

nical skills and training. Enterprising high school graduates have only to look about them to find that they are in great demand as trainees in technical, highly specialized jobs. College provides one path into the mainstream of our society. But we should keep in mind also that this is by no means the only path. Our nation's continued progress depends on our applying what we know. This, in turn, depends on the youth of our nation. Only in them will we find the human resources, the technical skills, the talents to do the job effectively.

WHY USELESSLY CONTAMINATE GOOD AMERICAN EARTH?

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, before the Senate adjourns, I should like to read, from the United Press International wire service, a report just issued. It reads as follows:

DUGWAY, UTAH.—The Army has admitted contaminating a remote area of Dugway proving grounds with a teacup full of deadly Anthrax bacteria.

But authorities said the threat to humans and animals is almost non-existent, at least partly because of the area's remote location.

Brig. Gen. John G. Appel, commander of the desert test center, said today a 100-square-yard area of nearly pure crystalline salt on the western Utah salt flats was contaminated with the bacteria 15 years ago "To determine how long it might present a hazard."

Similar tests by Britain during World War II indicated areas contaminated with Anthrax bacteria would be uninhabitable for more than 100 years.

The bacteria can be fatal to humans and

animals if they are inhaled into the lungs or contact a cut in the skin.

I conclude my remarks, Mr. President, by asking the military, with the results of the tests by Britain, tests that have already been successfully completed, why was it necessary to contaminate 100 square yards of pure crystalline salt? Or, more pertinent still, why was it necessary to contaminate 1 square foot of American ground with tests that had already been made and the results established and proved?

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 2, 1969

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 adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 2, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 28, 1969, under authority of the order of the Senate of May 27, 1969:

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Charles A. Bane, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge for the Seventh Circuit, vice Elmer J. Schnackenberg, deceased.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Hamer H. Budge, of Idaho, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 5, 1974; reappointment.

James J. Needham, of New York, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1973, vice Manuel Frederick Cohen, resigned.

IN THE ARMY

I nominate Brig. Gen. Hal Bruce Jennings, Jr., [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army), for appointment as the Surgeon General, U.S. Army, and for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3036.

I nominate the following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

MaJ. Gen. Arthur William Oberbeck, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

I nominate Lt. Gen. Richard G. Weede, U.S. Marine Corps, when retired, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with the provisions of title 10, U.S. Code, section 5233.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, U.S. Code, section 5232, MaJ. Gen. Frederick E. Leek, U.S. Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HUBERT HUMPHREY OFFERS COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS FOR ALL AMERICA

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 29, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, this is the time of year when high schools, colleges, and universities across the entire country are conducting their commencement programs.

A great amount of wisdom and good advice is being dispensed by thousands of speakers at these programs. Deserving of careful attention also is the advice offered by former Vice President Humphrey in an article entitled "An Open Letter to America's Youth," published in Parade magazine for May 18, 1969. What he has to say should be pondered carefully by every American, young and old alike.

Mr. Humphrey's article could well be classed as a commencement address for all of us.

Mr. President, 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:

AN OPEN LETTER TO AMERICA'S YOUTH
(By Hubert Humphrey)

No age group has a monopoly on idealism. The desire for justice, freedom and peace is

as alive among the old as it is among the young. Idealism, nevertheless, is most apparent in the young. Our students have the time and the energy and the motivation to express their discontent with the failures of our civilization, and to try in their own way to remedy these failings. Their discontent is praiseworthy, since we live in an imperfect world.

I find it unfortunate, however, that so much of the admirable energy of our youth is being dissipated on the fringes of society. While young people have been justly proud of some of their victories, and even prouder, perhaps, of some of their efforts that ended in defeat, they are falling far short of making their power felt on our society.

It seemed, a year ago when students banded together to advance the candidacy of Senator Eugene McCarthy, that they had gained an understanding of their power. Working within the democratic system, they proclaimed their message across the country, and they were heard. Unquestionably, a large part of Senator McCarthy's success in the primaries can be credited to young people who gave so much of themselves to his campaign. They also had an impact on the push for a Vietnam peace.

Although a good bit of the protest voiced during the last election campaign was directed against me, the greatest part of it was responsible protest. The youth of America had a message, and it did not go unheard or unheeded.

HEALTHY FOR COUNTRY

Certainly, I was disturbed when some groups interrupted my public talks and kept me from communicating with others who wanted to listen, but most of the young people who involved themselves in the last campaign respected the rights of others. These young people were directed toward is-

suess, and I think their participation was healthy for the country and for American politics. The Student Coalition—composed of McCarthy, Kennedy and Humphrey supporters—was among the most effective and hard-working campaign organizations supporting my candidacy.

Most of the students on our campuses, like most of the students who were involved in the last campaign, are concerned Americans. Most of the violent and destructive campus protests have been provoked by a relative few.

We find faults and deficiencies in all of our institutions—our universities, our government, our political parties, our corporations and labor unions, even our churches—but they will not be remedied by the actions of screaming, rock-throwing mobs. The answer lies in sustained positive action. This process of peaceful change is the foundation of a democratic society.

I urge that the doors to participation in our society be thrown open to young people who want to take an active part in the future course of this nation. It is one thing to stand on the outside and complain when our institutions seem unfair, unresponsive, irrelevant—or to resort to violence and other illegal tactics. It is another to do the work that is needed to make them fair and responsive and relevant. That is the opportunity that beckons young Americans today—as it has every generation.

In my youth, and that of most other parents of today's young people, much of our energy went to help our families and relatives survive the rigors of the Depression—and to educate ourselves like every generation, today's young people also want to be involved in building a more just and humane social order. But in most cases, their contributions are not essential to the welfare of

their families or friends. Instead, they encounter a society which places high value on material comforts and they properly conclude that materialism is an insufficient goal, either for themselves or society.

Is it surprising, then, that a growing number of young people are searching for higher goals and are expressing dissatisfaction with society as they find it? The paradoxes of our time contribute to this alienation and frustration; poverty in the midst of wealth, unemployment in the midst of an expanding economy, or hunger in the midst of food surpluses.

What is more, our young people know the imperative need of an education, but they see universities and colleges with programs wedded to the past and with standards unrelated to tomorrow's needs. This is fertile ground for trouble. And trouble we have. What to do about it?

DON'T WAIT FOR TROUBLE

First of all, the adults ought to seize the initiative in removing these inequities and injustices. We have the power to do something about them. We should do what ought to be done through the democratic processes of orderly change—rather than being forced to take action as a result of conflict, destruction and rebellion.

The existing processes of democracy provide a forum for action—for adults and young people. But will these processes be used effectively . . . or will they be rejected for the alternatives of unrestrained mob rule and intimidation? History has demonstrated conclusively that those persons who set themselves above the rules of ordered liberty are the ultimate destroyers of the justice and freedom upon which a democracy must rest.

