

Monasky, George E.
Mosby, Edward L.
O'Shields, Paul W.
Rochford, Philip
Rudolph, Jerome J.
Scott, Gale L.
Shaffer, Richard G.
Shelin, Ronald A.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Bailey, Jack S.
Barbo, Samuel H., Jr.
Boone, Harry M., Jr.
Boudreau, Harold J.
Clark, James L.
Davis, William P.
Devane, James J.
Fletcher, William E.
Fowler, Ephraim E., Jr.
Fussell, Edsel M.
Gallagher, Thomas J.
Hawkins, Kenneth L.
Lachapelle, Norman C.
Mohler, Clarence B.

NURSE CORPS

Barker, Elizabeth A.
Bednowicz, Eleonore A.
Bove, Mary L.
Brakus, Josephine D.
Butler, Phyllis A.
Carleton, Ethel R.
Davis, Kathryn A.
Dunn, Dorothea J.
Elsass, Phyllis J.
Fisher, Mildred K.
Fitzgerald, Helen M.
Florence, Mary E.
Gammer, Mary E.
Hanes, Wave J.
Higgins, Helen B.
Hinckley, Colleen
Humphreys, Regina B.
Jacques, Nancy J.
Jones, Bernice E.
Jones, Ellen J.
Jones, Kathaleen R.
Liakos, Angeline G.

The following-named women officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Acosta, Delores Y.
Bole, Barbara
Bostwick, Sally L.

Bufkin, Kathryn L.
Coye, Beth F.
Dupes, Yvonne M.

Short, George A.
Stevens, Mark M.
Terhune, Raymond C.
Toth, Wayne J.
Williams, Robert E., Jr.
Wingard, Charles E.
Yacabucci, James E.

Myers, James I.
Nichols, Lloyd B.
Palmer, Jack J.
Pittington, Francis C.
Pribnow, James F.
Roberts, Billy D.
Rooney, Mary L.
Shuler, Donald E.
Sickels, Forman J.
Spahn, James A., Jr.
Ulmer, Fred C., Jr.
Wherry, Robert J., Jr.
Wilcox, James G.
Ziegler, Harry F., Jr.
Zseltvay, Andrew J., Jr.

Hankey, Joan R.
Hersley, Janet L.
Holway, Nancy H.
Johnston, Edith E.
Kelly, Barbara J.
Kent, Ruth W.
Lee, Linda M.
Mohorich, Helen M.
Peterson, Doris A.
Richardson, Linda P.

Wilma E. Lewis, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of captain in the Supply Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Margaret B. Swayne, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the Supply Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

David W. Konold, Jr., U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and the temporary grade of lieutenant.

Richard S. Farwell, U.S. Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Phelps Hobart, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the Supply Corps subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

William R. Hudgens, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Burnett, William H.
Fears, John A.
Fernando, Sharon R.
Johnson, Daniel E.
Marks, William L.

Neville, William J., Jr.
Razzetti, Eugene A.
Steel, James R., Jr.
Tinch, Edward S.
West, David J.

SUPPLY CORPS

Dingeldey, Peter E.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Bankert, Frederick
B, III

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Borgia, Julian F.
Chitwood, Carl S.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Service Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Ackley, Paul N.
Alewine, Charles M.
Aubin, John E.
Bailey, Raymond P.
Benedict, Walter F.
Benedict, Jose P., Jr.
Bielawski, Jerome J.
Bolster, Harold G., Jr.
Brubaker, Ralph W.
Buckley, William M.
Bufano, Thomas J.
Cagle, Eddie C.
Campbell, Robert E.
Daniel, Paul E.
Donohue, Avon R., Jr.
Gardner, Gerald L.
Giron, Sagat M.
Gray, Donald R.
Hazelton, Robert H., Jr.
Holstein, Elmer, Jr.
Hopkins, Robert F.
Jackman, David C.
Kennedy, Arthur E.
Lamasters, Michael B.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps Candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the Line or Staff Corps of the Navy subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Davis, John C.
Kenney, Daniel F., III

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel:

Barbara J. Lee
Ellen M. McMahon

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major:

Jeanne A. Botwright
Manuela Hernandez
Mary S. Howard
Vera M. Jones
Mary S. League

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain:

Joan M. Collins
Paula J. Dietz
Marie L. Hallman
Jeanne L. Harfin
Kathleen D. Kupferer
Aniela Kwiatkowski
Shirley E. Leaverton
Donna R. McClennan
Antoinette E.
Meenach
Barbara A. Schmidt

Janice C. Scott
Donna J. Sherwood
Amy E. Spratlin
Joanne L.
Stangenberger
Karen J. Tomlinson
Norma L. Tomlinson
Clara L. Tucker
Martha S. Webb
Harriet T. Wendel

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MEALS ON WHEELS

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, November 7, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today I am contacting members of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission, urging swift amendment of the restrictions preventing the sponsors of a meals on wheels program from servicing the elderly in the area near St. James Lutheran Church, 16th Street and Eastern Avenue NW.

The Zoning Commission holds that the church's plans to provide cooked meals, delivered by volunteers, to elderly shut-ins for the cost of the food constitutes at least technically a commercial catering service. In order to permit this worthwhile program to be carried out in the District of Columbia, the Zoning Commission should make whatever innovations are necessary to permit the sponsors of the meals on wheels program to begin providing nutritious meals to shut-ins who are homebound and physically unable to prepare meals.

In his column, "Potomac Watch," William Raspberry gave a second report on the status of the attempt to conduct

a meals on wheels program in Washington. He points out that Congress is preparing to approve my proposal to provide food stamps which the elderly can exchange for cooked meals in our country's quest to end hunger and malnutrition. These food stamps would be designed specifically for use in conjunction with the meals on wheels and similar food and nutrition programs.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Raspberry's article, entitled "Food Plan for Elderly Aired," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 5, 1969]

FOOD PLAN FOR ELDERLY AIDED

(By William Raspberry)

City Council Vice Chairman Sterling Tucker said recently he would urge the city's zoning commission to "provide a broader interpretation" of the zoning regulations that have prevented a church from starting a "Meals on Wheels" program to feed elderly shut-ins.

There is pending in Congress a proposal that would make that "broader interpretation" even more important.

The local sponsors of "Meals on Wheels" want to prepare, package and distribute hot noon meals and cold suppers five days a week for about 30 residents in the area near St. James Lutheran Church, 16th Street and Eastern Avenue NW, where the meals would be prepared.

But their plans ran afoul of a city zoning administrator's ruling that the venture would be in effect a "commercial" watering service, prohibited under present zoning for the area. (Customers would pay \$10 a week for 10 meals under the nonprofit proposal.)

"Meals on Wheels" could be an even more valuable service for the District's elderly and shut-in citizens under provisions of legislation introduced by 84 congressmen.

That is a proposal to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to permit elderly persons to use food stamps for the purchase of the prepared meals.

