

Alfred T. Goodwin, of Oregon, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Oregon.

R. Dixon Herman, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania.

Cristobal C. Duenas, of Guam, to be judge of the district court of Guam for the term of 8 years.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Robert W. Rust, of Florida, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Florida for the term of 4 years.

U.S. MARSHAL

Harry Connolly, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years.

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Clarence M. Coster, of Minnesota, to be an Associate Administrator of Law Enforcement Assistance.

U.S. PATENT OFFICE

John Henry Schneider, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Commissioner of Patents.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ALL KINDS OF PEOPLE CAN WORK TOGETHER

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, on October 26, 1969, the San Francisco Examiner contained an article entitled "All Kinds of People Can Work Together" concerning the firm of Fred Meyer of California, and the men and women who make up that firm.

It was a warm story, a story of the American ideal at its brightest and best. It was the story of Fred Meyer himself, but it was also the story of everyone who is a part of this unique fireplace accessory firm in San Francisco's Potrero District.

It is the kind of thing that can happen in San Francisco and be taken for granted by all who are directly concerned.

I am taking the liberty of placing the full text of the article in the RECORD at this time, to share it with my colleagues and to give special recognition to the men and women of Fred Meyer of California for whom humanity and decency and democracy are not words but a way of life:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Oct. 26, 1969]

ALL KINDS OF PEOPLE CAN WORK TOGETHER (By Jim Harwood)

After a visit to Fred Meyer's little fire-screen factory, you wonder where the rest of the country went wrong.

Because a lot of American industry seems to have lost—or never latched onto—what Fred and his 80 employees take for granted: People can work together without a lot of hassle between races, between management or between male and female.

There are no real clues at Fred Meyer of California on Potrero as to why this is so. But there's considerable evidence that it is so.

First, there's Meyer himself, a semibearded Jewish leprechaun who goes around dropping lines not usually heard from company presidents. "I might be a Communist if I thought Communism would work. Let everybody own everything. But Communism doesn't work—it's too afraid of freedom. So I'm not a Communist."

Although a lot of his liberal ideas would rattle the china at the Commonwealth Club, Meyer actually makes a fairly good exhibit for the capitalistic system. Fleeing the Nazis who murdered his parents in Hamburg, Meyer arrived in New York in 1938 with his wife Ellen. As in all good immigrant success stories, he only had \$8.50 in his pocket.

Drifting to California during the war ("I had to go west since on the East Coast we Germans were considered 'enemy aliens.' But out here, the Japanese were the 'enemy'

and nobody worried about me"), Meyer fell into selling steel fireplace grates and andirons, two items he knew nothing about.

Joined by several boyhood friends from Hamburg who are still with him, Meyer formed his manufacturing company in 1948 and took off in a Hudson on a national sales tour, driving at night, selling by day and often sleeping in the car.

Today, Fred Meyer of California is among the top six in the fireplace accessory industry, averaging sales of 100,000 screens a year and 60,000 accessories. And Fred Meyer is presumably a moderately wealthy man.

A lot of his employees have been with him the whole 20 years. And it's out in the plant where a visitor finds more evidence that people don't have to claw to accomplish something.

The tour is led by the plant production chief, Hank Morioko, a Japanese who's been with Meyer for 15 years. "When I got married, he bought champagne for all my guests. Four hundred people." He's a great guy." Morioko notes that all employees are members of Local 128 of the Metal Polishers union, but there's never been a strike or even an arbitration case.

The employee names roll by. Gus Gimarelli and Joe Rio and Robert Rios and Ernesto Fernandez. A Chicano in charge of this. A Black in charge of that. An Oriental running something else. And there's Millie Robinson, 21 years with the company, boss of the paint department.

At big corporations they hire labor experts who go around hanging labels like "fully integrated work force" on such situations and try to figure out how they come into being.

At the little factory on Potrero St., nobody worries about it. "We never set out to hire any particular kind of people," says Fred Meyer. "They all just kind of wandered in here."

EUGE POETA

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Congressman PODELL of New York, on May 20, 1968, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the poem of our colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota, GENE McCARTHY, entitled "Three Bad Signs." This poem has now been awarded a prize by the National Endowment for the Arts. This award confirms Congressman PODELL's evaluation of Senator McCARTHY as one who "belongs in the front rank of American lyric poets."

As the Senator from Idaho, Mr. CHURCH, has said, there is no record of another Senator achieving this distinction. For most of us poetry is not our cup of tea.

Senators have written erudite tomes, economic studies, historical reminis-

cences, essays, doggerel, but never has a Senator earned a prize for poetry.

In achieving distinction as a genuine poet, Senator McCARTHY can bask in the opinion of Oliver Wendell Holmes who said:

There was never a poet who had not the heart in the right place.

The poem, "Three Bad Signs" inserted in the RECORD by Congressman PODELL and the poem "Ares" called to our attention by Senator CHURCH, are genuine poetic accomplishments.

It used to be that poetry had to rhyme and scan. It was Dorothy Parker who declared:

FIGHTING WORDS

Say my love is easy had,

Say I'm bitten raw with pride,

Say I am too often sad—

Still behold me at your side.

Say I'm neither brave nor young,

Say I woo and coddle care.

Say the devil touched my tongue—

Still you have heart to wear.

But say my verses do not scan

And I get me another man!

The poetry of McCARTHY is not that of the scanning and rhyming variety. It is the modern poetry of T. S. Eliot, E. E. Cummings, Marianne Moore, and others. It is of an excellence entitled to be considered with these paragons.

Therefore, I was disturbed that the Washington Star commented on McCARTHY's prize-winning poetry as follows:

POET McCARTHY

The National Endowment for the Arts has awarded a \$500 prize to Senator Eugene McCarthy for his poem, "Three Bad Signs." This confirms a long-held suspicion of ours that McCarthy is better at being a poet than he is at the other trades he's dabbled in, such as baseball and politics.

It has been reported that McCarthy, on being informed of his windfall, express the hope that politicians would now stop criticizing his poetry. That seems fair enough. Only those with some knowledge of poetry are properly qualified to comment on the work of a poet.

By the same token, it would seem reasonable to suggest that Poet McCarthy should stop sounding off on the work of professional politicians.

I wonder what test the Evening Star would put on professional politicians. GENE McCARTHY has won five elections to Congress and two elections to the U.S. Senate. That is playing in the professional league for quite awhile. In addition, he has made a substantial showing in the presidential league. If not being professional means not winning a presidential nomination then there are few professional politicians. If being a professional means success in the highest professional challenge, then GENE McCARTHY meets the test.

As only an amateur in the poetry business, I salute Senator McCARTHY.

As one professional politician to another, I salute a pro for his achievement in an area in which most of us are dilettantes.

Euge Poeta.

LETTERS TO PARIS

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, during the week of the 24th of November, I took great pride in calling the attention of this body to the "We Love America Week," which blossomed in Joplin, Mo., and spread to many neighboring cities and States.

The observance was highly successful, attested to by the fact that more than 73,000 red, white, and blue armbands were distributed and worn by the people of the area.

Now, the city of Neosho, Mo., has added a bit more luster, to the already shining example set by the patriotic Americans of southwest Missouri.

The Optimist Club of the city of Neosho in Newton County, has had a quantity of letters printed to be distributed to the Neosho area residents. The letter is addressed to the North Vietnam delegation to the Paris peace talks. The letter pledges support to the American peace effort and requests open inspection of the North Vietnam prison camps by the International Red Cross.

The individuals who live in the area, have been requested to sign and mail them to Paris. It is hoped by the Neosho, Mo., Optimist Club, that hundreds of these letters will be mailed.

Mr. Speaker, I commend these people on their resourcefulness and offer a copy of the letter, to be read by the Members of this body.

The letter follows:

Mr. XUAN THUY,
North Vietnam Delegation, Paris Peace Talks,
Paris, France.

DEAR SIR: I am just an average American who has become concerned over the conditions of the Vietnam War. Like any decent American or human being, I desire the war to be over, but I believe in a just and honorable peace for all men, both North and South. Therefore, I pledge my support for our valiant American effort to bring peace in Vietnam as well as the rest of the world. I also pledge my support of the policies of the past administration of President Johnson and the present administration of President Nixon.

There is one thing that bothers me extremely, and that is the condition of our American prisoners in North Vietnam. I appeal to your basic goodness as a member of the human race to open the prison camps for inspection by the International Red Cross. Also, I further appeal to you as a fellow human being to release our prisoners as a measure of good will. Please, sir, make an effort for the benefit of the good people of both America and Vietnam to ease the tragic conditions of this terrible war.

Sincerely,

YOUNG PEOPLE DO UNDERSTAND ISSUES OF TODAY

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, because of the work on the tax bill that has taken us far beyond a normal adjournment date, many of us have been forced to cancel speaking engagements of long standing that were made months ago when we thought surely this Congress would conclude its business at a reasonable time.

One of the addresses which I was scheduled to make was at the Flowing Wells High School in Tucson, Ariz. Unfortunately, I was forced to cancel that speech, but the patriotic program was held anyway and a friend read the speech in my place.

Shortly afterward, I received a copy of an "answer" to my remarks by Miss Stephanie Daniel, a student at Flowing Wells High School. Miss Daniel has, I believe, demonstrated an extraordinary and lucid understanding of the problems facing America. Her statement is particularly welcome because we hear so much about certain small irresponsible elements in today's society of young people.

I was impressed with Miss Daniel's presentation. I feel other Members of the Senate will share my appreciation for her statement and I ask unanimous consent that her remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

AN ANSWER TO SENATOR FANNIN

(By S. Daniel)

Senator Fannin, honored guests, Dr. Yoder, Mr. Meneley, faculty, and the Student Body: On behalf of Flowing Wells High School, we thank you for your provocative words, your philosophy and your challenge.

We are a restless generation, a generation in search of true knowledge. We listen to your words of wisdom, your words of experience. And with your words and your suggestions, we will attempt to guide the United States toward a more complete, successful and accomplished society. The time is now for positive thinking and constructive action on the part of our nations youth. If we are to survive, if we are to continue in the greatness of our Founding Fathers, if we are going to be the World Leader, if we are to have peace at home and abroad, we must bind the wounds of the Generation Gap, and accept the guiding hand of all generations. We will need your help, you the "older" generation. And we will need your patience, for sometimes we appear too eager, too aggressive, and too thoughtless. But our youthfulness cries out for action now. Action to rebuild our cities. Action to eradicate air pollution, action to feed the hungry, and action to find jobs for the jobless.

We know these programs take time. And let me also say to those who would destroy the nation with lawlessness, our nation was built on laws and rules of conduct, and without the protective hand of Law and lawmakers, our nation's future is one of anarchy and total destruction. Little is gained, and much is lost when we ignore the property rights of every individual, and take up the rioter's call of "Change through destruc-

tion". The many problems of our society can be healed, but must be healed, with laws to abide by and strong men to guide us.

We hear your challenge, Senator Fannin. We answer your call for understanding between peoples and nations. As the class of 1969 moves into the '70's with footprints small in size, we realize that one day our footprints will be the giant steps that will cure cancer, stop the common cold, rebuild our cities, make people laugh again, smile at one another, and say, "Hi brother", what can I do for you today?", and really mean it! Let us from this moment on, move into a new era of greatness for our country. Let the 1970's be remembered as the turning point in American History. A turning point from want, from destruction, from suspicion, from gaps between ages and races, and a move towards a century of goodness, love, peace and understanding. We thank you Senator Fannin, for "lighting the first candle for us". Now it is up to my generation to take up the light, and shine ahead and up, instead of behind and down.