Every citizen has the obligation, now, to see that our young people have every chance to participate effectively within the system—to be heard, to be taken seriously, and to be treated as equal partners in our democratic enterprise. Parade magazine has agreed to help young people gain access to the institutions of democratic government. Anyone who is interested in learning more about the many opportunities which do exist for young people can write to me in care of Parade.

AN URGENT NEED

For those who are qualified for government service, I will be delighted to pass on names to President Nixon, with my personal recommendation that they be given special consideration. I know that our Federal departments urgently need people with a young spirit and fresh ideas.

Others may be interested in working in the political parties. I will pass on the names of young Republican volunteers to the Republican Party. As a leader of the Democratic Party, I will forward the names of those interested in volunteering for Democratic activity to the appropriate party leaders.

There are other exciting opportunities such as the Young Franchise Coalition, a broadly-based movement committed to winning the vote for eighteen year olds—an objective I have worked for since 1952.

There is no political partisanship involved in these suggestions, and none will be tolerated, by Parade or by me. I also recognize that a written request for information is no substitute for dedication and commitment which young people ultimately must generate or for the receptivity and openness which the established leaders must demonstrate if the energies and ideals of youth are to be used constructively. But I also know that many young people would welcome some specific suggestions on how they can become more fully involved in the democratic process.

More than half our citizens are under 25 years old. Yet their voice has not been heard adequately in Congress, in the top councils

of government or in our political parties. That is, perhaps, the fault of my generation. Today, however, youth has an opportunity to put its idealism to work.

Its response will be a measure of its sense of purpose.

**DR. EDWARD H. LEVI, PRESIDENT
OF CHICAGO UNIVERSITY, URGES
2-YEAR LAW STUDIES**

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently Dr. Edward H. Levi, president of the University of Chicago, proposed that the Nation's law schools give serious consideration toward an earlier termination point for formal law training.

Dr. Levi's proposal was incorporated in an address he delivered during the program celebrating the completion of a law school building at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia on March 15, 1969.

I am including in the RECORD today Dr. Levi's address and am hopeful that his bold suggestion for an earlier termination of formal law studies will help start major dialog on the subject.

I believe that there is great merit in Dr. Levi's suggestion. His excellent address follows:

**DR. EDWARD H. LEVI, PRESIDENT OF CHICAGO
UNIVERSITY, URGES 2-YEAR LAW STUDIES**

Karl Llewellyn, outstanding law teacher of a past creative period, thought lawyers could do almost everything. He thought doing was important. A scholar of folklore and legal history, he included the proper conduct of ceremonial events among the proper doings of lawyers. With special shrewdness, he knew these events were necessary and should be done well. As a former law school dean, who in one year—stretching over two—took part in at least five separate final dedications of the very same building, I can only imagine with awe the trail of luncheons, symposia, dinners and dedications which your ten-year program to complete the law quadrangle has left in its wake. We do well to celebrate. Ten years is a long time in the history of any American university; particularly for a private university where the art of planning is a subdivision of fortune-telling and witchcraft. Ten years is a particularly long time now; both law and education are at a turning point. We must welcome the realization that the conditions of 1969 and probably the next ten years are quite different from those perceived in 1959. You have earned the good fortune of new and renewed facilities. Their significance will be in their use to meet the changes of our time.

Our period is characterized by an enormous sense of inequality, a belief in the unbounded affluence of our country, a self-concern which is within the traditions of individualism and idealism but has other roots as well, an acceptance of power and coercion as ruling principles, and of an anti-intellectualism typical of agrarian or populist movements. These views and attitudes are widely shared. They are frequently coupled with such an assurance of helplessness as to make freedom of choice seem no longer personal, or merely symbolic, or at least something not to be exercised now, or to emphasize the desirability of drastic or catastrophic change. A feeling of collective guilt is pervasive. We have a soil conducive to self-righteousness, never hard to come by, for as Edmund Burke wrote describing the atti-

tudes of a time which we hope is not too similar to our own "history consists for the greater part of the miseries brought upon the world by pride, ambition, avarice, revenge, lust, sedition, hypocrisy, ungoverned zeal, and all the train of disorderly appetites." There is a resurgence, too, reminiscent of older periods, of conviction in the inevitability and, therefore, the rightness of waves of the future. You may find this picture overdrawn and, of course, it is. Fierceness, exaggeration and wild, rapid swings in points of view are endemic in our history. But there is enough correctness in the characterization to present problems with which both law and education must deal.

Our present condition is the result of many circumstances, including the normal ones described by original sin. The attitudes and beliefs have deep roots. A combination of events has made them dominant today. To some extent the beliefs are based on reality. There has been and there is great inequality. The divisions and barriers are high. Steps to reduce them intensify awareness. There is affluence, although progress is not just purchasable—even though we may think it is—and resources are inadequate for the jobs to be done. The individualism in our country has always given high marks for getting ahead, even when individualism is used as an excuse for dropping out. We have not found a comfortable way of assuring an individual that even contentment is appropriate. So there is pressure. Even though we value the individual for what he is, we still find it necessary and so does he, to explain a lack of advancement as due to helplessness within a system. As for power and coercion, the examples cannot be avoided. The civil rights movement is seen as the creation of power necessary to counteract the coercion—and largely unlawful coercion—inherent in the society itself. The undeclared Viet Nam War harrowingly questions public and private morality and the legitimacy of violence.

Of importance to both law and education is the increased power of the communications media, with new forms and a new reach, and with an effectiveness which has made the creation of stereotypes and images a national endeavor. The stereotypes and images not only substitute for thought and discussion, they also substitute for experience. There have been times in the past when our country has had a special falling for platitudes. Now the combination of affluence, delayed entry into the world of doing, and the kind of education we have developed has made a large segment of the population more dependent upon what it is repeatedly told for its view of reality. It is not the world which is made available to the individual, but someone else's conception of it, telling him not only what is said to go on, but defining for him, in lieu of the real thing, what his reactions are. Of course, this has always been the case. One must depend upon the observations of others. But the patterns of life have changed sufficiently to make the individual particularly vulnerable to the message which substitutes for questioning and doing. Socrates taught by examining with his students certain common experiences. Today the pictures and the slogans not only come complete with the answer, when there is insufficient experience or thought to ask the question, but they operate on a level of a manufactured mythology of gods and devils. The individual is enveloped in this stuff. He is hard to reach—where does one begin?—and education is much more difficult.

Despite all the talk about the knowledge explosion and the rat race, we have a leisurely pace for education for many people in our country. At least we can say the education is long in time. Our motto seems to be "the longer, the better." Many more people are going to college and many more are going to graduate school. We have made a fetish about general education, confusing it with liberal education. We have contrasted liberal

education with professional, sometimes called vocational, training, meaning by this contrast that liberal education is not serious, or is not held to a high standard of proficiency, or that it is too serious, since it is concerned with self-development, to be turned to practical ends. In a peculiar although historic way, liberal education is often equated with amateurism. As Robert Brustein has cogently written, "the word amateur comes from the Latin verb, to love—presumably because the amateur is motivated by passion rather than money. Today's amateur, however, seems to love not his subject but himself." Since he frequently has not known any subject well enough to do anything with it, he often has not learned how to read, write or think very well. So he goes on to do graduate work, or enters a law school or some other professional school.