Under present law, persons otherwise eligible for food stamps may not use them if they do not have cooking facilities in their homes. The proposed amendment is designed specifically to permit the use of food stamps for "Meals on Wheels" and similar undertakings.

"Persons who are physically incapacitated or who suffer from serious illnesses that make it impossible for them to shop or prepare meals should not be denied the use of food stamps," said Rep. Edward G. Blester Jr. (R-Pa.), one of the bill's sponsors.

"These citizens, who are often among the most isolated and needy in the community, should receive the benefits which the Food Stamp Act was enacted to provide."

The bill, identical to a proposal by Sen. Hugh Scott (R-Pa.) that already has cleared the Senate, would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to designate specific church and nonprofit charitable organizations to accept food stamps in exchange for prepared meals.

"Meals on Wheels" and similar programs are already operating in 26 states and the District of Columbia.

The only bar to the St. James program is the zoning problem. Tucker is a member of the zoning commission that is expected to hear an appeal from the zoning administrator's ruling, probably in the next two weeks. He has indicated he will do what he can to help the program to get started.

Other members of the zoning commission include Mayor Walter E. Washington, City Council Chairman Gilbert Hahn, Architect of the Capitol George Stewart and Robert Horne, assistant to the associate director of the National Park Service.

With that formation, it seems a safe bet the commission will make it possible for the St. James program to get started either through the "broader interpretation" proposed by Tucker or through amendment of the zoning regulations.

It also seems likely that the food stamp amendment will be enacted.

The two changes could do a lot to ease the plight of the invisible poor among us—the nondemonstrating, unorganized, mostly silent old people.

CXV—2114—Part 25

NO NEED TO REDUCE MEDICAL STANDARDS IN SEEKING MORE MEDICAL SCHOOL GRADUATES

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 6, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a matter about which I receive considerable mail and which I hear about frequently from my constituents when I meet them personally is the shortage of physicians today, particularly general practitioners—those who do not specialize.

I had the privilege last weekend of speaking at the dedication of the new Ellicott-High wing of Buffalo, N.Y., General Hospital. This modern wing is the first step in a long-range modernization and improvement of this important hospital facility in our city.

In the course of my remarks, I referred to the shortage of doctors, and in particular to the shortage of what we used to know as the family doctor.

Today, the great accent in medicine is upon specialists. Physicians are either surgeons, gynecologists, oculists, internists, radiologists, pediatricians, anesthesiologists, urologists, dermatologists, pathologists, orthopedists, obstetricians—it is a long list.

FAMILY DOCTORS ARE RARE

Rare is the general practitioner of other days who cared for the pregnant woman, brought the baby into the world, tended to the infant and child through the formative years and kept right on treating them—for whatever the ill—as man, woman, or child.

Few doctors today will make house calls. Many will not consider taking a new patient—their office nurse will tell you to look elsewhere for medical help.

This is a situation which concerns me. It concerns many people. There has never been so much medical progress and medical awareness as in recent years.

Yet, in this climate, the shortage of doctors is growing all the time. We have not been keeping pace with the increase in population, nor with the modern-day demand which prompts the average person to seek medical counsel more often—and rightly so.

I was told the other day that there is a current shortage of at least 52,000 doctors in the United States. Personally, I think this is an understatement when you consider the few family doctors practicing today.

MEDICAL SCHOOLS FACE COLLAPSE

Even with this amazing, indeed alarming, shortage of doctors, I understand that there are 12 medical schools in the State of New York alone which are facing collapse. One is reported in danger of closing any day unless there is financial help forthcoming right away.

There have been suggestions of special Federal help for these medical schools. Maybe this is the immediate need. But that will only maintain the status quo so far as the number of graduates is concerned. Indeed, we are not

graduating enough each year as it is to meet today's needs.

Clearly, we need more medical school graduates, not just the same number each year, and we need to urge more of them to enter general practice instead of specializing.

By coincidence, perhaps, just a few days before the dedication ceremony at Buffalo General, the hospital's chief of surgery, Dr. Elmer Milch, spoke at a dinner in Buffalo on behalf of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine at Yeshiva University.

In his remarks, he argued vigorously that standards in medical schools should not be relaxed, even under social and governmental pressure.

I agree.

Certainly we do not want standards relaxed. And because we seek more graduates we are not by any means suggesting per se or even prepared to tolerate any relaxation of standards.

Since Dr. Milch has raised some questions on this subject, I believe it is only proper that his voice be heard, too. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am including with my remarks the text of Dr. Milch's remarks as follows:

DR. ELMER MILCH OF BUFFALO DISCUSSES NEED FOR MEDICAL SCHOOLS MAINTAINING EXCELLENCE

I should like, first, to express my sincere appreciation for the honor you do me this evening. Recognition is gratifying at any time, but it is recognition by one's peers such as the men at Albert Einstein Medical College which is deeply and truly valued.

As an individual who has been engaged modestly in medical education for more years than I care to admit publicly, these moments are treasured not only for the infrequency of their occurrence, but also for the opportunity to speak out in a reflective and philosophical mood both as a physician and a layman.

In a rapidly changing society—such as has been ours during the past 3 to 4 decades, we have watched the practice of medicine become a public utility subject to federal, state, and municipal regulatory bodies and laws, which have attempted by their actions to reduce physicians to one common denominator.

As a result of these actions excellence is in danger of becoming an increasingly vestigial structure and the resolve to pursue it may soon give way to disillusion. This we must never permit to happen to our youth.

COURSE OPEN TO YOUTH

What course then is open to our youth, to those in whom we intrust the future and health of our society, and if you will, the future of all mankind?

Disillusionment? I hope not. Callous cynicism and an attitude of "what the hell, I'll play ball their way?" I hope not. Petulance and withdrawal from our society, contenting themselves with pouting predictions of apocalypse for the world in which they feel condemned to live? I hope not.

I hope that those who one day join the medical profession will be taught to take none of the easy ways out, but will continue to pursue excellence—for the self-respect of knowing that one has done his best, for the joy of the pursuit, for the very love of excellence itself.

MUST TEACH BY EXAMPLE

But this hope will be in vain if we do not teach the young by our example.

Today, as the moral vacuity of our country is replaced by the moral vacuity of the crash pad, our society is learning the truth of the biblical admonition that it must reap as it has sown.

We, in medicine, as practitioners and teachers must try not to repeat the same errors. We just cannot afford the pious invocation of one set of values while we conduct ourselves by another.

If we as a profession are to retain our self-respect, we must demand excellence of ourselves first or else we must not demand it of those who will succeed us.

Nowhere is the dual nature of that imperative more manifest than in our medical schools.

If we are to expect our students to forget the lessons of compromise and expediency, then we must retain the most vigorous standards of excellence in their training.

We cannot heed the political call for *instant physicians*, in a futile, hasty effort to correct years of neglect and mistakes.

We cannot and must not play games with our youth and our health because of a wrong sense of priorities permitted to exist over the years.