Thank you.

EDGAR ALLEN POE

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the New Orleans Times Picayune recently published a well-deserved tribute to its Washington correspondent, my good friend, Edgar Allen Poe.

Needless to say, it is unusual for a newspaper to publish a tribute to one of its own reporters, but Edgar Poe is no ordinary reporter. He is a professional journalist with almost 40 years of outstanding reporting experience.

Because of his ability and warm disposition, Edgar Poe's colleagues have elected him to offices in numerous professional organizations including the White House Correspondents Association, and Sigma Delta Chi journalism fraternity.

For these reasons, I am inserting in the RECORD the following article by Craddock Goins and calling it to the attention of my colleagues:

POE'S CAREER IS LIVING PROOF NICE GUYS DON'T FINISH LAST
(By Craddock Goins)

(NOTE.—This being the Christmas season, publication of a newsman's rhapsody about a fellow newspaperman (particularly when the latter happens to be our favorite Washington correspondent) seems in order. Mr. Goins has known Mr. Poe in New Orleans, in Jackson and in Washington when both were writing news in those cities.)

WASHINGTON.—Perhaps no paper has had superior capital coverage more consistently in this century than The New Orleans Times-Picayune. That is believed by many who have known the late Paul Wootton and the unassuming chap who now walks his beat—one Edgar Allen Poe.

In his 22 years here Poe has been up front where the action is and the pressure runs high. He lists himself on the press-gallery roster as Edgar Poe, refers to himself as plain Ed and leaves the thought that he is just another Poe boy trying to get along.

Poe had to walk high and fast to match Wootton's strides. That spectacular man had kept pace with the period's public giants, including founding fathers of the National Press Club and the prestigious Gridiron Club, to rate high favor in the White House.

Wooton was probably the only newsman to achieve family-friend status with the presidency. That was won by his empathy for a child in tears. This child had fallen in front of her parents' apartment. As Wooton helped her up, she said her name was Margaret and "my father—boo hoo—is Senator Troo—boo hoo hoo—Trooman!"

Wooton's kindness to Margaret was so appreciated that Truman's ear was always ready when he needed information not available elsewhere. The Times-Picayune had status position on the executive's reading table.

"NICEST MAN"

Before going to Washington, in 1947, Edgar Poe served in The Times-Picayune's Mississippi bureau. Ten years in Jackson won him esteem for integrity and graciousness. Washington Post's Jack Gould described him in these words:

"Edgar Allen Poe was once described by his wife as 'the nicest man I ever met.' She's right. It was a privilege to work with Ed in New Orleans, Baton Rouge and Jackson, and see him help others, particularly other newsmen. He is a man of his word, a great reporter and as respected in Washington as he was there."

Mississippi's Secretary of State Heber Ladner backs that thought: "It is appropriate that you do a profile on my long time personal friend Edgar Poe. I am glad to have the opportunity to endorse his contributions in journalism to our state, the South and the nation. Ed exemplifies the highest ideals, always sticking to truth and fact, refusing to take statements out of context to mislead the public. He reports objectively without inflicting injury."

Poe is a member of the Gridiron Club, treasurer of the White House Correspondents Association and a past president of the Washington group of Sigma Delta Chi, a journalistic body.

As a member of the Senate and House Standing Committee of Correspondents governing admission to the galleries, Poe resisted a step to bar Soviet Russia's Tass correspondent in respect for America's free-speech traditions.

FAIRNESS, ACCURACY

Two senators who have known Poe from early days are Mississippi's James O. Eastland and Louisiana's Allen J. Ellender. Ellender knew Poe from stormy days when the Senator was speaker of the Louisiana House of Representatives and believes he is "a credit to journalism, very personable, trustworthy and, unlike some Washington commentators, is not prone to exaggerate. His reputation is based upon close attention to facts. He views thorny problems incisively while presenting an objective view."

Senator Eastland could recall Poe's record from early Mississippi days: "Ed Poe is one of the finer newspapermen in Washington. He had the ability to dig out stories where other reporters often miss them. You can count on him to make an in-depth treatment of any story. His reputation for fairness and accuracy is unequalled. I am proud to call Ed my friend."

A Poe story that drew admiration from Georgia's Senator Herman Talmadge was a review of Senator Ellender's long public career. In asking for unanimous consent to have that story published in The Congressional Record, Talmadge said: "One of the most respected newsmen in the nation's capitol is Edgar Allen Poe. He writes with balance and insight and is a credit to New Orleans and the South."

Louisiana's Senator Russell Long believes Poe is "one of the fairest, most conscientious men I have ever known. He has a tough job and he does it well. He has the ability to write and the ability to convey, an asset very important to the American republic. Ed is truly outstanding."

WAR CORRESPONDENT

One knowing Poe longest is Louisiana's First District Rep. F. Edward Hébert. He remembers when Poe was a local staffer on The Times-Picayune while Hébert was a New Orleans State deskman. "Ed Poe is one of the nicest guys I ever met," he said. "His compassion is something foreign to many newshounds. He is a mixture of good and accurate reporting and human understanding. Will Rogers said, 'I never met a man I didn't like.' Edgar could say he never met a man who didn't like him."

A tribute that touched Poe very much was never intended for publication. He received it in May, 1968, from Mrs. Ruth Lloyd Miller of Jennings, La. Congratulating him for an award from Alabama University "for outstanding political and legislative reporting," she added "a belated thank-you for something you did for me 23 years ago. It was your radio message from the USS Mississippi in Tokyo Bay that brought the first word that my husband, who had been missing, was alive."

Poe had taken time out from his Mississippi bureau assignment to be a war correspondent. He steamed from Okinawa to the Yokoshiba Naval Base to cover the Japanese surrender on the USS Missouri. His Pacific reporting won commendation from Navy Secretary James Forrestal.

Poe joined The Times-Picayune in 1930 after experience on a Birmingham newspaper. In his Deep South days, he covered historic political events: the campaign of the Longs, Theodore G. Bilbo, Pat Harrison, Hugh L. White, Martin Sennett Conner, Jimmy Morrison, Dudley LeBlanc and others. He was born in Jasper, Ala., first met printer's ink on The Mountain Eagle, a weekly published by his grandfather, James R. Gunter. He is married to the former Frances Margaret Harwood. They have two sons, Edgar A. Jr., of Washington and Thomas L., of McLean, Va.

PENNSYLVANIA SUPPORT FOR REPEAL OF UTILITY EXEMPTION FROM THE TRUTH-IN-LENDING ACT

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on October 13, Senator Scott and I introduced S. 3018, to repeal the unfair exemption from the provisions of the Truth-in-Lending Act now enjoyed by utilities. As I pointed out in my introductory remarks, this exemption was never discussed in hearings on truth in lending, but rather was added to the legislation in conference, in acquiescence to the powerful utility lobby.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a recent front-page editorial from Building and Realty Record, a Pennsylvania publication, objecting to this discriminatory treatment of the oil heat and other industries and supporting repeal of that exemption as we have proposed.

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

ELECTRIC & GAS UTILITIES

(By S. Beryl Lush)

The electric and gas utilities are exempt from the Truth-in-Lending act.

The oil heat industry is not.

As the law now stands it penalizes the independent businessman—and favors the utilities.

Truth-in-lending legislation was before the Congress for many years prior to passage of the Consumers Credit Protection act of 1968. When the bill was passed they snuck in a clause whereby the utilities were exempt.

The reason is obvious! Most people believe that when they get the bill from the electric or gas company they get a discount when they pay within 20 days.

Thus a bill for \$4.42 carries an imaginary discount if paid within 20 days.

This would make the actual cost \$4.10 and not \$4.42.

But what are the facts?

When you are billed a net and a gross amount depending upon whether the bill is paid before or after a specific date, it is not a discount from the bill for prompt payment as many people believe.

The amount you owe is really the net sum.

The Gross Sum is a Charge for Credit!

Thus the 32c charge in this case makes an interest rate of 142% per annum.

No wonder the utilities fought tooth and nail not to be included in "truth in lending."

If the truth were known the people would be justly disturbed.

The Utility companies run very little risk on late bills, because no one wants to risk having the service cut off.

We know of no other business that has such a club to hold over the head of their slow paying customers.

Where there are late payment penalties they would be regulated under State law, but very little attention is paid to the subterfuge of an imaginary discount which carries a hidden penalty of interest at the rate of 142%.

A bill has now been introduced to repeal the exemption of utilities—but the chances are good that the utility lobby will let it die with the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Utilities are supposed to be regulated by State agencies and the rates are approved by these agencies.

But this approval does not call for penalty allowances. The utilities get around that by billing gross and net.

They have no right to bill gross, as the net charge is the actual amount due.

The difference between the gross and net is the interest for delayed payment and, assuming they are entitled to some interest, how by the stretch of imagination can they have the nerve to charge 142%?

And no regulation is in effect to hinder this charge.

In addition, the poor consumer relishes the idea that he is getting a discount when in fact he is getting nothing.

We have nothing against our utilities. In fact we own stock in them. But when an injustice appears our duty is to reveal it.

GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues a letter I received from a constituent. This letter again, I think, exemplifies the fact that normal, every-day people can probably express themselves better than the rest of us on a subject of vital importance to all of us. In this instance, Mrs. Weyrauch has said so well what she and her husband believe and think about the pros-

pects of a guaranteed annual income of \$5,500. As for me, I find it most difficult to argue with her. I commend her for her very brief and exacting explanation. I particularly call your attention to her remarks regarding work:

TOGA, N. DAK.,
December 3, 1959.

Mr. KLEPPE: I have just finished listening to the Huntley-Brinkley report on TV. I am writing you regarding the demonstration in progress urging Mr. Nixon to pass legislation guaranteeing everyone a minimum income of \$5,500 yearly, plus free food stamps. What is this country coming to, that people have the idea that someone else owes them a living? Have they not heard of an old-fashioned project called work? My husband listened to this report on TV tonight, and made the remark that if the government would put out a guarantee of \$5,500, why should he work? I believe a huge majority of people have this same idea. I do not mean to say that people should go hungry, as a child, I know my parents got commodities from the government; sacks of potatoes, onions, oranges, etc. We did not go hungry. Nowadays, I see people using food stamps to buy steaks, frozen TV dinners and fresh coconuts, for example, while I buy hamburger and macaroni to feed my family. As for the housing a lot of these people live in, granted it is terrible, but do they try to improve it? Soap and water is cheap, and a can of paint goes a long ways if a person has the ambition to use it. My family lives in a house that two rooms were built by home-steaders to this state. It is clean, warm and comfortable. Even if you should provide the majority of these people new housing, would they furnish upkeep on it, or say in 10 years, would it look exactly the way the tenements do now? It is very discouraging to work for a living, and then hand over part of it to someone else who is too lazy to hold a job. Anyone can have hard luck, due to illness or accident—and temporarily need a helping hand. These are not the people who are demonstrating and constantly demanding more for nothing. These are the people who make a career out of being lazy leeches who want someone else to support them.

I urge you to do something in Congress to clean up this welfare mess.

Sincerely,

Mrs. FRANK WEYRAUCH.

A GREAT PATRIOT

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, we are sometimes prone to think of too many Americans as being self-seeking; to feel that too many disdain our Government, and that the love and respect of the very symbol of our liberty—the flag—has been too often trampled underfoot.

There is an opposite side to this picture, Mr. Speaker. This brighter side is epitomized by a great patriot from my own hometown in Ocala. I speak of Mr. Herb Romines, who 21 years ago as he traveled about Florida, suddenly realized how very few flags were flying and determined to do something about it.

