cannot be ignored any more than you can write off the labor movement by saying that all men are workers. And although consumer protection was among the original purposes of the existing regulatory agencies, the consumers' voice increasingly is drowned out by the stronger, better-organized voices of the industries being regulated. Both Norway and Sweden, they noted, have Ministries of the Consumer and Family Affairs.

Even to many of its supporters, however, chances for passage of a Department of Consumer Affairs bill in the next session of Congress appear slim. Some think it will be established eventually, perhaps four, six or eight years hence. Some would settle for less than a full-fledged department, an Office of Consumer Affairs, perhaps, with less power and authority.

The mood of the new Congress and the approach the Nixon administration takes toward consumer problems will determine the fate of the proposal in the immediate future. Even if nothing comes of the idea just yet, the talk about it shows that politicians, some eagerly and some reluctantly, are growing sensitive to consumers as an interest group and to their problems as an issue.

MAYOR WALTER J. SULLIVAN, OF CAMBRIDGE

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on November 24, the Honorable Walter J. Sullivan, mayor of the city of Cambridge, addressed the Marsh Post of the American Legion in Cambridge. The occasion of the address was the fifth anniversary of the death of the late President John F. Kennedy.

Mayor Sullivan talked about a fitting memorial for John F. Kennedy. He was not talking about statues or buildings—for there are already many of these—he was talking about a rededication of men and their endeavors toward those goals sought by the late President Kennedy. He said, and I agree wholeheartedly, that President Kennedy recognized the unity of the human family and sought to make that unity real and effective.

Mayor Sullivan suggests that present world problems and conditions should be viewed as part of the artificial divisions within the human family. As such, we who want to honor the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, must end those divisions and solve the problems. We cannot allow any one to suffer mistreatment, injustice, or oppression. We must alleviate present problems and prevent future ones.

This would be a fitting memorial to John F. Kennedy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read and think about the fine and understanding words of Mayor Sullivan.

Mayor Sullivan's address follows:

ADDRESS BY MAYOR WALTER J. SULLIVAN

It seems beyond belief that five years have passed since that Black Friday in November of 1963, when a vibrant young President, with limitless potential and promise, was cut down on the streets of Dallas. In the interlude of time from that day to this, John Fitzgerald Kennedy has been memorialized in a variety of ways. Most of these memorials are in brick and mortar. And while they are laudable attempts at expressing our affection, they are an inadequate expression to the late President. For, the fact is that memorials in stone are superficial. And this was neither the character nor the type of memorial that he would find satisfactory. I would like to suggest today what seems to me to be the enduring memorial to our late President.

I think that you will all agree with me when I say that there was one theme, one idea, one central belief which penetrated and resounded through all the speeches, writings, and decisions of John Kennedy. That pivotal idea was his sensitivity and commitment to the Oneness, the Unity of the human family. He realized with a passion that all of us, however diverse and different, are one. We are one by reason of origin—we are one by reason of destiny—we must be one in the common enterprise of building a human community which will insure the dignity, the value, the decency of every human being.

Might I suggest that if John Kennedy were here today, he would make it abundantly clear that lip service to the Unity of the human family is not enough. This Unity must be given flesh and blood. It must live in our midst. To insure its presence is your task and mine. Its presence will be the living memorial, the adequate expression of our affection for this fallen leader.

Does any area in the domestic life of this nation cry for the understanding of Human Unity as does the Crisis of our Cities? Initially, the underlying unity of the human family means that whether we be rich or poor; black or white or yellow; whether we be Protestant, Jewish, or Catholic; whether we be Irish, Italian, Polish, Russian, regardless of these accidental barriers, all of us are members of one family. And the time has come to live this fact to the full without compromise and without timidity. That John Kennedy was about to wage war against Urban Blight, in all its human dimensions, is clear from the testimony of his aides who report that just prior to his rendezvous with death, he had read and studied the incisive book by Michael Harrington entitled, "The Other America." That the Unity of the Human Family permeated his total person was made manifest in the response which John Kennedy determined to give to these compelling words of Michael Harrington:

"At precisely that moment in history where for the first time a people have the material ability to end poverty, they lack the will to do so. They cannot see; they cannot act. The consciences of the well-off are the victims of affluence; the lives of the poor are the victims of a physical and spiritual misery."

The problems of the cities are clear to all of us. It is time that we stopped moaning about them and began confronting these human needs with effectiveness. Like it or not, however inconvenient it may be, the fact is that a social revolution is throbbing in the hearts of our cities because a social revolution is throbbing within the hearts of the people who live in the heart of the city. To those in our midst who would close their eyes to this revolution, may I urge you to reflect upon what the late President remarked: "Those who make peaceful revolution impossible are the very ones who make

violent revolution inevitable." The present Urban Revolution must be peaceful. Each of us must work to make it so.