If he goes to graduate school it is likely he does this not because he wishes to learn how to do research, but rather because he would like to get the credentials so that he can become a teacher of other students who will go to college as he did and then go on to graduate school for the same reasons. The process is self-sustaining. The professional schools are in a separate category, although the lines are blurred. In general one can say the overwhelming trend is to build up more graduate programs and more professional schools, including for example, schools of business. It is a matter of some prestige to have the graduate or professional training begin as late as possible and to go on for as long a period as can be justified. Medicine is a good example. Not so long ago a medical student was expected to spend one year as an intern; now it is almost necessary that he spend two or three years more as a resident, or perhaps five or six or more for some specialties. He may be well in his thirties when this part of his training is over. Or, take the law schools. There was a time when we hardly had them. Then we began increasing the number of pre-law years required in college. In 1925 only one state required as much as two years of college before beginning law school. Today the general minimum is to require three years of college, and leading law schools, such as the University of Pennsylvania Law School, proudly require four. All this is regarded as good. But I wonder.

Education is costly. It costs the student. It costs society. For the student, a requirement of added years of formal study pre-empt part of his life. Should we not have as a mild principle: the required period of formal training will be as short as possible consistent with its proper purpose? To lengthen the period in order to screen or limit entry into the professions or because this is a result of the characteristic behavior of guilds, or adds prestige—these do not seem to come within a proper purpose. Our society has an educational burden which it has not met. The need is greatest at the pre-school, primary and secondary level. It is wasteful to misallocate educational resources—to keep the total period any longer than necessary is wrong. There are other consequences of the present system. We have isolated a substantial segment of the population, denying it experiences which it wants and needs. At the same time we have encouraged the megalomania of colleges and universities by demanding they behave as substitutes for the world at large and for the agencies of government. Thus, we have weakened the intellectual aims and life of the universities, and we have deprived students a chance to develop skills and even wisdom by working on tasks outside formal education. The results should give us pause.

On a festive occasion such as this it would be nice to conclude that these doubts and questions do concern law schools. Perhaps they don't. I hope the merits of our great law schools are obvious. Their intellectual standards are often high. They are teaching insti-

tutions in which the students share to an amazing degree in the creativity of research in the humanistic tradition. The unity of subject matter and interest and the method of instruction, which as an ideal, anyway, compels participation, not only create an intellectual community, but they provide a training in the liberal arts not otherwise given in most academic programs. We should take note that these qualities are insufficient in the minds of those who call for more social science training or research in law schools, decry the over-emphasis on the case method—which in its pure form surely has not existed for generations—and decry the emphasis on case law, believe that law students should be able to take broadening courses outside of law in other departments of the university, feel strongly that some further training in service and more explicitly in processes of law reform should somehow be a greater part of the law student's experience. I do not know whether the call for a more practical training has waned or has become lost in the effort to staff anti-poverty and similar programs. On all these points of criticism, the law schools over the last forty years—and nothing in this area is entirely new of course—have made certain adjustments and accommodations. In addition, the schools have developed, and particularly in the foreign field, intensive graduate programs of their own. But I believe it is fair to say that law schools deserve their distinction because of their dedication to the application of structural thought, with precision and persuasion, to complex human problems and transactions. This is a great contribution which, in itself, invites questions.

There are three questions. I do not suggest the answers are obvious. The first is, accepting what the law school's greatest strength is, would it not be possible to give this basic training within a two-year rather than a three-year period. I believe there is general acceptance of the view that for many students the guts of what a law school has to teach have been given within two years. The coverage would not be as great. But the suggestion is not to wipe out a third, fourth or fifth year, but rather to give a reasonable early termination point for those who wish to leave formal law training after two years of study. What an extraordinary constructive challenge to the rest of the academic world it would be if law schools took this step! I don't think they will.

The second question is why should law schools, now that some of the malaise of undergraduate and graduate education is perceived, insist that their students have completed a four-year program before their law study is commenced? I am not sure there is even a doubt but that undergraduates could do just as well as graduates in formal law study. The argument has rather been that a broad liberal arts training or perhaps a general education was necessary to make a man or a woman a good lawyer or a public servant. But law is a liberal arts training. It is one of the best. I realize the argument is that law training will replace other study, although we are not usually sure what this is. It is a fallacy, in any event, and one with particular significance for the age which we seem to be entering, to assume that education must come in these college years or not at all. We must work toward a period in which not only is self-education understood to be the education which counts, but also a period in which there is continuing access to courses and lectures, and continuing self-education throughout an adult's life.

The third question cuts deeper. Why not make law study clearly undergraduate with some courses available to all students followed by more specialized work for those who desire this? This shocking suggestion has at least three points to commend it. The first is that it is of the greatest importance that the average college student have access to some training in basic legal theory. And second,

this should be offered in terms of the serious consideration of legal problems so that college education can be revitalized by a professional standard of proficiency—we once could say excellence—building upon problems which can be perceived. And third, placing the lawyer's professional education at this point would respond to the law student's desire to take other broadening courses while he is engaged in law study. Those non-law courses are usually undergraduate courses which could be more easily available to him. I do not believe this suggestion will be adopted. It somewhat follows a European model, and we believe our training for law is better. Moreover, it flies in the face of the strongly held views of both the colleges and the law schools.

I have asked these questions to put the subject of law schools and legal education in its double perspective. One perspective looks toward the problem of education in its full sweep, with its confinement of the student, the length of time involved, the misallocation of resources as I think it is, the distance it imposes between the student and the reality of doing, and the lack of standards of proficiency when work is not seriously undertaken. We must, I think, find a way to shorten this period, to provide easier means for entrance and exit from the system with time out for doing, and we must find a way to give renewed seriousness—I have avoided the use of the word relevance—both in terms of the problems looked at and the standards of excellence required. The other perspective looks towards the law and the legal profession. Law schools do not train a complete lawyer. They cannot do so. In many ways we still have an apprenticeship system. But I do not believe the Bar has created the institutions which can make the necessary internship or apprenticeship as viable, equal and serviceable as can be done. And here, too, I believe, there are consequences for the law. It is not good to develop programs which only use law students to defend and represent the poor in criminal or civil cases or to lead community action programs, thus giving rise to the public view that the successful lawyer is busy on other things, and giving rise to the law student's view that virtue is to be found only on one side. We are in danger of developing a caricature of the adversary system, forgetting that this system only operates when the institutions of the law are created, defended and reformed by the Bar. It would help if the profession had institutions of doing in which all lawyers spent some time, and which were committed to the aid of the courts, to law revision, and to work in representation through assignment or some other mechanism so that a fair spectrum of causes would be seen and senior lawyers would be available on both sides. This is easier said than done. The institution which I have barely sketched undoubtedly won't work, but I am sure there must be some way for the Bar to face up much more directly to these problems than it has. I realize that in the last few years it has done quite a bit. I am suggesting there might well be a new allocation of responsibility between the law schools and the Bar, particularly if the law school could shorten the time, and young lawyers could more quickly move into a period of supervised practice.