Since that day, 21 years ago, Mr. Romines has personally donated 386 flag poles in Florida, from Miami to Tallahassee. Not content with donating the flag poles, Mr. Romines has personally helped in the actual installation of the poles.

I know the various schools, Little League ball clubs, and the many civic

and fraternal organizations which have received these flag poles, will join with me in paying tribute to Herb Romines as a great and truly patriotic American.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID R. COKER

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a great South Carolinian was honored recently, and I would like to make note of this occasion. Coker Life Science Building, located on the University of South Carolina campus, was named in honor of Mr. David R. Coker, one of the finest citizens our State has produced. The dedication remarks were made by Hon. R. Beverley Herbert, Sr., an able lawyer from Columbia. The remarks adeptly portray Mr. Coker as the type of man who makes this country great.

Mr. David Coker was an able and courageous man who contributed greatly to the progress of South Carolina and the Nation. Members of his family are equally distinguished. He married the daughter of the Honorable Daniel Roper, who served as Secretary of Commerce under President Franklin D. Roosevelt. His son, Robert R. Coker, is one of the foremost plant breeders in the country, and an estimable and highly esteemed citizen. His other children and his grandchildren are also talented and gifted citizens.

Mr. David R. Coker is a man whom we in South Carolina and the South held in high esteem and admiration, and are pleased that he was our own. He will be long remembered as a distinguished citizen who rendered great service to his State and Nation. During his lifetime, I was honored to know him and to claim him as a friend. I am also proud to claim the friendship of his distinguished son, Robert R. Coker, and of other members of the Coker family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks by Mr. Herbert eulogizing Mr. David Coker at the dedication ceremony, and those of Mr. Robert Coker in response, be included in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COKER LIFE SCIENCE BUILDING

(Remarks of R. B. Herbert, September 1969)

We are met here today to name and dedicate this splendid and useful building. It is named Coker Life Science Building in honor of David R. Coker who was a graduate of this University in 1891 and was a trustee of the University from 1911 until his death in 1938. He was Chairman of the Board at the time of his death.

The Board of Trustees and the President are to be congratulated on their honoring one of its greatest alumni and a truly great man and at the same time of honoring and perpetuating the name of the Coker family of which David R. Coker was a member. The Coker family and David R. Coker believed in South Carolina and have helped to make it a great State, and this University does well to perpetuate their name and example. I have sometimes wondered if we sufficiently appreciate and honor our home people. The Cokers have been remarkable for many splendid qualities, and one of the most notable

is that they have found in South Carolina the conditions and products they needed for success, and it is therefore peculiarly appropriate that their name should be honored in their State.

David R. Coker was the son of Major James Lide Coker of Hartsville, who, when I came to South Carolina seventy years ago, was known as the great man of the PeeDee. Although terribly wounded and left a cripple by the Civil War and living in a country that was left prostrate by the War, Major Coker built a career that any man might envy. He became a highly successful trader and farmer. He raised a family of distinguished children. He helped his oldest son, James Lide Coker, Jr., found Sonoco Products, one of the great corporations of America. He helped his second son, David R. Coker, develop the Coker Seed business, and he helped his third son, William C. Coker, to become the great botanist of the University of North Carolina. He built a railroad into Hartsville, and he founded and endowed Coker College—some achievements for a man left a cripple in a desolate country. Perhaps greater than any or all of these and more important was Major Coker, the man. Countless people have been influenced for good by him and by people who he influenced. If I may say a personal word, my old friend Judge Woods, the greatest man I ever knew, used to talk more about Major Coker than anyone else. He told me the most important things any of us do are not some achievements on some great occasion but are things we do as a matter of course, the standards we set from day to day and he cited Major Coker.

David R. Coker was the second son of Major Coker. After he graduated at this College in 1891, he clerked for a time in his father's store and became a humble farmer and learned the problems of the farmer and cotton grower. He learned as tens of thousands of other farmers had done how hard it was for our farmers to make a living, the small yield, the short staple and poor price of the crop and he set out to do something about it. Let us consider for a moment the courage of this man who at the turn of the century was starting out to grow a better product for a better price. He relied only on intelligence and hard work and endless care in his seed breeding experiments. He had not long been at his work when he was faced with a crisis. An invader more ruthless than Sherman's Army crossed the Rio Grande River without sound of trumpet or beat of drum and came steadily northward and eastward destroying the South's great money crop as it came—the Mexican boll weevil. It is doubtful if any agricultural people ever faced such complete destruction of their money crop. The weevil came at the rate of about fifty miles per year, and I well remember that the Governor of South Carolina and associates visited the boll weevil area and came back and reported they traveled a whole day and did not see a single cotton bloom.

What did David Coker do? Did he give up as many thousands did? Not only did he not give up, he redoubled his efforts. The plight of the Southern cotton planter became to him the plight of David R. Coker and he risked his all. He not only continued to improve his seed, to grow a tougher longer staple, a tougher boll, but he circulated information in every way he could how to plant and grow cotton and poison boll weevils.

Then came on top of the boll weevil the depression years and bank failures, and Dave Coker's brother, J. L. Coker, Jr., in true Coker fashion, knowing his difficulties came to him and said "When you go broke, I go broke."

There is no more dramatic story in America than how he strove and he won. When he started his work, the staple South Carolina was growing was less than an inch long; today 90 per cent of it is over an inch long. The yield then was 159 pounds of lint cotton per acre; today by the last Clemson report,

it is 443 pounds, nearly three times as much and David R. Coker is the man who wrought the change.

The University of North Carolina Press has published a book entitled "The Cokers of Carolina" by Mr. Simpson. Two of the Coker family were eminent professors at that University. I wish that book could be made required reading in our schools in South Carolina. It is a good book. I do not find but one thing in it I would change. It says in effect the great success of the Cokers has been due to fair dealing and technical skill. I would add as a third—invisible courage. They like Columbus "sail on" when lesser men stop.

David Coker was a great man and his widow, who we are fortunate to have with us today, is a great lady. Every measurement I can put on Dave Coker gives but one answer—greatness. In an excellent paper about him, Mr. A. L. M. Wiggins quotes Dr. Douglas Freeman who wrote the biographies of George Washington and General Lee and knew greatness when he saw it, he said David R. Coker "was one of the half-dozen inately great men I ever had the honor of knowing." As long as South Carolina continues to produce such men and the University keeps their example before our people, we shall have a great State. It is a splendid thing that this building carries his name.

Having been privileged to know Mr. David Coker and having read much about what he did and said, I have asked myself wherein his greatness lay.

His greatness lay in his consuming passion to lift the South Carolina and Southern farmer out of the drab poverty-stricken life he had been leading and set him on the high road to prosperity and happiness. He had proved to himself it could be done and he wanted to give it to the world. The great heart of this truly great man beat for his fellow man.

I am sure he must have been internally a very happy man because he was being used for a very great purpose.

This University could not possibly do better than to hold up his example to her people.

REMARKS OF ROBERT R. COKER AT DEDICATION CEREMONIES OF THE DAVID R. COKER LIFE SCIENCES BUILDING, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA, COLUMBIA, S.C., SEPTEMBER 9, 1969

Mr. Herbert, Chairman Osborne and members of the Board of Trustees, President Jones, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen: For myself and the other children of David R. Coker; for Mrs. May Roper Coker, his widow who shared in full measure his dreams and aspirations and who, as his co-worker, walked faithfully by his side during many years of humanitarian and scientific endeavor; for his grandchildren and great grandchildren; for his relatives beyond the immediate family; for the family members of his colleagues and contemporaries in scientific plant breeding; for his successors who carry on the work in the company he founded; for all these I bespeak profound and humble gratitude to the trustees and administration of this institution for their decision to memorialize, in this center of learning, the life and work of the one whom we loved, whose memory we cherish, and whose heritage and tradition are our constant inspiration.

When a great university honors the memory of one of its sons by giving his name to a building dedicated to the discipline to which he gave himself, it is his family, most of all, who is moved by that decision; for it is we who knew him best, who loved him most, who more than any others were influenced by his counsel, and who were most inspired by his spirit of selfless devotion to the great cause to which he committed his talents and gave the full measure of his

mental and physical energies. We are, therefore, deeply moved by the events of this day, by the gracious words which have been spoken, and by the thought that this building shall memorialize in perpetuity, through succeeding generations of students and teachers, the spirit and work of David Robert Coker.

It is impossible, of course, for brick and mortar to capture the spirit of a man. But it is possible for a building of brick and mortar to be so dedicated to learning and service, and for those who pursue learning within its walls to be so imbued with the desire to know and to share that knowledge with their fellowman, that the building itself shall come alive with the spirit of the one whose name it bears.

It is our sincere hope, indeed our prayer, that the Coker Life Sciences Building shall be such a place; that within these walls the students of this and succeeding generations shall so apply themselves to the principles of scientific learning, and so go from here with a desire to make their learning serve the cause of human progress, as to make this building, its classrooms, its lecture halls, and its laboratories a continuing center from which enlightened minds and dedicated spirits go to serve all mankind.

In so doing, it will do more than honor the memory of a man. Far more importantly, it will be a lasting interpretation of the spirit of education and service itself. It will build character as it expands knowledge; it will grow men as it furthers learning; it will enlighten man's spirit as it stimulates his curiosity and cultivates his intellect. This was the combination my father sought to achieve in his life, and for which we, the members of his family, are indebted as his heritage.

Again, we are deeply grateful for this memorial tribute to him on the campus of the university where, as a student, he found added stimulation to that obtained from his father before him to make the life sciences the commitment of his life, and through their discipline a life service to his native and beloved South.

"SESAME STREET"

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, 1 month ago today, American educational TV commenced the daily broadcast of a children's educational program which is fast proving itself as an invaluable learning tool for millions of this Nation's preschool children.

I refer to a program called "Sesame Street," a creative, enjoyable, and well-planned ETV production, which began a 26-week series on more than 170 television stations throughout the country on November 10.

"Sesame Street" is the product of a unique cooperative effort undertaken about 2 years ago by the U.S. Office of Education, the Carnegie Corp., and the Ford Foundation. The three organizations determined that extensive television viewing consumed a substantial portion of a child's day. Indeed, they learned that most young children were exposed to television for about 50 or 60 hours per week—that is quite an audience, when you consider that more than 96 percent of all American homes have at least one television set.

Based on this evidence, the cooperating organizations created the Children's

Television Workshop, to research and develop an experimental series of programs which would educate young children and help make them more receptive to learning and more eager to learn. "Sesame Street," designed and produced for the preschool youngster, is one of many laudable results of this effort—developed over an extended period of intensive research into what children react to, how they learn, what their minds retain, and how they are able to apply what they have learned to specific situations. Among the show's many features are exercises with letters, words, and numbers, as well as with impressive personal and social values, which are enlivened by a cast of human and illustrated characters.

Not long ago, Mr. Speaker, the executive director of the Children's Television Workshop, Mrs. Joan Ganz, appeared before a subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee to discuss the educational potential of American television. Mrs. Ganz related the sorry facts that half of the Nation's school districts have no kindergartens and that only about one out of every four children from so-called disadvantaged neighborhoods are exposed to social services in any way educative.

The Education Committee has undertaken extensive hearings relative to the educational needs of our elementary and secondary schools for the 1970's. It is hoped that "Sesame Street" will provide a model for some of the committee's considerations.

"Sesame Street" and projects like it, whether commercial or noncommercial, can have a very large role in preparing our children during the new decade to face the challenges of learning and the challenges of life. This is public service in its highest state.