SOCIETY MUST DEFEND STANDARDS

If we are to preserve the self-respect of the medical profession, then society as a whole must defend the standards of excellence.

For only through such a defense by the public itself can we hope to produce physicians who will be worthy of their calling and our trust.

For only by being the instruments of our own support and standards can we hope to teach the young the necessity of integrity.

Only by ourselves turning away from the bastions of mediocrity which would prostitute these principles in the name of political expediency can we hope to one day view ours as a profession which serves as an example to society rather than partaking of its present ills.

And these facts society must understand and must help us as teachers and physicians do.

It is because Albert Einstein Medical College in the comparative short time of its existence has demonstrated these standards and principles of excellence.

It is because as a private institution depending greatly upon public support it has held its head high and to date has refused to bow to the pressures of mediocrity—that I, as an individual, am very proud to be honored this evening and to accept this plaque in behalf of all grateful practitioners and teachers of medicine.

WAR AGAINST OUR CHILDREN

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 6, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have long been in the forefront in the fight against pornography. It was my privilege earlier this year to introduce one of three administration bills which would dry up this filthy business.

I have contended for many years it is our children the smut merchants are really after. Children are curious and they are subject to being hurt the worst because once their lives are changed, it may take years to erase.

Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following Omaha World-Herald article by the California

superintendent of schools, Dr. Max Rafferty, which outlines what these despicable people are doing in quest of dollars:

WILL PARENTS WIN—OR SMUT SALESMEN?

(By Dr. Max Rafferty)

The smut salesman despises your children even while he bloats and fattens upon them. He makes war on them, and simultaneously he makes big money off them. Without the kids, he would be small potatoes.

In Los Angeles, "sex shops" exist where all kinds of dirty snapshots, films and gadgets may be purchased by anyone who has the price. And the Hollywood film factories which once guaranteed family entertainment to the world now export obscenity to its four corners.

The relationship between pornography and sex crimes is pointed up by police chiefs and county sheriffs across the land. Odorous stacks of this filth are found in the pads of virtually all the youthful sex offenders who are rounded up by the law.

The muck merchant relies upon two characteristics of today's youth: its immaturity and its affluence.

All degenerates for profit are enemies of the children whom they fatten upon. But two groups of these ghouls deserve singling out.

First, consider the apologists. They chant the slick slogans of the Sick Sixties—the new paeans to prurency:

"Much of the world's great literature is erotic in content. It's no longer a question of whether children should be exposed to such material, but only a question of when."

"Today's 'New Morality' is far franker and healthier than the old."

"Sexual misconduct is no longer a relevant term. There's no such thing any more."

Every one of these statements is a deliberate lie aimed straight at your children.

Let's knock this sort of guff in the head right now. Sexual misconduct is behind half the murders and most of the acts of violence committed in this country. Sexual perversion is a sin as well as a crime. Premarital sex causes thousands of heartbreaks and wrecked lives.

Then there are the movie-makers. There are some healthy exceptions to the rule. The Disney people, for example. Yet the premise is universal enough to stand:

"The movie-makers are systematically seducing your children to make a fast buck."

Want to watch sodomy glamorized? You can see it in the movies.

Like to have adultery portrayed as normal and desirable? You can see it in the movies.

Think lesbianism should be shown sympathetically? You can see it in the movies.

So can your children. And you'd better believe it. I accuse the movie moguls of soullessly and cynically pandering to the basest instincts of the human race.

And I accuse the movie actors and actresses who starred in these ill-started putrescences of debauching the great and ancient art of acting.

I understand some of these characters actually are parents. How can they look their own kids in the face after what they've done to other people's children?

What's to be done, then, about pornography?

First of all, decide once and for all whether you as an individual are prepared to coexist with this sleaziest of all corruptions. If you are, then of course there's no need to go further.

But if you're fed up with this assault on your kids, there's plenty you can do about it:

—Demand that the movie industry fire the clown presently masquerading as "film czar" and get someone like J. Edgar Hoover to ride herd on movie morals.

—Organize neighborhood and even city-

wide boycotts of filthy films and sick stage plays.

—Picket the dirty magazine stands and the sex shops.

—Above all, know what your own children are doing with their money, their time and their curiosity.

You really have only two alternatives in this sector of the War Against Your Children: you can fight back as grimly and as unceasingly as the enemy is fighting, or you can surrender.

There is no temporizing with perversion for profit. Either you and your children win, or the enemy wins.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION TO DISCRIMINATORY INCOME TAX

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 6, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, numerous sincere, law-abiding Americans who regard themselves as individual sovereign citizens feel that the present income tax laws are discriminatory and, therefore, should be abolished and succeeded by a more equitable tax structure which is fair to all citizens.

It is easy for bureaucrats, in their ivory towers, far removed from the frustrations of the people to blame the citizens and their ever-growing distrust and antagonism toward runaway government. I try to remain in touch with people, to understand their concern and their desperation. In too many cases, it is not the people who are to blame or who should be vilified, but rather those in power who have created the crisis to which people react in varied manners.

Earlier I had extended the letters of Dr. William Douglass, of Sarasota, Fla.—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 18, pages 23637-23640 and volume 113, part 19, pages 25682-25685.

Another recent approach to the tax problem by a concerned citizen, Mr. Julius W. Butler, of Oak Park, Ill., is so unusual and far reaching that I call it to the attention of my colleagues and include it following my remarks:

I, Julius W. Butler of Oak Brook, Illinois, after much careful thought and research, have decided that I shall file the 1040 ES Return Form of my Income Tax in blank, but I shall not pay to the U.S. Treasury Department's Internal Revenue Service any personal Income Tax, for the following reasons, in line with my own conscience, the moral law, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitutions, both Federal and State. This does not in any way mean that I do not love my country or that I am unwilling to bear my share of a fair and equitable tax structure based upon the Constitution and implemented for the benefit of all Citizens in a just and Constitutional way, to support our Government. I will not participate in a scheme for its erosion and ultimate downfall.

(Area of religion): God's law is clear and certain with regard to the forbidding of adultery and fornication.

It is against my religious principles to give support to the United States Government's involvement in these evil acts and their resultant consequence which is illegitimate children.

The U.S. Constitution reads as follows: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof".

(Area of subversion): The William Campbell Douglas Letters brochure gives many examples of the U.S. Government's support of individuals and organizations and activities whose objective is the overthrow of our constitutional form of government, thus dissolving the sovereignty of our nation.

I list here a few picked at random from the Douglas Letters: Dean Rusk, Alexander D. Peaslee, Walt Whitman Rostow, Abba Schwartz, John Stewart Service, Charles N. Spinks, Edward A. Symans, William Wieland, Ralph Bunche, Thurgood Marshall, Post Office, U.S. Commerce Department, Central Intelligence Agency, War on Poverty, and the United Nations.