What a queer talk to give at the end of a celebration of the completion of facilities which so elegantly meet the needs of the great law schools of today, and enable them to preserve the community which they have created. Our great law schools must be preserved. They will be. But they will do so best in these shifting times by looking ahead, not only at their own needs, and not only at the needs of the legal profession, but at the pattern of professional life in this country, and not only of education in general, but our system of justice and our understanding of it. The responsibility is very great. It is

a responsibility for leadership. I am sure this school, in the light of its tradition and its strength, will be among the leaders.

THE INCOME TAX SURCHARGE, PAY INCREASES, AND INFLATION

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 29, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial entitled "Nuff Said," published in the Savannah, Ga., Press of May 5, 1969.

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

'NUFF SAID

Comments that require no editorial interpretation:

Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., speaking of recent salary increases given members of Congress, the Supreme Court, Cabinet officers, and about 1300 other high-ranking executive and judicial officials: "We are in a period of high inflation. If we're going to get inflation under control there must be example at the top."

Sen. John J. Williams of Delaware, speaking on the same subject: "More than one-half of this \$9 billion extra revenue that's coming in from the 10 per cent income tax surcharge, which we levied on every taxpayer in this country, will go for pay increases in the first half of this year."

TEXTILE IMPORTS SKYROCKET

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, 2,400,000 textile employees are concerned about the fantastic increase in textile imports. For instance, textile imports reached a record monthly level of 362 million equivalent square yards in March. The March level was 45 percent higher than March 1968.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are concerned about this threat to an industry so vital to the national defense of our country. Secretary Stans is making a determined and courageous effort to protect the textile job security of the American people and preserve the defense posture of our country.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C., the textile capital of the world, and an excellent column by Mr. James K. Kilpatrick which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Sunday, May 25.

The material follows:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, May 23, 1969]

NINETY-DAY NOTICE ON TEXTILE TRADE

The Nixon administration obviously hopes to work out a negotiated solution to the textile imports problem which threatens many American jobs and the economies of several states.

A negotiated and fair settlement, worked out with all countries involved, would be in the best interests of everyone. While it is necessary to protect textile markets in this country in order to keep the domestic industry strong, nobody really relishes unilateral action which could set off all sorts of trade repercussions.

Basically this section of the country clings to the ideal of free and friendly trade among nations, with as few barriers as possible. But free trade also has to be equitable.

The textile situation has special considerations. Under existing international arrangements, low-wage nations can and do flood certain segments of the manmade fibers market in this country, causing sudden disruption affecting many domestic plants and thousands of workers. A few years ago, they hit cotton with severe results. It is unfair competition from any angle.

Unlike previous administrations, the Nixon team has grasped that fact and is determined to do something about it. Preferably the solution will come through voluntary agreements with those nations in the Far East, Europe and a few in Africa which can and often do upset textile markets in the United States.

Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans' recent trips abroad were made with that purpose in mind. He was and still is trying to arrange friendly and fair agreements with all foreign nations concerned.

His efforts so far have not met like response. The Japanese attitude is especially intransigent and unrealistic. The Japanese insist on the privilege of virtually unlimited access to American markets. Japan, however, has numerous protective devices of her own.

Refusal of Japan to agree to voluntary controls prevents other countries from entering into such arrangements with the United States. As of now the prospect is not too bright for a negotiated settlement.

Secretary Stans, therefore, is quite right to issue what amounts to a 90-day ultimatum on Japan and other countries to show signs of reasonableness. He strongly indicates the administration will back legislation to put quotas on textile imports if voluntary give and take fails. Many members of Congress have quota bills ready for action.

As we have said before, we much prefer negotiated solutions to such issues, but textile state congressmen should keep their mandatory legislation updated.

[From the Evening Star, May 25, 1969]

THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY FIGHTS FOR ITS LIFE (By James J. Kilpatrick)

SALISBURY, N.C.—Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans returned a week ago from his disappointing tour of the Far East. He went forth as a missionary preaching voluntary limitations on textile exports, but he came home with no converts. The very day after he got back, the U.S. Department of Labor hit the textile industry with a new regulation on noise levels.

Here in this textile town, it seemed too much. The industry is in deep trouble, fighting for survival against its foreign competitors. In the past seven years, imports of cotton products have more than doubled—from 720 million square yards to 1,700 million square yards—and imports of woolsens and blends have gone up by 54 percent in the past year alone.

Now comes the limitation on noise, applicable to plants filling federal contracts. The rule says that factory noise must be held to 90 decibels. A typical plant manager, Thomas W. Borland of Cartex Mills, says flatly that it can't be done—not without the development of machines that haven't even been invented. Even expensive remodeling, involving carpeted floors and acoustic ceilings, won't reduce the noise level of spinning rooms and wave rooms to the newly-fixed point.

Borland looks like everyone's grandfather ought to look: Tall, white-haired, a ruddy face. He takes a visitor on a tour of his plant, talking as he goes of free trade, comparative wages, noise levels and equipment changes. His is a small mill, representative of scores of plants throughout the Carolinas. Great bales of orlon, dacron, and imported cotton arrive at the rear of the plant. The raw material passes through a long series of cleaning and carding procedures, runs through the Rockette rows of spinning bobbins, and emerges from the winding rooms as finished yarn.

Yes, it's noisy, but monster vacuum cleaners keep the place spotless and workers say they get accustomed to the racket. A reporter who strikes up conversations in drug stores, filling stations, and in the "towel stores" that dot the highways, learns that workers are merely mystified by the noise regulation. They are deeply concerned about foreign trade and the future of such towns as Salisbury. The U.S. textile industry employs 987,000 persons; the related apparel industry employs 1.4 million more. Never mind the noise. What about jobs?

This profound human concern was pressed upon President Nixon during the 1968 campaign. He promised, if elected, to seek voluntary restraints by foreign manufacturers. Stans' tour of the Orient fulfilled this pledge, but it produced no commitments from competitors abroad. They have a good thing going in the free American market; they don't want to see it curtailed.

Textile wages in the United States average about \$2.28 an hour. The comparable figures are 25 cents in Hong Kong, 36 cents in Japan, 18 cents in Portugal, and 56 cents in Italy. European manufacturers are behind the U.S. in equipment technology, but Japanese mills are miniskirt modern. Shipping costs make no significant difference. Importers are having a marvelous time; the domestic industry is hurting: Its profits last year amounted to a net of 3.1 percent on sales, after taxes. Only the food industry has a smaller margin of profit.