BUSINESS BARRELS TOWARD A TRILLION DOLLAR ECONOMY

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been calling attention in my public speeches to the fact that the United States is headed toward a trillion dollar economy by next year.

I have pointed out time and again that this phenomenal growth has created many of our social problems and that these problems must be met.

I have stressed the need for intensified and vastly expanded education to produce the skilled manpower that this Nation will need to sustain a trillion dollar gross national product.

On many occasions, some doubting colleagues challenged my confidence in the future in America and some even accused me of exaggerating our fantastic growth.

I am including in the RECORD today an article which appeared in the November issue of Nation's Business which shows how this Nation is headed toward a trillion dollar economy.

I am pleased that this very prestigious business publication confirms what I have been saying for a long time.

I am even more pleased to have been a Member of this Congress during the past 11 years and have participated in many landmark legislative decisions which have brought America to this fantastic pinnacle of economic growth.

All of us who have served in the Congress during this past decade can take great pride in having been partners in his magnificent and enormous growth of our Nation.

But this is only the beginning. While it took us almost 19 decades as a nation to reach a trillion dollar GNP, our Nation's wealth will more than double in the decade of the 1970's.

By 1980, I have every reason to believe that America's GNP will surpass the \$2 trillion mark.

It is important for us in Congress to realize that this fantastic growth will bring problems never anticipated by civilization and we as responsible legislators should begin to start addressing ourselves to these problems today.

As we anticipate this fantastic growth during the next 120 months, it would be my hope that much of the petty and meaningless debate which so frequently divides us in this Congress would be set aside and that we—as Americans—would address ourselves to a realization of the problems ahead.

In this next decade we can bring about the fulfillment of man's eternal dream—the hope to stamp out want, destruction, brutality, and conflict.

We shall make discoveries in medicine and environmental health never before dreamed of by the human mind.

The article which I am enclosing in the Record today clearly demonstrates the degree of achievement that the human animal is capable of projecting and is indeed a prelude of what enormous opportunities lie ahead for our Nation and mankind so long as we remain—above all—free and resolute.

The article follows:

THE 1970'S: BUSINESS BARRELS TOWARD A TRILLION DOLLAR TOMORROW

The big American Airlines 727 jet roared at dusk into Washington's National Airport. Only 65 minutes earlier, it had taken off from Boston.

As the plane braked to a halt, a safety-belted businessman peered out a window and turned to a companion.

"Everywhere you go," he said, "you see the same thing. . . ."

He gestured toward a massive new airport terminal wing being built for TWA.

"Either tearing down, or building up."

He had summed up a major quality of American business in the 70's: Change—highlighted by growth.

Much of it will be due to America's two greatest resources—technology and an educated people.

John Diebold, whom many credit with coining the word automation, points out:

"Half the research conducted in the United States since the republic was founded has been crowded into the last eight years. And 90 per cent of the scientists who ever lived, live today.

FASTER AND FASTER

The result: a highly technical, sophisticated society, its foot on the gas pedal, traveling at an ever faster clip.

Here are some statistics which show where we stand today, and how far we will go in the next 10 years.

In 1969, our gross national product will reach \$932 billion, according to financial consultant Louis J. Paradiso, former assistant director of the Commerce Department's Office of Business Economics.

Next year, the National Planning Association estimates, it will be more than \$1 trillion. By the decade's end, NPA says, it will be nearly \$2 trillion in then-current dollars.

In 1969, 81 million Americans held jobs. By 1980, close to 100 million will. The increase alone nearly equals the entire population of Canada.

In 1969, we're spending \$580 billion on food, fun, health, housing, education and other personal items. By 1980, we'll spend almost \$1.2 trillion.

But we'll be able to afford it.

At the end of the 70's, nearly one third of the nation's families will be in the \$10,000 a year bracket and up—in 1969 dollars. They will receive more than half the national income.

That's growth. It will help business.

Change will hurt as well as help.

Change means three Japanese firms, Canon, Inc., Hayakawa Electric Co., Ltd., and Tokyo Shibaura Electric Co., Ltd., grabbing off a big share of the U.S. market for calculators. It means Volkswagen selling more than 500,000 German-made autos a year in the country where the Tin Lizzie was born.

But it also means IBM cornering a large part of the world market for computers.

HIGH ON TECHNOLOGY

That's the recent past. The future will mean an even more rapid ebb and flow in markets and products.

In this environment, well-run, high technology firms will flourish, experts say.

But some other companies will fall by the wayside. In the 60's, scores of the big, well-known American companies disappeared. Some are just names on corporate headstones. Most were swallowed up in mergers.

The accompanying table (pages 30-31) summarizes how major American industries will fare in the next decade. It tells what their output is now (based on latest available figures) and what it will be in 1980.

It gives also their average annual rate of growth in the 70's.

The table was adapted from the National Planning Association's "National Economic Projections Series."

From the evidence, America won't have enough workers, skilled and unskilled, to do all it wants to do.

Today, the U.S. population totals about 204 million. In 1980, it will be some 235 million.

With few dissents, most forecasters see American prosperity hitting new peaks in the 70's.

Arthur Okun of Brookings Institution, a chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers during the Johnson Administration, says:

"I think we're going to stay on a high growth path. We're going to have to try to solve the problem of inflation. And I think we're going to."

A FLATTER BUSINESS CYCLE

NPA economist Morris Cobern notes his Association's forecast assumes the economy will have a real growth rate of 4.4 per cent a year. It adds 2.7 per cent a year for inflation, which it expects to ease, but not stop.

"Our Future Business Environment," a General Electric Co. study based on the views of "upwards of 100 of this country's best thinkers" on social, political and economic trends, says economic stabilization is expected to be a hallmark of the next decade.

"There is now widespread agreement," it says, "on the prediction of a further flattening of the business cycle. Whereas in the 15 years, 1949-64, the unemployment rate had a five-point swing, from a low of 2.5 per cent to a high of 7.5 per cent, the next 15 years

may see the swing kept within a 1-1.5 point range, at a level of about 3-4.5 per cent.

"Again, whereas post-World War II recessions have averaged 10 per cent cutbacks in industrial production, future declines are expected to be only half as deep."

It adds that large-scale unemployment "has become too great a political liability for any Administration to tolerate for long." And it also cites these new factors which tend to keep factories running and people at work:

Technology and automation, which involve long-range programs and high fixed overhead, and place a premium on stable production.

Computerized inventory control, which helps to narrow wide swings in the inventory-sales ratio.

A new kind of labor force, with more and more men and women in white collar jobs where layoffs are fewer.

Higher unemployment compensation, plus company-paid supplemental unemployment benefits, which make layoffs more costly.

UNPARALLELED PROSPERITY

All this helps add up to unparalleled prosperity.

U.S. per capita income, now \$3,420 a year, will be \$6,340 in 1980, NPA says.

If this outlook sounds unduly rosy, a look back may put it in perspective.

In the last 10 years, one authority points out, "this nation has doubled the value of its annual output of goods and services.

"What we now produce in a month (\$78 billion) approaches in value the total annual output in 1939—or even 1929."

Will only corporate giants be able to survive in this new decade? Jesse W. Markham, Harvard Business School professor of business administration, thinks not.

"Actually," he says, "the number of businesses big and small tends to grow roughly at the same rate as the population." That means that small businesses will continue to outnumber corporations about 10 to one.

In 1966, the last year for which Internal Revenue Service has statistics, 1,468,725 U.S. corporations filed returns, compared to 9,088,714 proprietorships and 922,680 partnerships.

THE CLIMATE IS CHANGING

There will be some sweeping changes in the climate, at home and abroad, in which American businesses will operate.

Domestically, our rising affluence, economic growth and higher and higher level of education will be major influences.

Just as in the 60's, new industries will rise or mature in the 70's.

Prof. Kenneth R. Andrews, chairman of Harvard Business School's Advanced Management Program, sees industry taking over many tasks once considered government's private preserve—for example, in health services, in social service functions such as operating day care centers, and in education, especially vocational or technical.

Prof. John G. Kemeny of Dartmouth College foresees a national network of large time-sharing computer systems, comparable to today's public utilities. They could be used, among other ways, to match jobseekers with job openings in an entire city or region; to help would-be college students find colleges which want applicants, and to replace costly private and public libraries with an electronic reference service.

SMALL WORLD

American business will operate in an expanding economy, but a shrinking world.

"The impact on world trade will be tremendous when we get new aircraft like the C5A," predicts Harvard Business School Prof. John Glover. "Mozambique will then be closer to Boston than Chicago was in 1940.

"The total cost of air transport will be so cheap that it will cost a German manufacturer less to roll an auto aboard a plane and fly it to St. Louis than to load it on a

truck or train, carry it to a port or dock, put it on an oceangoing cargo carrier, take it off at New York City, then ship it overland.

"Our old natural tariff barriers—distance and cost of handling and shipping goods—will disappear."

Experts predict a great upsurge in U.S. world trade. Today, Americans are importing goods made abroad at annual rate of \$35.3 billion, and exports come to \$36 billion. By 1980, some experts say, annual imports will be \$90 billion, but our net exports will top that by \$15 billion.

Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans is a bit more cautious. He says, "Our exports could be close to \$100 billion by 1980."

"To do this, of course, we need a great deal of successful negotiating to reduce trade restrictions and provide for orderly markets."

As for the American economy as a whole, the Secretary says:

"We have every reason to expect a substantial growth in the 70's, provided that we manage our economic affairs properly, and don't allow inflation to get out of hand again."

"If we do that, we can operate at a high level of prosperity with a high level of employment."

"But to finance this growth will take money. We must see that our tax laws don't inhibit capital formation. That's why the bill recently passed by the House is unfortunate. It taxes industry too heavily."

"For progress in the 70's, we must find ways to reduce taxes on corporations and permit the capital growth that is necessary."

"After all, it is American enterprise that has given us everything we have now. If we encourage it, it can give us about anything we want."