Public Law 85766, Section 1602 states: "No part of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act shall be used to pay . . . any person, firm or corporation, or any combination of persons, firms or corporations, to conduct a study or plan when or how or in what circumstances the Government of the United States should surrender this country and its people to any foreign power."

Section 109, Public Law 471 states. "It is illegal to use funds for any project that promotes One World Government or One World Citizenship".

(Area of banking): Article I Section 8 Part 5 of our Constitution gives Congress the sole power to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and for the standard of weights and measures. This is a sacred trust granted to Congress by the citizens of the United States.

Congress has no more right to delegate this authority to others than it has to give to others the right to declare war.

The acquisition of this power by the Federal Reserve Banking System is without cause and hence it must be recognized as a move to defraud the people of the States. Its established conduct is unjust, and is compelling the citizens to not only pay for the loss of their own sovereignty but that of the States and the Nation.

The Federal Reserve Bank has, for example, purchased from the U.S. Bureau of Engraving and Printing, a \$10,000.00 Federal Reserve Note for less than a cent of cost and buys with this note United States obligations worth \$10,000.00, and upon which the United States pays interest. The unrighteousness of this procedure cannot be questioned. I for one will not assume any part of this \$9,999.99 obligation plus interest.

Quoting the Bible: Leviticus 19:35 and 36. "Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, in meteyard, in weight, or in measure". "Just balances, just weights, a just ephah, and a just hin, shall ye have."

The special privilege contained in 12 U.S.C. 420 is contrary to the God-given law of just weights and measures. It is clearly the obligation of Congress to fulfill the requirement of Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 5 of the Constitution, and adhere to it!

Law 12 U.S.C. 531 exempts the privately owned and controlled Federal Reserve Banks from paying an Income Tax. This infamous law was passed 10 months after the XVI Amendment was ratified. However, the XVI Amendment reads in part as follows: "... on incomes from whatever source derived." (Emphasis supplied).

With the exception of small coins and small U. S. Notes, the Federal Reserve Banks, in which the U. S. Government owns not one share of stock, exercise *exclusively* the above named powers and further, are acquiring U.S. Securities with *non-existent* money and credit created in their own books.

Be it remembered the preamble of our Constitution clearly sets out the purpose of our government, "to establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the com-

mon defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity". Because of the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, we do not have a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

I regret to say that it seems as though members of Congress would rather stay silent than to act in keeping with the Constitution of the United States and their oath of office to support the Constitution. Such conduct identifies them with treason and tyranny.

(Area of Vietnam war): Our involvement in this Viet Nam War forces me to contribute funds used in aiding the killing, injuring and maiming for life many of our American boys. The Viet Nam War is a violation of the Declaration of Independence and my Constitutional Rights as declared in Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 11, "Congress shall have the power to declare War".

The Declaration of War is not present. My rights are further protected in the Constitution in the words found in Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 15: "Congress shall have power to call forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions". To invade another country is without Law or Reason.

My rights are also being violated in Art. 1, Sec. 10, Cl. 1 where we read these words: "No state shall, without the consent of Congress, . . . keep troops, or ships of war in time of peace . . . or engage in war unless actually invaded or in such eminent danger . . ." According to our Constitution no provision has been made whereby we as a nation can commit ourselves to a policy of waging war in various foreign areas of the world.

(Area of tax exemption): Individuals, activities, organizations, Co-operatives, mutual Insurance Companies, and Foundations have been granted exemptions from paying an Income Tax. The result of tax exempt privileges gives these preferred groups an advantage over private enterprise which *does* provide the revenue needed to support the legitimate function of Government. Nobody in America should be given special privilege or tax exempt status. To do so causes an unjust increase on the backs of those who do pay taxes.

Tax exempt Subversive Organizations, hide behind the protective mantle of the Federal Government. One example of this injustice by tax exempt foundations, is the Institute of Pacific Relations. The Carnegie Corporation, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Rockefeller Foundation have contributed large sums to that organization—a highly effective Communist espionage ring.

(Area of totalitarianism): In Genesis 3: 19 we read the following words: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread . . ."

I do not believe in special privilege. I believe that all should carry the burden imposed by taxation in an equitable manner. There is nothing in Article 1, Sec. 8 of our Constitution which gives the Government the right to engage in business. Everyone knows the Government pays no taxes and the result is flagrant injustice for all citizens.

The interest of the citizenry could be best served if the 700 different businesses, mentioned in the Liberty Amendment Fact Sheets, were sold, the proceeds received therefore applied to debt reduction, and the loss of revenue *now* sustained by this unjust situation stopped. Result: lower taxes!

The elimination of the U.S. Government participation in the 700 activities that *now* invade the field of private enterprise, without Constitutional authority, with obvious loss of revenue would *eliminate* the need of the Federal Income, Estate, Inheritance and gift taxes.

(Area of unconstitutional involvement): The Constitution (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 1) limits the spending of tax money to three distinct purposes—namely . . . "to pay the debts,

provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

The following items disclose that income tax revenue is being unconstitutionally collected and spent for purposes as follows:

January 11, 1968, Chicago Tribune—\$927,341.00 was given to the Blackstone Rangers and another South side street gang in Chicago, and some received salaries which money was used to train kids for organized crime.

January 5, 1962, Chicago Tribune—An act of treason was the use of U.S. funds to offset Russia's default of \$41,271,180.00 to the United Nations.

January 13, 1969, Chicago Tribune—U.S. Government has allotted \$419,057.00 for the growing and study of marijuana.

January 5, 1962, Chicago Tribune—2.8% of UNICEF money has gone to help communist countries. This is aid and comfort to the enemy. Those involved in this should be tried for treason.

Many, many more examples are available involving the unconstitutional spending of billions of dollars of citizen's money and will be submitted upon request.

(Area of form 1040): Two previous Supreme Court decisions held an income tax to be unconstitutional. I am also aware of the two Supreme Court decisions that I believe invade citizens rights regarding the requirements to file an income tax form.

I will recite the highlights of the Supreme Court decisions:

The United States vs. Manley S. Sullivan (71 L. ed. 272, 274; 1037), October term, 1926. The court said the following: "If the form of return provided called for answers that the defendant was privileged from making, he could have raised the objections in the return."

The Supreme Court used the above decision in the William Albertson and Roscoe Quincey Proctor vs. Subversive Activities Control Board. (U.S. 15, Fed. 2nd 165) November 15, 1965. The court said in this case that it would be needless for the communist party to file the form designated by the Subversive Activities Control Board. This case was in litigation some 15 years. Hence, why am I, a sovereign citizen, compelled to answer questions and pay a computed tax when the Supreme Court has ruled in other cases, that to do so might cause me to waive my Constitutional Rights. That I will not do.

To conclude, I am willing to pay a constitutional tax with lawfully constitutionally declared money based upon and within the legal spending limits of the Constitution.

The proper governmental officials should investigate my charges and when found to be sound and correct, cause a change in the social doctrine to conform with the Declaration of the Independence within Constitutional limits.