"Either we get quotas put on imports, or many of our mills will close," Borland says. A number of members of Congress, not only from the South, but from other regions also, accept this unhappy prospect. The choice is especially galling for the South, which has preached the doctrines of free trade since the days of Jefferson and Calhoun. But some thing has to give; and if principle has to bend to reality, the realities of North Carolina count more than realities in Hong Kong.

This is not a novel dilemma. "Free trade," said Macaulay, 150 years ago, "is one of the greatest blessings which a government can confer on a people, but it is in almost every country unpopular." If the Congress slaps on import quotas on foreign textiles, all the old devils of protectionism may swarm on Capitol Hill. Nixon is a free-trade man himself, but he can hear the political noise level rising. The astute Japanese, happily counting their profits, would do well to count these decibels, too.

WHERE ARE THE HEROES OF YESTERDAY?

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day fast approaches, and this year its meaning shall be brought home to us in no uncertain terms. One cannot help but ponder wars and sacrifices of the past—those involving other lands as well as our own.

Why do men make war and offer their lives on an altar of sacrifice? There have been acts of heroism and selflessness through the ages which defy most explanation. Leonidas and the Spartans gave their all for the laws of their land. El Cid died for Spanish unity and freedom. The French soldiers at Verdun perished by the thousands for the sacred soil of their land. The last stand of the Imperial Guard at Waterloo is yet another example of what men will do in the manner of sacrifice.

There is devotion to duty, love of country, thirst for freedom, demand for liberty, and nationalistic sentiment. All have secured the ultimate gift a person can give to a cause or belief—the life of another human being.

Our Nation was conceived in an age of turmoil, from which surfaced certain elementary ideals of human dignity which we have since sought to embody by our actions and existence. From the very beginning of our national life we have enshrined sacrifice for a noble cause. Our ideals have supported this. Our wars have reinforced this. Our young men have died for it. Our people have revered it. Always there is one strain running through all these actions and happenings. The dignity of man and his inherent right to be free does not stop with any era of history or at the threshold of our Nation. For this Americans have fought and given their all in many wars, here at home and in far-off places. Always we felt it was worth while.

That is why we say that it was worth it to give half a million young Americans to strike the shackles from the limbs of 4 million enslaved human beings. It was correct to fight the Kaiser and the right thing to crush Adolf Hitler and prevent South Korea from being swallowed up by an aggressor. Many men have fought to enslave other men, but only our country has consistently fought to free them. Until now.

Memorial Day or Decoration Day was originally a spontaneous occasion that began after the Civil War. It was and remains a gesture of respect to the dead from the living for their sacrifice and ultimate devotion to our beliefs.

Our graveyards grow nowadays with a terrible swiftness, filling with the young men who only yesterday were their father's hopes, their mother's love and their sweetheart's dreams. In the past we could place their deaths in immediate perspective, for we knew instantly what we were struggling for. Grief could be dealt with, if not alleviated. In years afterwards, loved ones always had the consolation of knowing that their beloved had died for a cause that embodied America's highest ideals. Somehow military cemeteries of all wars and all nations are similar. I have visited several, from the Normandy beaches to the hills above the Valley of Meuse at Verdun. One wanders among the markers, noting that this one was 19 or that that one had been 21 when struck down. Always it is the young ones who perish, sent by the old to die.

As one stands overlooking one of these silent gathering places, the thoughts rush in. How many Einsteins lie buried here? How many Chopins? How many great

surgeons and researchers? How many had quick laughs and warm hearts? Who among them was very sentimental or overly generous? Who had been an only son or a mother's sole support? Who had been the swift runner and who the innovator?

And before they died had they the chance to savor the beauty and warmth of life? Had they known the love of a woman and the joy of hearing their child's first cries?

How had they died? With brave words on their lips charging at the foe? Or in terror, dirt and loneliness? Did the words of glory which come so easily to the lips of the noncombatant race through their minds before they were struck in mid-flight? Their last thought? Of home? Of a woman's caress? A father's enjoiner? A thought of the Almighty? No one can know.

We can only ask ourselves whether or not it was a worthy altar upon which they laid their lives. For independence from Britain? Certainly. For the end of slavery? Of course. For stamping out Nazism? No doubt about it.

Today, however, we can and should ask the same questions about our present involvement. Let us compare what we are involved with today with the conflicts and sacrifices of the past. Do they compare? Are the sacrifices we are being asked to make today as worthy of being made as those our forebears made so freely and generously yesterday? Will pride mix with remembrance in years to come when we memorialize and revere the memory of our dead? Or will we have stained our escutcheon for the first time. Or will Americans have perished for the first time for an ignoble cause and in vain?

Let this Memorial Day be a time for soul searching as well as for memorialization and remembrance. Let us ponder our Nation, its destiny, its ideals, and what we want it to do. Those who have gone before would surely request this of us—in the name of what they died for to hand over to us. Let us give thought to what we are doing with their heritage and what we are going to pass on to our inheritors.

KEEPING TAB ON EX-OFFICERS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily News recently commented editorially on my proposal which requires defense contractors to list former military men in their employment.

I am pleased that the Chicago Daily News has endorsed this proposal.

The Chicago Daily News editorial follows:

KEEPING TAB ON EX-OFFICERS

Rep. Roman Pucinski's proposal to require defense contractors to list former military men in their employ is in the public interest. The information is particularly pertinent in the light of the costly waste and blundering sometimes involved in such contracts, and joint efforts by the military and industry to cover them up.

The Chicago congressman's measure is based in considerable part on the recent Daily News series by William McGaffin and Robert Gruenberg detailing some of the wheeling and dealing by the military-industrial complex, in the course of which the taxpayer took a drubbing.

There is nothing necessarily sinister in a former military officer's accepting a private job in an industry engaged in defense or related work. The education and training of career officers tend to qualify for that type of work. At the same time, there is no denying that an ex-officer employed by a defense contractor may have certain advantageous contacts at the Pentagon. It would help clear the air all around if the identity of such officers were a matter of public record.

We do have a reservation about the requirement that contractors list not only ex-officers but all former military personnel, including enlisted men, who have served four or more years in the armed services. Compiling the roster of ex-enlisted men would entail a great deal of paper work, and prove nothing of any consequence. The bill should apply to former officers only.

FRAUD IN AMERICA—II

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, 1 year and 1 week ago tonight, the CBS television network produced "Hunger in America." That show was possibly one of the most shocking things ever viewed in the United States. Its implications were vast, and it produced a national wave of revulsion, indignation, and demands for action.