GROSS PRODUCT BY INDUSTRY—THE NATIONAL PLANNING ASSOCIATION, LOOKING INTO THE DECADE AHEAD, SEES THIS

[Billions of dollars]

Industry	Now	1980	Average annual growth rate percent
Agriculture, forestry, fisheries.....	27.2	28.5	0.4
Farms.....	25.0	24.9	0
Agricultural services, fisheries.....	2.2	3.6	4.3
Mining.....	14.2	20.2	2.9
Metal mining.....	.8	1.9	6.9
Coal mining.....	1.7	1.6	-.7
Crude petroleum, natural gas.....	9.8	13.2	2.5
Nonmetallic mining.....	1.9	3.5	5.3
Contract construction.....	39.5	99.9	8.0
Nondurable goods manufacturing.....	98.7	179.7	5.1
Food.....	23.3	38.9	4.3
Tobacco.....	3.6	5.2	3.0
Textiles.....	7.6	8.2	.6
Apparel.....	8.8	14.6	4.3
Paper.....	8.8	17.0	5.7
Printing.....	11.5	23.9	6.3
Chemicals.....	18.3	41.1	7.0
Petroleum refining.....	7.9	13.3	4.4
Rubber.....	6.6	14.0	6.5
Leather.....	2.4	3.7	3.7
Durable goods manufacturing.....	147.7	324.6	6.8
Lumber.....	5.9	6.6	1.0
Furniture.....	3.7	9.2	7.9
Stone, clay, glass.....	7.2	14.1	5.8
Primary metals.....	19.4	33.6	4.7
Fabricated metals.....	15.8	31.5	5.9
Machinery, except electrical.....	25.4	52.4	6.2
Electrical machinery.....	21.5	55.6	8.2
Transportation equipment (except motor vehicle) plus ordinance.....	18.1	58.3	10.2
Motor vehicles.....	21.0	40.5	5.6
Instruments.....	6.3	17.6	9.0
Miscellaneous manufacturing.....	3.6	5.2	3.1
Transportation.....	34.6	78.9	7.1
Railroads.....	9.3	9.9	0.5
Local plus highway passenger transportation.....	2.9	3.6	1.8
Motor freight transportation.....	12.6	32.5	8.2
Water transportation.....	2.5	3.9	3.6
Air transportation.....	5.2	25.2	14.0
Pipeline.....	0.7	1.2	4.5
Transportation services.....	1.3	2.7	6.3
Communications.....	19.0	49.8	8.4
Telephone plus telegraph.....	17.2	44.3	8.3
Radio plus TV.....	1.8	5.0	8.9
Electric, gas plus sanitary services.....	20.0	50.5	8.0
Wholesale plus retail trade.....	142.2	263.7	5.3
Wholesale trade.....	56.5	111.2	5.8
Retail trade.....	85.7	152.5	4.9
Finance, insurance, real estate.....	117.1	296.4	8.1
Banking.....	13.8	26.9	5.7
Security brokers.....	4.5	12.5	8.8
Insurance carriers.....	8.1	17.7	6.8
Insurance agents.....	3.6	8.9	7.9
Real estate plus combination offices.....	87.3	230.4	8.4
Services.....	95.3	261.2	8.8
Hotels.....	4.9	8.9	5.1
Personal services.....	8.3	15.1	5.1
Miscellaneous business services.....	13.0	51.4	12.1
Auto repair services.....	4.2	12.3	9.3
Miscellaneous repair services.....	2.1	4.0	5.5
Motion pictures.....	1.8	2.6	2.9
Amusements.....	3.9	8.9	7.1
Medical services.....	24.4	66.3	8.7
Legal services.....	5.4	16.8	10.0
Educational services.....	5.9	18.0	9.7
Nonprofit membership organizations.....	8.3	21.1	8.1
Misc. professional services.....	8.5	29.1	10.8
Private households.....	4.6	6.7	3.1
Government plus government enterprises.....	108.0	251.7	7.3
Federal general government.....	39.5	72.5	5.2
Federal government enterprises.....	6.1	8.7	2.9
State plus local general government.....	55.7	153.1	8.8
State plus local government enterprises.....	6.7	17.4	8.3
Total GNP.....	865.7	1,920.1	7.1

LEGAL ACTION TO PROTECT RIGHTS OF STUDENTS

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, back in October, instigators of the Vietnam moratorium promised widespread disruption of classes at universities across the Nation. Their escalating timetable called for 1 day in October, 2 in November, 3 in December, and so on through 8 days in May.

The October event did result in the shutdown of certain universities. But the November and December moratoriums seem to have fizzled out. The 27 days of threatened lockouts simply have failed to materialize. Why?

Perhaps one reason is that the prospect of protracted lawsuits have been made painfully clear to those few college administrators who would accede to radical demands for formal cancellation of classes.

In August, Young Americans for Freedom held its national convention in St. Louis. At that convention, a plan proposing lawsuits for money damages against the universities and their administrators was proposed.

It was pointed out that the U.S. Supreme Court has approved the proposition that the "First amendment rights—are not a license to trample upon the rights of others." Those who demand "free expression have no right to deny to those who disagree with their demonstrations the equal right to express themselves freely at attending classes rather than marching. Nor do the universities have any right to yield to demands for a lockout of the scholarly."

The universities have accepted the students' money. YAF feels that even if only one student demands it, the university must give that one student the education for which he—or his father—paid. When a teacher willfully refuses to show up for a scheduled class, the university has breached its contract. Courts long have held that college catalogs are binding contracts. The schedule of classes printed in the catalog forms a part of the contract.

Legal action already has been taken as a result of isolated class cancellations on October 15. News travels fast in academic circles. No doubt the painful prospects of litigation and publicity had a salutary effect in November and December. Perhaps YAF has succeeded in encouraging certain university administrators not to falter in the exercise of their leadership.

Typical of the nationwide publicity accorded YAF's legal attack on disorder are the following news items:

[From the Sunday Star, Washington (D.C.), Aug. 31, 1969]

LAWYER SUGGESTS TUITION REFUNDS IN CAMPUS DISORDERS

St. Louis.—A lawyer recommended yesterday that college students sue for a refund of tuition fees for days classes are interrupted by campus disorders.

Maurice R. Franks of New Orleans, legal adviser to the Louisiana delegation to the Young Americans for Freedom convention, said courts have held that a college catalog is a binding contract between the school and its students.

"Whenever the class schedule listed in the catalog is altered, as for example by leftist campus disorders, any student has a right to sue to compel refunds to all students of tuition for the days on which classes were interrupted," he told a news conference.

He said he would place his proposal before the convention today during a panel on YAF's legal attack on the new left.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Oct. 5, 1969]

TUITION REFUND POSSIBLE—YAF STUDENTS CAN SUE WHEN CLASS INTERRUPTED, VIEW

Tuition-paying college students have a right to demand refunds if their education is denied by class disruption, representatives of the Louisiana Young Americans for Freedom said here Friday.

YAF spokesmen declared at the Press Club of New Orleans that the parents of disruptors who are minors are legally responsible for any damages caused by their children.

The press conference conducted here was one of several held across the nation by the YAF Friday to alert students and parents of the possible legal consequences of student disruption on the campus.

The time is ripe for massive lawsuits against certain universities, according to Maurice R. Franks, legal adviser to the Louisiana YAF.

Under a 1968 federal court decision in Louisiana, he said, "College officials have a legal duty to expel students for attending meetings of groups conspiring to breach the peace."

Franks added that other federal appeals court decisions and the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution "are not a license to trample on the rights of others" and that any unlawful obstruction which denies the majority of students the right to attend classes for which they paid "constitutes illegal interference with the contract between the students and their university."

YAF representatives from Tulane, Loyola and Louisiana State University in New Orleans attended the conference.

Franks called a college catalog a binding contract between the students and the university.

He said that whenever the class schedule listed in the catalog is altered, "as for example by leftist campus disorders, any student has the right to sue to force a tuition refund to each and every student for the days on which classes were interrupted."

Franks said that this could amount to a quarter of a million dollars in a short disruption at the larger private universities.

He urged students to file "representative suits" on behalf of their fellow students when disturbances occur.

In the case of public high schools which do not charge tuition, Franks said students should "file for a mandamus to compel the school's leaders to hold classes."

Franks said the national YAF has prepared several briefs to help the student who feels he is being deprived of his education by class disruption but that the YAF does not file suits or act for the student in such cases.

[From the Dyersburg (Tenn.), Mirror, Oct. 16, 1969]

HIT WHERE IT HURTS

One of the sidelights of the campus coding of disruptive demonstrators in recent years is the drop in donations to colleges and universities. The normal level of contributions from graduates to their alma maters has declined in many instances, and the rea-

son frequently cited has been the failure of school administrators to punish those who use destruction and obstruction as a means of registering their grievances.

No matter what the cause, graduates are not going to give their dollars to a college only to see a mob of radicals tear down its facilities, go scot-free and be readmitted for a repeat performance. We cannot fault this logic. We are of course, not discussing legitimate protest by law-abiding students. We limit these observations to the wrecking crews and sit-in types who disrupt the studies of other students.

The Young Americans for Freedom (YAF), a campus-oriented, conservative group, recently held its national convention in St. Louis. One of the programs proposed by the group was a legal action plan to be taken against radical student groups and the college and university administrations that take no steps to halt disruptive actions.

Maurice R. Franks of New Orleans, legal adviser to the Louisiana YAF delegation, stated that college catalogs have been held by the courts to be binding contracts between the school and its students and, as such would justify suit against the school by students whose class meetings are interrupted by campus disorder.

Mr. Franks said: "Whenever the class schedule listed in the catalog is altered, as for example by leftist campus disorders, any student has a right to sue to compel tuition refunds to all students for the days on which classes were interrupted."

We favor the use of legal action to stop the wreckers and their protectors. Perhaps the administrations will begin to understand that there are rights for law-abiding students—notably the right to the education they are paying to get.

There is reason to believe that the SDS is planning to invade more schools in the new academic year with their message of rule or ruin. Perhaps it's time to warn public boards that the right to sue may well extend to taxpayers, whose children lose school sessions due to the coding of offenders.

VIOLENCE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, recent events in Chicago and Los Angeles have demonstrated that violence continues unabated even as we enter into the Christmas season and prepare for a new decade.

Eight of my colleagues and I have asked President Nixon in the light of those recent events to continue the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence in order that it may investigate the running war between some police departments of our Nation and the Black Panthers. I made the request not as judgment, but as a request for an impartial investigation; one which can gain the trust of both sides. There has been no reply yet from the President and it may well be that there will be no reply, or a negative reply. Even so the need for this kind of study, investigation, mediation, and reconciliation is self-evident. If the President does not choose to act, then the Congress in some form must act.

The National Commission on the

Causes and Prevention of Violence has done much to explore and expand our knowledge of the violent side of American life. Marquis Childs in today's Washington Post has outlined the work of the Commission and its Chairman, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, in an excellent article. I ask that this article be reprinted in the RECORD for the benefit of all Members of this House. The article demonstrates why the Commission should be continued.

Mr. Childs also points to the Commission's excellent work on the causes and prevention of violence on the campuses. His comments, and the Commission's work, are particularly applicable to my home State of California. I recommend all Californians study the underlying cause of campus unrest. They are far different than one might believe if one listens to some Californians who have political stake in continuing violence on campus.

I would hope the Commission will be continued. It could do further valuable work, and there are areas where its efforts are sorely needed. If this healing work is not done, we will face a bleak future.

We must in the next decade come to grips with the problem of violence in America and overcome it.

The article follows:

VIOLENCE COMMISSION PROVIDES ACCURATE STORY OF DIVIDED U.S.

(By Marquis Childs)

In the babble of angry and excited voices rising from every quarter the task of separating fact from impassioned prejudice seems hopeless. But even as the clamor has grown there has been a guide to sanity and reason.

The staff reports of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence have in one instance after another put the facts on the line. Demonstrations, the black militants, student rebellion—all the symptoms of upheaval in a time of troubles have been subjected to clear, cool analysis by specialists and scholars. Their conclusions have often been contrary to popular prejudice as they have looked beneath the boiling surface into underlying causes of divisiveness and unrest.

Chairman of the commission for the past year and a half is Milton S. Eisenhower, brother of the late President Dwight Eisenhower.

In assuming a demanding and difficult chore at the age of 69, Milton Eisenhower showed once again the response to public service that has marked his career. As government official, educator and, above all, as close adviser to the President during the eight Eisenhower years, this youngest of the five Eisenhower brothers has dedicated himself to the public good.

In the age of the quick buck and the cynical grab for profit and power, the Eisenhower example—and a host of men and women like him in education, the foundations, at every level of public office—is too seldom noted. As did two of the five brothers, Milton might have gone in for money-making with the rewards so conspicuous in a money-oriented society.

If his name had not been Eisenhower he might have held high public office. As confidant and adviser to President Eisenhower he was content to subordinate himself, keeping out of the news and rarely, if ever, speaking in public. His advice was on the moderate-liberal side, countering, it was reported at the time, the conservative businessmen in the Eisenhower Cabinet. During those years Milton was, first, president of

Pennsylvania State University and then of Johns Hopkins.