(Finally): Ponder this, from 2 Cor. 6:14 and 17: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness?"

"Wherefore come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you".

JULIUS W. BUTLER.

SILVER COINS ARE PASSÉ

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 6, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on October 15, the House overwhelmingly approved H.R. 14127 which would imple-

ment the recommendations of the Joint Commission on the Coinage. Members of the House are to be commended for defeating the proposal to use any silver in future coinage programs. Unfortunately, the Senate has voted to use some 100 million ounces of silver in the minting of Eisenhower coins.

The silver market has been in a turmoil since the votes on October 15 because of the rumors that a compromise involving silver in the Eisenhower coin will be made. The price has risen 19 cents in just 14 trading days. I would like to make it clear that these rumors have no basis in fact.

The last compromise that was made to the silver producers was in the Coinage Act of 1965 when the 40-percent silver half dollar was authorized. I and others of this body fought hard against this proposal and lost. However, we have been proven correct in our judgment on this issue. The 40-percent silver coin has not circulated despite the minting of more than 800 million of them. What is most disgraceful is the fact that more than 120 million ounces of silver, an important raw material, has been wasted in this operation. This compromise to the producers of silver has cost this Nation more than \$220 million in lost seigniorage profits and revenue from silver which could have been sold to industries in this country for useful purposes.

I say that the time for compromise on the question of the proper use of the remaining silver stocks in the Treasury has long past. To put any silver in future coinage would cost the Government in lost seigniorage profits and revenue from the sale of silver. In addition, the silver otherwise available for sale would help reduce the imports of silver which will be needed to meet the industrial needs of this country, and thereby help our balance of payments.

There have been several editorials around the Nation which have supported the Treasury's proposal for the use of cupro-nickel clad material in the minting of the dollar and the half dollar. Two of these are especially good and should be made available to every Member of the House. I include, therefore, the editorials from the Wall Street Journal of October 23, 1969, and the Mining Record of October 15, 1969, at this point in the Record. It should be noted that the Mining Record, published in Denver, Colo., carries as its motto, "The Voice of the Mining Industry"; and in the October 15 editorial advocates "that silver should be removed entirely from our coinage":

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 23, 1969]

THE EISENHOWER DOLLAR

No one can quarrel with the idea of honoring the memory of Dwight D. Eisenhower, but why do some Congressmen have to wax foolish about it?

The Nixon Administration proposed coining an Eisenhower dollar, which would be clad in nickel and copper, just as quarters and dimes currently are. The Government stopped minting silver coins because rising silver prices threatened to make the metal content of such coins worth more than their face value.

That, of course, would have made coin production a money-losing business for the

Government, which would be pretty silly. Yet the Senate has voted, 40 to 21, for an Eisenhower dollar of 40% silver.

Not at all surprisingly, the battle for a silver dollar was led by legislators from major silver-producing states—which may have raised questions as to whether they wanted mainly to honor the late President or to help a home industry. One Congressman actually waved strings of beads at his colleagues and warned that the nation was in danger of returning to "wampum."

Now Mr. Eisenhower as President did fight long and hard, and finally with some success, to curb inflation. In the ensuing years, however, the situation again was allowed to get out of hand. As the Administration warns, silver coinage now could inflate silver's price, with resulting cost burdens for industrial users.

The silver scheme, we suspect, is something Mr. Eisenhower would oppose. Whatever the situation, the General never seemed a man who would like false fronts and empty show.

[From the Mining Record, Oct. 15, 1969]

SILVER COINS ARE PASSE

(By Eleanor Fry)

Sometimes it takes awhile for an editorial writer to muster up the courage to espouse his convictions, but we have decided to put our neck in the noose and admit that we agree with the Silver Users in the belief that silver should be removed entirely from our coinage.

Before some of the readers get up a lynching party, we ask that you read on and see how we reached that conclusion. If you disagree, kindly send us a letter for use in the Sluice Box.

For a multitude of reasons, the demand for silver drives the coins out of circulation. This is true in most other nations, and not just the U.S. alone. We agree with the diehards for silver coins that this is not a good situation, but minting the Kennedy half dollar with a 40 per cent silver content hasn't brought about the cure, and neither will an Eisenhower dollar with any percentage of silver content.

How often do you see a Kennedy half dollar?

The American people squirrel them away; we doubt if many who are collecting the Kennedy half do so because of respect for the martyred President, or because of the silver content. It just seems to be the "in" thing to do.

Is there any reason to believe that an Eisenhower dollar, containing some percentage of silver, would circulate? Why mint a coin that won't get into circulation?

A cupro-nickel dollar coin might have some reason for existence, although convenience in carrying them in the purse or pocket isn't one.

If there is a demand for a silver "coin" to commemorate the memory of President Eisenhower, or President Kennedy, give one of the private mints the franchise and let them produce the medallion and sell to the collectors at a profit. Why should the taxpayers be expected to pick up the tab?

The fact that the price of silver has been tied in with the coinage is one reason for the relatively low price today. When the Government finally gets out of the silver business, and surely one of these days it will reach the bottom of that bottomless pit, then the price of silver will advance on the open market to a point where it can be mined at a reasonable profit.

Before we criticize the Government and its sale of silver from its stockpile, let us not forget that stockpile was built up at a time when silver miners were in a more dire circumstance than now.

It was the building of that stockpile that helped many a silver mining operation to

stay in business some years ago. (The same goes for gold—we curse the \$35 ceiling today, but at the time it was imposed, gold had been bringing around \$20 an ounce. That \$35 price looked good then.)

At this point we'll take a dig at the Silver Users Association. They are the ones who produce silver tableware, jewelry, et cetera. The price paid to the miner for his silver doesn't justify the tremendous increase in the price of the product offered the consumer. Is the manufacturer's profit out of proportion?

The silver industry should leave no stone unturned in its efforts to find new uses for its product. At present, the demand is exceeding the supply. Reports indicate that the government could sell about ten times as much silver as is offered at its weekly auctions.

However, 29 percent of the silver being produced is used in the photographic industry. Whether the new Contone process of photography, not using silver, is of real concern to the industry is not known at this time. If there is a chance that 29 percent of the sales may be lost within the next decade, then it behooves the mining industry to be sure there is a market to take its place.

The argument that coining an Eisenhower dollar with part-silver content would help the silver miner is just a lot of sentimental malarky contrived to win elections. Three million 40% silver dollars wouldn't make that much difference.

The silver miners have been depending upon the Government for too long.

What the silver producer needs to do is admit that, whether for good or otherwise, the silver coin is passe. Perhaps these young economists are right when they say that a nation's resources, and not the amount of silver in its coins, determines its wealth.

We do need a good silver producers' association to work in conjunction with the present Silver Users. Although it would appear that this eastern group is often at odds with the western producers, both are dependent upon a market for silver products for their livelihood. The silver producers should work at making and keeping a demand on the open market for silver. There undoubtedly are uses for silver that haven't been thought of, and it is up to the silver producers to find and to sell these uses to the public.