No one denies that there is hunger in America. But it became clear that "Hunger in America" was a vastly overstated documentary, inaccurate, distorted, and shot through with fabrications. I pointed out all these things to CBS, in a long series of letters. I also called these facts to the attention of the House. From CBS I got replies to each of my letters—each reply from an executive higher on their totem pole, each one a little more curt and a little more insulting. Not one of the letters I got from CBS showed that I was wrong in condemning their film; in fact their responses showed that they knew they had lied to me and to the country at large, but in their sense of journalistic responsibility evidently nothing matters except ratings—certainly not objectivity and accuracy.

The opening segment of the "Hunger in America" show—what they call a "teaser" in the entertainment industry, was a picture that purported to show a baby dying of hunger. But independent investigations showed repeatedly that the picture was not of a baby starved to death, but of one that was born 2 months premature, of healthy parents who were neither ill nor hungry. Those investigations were conducted by a journalist, by the Federal Communications Commission, and by investigators from the great Committee on Appropriations, and every one of them came to the same conclusion; namely, that this shocking, horrifying scene that CBS used as its

"teaser" to gain and capture the attention of millions of viewers, and hence boost ratings, was a complete and blatant lie. But not only has CBS denied the truth, they brush it off as unimportant, and the findings of all investigators as mere nit-picking. Further they have gone to the trouble of promoting themselves a so-called Emmy Award, which in their view at least, will serve as a testament to the validity of their show.

Now it is revealed that CBS paid the persons who appeared on "Hunger in America." This is a clear violation of the Communications Act. CBS calls some of these payments "payments for releases" but in one case at least, a person was offered construction materials, and in another instance, a person was paid for the trouble of spending 3 days at home while awaiting the film crew's arrival. The amounts of the payments were small—usually ranging from \$5 to \$40 apiece. But the principle and the law are not so small. CBS might excuse itself for the payments by saying that they were for charity. But then it is plain that their "charity" hardly nicked the corporate coffers. One would expect more from the barons of the broadcast world. Or CBS might say that they paid for services rendered, or just to compensate people for their troubles. If that be so, Mr. Speaker, their wages are far below union scale for speaking parts, and they are cheating Actors' Equity out of their dues.

CBS was plainly looking for sensationalism in this film—not any objective study. They remarked to one man who cooperated with them that they were disappointed in the subjects he obtained for filming, because they looked too healthy. This gentleman pointed out that he told CBS representatives that cases of hunger were generally temporary in nature, and that in any case hunger might be present only because of other problems in the family. In the case of one family shown on the film, there might have been hunger, but there was also a father who was said to drink a great deal and stay away from home 3 to 4 weeks at a time. Yet if you believe CBS, the family was having problems because of governmental indifference and neglect.

Sensationalism requires the right kind of pictures. CBS wanted to show long lines of hungry people in San Antonio, waiting for food commodities. So they went to the commodity distribution office. When no big line of people showed up they asked that the doors to the place be closed until a line built up. The doors were closed for an hour and 45 minutes, so a line of people built up, for the benefit of the cameras. Even though the film was never used, it shows the callousness of the CBS crew, which cared not a whit about the inconvenience they were causing people, or the plain suffering that might have resulted from their tactic—they were told to get pictures of long lines of starving people, and that was one way that they could get what might seem at least to fill the bill. This incident shows clearly that CBS aimed to manufacture a story if nothing could be found that would factually support their script.

In another instance, CBS showed a girl about 11 or 12 years of age who had been

arrested, they said, for soliciting for prostitution. They said that she was selling her body for food. Again the implication clearly was that governmental indifference and neglect had led this girl to her fate.

The fact is that at the time the film was made no investigation on her had been completed; indeed, she was placed in a foster home at the time of the filming and her troubles were being worked out. But she was taken out of the home and brought to a courtroom specifically so that she could be filmed as a Dickensian example of the hard life a careless and uncaring government had wrought. The television crew did not care about the facts of the matter, or the truth of the statement, or about how the girl had happened to be in the trouble she was in—they just wanted to be able to say that this was yet another example of horror in America. In fact, the child was neglected by her father, who evidently had no problems in caring for his children if he would only assume his responsibilities.

I do not find evidence of a single case where CBS attempted to document the full story of the people that they presented as being starving. There were no medical records checked on their "dying baby" segment; no interviews with medical personnel—unless those interviews happened to fit into the script; there were no efforts to trace how a family might fall into dire straits, or what might have been done to help them that was not already being done; only an effort to produce the harshest, most shocking picture possible and demand action from the Government.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a day when I do not encounter a family that has severe problems. I do not deny that there are people who are hungry, or who do not eat properly. But CBS lied and slandered in its presentation of the problem, it distorted the facts and it misrepresented the entire situation. Not only did CBS lie about the extent of the problem, it did not truthfully portray its causes, and made no effort whatever to assess what was being done about it, or how specifically more effective action might be taken.

CBS violated its public responsibility. Its conception of journalism is clearly not that which serves the truth, but that which serves CBS.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point a story from the San Antonio Express and News dated Sunday, May 25:

THE COCK PIT

In the whole long controversy over the CBS TV show "Hunger in America" there has been little, if any, public discussion of the way it illustrates the increasingly pervasive influence of massive foundations in the areas of communications and of politics itself.

It's an influence that stirs cheers from some Americans and fears in others, but it also marks a powerful new trend in public affairs that deserves honest and open examination and evaluation.

The CBS show which devoted a highly controversial one-fourth of its hour to San Antonio serves to illustrate this national trend. As far back as last July the Express-News disclosed the fact that the most shocking portion of the film—a scene purportedly

showing an infant dying of hunger at Green Hospital simply was not true, and that the baby, in fact, had died of the complications of premature birth.

But it was only last Friday that a congressional committee made the flat assertion that much of the entire film appeared to have been staged. The committee report then lectured the press, radio and TV on their responsibilities for accurate newsgathering.

There seems little question but that the inspiration for the CBS show was the earlier report "Hunger USA" produced by the "Citizens' Board of Inquiry into Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States."

The Congressional committee report last week also indicted this work of the "Citizens Board" which has played a key role in the development of the national hunger controversy.

The Citizens Board was a spin-off from organizations which are now part of the "Center for Community Change" a national organization which has been heavily financed by the Ford Foundation and which—the New York Times has objected—is linked closely through its directors to the political activities of the Kennedy family.

The major organizations which were banded late last year into the Center for Community Change were the Citizens Crusade against Poverty which had established the Citizen Board of Inquiry into Hunger and Malnutrition, and the Citizens Advocate Center which helped staff the hearings and research of the Citizens Board. Included also was a "community press" which published "Hunger USA."

A member of the board of the Center for Community Change is County Com. Albert Pena who was a key advisor to CBS in its hunger filming here.

Pena was cited by CBS as authority for some of its statements about the hunger problem in San Antonio and CBS also relied on testimony given the "Citizens Board of Inquiry" at its September, 1967, San Antonio hearing in answering complaints by U.S. Rep. Henry Gonzalez as to accuracy on the San Antonio segment of the program.