Staff reports of the Eisenhower commission do not necessarily reflect the views of the commission itself. A foreword by Chairman Eisenhower in each report specifically states that it is a work of scholarship to be judged on its merits so that the commission as well as the public may benefit from the study and the debate growing out of it. This disclaimer does not, however, lessen the usefulness of the reports.

A recent report deals with the politics of protest and the violent aspects of protest and confrontation. It would be hard to conceive of a touchier subject generating more hostility and prejudice. Nevertheless, the voice of reason comes through clear and strong.

"The overriding issue," the report states, "is whether an educational system can endure without the consent and support of faculty and students and whether such higher authorities as trustees, boards of regents and legislatures can expect tranquility on a campus that is governed on controversial issues by remote authorities whose understanding of academic values is minimal and who are empowered to undercut academic and administrative decisions with which they disagree. Reform of the present condition of university governing boards is a prerequisite to campus order in the future."

Essential, too, the report declares, is the increased participation of students in university decision and policy-making. This last taking hold on campus after campus recovering from painful disorders. It is not an infallible solution but, as the report notes, it is neither realistic nor justifiable to expect students today to be content with second-class citizenship.

Some admirers of the impressive work of the commission have been disturbed by a statement on group violence issued under the imprimatur of the chairman. As a means of coping with right of free speech in violation of the first amendment, the commission recommends giving the federal courts the power, on request of the attorney general or private individuals, to grant injunctions against "threatened or actual interferences" with speech or assembly. The proposed law would also authorize suits for either damages or an injunction by persons believing themselves aggrieved and allow the attorney general to intervene in such suits.

This would put the federal government in the role of policeman and arbiter in disputes without end. It would give the attorney general extraordinary powers and, in light of the record established by the current incumbent, John M. Mitchell, the Congress will want to think twice before any such grant of power.

The long series of reports by the commission, soon to conclude its work, tells the story of divided and disrupted America as it is. To cloud this monumental work, to which seekers after the truth can repair, with a dubious and highly controversial proposal is a disservice to the scholars and specialists who have given so much of their time and effort.

MASSACRE AT MYLAI

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the reports of the alleged massacre at Mylai have stirred the conscience of every American and deeply troubled the people of this Nation, a compassionate people who cherish human life.

The article by Emanuel Goldberg in the Jewish Times of December 4, is a

demonstration of the profound impact that these events have had on a nation founded on the basic principles of humanity and freedom. It is a moving testimony to the desire to preserve these principles, our hopes, and our idealism, and I include it here for the consideration of my colleagues.

[From the Jewish Times, Dec. 4, 1969]

HEAVEN AND HELL AT SONGMY: A PROPOSAL

(By Emanuel Goldberg)

Just before the national moratorium against the Vietnam war, a Valparaiso University professor of government, Dr. Albert Wehling, gave a newspaper interview in which he endorsed "ten moral issues" intimately connected with the participation of the United States in the conflict. He was not a proponent of the demonstrations.

Topmost was his assertion that four Presidents and four secretaries of state had agreed upon our country's commitment under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty and its protocol, "both made to respond to the criminal trespass of international villains."

He repeated President Nixon's assurance that our presence in Vietnam "and the devotion of our troops there in support of our position constitute one of the finest hours in our history." Dr. Wehling also stated that our military forces have fought "under unprecedented orders" not to seek a military victory but "to use every reasonable precaution to protect noncombatants, while fighting an enemy who rejected the laws of war and gave no quarter."

Then came the revelation of the massacre of Songmy—and I wonder if Professor Wehling is having any afterthoughts. The world obviously is and so is every thinking American.

Adequate ventilation of mankind's latest agony has been made by the much-maligned media. Whatever the investigations and trial further bring out will probably do little to ease the initial trauma—for, in microcosm, the merciless slaying of men, women and children by American soldiers in the little South Vietnamese village has the grim, apocalyptic design of the holocaust and the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The religious among us live under the shadow of atonement and eventual punishment for crimes of this magnitude. Even some nonbelievers recognize a threat to self-preservation.

I would like to see the village of Songmy become an international shrine—a hallowed, functioning, dedicated place where a vast hospital and medical research facility, free and available to all who can come, would be built.

Nearby perhaps—an international airport, an agreed upon strip of extraterritoriality, and the place where many visitors could also arrive—to gaze upon a suitable scroll containing each slain person's name, biography and reconstructed likeness. The latter would stress the sacredness of every human life, no matter how humble in origin or defiled—a reminder to the world that there have been societies in which a Zola could write "J'Accuse!" and a Gandhi could starve out the human conscience.

All of this should be financed by America and my only misgiving here is the fear that this nation would be accused of trying to buy off a bad conscience. Nevertheless, the federal government should provide the capital outlay for hospital, research buildings and laboratories, perhaps even a medical school, the airport and other enriching, surrounding institutions that might grow in the future.

The American people—you and I—would be asked to give individual gifts of \$1 or more, annually (for mankind apparently needs constant reminder) to the Village of

Songmy. This would account for operating costs, the wherewithal to provide doctors, nurses, administrators, other staff and equipment designed to offer hope and relief to hundreds, perhaps thousands, of unfortunate persons who would come regularly to the village and begin to recount its name with a gradually changing connotation.

If money mounted and Songmy's installation was well underwritten, others in other lands could spin off and underscore the testament that Americans still cherished their humanity and freedom, and could never forgive themselves (and here I intentionally omit reference to the benighted, criminal soldiers) for what had transpired.

This sort of practical, idealistic action is now needed in our country.

HE DID NOT WANT TO GO INTO THE SERVICE, BUT WHEN HE WAS DRAFTED HE WENT IN TO SERVE HIS COUNTRY TO THE BEST OF HIS ABILITY

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in our congressional district, we have the good fortune to have a very dedicated young man, who has served with outstanding distinction during the Vietnam conflict. The people of Ramsey, N.J., and the State, and the Nation, are very, very proud of his record.

Sgt. Richard S. Polak has demonstrated extraordinary courage in the performance of his duty. He is today New Jersey's most decorated soldier in the conflict. He wears two Silver Stars, two Bronze Stars, three Air Medals, and he has also received the South Vietnamese Gallantry Cross.

The young sergeant is presently an instructor at the Scofield Barracks in Oahu, Hawaii. According to his mother, "Richard didn't want to go into the service any more than anyone else, but when he was drafted he went in to serve his country to the best of his ability." He certainly has. His sense of responsibility to his country and to his fellow servicemen transcended any self-serving actions he might have taken. His courage and realization of duty are in such marked contrast to the comparatively few young men in our country who scurry across our border when they are drafted, or create pockets of revolt in the service.

We salute him and congratulate him on his record, and the example that he has set. I am appending an editorial from the Ridgewood, N.J., Herald News of December 4, 1969, which speaks for itself. Also appended are articles from the Ridgewood Herald News of December 4, 1969, and the New York Sunday News of November 30, 1969.

The materials follow:

[From the Ridgewood Herald, Dec. 4, 1969]

PICTURE OF AMERICA

The nation is now embarked on a long galling journey into shame in the investigation of the alleged atrocities by our soldiers in Vietnam, but no matter what finding issues from the slow-grinding mills of the military, we will declare right now that we

do not associate atrocity with our concept of the typical American youth in war. Our own thoughts tend more toward the words of a mother of a man who has been in action: "He didn't want to be drafted but when he was he went in to serve his country to the best of his ability." This was not merely wish-fulfillment by the mother, because her son is Staff Sergeant Richard S. Polak of Ramsey, who is one of the most decorated soldiers of the unhappy conflict in the Far East.

Neither do we mean to imply that every young man bearing arms is a hero; but we do think that every American tries to do his best, in service and otherwise. The nation, our area and Ramsey may be particularly proud of Sgt. Polak, who has been breath-taking in his deeds. He wears two Silver Stars, two Bronze Stars, three Air Medals and the South Vietnam Gallantry Cross. He achieved aerial distinction, fought off a sally single-handed, almost miraculously destroyed two fortified enemy bunkers when he was under direct fire. No, we cannot expect every soldier to equal the feats of the Don Bosco graduate who won that school's athletic award of the "Iron Man" but we do believe the vast majority of our men in arms is somewhere near Sgt. Polak in spirit at least.

[From the Ridgewood (N.J.) Herald-News, Dec. 4, 1969]

RAMSEY HERO RECEIVES PLAUDITS OF HIS NATION
(By Pat Hall)

RAMSEY.—What makes a hero? Staff Sgt. Richard S. Polak of 58 Lake St. is one. He is winner of two Bronze Stars, two Silver Stars, and three Air Medals as well as the Gallantry Cross with Bronze Star from the Vietnamese government.

"Richard didn't want to go into the service any more than anyone else," says his mother, Mrs. Stanley Polak. "But when he was drafted he went in to serve his country to the best of his ability. I think he has," she added quietly.

The number of medals won by the 22-year-old Don Bosco graduate makes him one of the most decorated servicemen in the county.

The two Bronze Stars were awarded "for heroism and outstanding achievement involving conflict with an armed hostile force in the Republic of Vietnam," according to the citations accompanying the medals.

Each of the Air Medals, issued by direction of the President, commemorated more than 25 aerial missions over hostile territory in support of counterinsurgency operations. "During all these flights he displayed the highest order of air discipline and acted in accordance with the best traditions of the service in spite of inherent hazards," according to the citations.

Staff Sgt. Polak was awarded a Silver Star on June 21 for gallantry. While on a reconnaissance mission, serving as Platoon Sergeant with Company D, 4th Battalion, 39th Infantry, his group was ambushed. After positioning his men for return fire, he was suddenly confronted with two Viet Cong charging his position. According to the citation, "he showed absolute disregard for his own safety by standing up completely exposed to the enemy and eliminating them."

Again, in July, he was awarded the Silver Star. On a reconnaissance mission with Company D, the group came in contact with North Vietnamese soldiers in well fortified bunkers, according to the citation. Repeatedly exposing himself to enemy fire, he destroyed one bunker with an M-72 anti-tank weapon. He crawled 75 meters, again through heavy fire, to a position from which he was able to destroy another bunker with a hand grenade. The Silver Star citation notes extraordinary heroism in close contact with an armed hostile force.

His latest medal, the Gallantry Cross with

Bronze Star, awarded by the government of South Vietnam, cites action in search and destroy operations late last spring. In Dinh Twong province, under enemy fire, Staff Sgt. Polak led his platoon to deliver an assault on the Viet Cong. The citation terms him an "excellent platoon leader with abundant experience in combat, and with exemplary service spirit."

Staff Sgt. Polak entered the army in 1968 with basic training at Fort Dix, advanced training at Fort Polk infantry school in Louisiana and was graduated from Airborne School at Fort Benning, Ga. in November, 1968. He was sent with his outfit, 39th Infantry, 9th Infantry Division to Vietnam, the Mekong Delta area. He has recently been transferred to Scofield Barracks, Oahu, Hawaii, to instruct at the non-commissioned officers school.

Staff Sgt. Polak has a younger brother serving in the Air Force. His father, Stanley Polak served during World War II in the Air Force.

What sort of a boy becomes a war hero? "A typical American boy," according to his father noting the advantages of growing up in this community. Richard liked sports and the tall, brownhaired youth was selected as an "Iron Man", an athletic award given at Don Bosco.

The family is counting the days for his return ("He'll be home 99 days from this past Thanksgiving"), said his mother.

Seated on a hassock, and flanked by two of the family pets, friendly sandy colored dogs, Polak's sister, Eileen, aged 10, speaks of her big brother.