Fifty years from now people in the mining industry may look back to the decision of the Government to cease using silver in coins as a real milestone of progress!

POSTAL REFORM

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 6, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the name of the game is postal reform—complete, meaningful reform of our postal system.

This is what our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has been working on since last April in spite of—not with the help of—the new team now running our Post Office Department.

Their hangup is that they cannot see any postal reform at all unless we convert to a public corporation.

This is so shortsighted it is ridiculous.

If they cannot have their entire Postal Corporation plan, they do not want anything. If we in Congress were as stubborn on public matters, our Government would be in chaos.

We have listened carefully, and repeatedly, to their case. More important, we have gone on from there and have listened to other views as well. In our case, we are trying to see the woods as well as the trees.

Our committee now is on title III of a realistic and comprehensive postal reform bill. We are improving the bill as we move along. That is the orderly way to proceed and that is the way to get results.

Mr. Speaker, the editor of Local 374 Reports, the publication of local 374 in Buffalo of the United Federation of Postal Clerks, AFL-CIO, has sent me a recent edition which contains some interesting sidelights on the postal reform issue as follows:

Efficiency: How can the Department promise success (under the public corporation concept)?

This is entirely new and untried. Once this corporation is established it would be difficult, if not impossible, to retreat to the Postal Service as we know it.

Profit: The Post Office is now known as a service. If we were to try to turn it into a profit-making corporation, do you realize how much postage rates would have to be increased? At least 100%. This would be like turning the Defense Department into a corporation.

Wages: The postal officials are on record as always being against wage increases. What justice could rank and file employees expect if they were at the mercy of corporation officials (without the right to strike) and could not petition Congress?

SOME POW WIVES REFUSE TO BE USED BY THE COMMUNISTS

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 6, 1969

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, one of the diabolical dilemmas which the North Vietnamese Communists and the Vietcong have attempted to impose on the wives and families of our prisoners of war is that unless they march in the so-called peace moratorium they would not be permitted to communicate with their husbands or fathers.

It is difficult to imagine such a mean, despicable proposal—but the Communists have used this psychological technique often as a conventional tactic of their terroristic warfare.

It is difficult to imagine a wife or family who, under the terrible circumstances, would not feel obliged to comply with the despicable demands.

However, there are numerous wives of POW's who will resist this ugliest of blackmail.

Their refusal to comply is an unsurpassed feat of gallantry, not simply to discharge their own duty or patriotic responsibilities, but to help safeguard the humane treatment of future prisoners of war and to help vitiate this technique as a tactic of warfare.

One wife of a U.S. POW gave me permission to forward her name to the North Vietnamese in Paris as one who would not subject herself, degrade her

husband, or demean her country by marching in any demonstration against her own Government to achieve treatment of her husband to which he and all other POW's are already entitled. She deserves the plaudits of every American citizen for this extraordinary act of courage, patriotism, and principle.

I insert in the RECORD a copy of her letter to Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, our chief negotiator in the Paris peace talks. She, too, among most other wives and families of POW's and MIA's supports President Nixon's policy for peace. She, like others, wants, peace, but not at any cost.

The letter follows:

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Please forgive the legal paper; but since I would like to ask you to share this with the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong delegates in Paris, I can make my writing more legible.

My husband is a Prisoner-of-War somewhere in North Vietnam. He has been held captive for one year and one month. I fully support the present administration's policy of peace, but not at any cost.

It was disgusting to read in the papers, and see on the news, the insulting way the above-mentioned delegates informed two P.O.W. wives that they would have to "demonstrate against their government" to seek their husband's release. I am further disgusted by the delegates' encouraging demonstrations here. I refuse to acknowledge any so-called "Peace-groups" working with those same people who hold my husband captive. This is ugly black-mail. I will not send any mail to my husband through any of these channels. The only re-routing of mail which I will accept is that which would come through a completely neutral country, recognized by the Geneva Convention.

No one asked me to write this letter, Mr. Ambassador. You have never ever met me. If I am viewed as being "brain-washed," then it is a voluntary, self-induced patriotism.

My views are in the hands of the Governor of my state, California. Also, they are in the hands of a Congressman and an Assemblyman from the same state. In addition, a letter similar to this, with stronger language, was published, in full, in the *Central California Register*, a newspaper with a large circulation. I am not afraid to speak out in favor of my God, and my country, and the humane treatment of American prisoners-of-war in North, and South Vietnam. I am doing everything I can to encourage as many people as possible to speak out against these "psychological demands" coming from the North Vietnamese and Vietcong delegates.

Every morning at Mass, my children and I pray for the success of your efforts, Mr. Ambassador. What you are doing, and what you are up against is understood. God be with you.

Very sincerely yours,

DR. IRMAGENE NEVINS HOLLOWAY

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 6, 1969

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following talk was presented by Dr. Irmagene Nevins Holloway, at the time of her retirement as Assistant for Consumer

Education, Office of Product Safety, Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on October 31. Dr. Holloway is a Kansan, born and raised in Dodge City, and taught at Hutchinson and at the Kansas State College at Pittsburg. Recently she was selected as the 1969 District of Columbia Professional Woman of the Year.

I thought the talk was such a gem that I would want to share it with Congress:

ADDRESS BY DR. IRMAGENE NEVINS HOLLOWAY

Mr. Chairman and friends, At a gathering such as this, I am reminded more and more that friends are like great paintings. You need to step back and see them from a distance to get the full advantage, that is the contrasts in colors, the depth and meaning, the content as well as the frame.

When one is away from her friends she sees them in the framework of their goodness, their bright sayings, and their happy ways. All else is forgotten. I am a stronger person because of each of you, you gave me confidence, you forgave my mistakes, you inspired me, you gave me understanding and appreciation. Words fail me in expressing my gratitude to my co-workers.

Yes, I have lived long enough to retire. My life span began on the main street before it was macadamized, before Henry Ford motorized it, before Sinclair Lewis satirized it, before the Chamber of Commerce advertised it, before the unions organized it, before the chain stores standardized it, and before the Government subsidized it.

Yes, I am ready to retire. I don't mind my trifocals; I see much better, but I hate them. I don't mind my dentures, I eat much better, but I dislike them. I don't mind my arthritis when I remember my cortisone, but oh, how I hate to forget the things I ought to remember.

How does one know when it is time to retire? Perhaps this little jingle will illustrate:

"How do I know when my youth is spent?
When my get-up-and-go has gone and went.
Still I can grin when I think where I have been."

And where have I been? On the first and fifth floors of the South Building, Tempo D, Tower Building I, to Cincinnati and back to Tower Building II, then to FOB 8, and now Crystal Plaza V.