A major recent flare-up in the political controversy over the CBS "Hunger in America" program and the Hunger USA publication also involved activities by the foundation-financed groups.

This occurred after the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture began its own investigation of both the publication and the TV film, sending investigators across the country.

The committee probers came under quick attack, and a major incident was headlined across the country from San Antonio.

This came when Rev. Ralph Ruiz, a member of the "Texas Committee Into Hunger and Malnutrition" which had sponsored the San Antonio hearing of the "Citizens Board of Inquiry," appeared before the December hearing of the U.S. Commission of Civil Rights in San Antonio to charge that FBI agents working for the House subcommittee had harassed and frightened poor people from San Antonio who had appeared on the CBS TV show. Rev. Ruiz had been a major performer on the show, but agreed he had not been frightened by the FBI agent who met with him.

The Ruiz charges made headlines from coast to coast.

One interesting aspect of them was the fact that the text of his remarks before the Civil Rights Commission had been made available in advance to major U.S. newspapers by Washington sources connected with the escalating battle over hunger.

At about the same time Harry Huger, a Washington attorney who had been a member of the "Citizen Board of Inquiry" appeared in San Antonio and visited Green hospital with an introduction from Pena.

Pena explained that Hugu was doing a story for the original Citizens Board of Inquiry.

Hugu subsequently joined Robert Cole in writing a lengthy article for "The New Republic" entitled "FBI on the Trall of the Hungar-Mongers." It centered on San Antonio and, needless, to say, was highly critical of the use of the FBI agents by the House committee—though the G-men, incidentally, did not identify themselves as such, but only as investigators for the committee.

The New Republic article also quoted Ruiz at length, noting he had substantially repeated remarks he made to the authors in his subsequent statement to the Civil Rights Commission.

Interestingly enough, Ruiz quoted from the very same portion of the 1967 San Antonio Model Cities application in proving a point about local poverty conditions as had CBS in one of its numerous exchanges with Rep. Gonzalez.

Now the House committee has had its say and it was a blockbuster. But what with the kind of virility being shown by foundation-backed groups working in the area of "social change" it will probably not be the last word in the propaganda battle over "Hunger in America" and "Hunger USA."

VENTURA COUNTY NAVY COMMANDS LEAD NATION IN YOUTH PROGRAMS

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues will join me in a feeling of pride in the accomplishments of the Ventura County Navy commands in the back-to-school programs.

An article from the Point Mugu, Calif., Missile follows:

VENTURA COUNTY NAVY COMMANDS LEAD NATION IN YOUTH PROGRAMS

POINT MUGU.—Navy commands in Ventura County top the nation in youth assistance programs, the Navy's Office of Civilian Manpower Management (OCMM) announced recently.

Point Mugu and Port Hueneme Navy commands average one Back-To-School program employee for every 37 full-time civilian employees, the latest statistics show.

"This is almost three times better than the nearest Navy metropolitan area," Louis T. Shook, Pacific Missile Range (PMR) employment officer said.

The Pensacola, Florida, area has a ratio of 1:92. Other metropolitan areas which include Navy bases range from 1:95 to one youth program participant for every 1,117 employees. The Navy-wide average is 1:165.

"One of the outstanding features of our program here," said Shook, "is absolute backing from top management to first line supervisors. There is enthusiasm for the Back-To-School program at every level."

Support for the program is partly based on results, Shook believes.

"The command has found that the youths are a real asset," he said, "and this attitude enhances acceptance of the program here."

The Point Mugu program enrolled 137 students during the 1968-69 school year. Some graduated or returned to full-time school work during the year.

A summer youth opportunity employment program here will recruit 175 area youths, including many now in the Back-To-School plan. Another 50 persons will be trained at Point Mugu under the Neighborhood Youth Corps' Project Value, funded by the Department of Labor.

The OCMM noted that youth programs "are strongly encouraged by the Federal Government and the Navy," but not required.

The Naval Air Systems Command, under which Point Mugu operates, has more of its activities participating than any other major component of the Navy.

HIPPIES AHOY

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the age-old fable about the grasshopper and the ant has never been more applicable than it is today, especially in regard to the so-called hippies and other indolents who enjoy the good life at the expense of those of us who work for a living.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the honest, hardworking American taxpayer is justifiably sick and tired of the vermin which we have all been subjected to in recent years. As far as I am concerned, these unkempt, long-haired creeps who are constantly flaunting the law, especially on the American college campus, are a worse form of blight on the natural beauty of this country than all of the junkyards and other debris which Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson sought to eliminate in the so-called beautification program.

The editor of Christian Economics, Mr. Howard E. Kershner, recently wrote an excellent article about these creatures which is one of the best analyses of their irresponsibility that I have ever read. I would like to include it as a part of my remarks as follows:

HIPPIES AHOY

Hippies, ahoy! The rapids are ahead. You may live as vagabonds now while you are young, while you get support from your parents, while a benevolent government tolerates your irresponsibility, while taxpayers pay for the roads you use, the buildings in which you live and afford a generous amount of charity by which, in some degree, many of you exist.

You are privileged to live the kind of lives you lead because other, responsible citizens produce the undergirding which makes your irresponsible life possible. Your illegitimate children are adopted by stable families whom you despise. Your medical needs are taken care of by hard working, diligent doctors who work, as you are unwilling to work. The motorbikes you ride and the cars you drive were not made by people like yourselves, but by men and women who are willing to discipline themselves, as you are unwilling to do, and to produce the things which you are unwilling to produce.

You can be the irresponsible creatures you are, the drones living off of the work of others, only because most of the people are not like you. If they were, then your form of life would come to an end. All would perish, or discipline would have to be imposed by some tyrannical ruler who would be obeyed as a better alternative than starvation.

What right have you to be free of discipline while sponging your very existence off of people who must submit to it? The latter will not always tolerate your arrogant assertion of the right to enjoy the luxury of the civilization they create, without contributing to it.

Moreover, you will grow old and your needs will increase. They will be far more exacting than they are now. You will need warmer clothing, better housing, a better grade of food and more expensive living in many respects. What right have you to expect that others will provide for you? And if not, how will you provide for yourselves? You have little education, few skills and little to contribute to society in return for the living which you will need.

What is ahead for you, say, after forty? It is difficult for any one to find a good job after that age, but for people like you, without discipline and without skill, what is to become of you? You will not deserve charity and you cannot assume that you will get it. The taxpayers have every right on revolt against providing for you. Your indolence and defiance of the law of nature that men must live by the sweat of their own faces do not qualify you to expect, nor to receive, help from your more diligent brethren.

You are the perfect example of the ancient fable of the grasshopper who sang away the summer as he fitted from flower to flower enjoying the nectar and the sunshine. Meanwhile the diligent ant was storing up food. When the sun was gone and the flowers had dried up, the grasshopper was hungry and cold. He said to the ant, "Give me of your food and let me share your shelter."