Do you feel proud of Richard? "Oh very proud!"

Do you miss him? "Yes, I do. He used to play with me."

[From the Sunday News, Nov 30, 1969]

RAMSEY MAN BECOMES TOP NEW JERSEY SOLDIER

(By Brian Vachon)

When Staff Sgt. Richard S. Polak of Ramsey received the Silver Star for bravery for action in Vietnam recently the 22-year-old became New Jersey's most decorated soldier in the war.

The Silver Star was Polak's second in his one-year tour of duty in Southeast Asia. He has also received two Bronze Stars, three Air Medals and the Vietnamese Gallantry Cross with Bronze Star.

Polak, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Polak of 58 Lake St., was a draftee and he's uncertain whether to become a career soldier or return to civilian life when his time is up in March.

NOW AN INSTRUCTOR

He is presently an instructor at the Scofield Barracks in Oahu, Hawaii.

In the special order awarding Polak his second Silver Star, which his parents received this week, his actions were described this way:

"Sgt. Polak is awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action involving close combat with an armed hostile force in the Republic of Vietnam. He distinguished himself by exceptionally valorous action on 27 June 1969 while serving as a platoon sergeant with Company D, 4th Bn., 39th Infantry, on a reconnaissance mission. When his lead squadron came in contact with North Vietnamese soldiers in well fortified bunkers.

"Sgt. Polak moved through the murderous hail of rounds to an exposed position in the front of the battle where he destroyed one bunker with an M-72 light anti-tank weapon. Showing complete disregard for his own life, Polak boldly crawled 75 meters through the hostile fusillade to a position from which he was able to destroy another bunker with hand grenades.

"His vallant actions were instrumental in

crushing the enemy force," the order concluded.

"He's alive and we're satisfied," said his father, who ran unsuccessfully last year for the Assembly on the Conservative ticket. "He figured when he was drafted it was his job to serve his country and do the best job he could. But who would have expected this?"

IS OUR FLAG WORTH THE TROUBLE?

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Sunday Knoxville, Tenn., News-Sentinel, I read what I consider the best letter I have ever seen written by a representative of young America. Miss Kay Lovett's statements are penetrating and thought provoking, and I only wish that all high school and college students in this country could have the opportunity to hear what she has to say about our flag and the meaning of this great country.

Her letter follows:

DOYLE HIGH SENIOR ASKS: IS OUR FLAG WORTH THE TROUBLE?

EDITOR, THE NEWS-SENTINEL: An article appears in the newspaper entitled, "New Look on Campus: Stark Naked Flagpole", and continues with, "The U. of Penn., fearing a confrontation with student war protesters, has lowered its American flags and placed them in storage . . ."

When the people of America are afraid to fly the emblem of their heritage, it is a sad commentary on the sacrifices of our forefathers. It is shameful easy way out of bowing to a handful of student protestors. In a situation of this kind, surrender is much simpler than fighting, even when fighting for what is right.

If our ancestors had yielded so effortlessly, perhaps the United States would never have been created, and the colonies would still be bound to Great Britain by the invisible chains of slavery. To many people of the Twentieth Century, the names Bunker Hill, Saratoga, and Valley Forge are merely words in a history book. Have the bold endeavors of the American colonists been so carelessly obliterated from our memories?

The American Flag represents all the struggles of our ancestors to attain the wealth we enjoy today. This wealth is not measured in terms of riches and money, but it refers to the rights and freedoms so precious that thousands of our forefathers sacrificed their lives so that future generations might inherit them.

When we salute the Flag, we are honoring much more than a colorful piece of cloth with 50 stars and 13 stripes upon it. We are recognizing the sweat, blood, and tears of the many devoted men and women who helped build our great nation to remarkable heights. The American people should not sit back and allow various organizations and individuals to slowly but steadily erode all these efforts commemorated in one noble symbol of national honor.

When an American sees his country's Flag, he should think about its true meaning and feel in his heart a throb of loyalty, courage, and dedication to freedom of mankind. Like our ancestors, one should be proud to exhibit this banner, instead of thinking, "What does it matter to me?" When one has this kind of attitude and is afraid or ashamed to fly the Flag of the United States, he is no longer a true American.

Hopefully the time will come (with God's help) when the Star-Spangled Banner will again wave "o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

KAY LOVETT,
Senior, Doyle High School.

THE TRAGEDY AT MYLAI 4

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of Mylai 4, like so much that has surrounded our existence in the war, has raised many questions. However, this incident more than any one event of our involvement, has raised a question that we cannot let pass with the mere statement that it was the alleged decision of a single man.

Rather, it brings us irrefutably to the reality which is war.

This reality was recently discussed in an exceptionally fine editorial in the Westbury Times, an important weekly newspaper in the Third Congressional District that has gained a strong and consistent following among its readers. Mr. Martin E. Weiss, the outstanding editor and publisher, and a man whom I have had the good fortune of knowing for a long time, approaches the tragedy of Mylai 4 in a manner deserving of all our attention. He deftly discusses the breadth and depth and impact of this event, an impact which we know is far greater than the appalling tragedy of the wanton destruction of so many lives.

I, therefore, would like to take this opportunity to extend my remarks to include this editorial in the RECORD:

THE TRAGEDY AT MYLAI 4

The alleged massacre at Songmy, and there would seem to be enough confirmation that it is fact, brings up far more than the legal question as to whether the lieutenant already charged, and those who may have participated, can adequately be judged.

We will, at some point, have to define war. And this, even in its simplest terms, will be difficult.

The focus of the tragedy at Mylai 4, one of the six Songmy hamlets, is 1st Lt. William L. Calley, Jr., who is charged with having ordered the death of anywhere from 100 to 370 Vietnamese living in what the Army has labelled as "Pinkville".

Everyone is suddenly "shocked" and "sick" over what Lt. Calley's orders may have caused.

So are we at the reported deaths of men, women and children by American bullets—but we can be no less concerned over this specific brutality than we can over the random destruction which has been visited over both North and South Vietnam by the indiscriminate bombing and shelling of such hamlets by American planes, artillery and warships.

Are those who drop the bombs and fire the shells any less guilty than Lt. Calley?

The recent history of warfare has distinguished only lightly between the military and the civilian; we suggest that though this is where the error lies, it is impossible, because of the nature of such warfare, for troops in the field to distinguish between "right" and "wrong".

Let us say that if the charges against Lt.

Calley are correct, the first platoon of Company C, 1st Battalion of the 11th Infantry Brigade's 20th Regiment, engaged in an action which was, at best, criminal.

However, how can we reasonably delineate the charge against this platoon without indicting all of our forces in Vietnam? Or all of the U.S. troops who fought in Korea? Or all of the Americans who battled in World War II?

The fact is that we have suddenly been confronted by a reality of war—and it is war itself, not individuals, which must answer.

History has given us siege and starvation; history has given us slaughter on the battlefield and subjugation by force; history has given us the martyrs of Rome and those destroyed in a moment at Hiroshima; history has given us a generation emaciated at Verdun and the fact of genocide as practiced by Nazi Germany.

Songmy is but a moment in the chronicle of man's inhumanity to man. It is a chronicle which will end only when we learn to live in peace.

ARCHBISHOP IAKOVOS OF GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH VISITS LATIN AMERICA

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, the primate of the Greek Orthodox Church in North and South America, Archbishop Iakovos, recently traveled to five Latin American countries, where he visited Greek Orthodox parishes in 17 cities of Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Brazil.

Upon his return, Archbishop Iakovos released a statement commenting upon his impressions of his Latin American tour.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting this statement, made on November 24, 1969, at this point in the RECORD:

ARCHBISHOP IAKOVOS SEES "REVIVED RELIGIOUS FEELING" IN LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES

Upon my return to the United States of America today, I thank the Lord and Glorify His Name for these past thirty days. I have been on a pastoral and missionary tour and study of our Greek Orthodox parishes in five countries in South America—Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, Brazil and Venezuela. Truly, this month has been most rewarding. The experience I gained through my countless contacts with religious, state and civic leaders, in addition to the "ordinary people" and congregations, can be categorized as follows:

(1) There is a revived religious feeling; a definite spiritual thirst for revised and purified religious standards and concepts.

(2) People are becoming more ecumenical minded, less chauvinistic, and are in general most interested in the Church Unity movement. They hope that Churches will be able to do what other institutions (political, social and economic) have failed to achieve. In other words a more enlightened leadership.

(3) They pray that the revolution or crisis which the Church is presently experiencing may result in a renewal of the individual as a believer, with a new, more dynamic interpretation of the Gospel of Christ, the God of love.

(4) They expect, in fact, they demand, that the Church part with the "ceremonial" and embark upon a more activist policy. This will come closer to satisfying the "mod-

ern man" and help to detach him from the vain slogans and the empty verbalism of our times.

(5) They also seem to prefer a good neighbor, rather than an exploiter, freedom instead of protectionism, which in their minds belittles their dignity and offends their sensitivity.

(6) Our neighbors to the south are not anti-United States nor anarchistic. In only one city did I observe anti-American slogans still in use. Latin-Americans are concentrating their efforts on improving their standards of living and elevating their industrial, cultural and academic levels.

(7) There is poverty, even in the richest lands, but it seems to exist for one reason only: to put to shame those of us who are concerned with, yet not brave or determined enough to bring an end to it, through our personal work, sacrifice and sharing.

(8) People are concerned with many problems: the rather slow pace of the ecumenical movement, the pill (contraceptives), the celibacy of the clergy, youth, the war in Vietnam and the Middle-East, social injustice, political sterility and instability, inflation and racism and with technology and disbelief. I found, however, that their concern is more sincere and more painful than ours. They think that these issues need to be confronted with greater seriousness and a higher sense of responsibility than they are met with today.

(9) I found that political freedom is restricted in many facets of public life. I will refrain, however, from expressing any criticism, for I am convinced that a clergyman's task and obligation is to announce good news and not to denounce situations unless he is in a position to do something more essential than mere criticism.

(10) Catholics, Protestants and Orthodox in Latin America are experiencing a state of spiritual re-awakening and ecumenical agony. They reach for one another in search for solidarity and unity. While they join their hearts in prayer, they also join their hands in an effort to break down existing prejudices. They desire to lay the groundwork for cooperation, so that they may rebuild the image of the Church to the point that the people expect. They will become involved in the kind of Christian activism which will free them from self-illusion, and their respective congregations from the state of frustration that keeps them confused. Unhappy in their distrusts, and pessimistic in their very personal and subjective way of thinking, Latin American Christians need to be convinced of the possibility that the spiritual and moral values of Christianity may at last regain their powerful impact in the lives of men and replace materialistic and nihilistic views that seem to torment their minds and hearts.

MYLAI—MANKIEWICZ AND BRADEN

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post printed December 9 a Frank Mankiewicz-Tom Braden column concerned with the Songmy incident:

Vice President Agnew was right—

About the news media—

but for the wrong reasons. The press, yielding to Pentagon direction and public expectation, has largely failed to make Americans see what this war was.

This is the theme of their statement. Vietnam is not the sort of war we have

experienced previously. This column is useful in reminding us just what kind of war it is:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 9, 1969]
MYLAI IS A TYPICAL VIETNAM BATTLE IN A WAR THAT'S DIRECTED AT CIVILIANS

(By Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden)

An unconscious yearning does much to explain American shock at the massacre of Mylai.

Unconsciously Americans want the war in Vietnam to be like the wars they've fought before. They want "fronts"; "battle lines"; progress in ground taken and cities held. They want to think of their boys—upholding the right—fighting against enemy soldiers—upholding the wrong.