A second area where the Unity of the Human Family must be given life is in our determination as individuals and as a nation to secure world Peace. No generation has more to lose through war than do we. Yet, no generation has more to gain through Peace than do we. That John Kennedy saw this was evident in the manner in which he expended his energy in securing the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. That he recognized that in a Nuclear Age, War was not a means for resolving national grievances was clear when he observed:

"In a nuclear war, the fruits of victory would be but ashes in our mouths."

His sensitivity to the Oneness of the human family compelled John Kennedy to leave no avenue untraveled in pursuit of Peace. Today, you and I and all Americans must continue this pursuit. For we must realize that Peace is much more than the absence of War. It is the determined effort to resolve and diminish those tensions of our day, which if allowed to go wild, would escalate into armed conflict. With this realization in mind, it is for all of us to mobilize public sentiment and urge our President and President-Elect, as well as the Congress, to ratify the next important step in our quest for Peace; Ratification of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. To take this next step is a mandate from humanity itself. We must make our support known to our legislative Leaders. This is the type of Memorial to the late President which has enduring value.

My friends, the times in which you and I live are difficult. They are testing us as we have never been tested before. Yet, when I sometimes get discouraged at the seemingly overwhelming needs of today, I reflect upon what Dr. Martin Luther King once said:

"If I were taken to the beginning of time and creation and were given choice of any epoch in history, my preference would be the second half of the 20th Century."

Let History record that you and I accepted the present challenges of Destiny. More than that, let History record that the real memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy was the manner in which the people who loved him carried his ideals and made them live in the crucible of the daily life of the nation. This is our task.

I would like to conclude my remarks by asking you to take with you from this hall and make your own a statement which sums up all that we have to do, a statement spoken by the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy:

"In troubled times, there is always a temptation to grow one's own hedge, and cultivate one's own garden. For us to give in to such a temptation would be unworthy of our past and unfaithful to our future."

A TRIBUTE TO SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN RUSK

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1969

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Dr. MORGAN, in paying tribute to the Honorable Dean Rusk, 54th Secretary of State.

For 8 years, under two Presidents, Secretary Rusk has discharged the huge burden of carrying on America's foreign

affairs. As is well known, his tenure in the difficult office of Secretary of State is comparable to that of Cordell Hull.

Moreover, Secretary Rusk's stewardship has been carried out during one of the most difficult, discouraging, critical periods of world and American history. Crisis after crisis have marked the days since 1960 when he first took office under President John F. Kennedy.

It is the mark of the man that Dean Rusk has proved repeatedly equal to the challenge. Again and again he has helped guide the ship of state through the constant perils which have beset the United States.

Secretary Rusk considers his greatest accomplishment in office the fact that a nuclear war was avoided.

This fact serves to remind us of the life-and-death responsibilities which Secretary Rusk carried as the leading initiator and administrator of American foreign policy. In no small measure Mrs. Rusk has been of great assistance to her distinguished husband in carrying this awesome burden.

While it would be presumptuous to assume that the world is more peaceful than it was when Secretary Rusk took office, there can be no doubt that important steps toward that goal have been taken during his tenure.

The treaties which have been signed with the Soviet Union and other major nations for preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, for banning the use of space for nuclear weapons, and for forbidding the use of the moon for military purposes—all have resulted from leadership given by the Secretary of State. Further, important actions have been taken in the past 8 years throughout the Western Hemisphere and in the Western World toward peace through mutual security.

Let us not forget—as Pope Paul has pointed out—that the peace in our time is "development." Secretary Rusk has been a strong proponent of and an eloquent spokesman for our foreign assistance programs which are directed toward peaceful change in the emerging nations.

Some commentators have noted, and not without some wonder, Secretary Rusk's popularity with the Members of Congress, a body more known for its antagonism rather than friendship toward Secretaries of State.

I believe this high regard by Members of Congress reflects the American people's attitude toward this distinguished statesman. He is respected and admired for his patience, perseverance, composure under fire, integrity, loyalty, and courage. Day after day, under constant attacks and provocations, he has continued to speak with the quiet voice of reason and intelligence about and for America and its mission in the world.

With 8 years of hard work and sacrifice behind him, Dean Rusk has amply earned his ease. However, he will not take it. Rather, he has announced plans to reminisce and write about the rich and intense experience of the past 8 years so that future Secretaries of State

and American foreign policymakers may have the benefit of his wisdom and suggestions.

Working with Secretary Dean Rusk these past 8 years has been a memorable

and rewarding experience for me and, I know, for many of my colleagues on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and in the Congress. Let us hope that soon again he will come center stage in the contin-

uing drama of American progress. Undoubtedly his talents and skills will be available and called upon as one Nation continues in the effort to develop a peaceful world.