At each of these places I left a part of me, yet I wonder if the move was necessary. I had the opportunity to work with dedicated Government workers, it didn't make any difference whether the person was Civil Service or member of the Public Health Corps, the goal was to reduce accidental injuries. During the past eight years I have had three different titles, yet the work responsibilities were the same. Many times I wondered who "they" were, those people who were responsible for moving us about and making the changes in our work assignments. It reminds me of:

"A curious animal is man
His future he can plan,
But events unpredictable
And acts contradicable
Put man and his plan in the can."

Yes, I plan to live in the Washington area. Why you might ask. The World Capital is a most interesting place to be and here I have the opportunity to be associated with the leaders from my home State. The Honorable Joseph Skubitz and his charming Jess, the Honorable Garner Schriver and his gracious Martha Jane and the Honorable Bob Dole and his lovely Phyllis. Kansas is well represented in the Halls of Congress.

On the day of retirement, one can reminisce. In the Division of Accident Prevention, I remember the dedicated people who

worked tirelessly on reports, analyzing statistics, preparing research proposals, writing programs, supervising projects, directing task forces, writing contracts, each activity geared to ways to prevent human suffering which results from accidents. Dr. Paul Joliet, Chief, and Mr. Eugene Lehr, Deputy Chief, deserve special thanks for their leadership. I wish I could mention each person by name, time does not permit this. I do, however, want to give credit to my secretaries. Whatever success I achieved each one contributed significantly to my success. A special thanks is given to Mrs. Joyce Lennon Holsinger and to Mrs. Marcella McGrath.

In the Injury Control Program where most of the personnel were members of the Division of Accident Prevention staff, I again recall the dedicated people interested in the control of injuries. Dr. Richard E. Marland was the Chief ably assisted by Mr. Alphonso Schapowsky, a Kansan, who was Deputy Chief.

And now the Office of Product Safety has assumed part of the responsibilities assigned to the Injury Control Program. It has been a real pleasure to be associated with Mr. Basil Long, with whom I had the privilege to work in the other two assignments. A special word of thanks to Miss Carol Young, who will assume some of my responsibilities, I wish for her every success. Excellent leadership is being given to the Office of Product Safety by Dr. Howard I. Weinstein, Director, Mr. Samuel Hart, Deputy Director and Mr. Fred Thornberry, Administrative Officer.

In closing I am reminded of the following:

"I often wonder as I go,
What makes the little daisy grow.
And when I die, as die I must
And dust again returns to dust.
Some other fellow will want to know,
What makes the little daisies grow."

I wonder who will carry the banner for the "Crusade for Children. . . Control Injuries and Prevent Fatalities" and other areas of accidental injuries. It doesn't make too much difference whether it is located in the Office of Product Safety or in the Environmental Control Administration. It is important that there be a Division of Injury Control with staff members concerned with the greatest killer of those between the ages of 1 through 34—the Americans with a future. Each youth has the right to live to his age of retirement; someday this right will be guaranteed, because leadership will be given to this program by those who have the responsibility for providing it.

May I share with you an old Gaelic Blessing:

"May the road rise to meet you,
May the wind be always at your back,
May the sun shine warm upon your face,
And the rains fall soft upon your fields,
And, until we meet again
May God hold you in the palm of his hand."

GENERAL HERSHEY HAS ILLUSTRIOUS CAREER AS SELECTIVE SERVICE DIRECTOR

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 6, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Lewis B. Hershey is retiring as Director of the Selective Service System after many years of dedicated public service.

General Hershey is a patriot—a great American—and he has served this Nation with distinction in performance of

one of perhaps the most unpopular duties of Government—the selection of young men for military service.

As General Hershey leaves this important post I want to join others in wishing him the very best of good luck and success as he assumes other duties in the manpower field.

In this connection I insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Manchester Times of Manchester, Tenn., which provides some rather interesting insights into some reactions concerning General Hershey's departure as Selective Service Director:

[From the Manchester (Tenn.) Times, Oct. 17, 1969]

CROWS GOT THE EAGLE

They finally got him.

All the peaceniks and anti-war protesters who have been after the scalp of Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Selective Service director for more than 28 years and through three wars, have finally won.

President Nixon has placed the old warhorse, who embodied national resistance to foreign enemies of every hue, out to pasture. He will retire come Feb. 16.

We think it's a shame. We believe the President deliberately sacrificed Gen. Hershey, not because of his age or his performance, but as a sop to soften the outraged cries of the peace-at-any-price minority.

They and their ragtag minions of protesters had come to regard Gen. Hershey as a central target of their efforts to hand South Vietnam to the enemy on a platter without regard to our investment of lives and suffering in that war-torn country.

Too, the venerable general was a focal point for every ill-livered American who is too weak-kneed or weak-headed to wear his nation's uniform in peace or war.

So, we're sorry to see the President sack Gen. Hershey in an effort to shut these people up. It won't, you know. They have a taste of blood now, and a scent of victory for their side is in the air.

Some of their kind would abolish the draft entirely and dismantle all U.S. defenses, even while the enemies of our nation continue to build up their military might.

It would appear that Mr. Nixon has made this sacrifice for nothing.

You don't make deals with the peaceniks. They give no quarter, and as soon as one of their outrageous demands is met, they make yet another.

Many of them—and their group includes every troublemaker in the book, from the Black Panthers to the Students for a Democratic Society—would completely wreck this nation if all their demands were met.

In their methods there is nothing peaceful, yet they cry peace; in their ideologies, there is nothing sacred, yet they scream for—individual rights and human dignity.

Gen. Hershey stood for the old, sound belief that a man earns his rights by sharing responsibilities—one of these being that a good American defends his country in peace and war.

With his going, about all that can be said is that an eagle has been brought down by a bunch of crows.

THE GOLD GAMES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 6, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, while U.S. gold experts continue to control U.S. gold

at a guarantee of \$35 per ounce, the international gold market has declined to \$39.50 per ounce.

The international bankers are doing an excellent job of manipulation but one wonders of the relevancy to Americans, who are forbidden by law to own gold. Surely, it is not unreasonable to relate an artificially created decrease in the value of gold—a priceless metal with intrinsic value—to high interest rates and inflationary prices in our planned domestic economy.

It is doubtful that gold will ever go out of style or that the value of gold can ever be stabilized as theorized—there is not enough of it. Then, too, the international humanists who profess a paternal desire to protect the masses from gold would do so by controlling all of it themselves. After all, as a superior class, they apparently feel they are immune to the evils of gold possession.

It is becoming more and more difficult to convince people that gold is unimportant—to anyone but an international banker, that is.

I include several news articles:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 7, 1969]

GOLD PRICES ABROAD SLUMP DRAMATICALLY

LONDON, November 6.—The price of gold slumped dramatically in all the world's bullion markets today and experienced dealers tonight were forecasting that the slide may continue tomorrow.

Whatever the source of the gold, there was so much of it on the market that the morning price was forced down by 35 cents an ounce to \$39.05.

When news of the London price drop spread through the world's bullion markets, they too clipped their rates—Paris by 30 cents to its lowest for a year, Zurich by 35 cents, Hong Kong by 28 cents and Beirut by 55 cents.