The ant replied, "Have you no food and shelter of your own?" The grasshopper confessed that he had none. "But what have you done all summer?" said the ant. "I sang," said the grasshopper. "You sang?" said the ant. "Well now you may dance."

Beware, young Hippies, you are wasting your substance and the precious years of your youth in indolence and short-lived sensory pleasure. Sex, dope and idleness have their limitations. You have no idea of the bitter dancing that lies ahead for you, if you do not change your ways before you have squandered your heritage of time and strength. If you do not use your youth to lay the foundation for success in maturity and comfort in age, your suffering in years to come will be unmitigated bitterness.

EXPANDED NORTH PACIFIC AIR ROUTE BETWEEN SEATTLE AND TOKYO NEEDED

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Pacific Northwest and especially those in the Seattle area were appalled at the recent decision of the President and the Civil Aeronautics Board which dealt them a disappointing blow in the transpacific air route case. These people felt entitled to competitive service and that if a second carrier was granted backup service with certain eastern and midwestern cities, through Seattle, as the closest gateway to the Orient the traffic would fully justify such competitive service.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the ever-alert Japa-

nese have recognized the potential of the timesaving northern route.

The State Department should grant Japan Air Lines' request and thereby the needs of such service will be partly met.

In turn it is to be hoped that Japan will grant similar American flight privileges so that the recent mistake of our Government will be overcome.

On this subject, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the May 25, 1969, Seattle Times:

SECOND CHANCE ON NORTH PACIFIC

The ever-alert Japanese have recognized what the American government apparently failed to see in its recent, disappointing decision in the transpacific air-route case.

That decision left the Seattle international air gateway with single-carrier service over the short, time-saving North Pacific route between Seattle and Tokyo.

But the Japanese have recognized the impressive traffic potential in such a route if it is provided with adequate backup service to Eastern and Midwestern cities.

A column by Robert L. Twiss elsewhere in the Times today reports on Japanese-government plans to seek two North Pacific air routes in bilateral discussions to be held between the United States and Japan, beginning next month.

One such route would link Tokyo with Chicago and New York by way of Seattle, the closest major United States point to Japan. The other route would connect New York to Tokyo via Anchorage.

Northwest Orient Airlines now is the only passenger carrier on the North Pacific Seattle-Tokyo route. Washington State parties in the transpacific-route case sought without success to convince the administration of the need for competitive service on that route to meet an expected boom in Pacific travel.

The logic of this view can be seen in the opinion of Shizuma Matsuo, president of Japan Air Lines, that air travel between the United States and Japan will double within the next six years.

Japan's interest provides Washington State governmental and trade-promotion groups with an opportunity to renew their bid for competitive service through the Seattle gateway over the North Pacific. It is to be hoped that they will make maximum use of that opportunity.

We urge the State Department to grant Japan Air Lines' request, which, of course, should open the way for additional American flight rights in Japan.

The logic of geography as well as present-day trends in international air transportation support the Japanese position.

PUCINSKI HAS A POINT

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced legislation which will require that all bids for defense contracts would have to list military personnel working for the company submitting such bid.

The Chicago Sun Times has commented on my proposal and I would like today to call the Sun Times editorial to the attention of my colleagues.

I am pleased to have the editorial support of the Chicago Sun Times on this proposal and I believe that the suggestion made by the Sun Times improving the legislation is most valid.

The Chicago Sun Times editorial follows:

PUCINSKI HAS A POINT

Rep. Roman Pucinski (D-Chicago), a former military officer in World War II, has raised an eyebrow at some statistics he uncovered. Pucinski says the nation's 100 largest military contractors employ more than 2,000 retired high-ranking military officers.

Pucinski has introduced a bill to require all defense contractors to list the names of retired military personnel (and their former military assignments) in bids for defense contracts.

There has been much justified criticism of military spending. An enormous amount of waste in dollars and time has been uncovered by the General Accounting Office and others.

Nor is it uncommon for the defense-contracting industry and the military services to band together to conceal the fact that millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money has been wasted.

However, if defense contractors had to list such retired officers in their contract bids, it might be much easier to follow the line of influence when contracts go far beyond the agreed upon amount or violate the time limit for delivery of military hardware.

Pucinski's bill is in the public interest. It should be modified slightly. The bill now requires the listing of all former military men—officer and enlisted—who had served four years to be identified by the defense contractor. The requirement to list the former enlisted men should be dropped. It cre-

ates unnecessary paperwork. Few if any enlisted men ever had any influence in the esoteric circles of defense procurement in the Pentagon.

HON. WILLIAM J. DRIVER

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to join my colleagues in paying tribute to William J. Driver, who is leaving as Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. He does so, I am certain, with pride.

As head of the VA, Bill Driver administered the world's largest medical program involving some 5,000 doctors and 15,000 nurses who care for the wounds and ills of veterans and their families.

He has continuously fought for legislation to improve loan programs enabling veterans and their dependents to own a home, a farm, or a private business.

The VA has the largest program of adult education and vocational rehabilitation and training ever undertaken in this country. The VA has underwritten the GI bill, enabling millions of veterans and certain numbers of their wives and widows to attend schools of higher learning under the direction of Bill Driver.

Few men, Mr. Speaker, have so justly earned the acclaim so justly bestowed on Bill Driver today. I am proud to share in this tribute to my friend and I wish him well.

Mr. Speaker, a few years ago it was my pleasure to have the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), and Bill Driver as guests in my hometown of Muskogee, Okla.

It was a most pleasant experience, and I was highly impressed with the genuine admiration the employees at the Veterans' Administration hospital and the VA regional office in Muskogee showed for Bill Driver.

He earned and received the respect of those he worked for—the veterans—and those who worked for him. This is distinction of the highest order.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, June 2, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

From the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same the Lord's name is to be praised.—Psalm 113: 3.

Almighty God, our loving Heavenly Father, who art clothing the world with beauty and throwing a mantle of green across the shoulders of the hills, by whose law the planets keep their courses and by whose creative thought life has risen on this planet, make us conscious of Thy presence and help us to be patient and strong in Thee.

May the thoughts of our minds be channels for Thy way. May the dreams

in our hearts fulfill Thy purposes for our Nation and for mankind. May the work of our hands weed out injustice and war and cultivate the seeds that flower into justice for all and peace in our world. By Thy spirit may we have courage enough to be pioneers in brotherhood, sustaining the hands and hearts of all who seek to end strife and to bring peace to the hearts of men.

To this end guide Thou our President, our Speaker, the Members of this body and all who labor with them. Ennobled their lives by the sense of Thy presence that they may be for this generation channels through which Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done on earth.

In the Master's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 28, 1969, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 412. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to classify as wilderness the national forest lands known as the Lincoln Back Country, and parts of the Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests, in Montana, and for other purposes.