The press, because it also yearns, has by and large given the people what they want. The daily communique from Pentagon East becomes the wire service account of action in Vietnam. The body count indicates "progress," and it is always the "allies"—that comfortable, reassuring and in this war totally meaningless word—who are making it.

There have been exceptions to this standard fare and those exceptions—filmed scenes of U.S. troops burning villages, or written reports by special correspondents on the use of chemicals—have shocked a public longing for the familiar past.

The result of yearning is that Americans were unprepared for Mylai. Vice President Agnew was right but for the wrong reasons. The press, yielding to Pentagon direction and public expectation, has largely failed to make Americans see what this war was.

Take, for example, the public testimony of Capt. Ernest Medina. It reveals the problem in whole. His orders, he said, were to destroy Mylai and its livestock. He did not find it in the least extraordinary to receive an order not to kill women and children. The village, he explained, was a "free fire zone," meaning a shooting gallery into which death could be poured without nice distinctions about innocent people. Customarily, he explained, it is permissible anyhow to shoot anyone who runs, and his words recalled the familiar complaint of Vietnam veterans: "Sometimes it's awful hard to tell the difference between a run and a fast walk."

But Medina went on. He saw 20 to 28 civilian bodies, and he didn't bother to count how many were those of women and children. He felt a little uncomfortable when he discovered that the woman he shot had been unarmed. But she had moved and he had a right to be afraid. The 20 to 28 bodies did not seem to him to evidence atrocity or deliberate action against civilians.

The terrible truth is that Medina was describing a rather typical day of battle in a war which is largely a war against civilians.

Three-hundred-thousand of them have been killed in the past four years, mostly by United States troops, mostly by bombing. The Senate Subcommittee which released these figures cannot say how many of these dead are Vietcong and how many are "Friendlies" or "Gooks," as the soldiers say. Neither can anybody else.

We kill civilians because the enemy is among them. We kill their livestock because it may feed the enemy. We use chemicals forbidden in the United States because—although they may cause deformed births—they defoliate so that the enemy can be found. By these standards, can Medina be far from the mark by suggesting that there was no "atrocity" at Mylai.

The press is guilty, not for doing what Agnew said it was, but for not doing it enough. It failed to bring home to Americans that they were sending their uniformed sons into battle—not primarily against other uniformed sons, but against civilians, women and children and aged men. Americans have never understood that there are no young

men in the villages. Young men are gone to the uniformed ARVN or are out in the countryside with the civilian-clad Vietcong.

The American people are guilty, too—we didn't want to hear it the way it was. In a war where friend is distinguishable from foe only by what is in his heart and mind, you can always win the count of bodies, but you must always lose the count of souls.

EMOTIONAL REACTION IN AGNEW-TV HASSLE

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Progress-Bulletin, a newspaper which has served the residents of the Pomona Valley in California for 84 years. The editorial is concerned with the speech Vice President Agnew made on November 13, 1969, on the subject of the television news medium and in my view is very helpful in setting the record straight with regard to what the Vice President actually said in his speech as opposed to what has been implied from his remarks by representatives of the broadcasting industry.

In my view the editorial is correct in its interpretation of Mr. Agnew's speech as a direct challenge to the broadcasting industry for self-improvement in connection with its presentation of the news rather than a call for Government censorship of the television medium which has been suggested by some critics of the Vice President's remarks.

The editorial is also helpful in that it focuses on the fact that in our free and democratic society the only control which can be maintained over the powerful medium of television is one of the main elements of our free enterprise system itself—competition. In this case, the competition is provided by other information media. The editors of the Progress-Bulletin further emphasize the need for initiative on the part of the American public to broaden their knowledge of the news rather than relying on the television medium alone for information of world events.

Because of the importance of an informed citizenry to a free and representative democracy, I consider the views expressed in this editorial to be worthy of the consideration of my colleagues and under leave to extend my remarks, I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

EMOTIONAL REACTION IN AGNEW-TV HASSLE

Vice President Spiro Agnew's attack on the television industry unmistakably touched a responsive chord among a lot of not-so-silent-any-more Americans. The vibrations go on.

Letters and telephone calls to the headquarters of the three major broadcasting networks and to local stations all over the country have run overwhelmingly in his favor. Even more than his remarks about an "effete corps of impudent snobs" (or was it an "impudent corps of effete snobs?") involved in the October 15 Vietnam Moratorium, the vice president's targeting of "a small group of

men" which determines what news goes out over the air clearly hit something close to the heart, or guts, of many people.

As usual, however, it is not what the vice president said but what he allegedly implied that has caused the agitation.

What he implied, some defenders of the industry have been quick to warn, is government censorship of television, followed inevitably by censorship of the press, followed eventually by a police state and dictatorship and the abolition of all the freedoms Americans hold dear.

What he actually said, and it bears repeating, is this:

"Tonight, I have raised questions. I have made no attempt to suggest answers. These answers must come from the media men. They are challenged to turn their critical powers on themselves. They are challenged to direct their energy, talent and conviction toward improving the quality and objectivity of news presentation. They are challenged to structure their own civic ethics to relate their great freedom with their great responsibility.

"And the people of America are challenged, too—challenged to press for responsible news presentations. The people can let the networks know that they want their news straight and objective. The people can register their complaints on bias through mail to the networks and phone calls to local stations. This is one case where the people must defend themselves, where the citizen—not government—must be the reformer, where the consumer can be the most effective crusader."

This does not sound like a call to censorship and repression.

Unfortunately, these words came near the end of the vice president's address, following many paragraphs criticizing the shortcomings—which are numerous—of the television industry, and neither his critics nor his supporters seem to have heard them. The total effect was to appeal not to our intellects but to our emotions.

One wonders whether the popular enthusiasm which has greeted the vice president's speech stems from real dissatisfaction with the way in which the broadcasting industry presents the news or from dissatisfaction just with the news itself, which has been uniformly dismal for the past half-decade, it seems. One wonders if many of us are not, in fact, guilty of failing to distinguish between the news broadcaster and the news he broadcasts.

By its very nature, television is a medium unlike any other in the immediacy and concentration of its impact.

While a newspaper may center a story on the front page and proclaim it with bold headlines, the printed news is still passive and is surrounded by a mass of other news, advertising and features. The newspaper reader scans, but the television viewer is forced to concentrate his whole attention on whatever happens to be playing in that small square of light at a given moment. He lives what he is seeing.

This is television's greatest strength and also its severest limitation.

The only kind of control over television that is permissible and practical in a democracy is that which results from the competition of other information media—newspapers; magazines and books, which by their nature are able to examine news and social developments more leisurely and in greater depth and width.

To utilize them, of course, requires a measure of initiative on the part of the public beyond that required for the mere flipping of a dial, sitting back and sponging up sensory impressions from a flickering tube.

Another alternative is the system they have in South Africa, where the govern-

ment has never permitted any kind of television at all, good, bad or indifferent. There the people are spared this problem by the thoughtful men who rule them.

LOWERING THE VOTING AGE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times of December 1, 1969, put into proper perspective the need for lowering the voting age in America.

I believe this is a most timely editorial and performs a notable public service.

The editorial follows:

LOWER VOTING AGE

A plank in The Sun-Times' platform calls for a voting age lower than 21. We have suggested that the Constitutional Convention could consider such a change when it meets to modernize the state's basic charter.

Now, the National Commission on Causes and Prevention of Violence has lent its considerable support to a reduction in the voting age, suggesting a minimum age of 18.

The commission contended that much of the frustration of today's youth, and some of the violent manifestations of that frustration, might be eased if youth were given earlier access to the ballot box. Milton S. Eisenhower, commission chairman, said also that "there is a lot of good common sense in the statement that those who are old enough to carry out the foreign policy of this country by offering their lives in war are also old enough to decide (through voting) if they are to have a war."

The Sun-Times, which has supported a reduced voting age since 1954, took a position similar to that of the commission's two years ago. Recognizing that dissent was rising among the young, we said: "While violence must not be countenanced . . . the right to dissent must be protected. The best way to protect that right is to channel it constructively in a way that will encourage

response from national leaders. The answer is to channel dissent through the ballot box."

Granting of the right to vote should not, of course, be considered a means of lowering the decibel count, or a means of buying society's way out of uncomfortable situations created by youthful questioning and vigor. The fundamental reason for lowering the voting age is that, because of improved education and communications, today's younger generation is smart enough and alert enough to vote as wisely as any older age group does.

It won't be easy to lower the voting age. Citizens of Hawaii, one of the four states with a voting age under 21, last year rebuffed an effort to lower the standard from 20 to 18. Also, entrenched politicians always are fearful of unleashing a new bloc of potentially independent voters.

Nonetheless, the voting age should be lowered, as the violence commission has said, and as we have said so often. And since the Congress is reluctant to act, and since the Illinois Legislature has failed to act, the matter should certainly be on the agenda for the Constitutional Convention.

WHAT MORE, FOR PEACE, COULD MR. NIXON DO?

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the Miami Herald on December 4 asked a reasonable question: What more could the President reasonably do to obtain a just peace?

The implied answer was "nothing." Most of the Nation agrees that the President is doing all that can be done in that regard.

The text of the Herald editorial follows:

[From the Miami Herald, Dec. 4, 1969]

WHAT MORE, FOR PEACE, COULD MR. NIXON DO?

Hawks and doves in the House became birds of a feather in voting 333 to 55 for a

resolution endorsing President Nixon's efforts to negotiate a "just peace" in Vietnam.

For that reason the resolution, which seems to mean all things to all men, is meaningless. But it does serve to highlight the Nixon program in Vietnam which goes far beyond the position of the Johnson administration and, indeed, rather out-doves the rejected minority plank in the 1968 Democratic platform.

That plank, which was howled down in Chicago, called for immediate cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam and of the offensive search and destroy missions by combat units, for a negotiated withdrawal of troops by opponents in the hostilities and for a negotiated coalition government that would include the Communists.

In his speech Nov. 3, Mr. Nixon "set forth our peace proposals in great detail," as follows:

"We have offered the complete withdrawal of all outside forces within one year.

"We have proposed a cease-fire under international supervision.

"We have offered free elections under international supervision with the Communists participating in the organization and conduct of the elections as an organized political force . . ."

To be sure, Hanoi rejected these proposals but in other respects the President was acting on his own.

He had already withdrawn unilaterally the 60,000 troops—including 20 per cent of all combat troops—he promised would be out by Dec. 15.

He has put into effect the Vietnamization plan announced in March.

He has worked out a plan for the withdrawal of a U.S. troops and their replacement by Vietnamese.

He has continued the bombing suspension ordered just before the election last year by President Johnson, who also decreed no other change whatsoever in his own Vietnam program.

So Mr. Nixon has gone beyond the dove at Chicago and he has reversed most of the Johnson policy. Thus it is all the more remarkable to us that the vote Tuesday on the House resolution was not unanimous. What more, as of today, could the President reasonably have done?

SENATE—Thursday, December 11, 1969

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, who in times past hast called men to serve Thee in the Government of this Nation, and hast not ceased to call, call us this day from life on all lower levels to service in the higher realm of Thy kingdom of righteousness and truth. Bless the labor of the Members of this body for the welfare of the whole Nation. Keep us from running out or wearing out until our work is done. When nerves grow taut and spirits tense, bring us to Thy peace. Walk with us amid the difficulties and uncertainties of the day's work that we may have Thy light upon our pathway, and with joyful hearts and radiant spirits bring to completion the divine intention for all men: For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, December 10, 1969, be dispensed with.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with "New Reports."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated, as requested by the Senator from Montana.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.