In London the selling continued during the day—although not as heavily as earlier—and in the afternoon another 5 cents was knocked off, bringing the free market rate down to \$39—its lowest since October, 1968. Later unofficial deals here were being made as low as \$38.90.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 20, 1969]

MONEY—A NEW EPOCH: CENTRAL BANKERS HOPE TO FIND A WAY TO MANAGE POLITICIANS

(By J. A. Livingston)

This brings us to an irony. Triumphant, the members of the International Monetary Fund have created "paper gold"—Special Drawing Rights—as a substitute for and supplement to gold bullion. The SDRs are designed to buy time for and to perpetuate the Bretton Woods system. Yet, at the instant of triumph, central bankers are debating among themselves: Must the system be changed to be saved?

Three principles governed Bretton Woods. First: The dollar would always be exchangeable for gold at \$35 an ounce. Today, this is adhered to in theory, but not in practice. The unmortgaged U.S. gold stock is only about \$10 billions.

Consequently central bankers hesitate to exchange dollars for gold. Were they to knock too often on the gold window of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York they would find it closed. They would have to accept the dollar.

A U.S. embargo on gold would topple the international monetary system. It would derange world trade. No responsible central banker or finance minister wants that. Para-

dox: Fear of disrupting the system keeps the system going!

Second: Prices of currencies would be fixed relative to the dollar and hence to one another. These firm relationships were the heart of the Bretton Woods system. If the prices of currencies bob up and down, so would prices of groceries and automobiles. Consumers wouldn't accept this. Businessmen wouldn't like it. Politicians couldn't survive the economic uncertainties such fluctuations would create.

Third: Though the parities, the prices of currencies were fixed, they were not immutable. If a country's competitive position changed for the worse, if it suffered a prolonged balance-of-payments deficit, the Bretton Woods articles proposed lowering the price of the currency. Conversely, if a country has a prolonged balance-of-payments surplus, an increase in the price of the currency was contemplated.

But such adjustments are a politician's nightmare.

The Government that devalues a currency confesses failure.

The government that raises the price of its currency can not expect hometown hurrahs. Revaluation hurts exporters. It is likely to cause some unemployment.

Some central bankers have concluded that they must find a way to manage politicians. In that way, maybe they will be able to manage money.

By manipulating changes in exchange rates, they hope to lead presidents and prime ministers and legislators into economic policies which will achieve the best mix among four hard-to-reconcile objectives:

1. Economic growth; 2. Price stability; 3. High employment; 4. Balance-of-payment equilibrium.

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 4, 1969]

SOUTH AFRICA PRESSING THE UNITED STATES FOR COMPROMISE ON GOLD ISSUE

(By Lee M. Cohn)

South Africa is stepping up pressure on the United States to compromise on the role of gold in International Monetary Reserves. Negotiations between the two countries

here this week made little apparent progress, but Nicolaas Diederichs, South Africa's finance minister, told a news conference yesterday that there is "a greater willingness, a greater desire on the part of the Americans to come to some agreement."

U.S. officials concurred that they want to strike a bargain. They scoffed, however, at the idea that South African maneuvers have pushed the United States into a defensive position.

Gold talks took place privately during this week's joint meeting of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, which ended yesterday with formal approval for creation of a new kind of monetary reserves called Special Drawing Rights (SDRs).

South Africa abstained from the nearly unanimous vote for SDRs, which have been nicknamed paper gold.

The gold issue was sharpened when the United States and other leading countries last year established a two-price system, with monetary gold pegged at \$35 an ounce and the price of gold for industrial and artistic use allowed to fluctuate freely on the market.

A key part of the system is the understanding that almost all newly mined gold is to be sold on the markets not to central banks or the IMF to expand monetary reserves. By compelling sales on the market, the United States hopes to hold the market price down close to \$35.

Creation of SDRs supposedly will make purchases of real gold for reserves unnecessary. The importance of gold as a reserve would diminish gradually as SDRs accumulated.

But South Africa, the world's biggest producer of gold, is resisting and demanding the right to sell some of its gold to central banks and the IMF as a means of holding the market price up.

Diederichs reiterated that South Africa has sold gold to central banks despite the U.S. position that they should not buy.

Besides direct sales, Diederichs confirmed that South Africa has used IMF transactions to channel gold to central banks of some countries.

Members borrowing South African rands from the IMF, along with other currencies have converted the rands into gold on some

occasions. This process helps South Africa unload gold without the risk that additional supplies may depress the market price.

Britain and France reportedly have been among the countries acquiring gold in this manner. U.S. officials played down the size and significance of these transactions, maintaining that they do not imperil the two-price gold system, but they conceded that a clear agreement on South African gold sales would help overcome "suspensions" that the two-price system might be undermined.

Diederichs indicated he believes the ability of South Africa to sell gold to central banks strengthens his bargaining position.

"I see no reason why we cannot carry on in that way," he said.

Negotiations are expected to continue through correspondence and later perhaps in meetings between U.S. and South African officials.

Treasury Secretary David M. Kennedy told a news conference the United States wants to settle the issue but is determined to protect the two-price gold system.

On another question, Kennedy predicted that the next movement of interest rates will be downward but indicated he does not expect a sharp rate decline soon.

Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, the IMF's managing director, told a news conference the two-price system has proved to be workable, and added that South Africa has had no problem in disposing of its gold.

Gold will remain "for quite a while the basic standard of the monetary system," he said.

Schweitzer indicated he has no objection to conversion of rands borrowed from the IMF into gold.

On the forthcoming increase in IMF quotas, Schweitzer said the present \$21 billion total probably will be expanded by about \$7 billion or \$8 billion.

He said he is confident that West Germany will resume supporting the mark within 1 percent of a fixed par value as soon as possible, after temporarily letting the rate float freely in the markets.

Germany's action letting the rate float may take some of the steam out of proposals for making the currency system more flexible, he said.

SENATE—Monday, November 10, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Reverend Dr. Frank A. Tobey, chaplain, major general, U.S. Army, retired, former Chief of Chaplains, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, eternal, almighty, Father of us all, we turn aside for just a moment in time to confess our need of Your leadership in finding suitable solutions for today's intricate problems.

Be the guardian of this Senate.

May Your divine purpose be the guiding spirit of this session. Grant us wisdom in the mending of every national flaw. Direct us in our legislating that we may secure the right of every citizen and unite us in purpose for the betterment of all mankind.

Enable our leaders to convince all others of our desire for peace. And, above all, may we remain a nation under God.

In the name of Him who is the giver of life and who holds the destiny of all nations in the hollow of His hand. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, November 7, 1969, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 515 and the succeeding measures in sequence.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

1972 UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 179) expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States should actively participate in and offer to act as host to the 1972 United Nations Conference on Human Environment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) is absent today on official business. He is, however, vitally interested in Senate Resolution 179 and has prepared a statement for the Record. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the state-