

## CORN

[Production, support price, average price, crop value, Government payments]

Crop year	Production (million bushels) (grain)	National average support price (per bushel)	Average price to farmers <sup>1</sup> (per bushel)	Farm value <sup>2</sup> (millions)	Government payments (millions)	Crop year	Production (million bushels) (grain)	National average support price (per bushel)	Average price to farmers <sup>1</sup> (per bushel)	Farm value <sup>2</sup> (millions)	Government payments (millions)
1933	2,104.7	\$0.45	\$0.494	\$1,246.8	None.	1967	4,651.6	\$1.35c, \$0.30d, \$1.05e			
1934	1,146.7	\$0.55	.802	1,181.5	\$311.9 corn-hog.	1968		\$1.35c, \$0.30d, \$1.05e			
1935	2,001.4	\$0.45	.632	1,506.3	\$176.9 corn-hog.						
1936	1,258.7	\$0.55	1.035	1,571.9	None.						
1937	2,349.4	\$0.50	.49	1,369.5	None.						
1938	2,300.1	\$0.57	.469	1,239.6	\$61 conservation.						
1939	2,341.6	\$0.57	.542	1,465.1	\$149.9 conservation.						
1940	2,206.9	\$0.61	.601	1,518.7	\$129.8 and parity.						
1941	2,414.4	\$0.75	.736	1,991.1	\$130.2 and parity.						
1942	2,801.8	\$0.83	.894	2,813.8	\$188.1 and parity.						
1943	2,668.5	\$0.90	1.08	3,328.5	\$129.5 and parity.						
1944	2,801.6	\$0.98	1.03	3,353.2							
1945	2,577.4	\$1.01	1.23	3,651.9							
1946	2,916.1	\$1.15	1.52	5,028.3							
1947	2,108.3	\$1.37	2.16	5,082.7							
1948	3,307.0	\$1.44	1.28	5,675.1							
1949	2,946.2	\$1.40	1.24	3,666.0							
1950	2,764.1	\$1.47 <sup>a</sup>	1.52	4,222.4							
1951	2,628.9	\$1.57	1.66	4,364.7							
1952	2,980.8	\$1.60	1.52	4,557.0							
1953	2,881.8	\$1.60	1.48	4,291.4							
1954	2,707.9	\$1.62 <sup>a</sup>	1.43	3,872.4							
1955	2,872.9	\$1.58 <sup>a</sup>	1.35	3,848.6							
1956	3,075.3	\$1.50a, 1.25b <sup>a</sup>	1.29	3,967.3	\$170.2 acreage.						
1957	3,045.4	\$1.40a, 1.10b <sup>a</sup>	1.11	3,393.5	\$194.3 reserve.						
1958	3,356.2	\$1.36a, 1.06b <sup>a</sup>	1.12	3,755.6	\$280.4 soil bank.						
1959	3,824.6	\$1.12	1.05	4,013.1							
1960	3,906.9	\$1.06	1.00	3,928.8							
1961	3,597.8	\$1.20	1.10	3,939.0	\$645.4 feed.						
1962	3,606.3	\$1.20	1.12	4,025.3	\$684.0 grain.						
1963	4,019.2	\$1.25c, \$0.18d, \$1.07e	1.11	4,454.0	\$679.8 program.						
1964	3,484.3	\$1.25c, \$0.15d, \$1.10e	1.17	4,064.2	\$926.2 program.						
1965	4,084.3	\$1.25c, \$0.20d, \$1.05e	1.16	4,731.9	\$1,094.1 program.						
1966	4,103.3	\$1.30c, \$0.30d, \$1.00e	1.29	5,285.3	\$1,028.0 program.						

<sup>1</sup> Table 30 feed statistics through 1966 (S.B. No. 410).<sup>2</sup> Farm value based on production of all corn from 1933 through 1948 and on production of corn for grain only beginning 1949.<sup>3</sup> Commercial corn-producing area only. Level outside the commercial area was 75 percent of the level within the area, except 1956 when it was 82.5 percent and 1957 when it was 70 percent of parity.<sup>4</sup> Season average price including the price-support payment averaged to reflect total production.

Note: Key to letter references: a—Support price for farmers who complied with acreage allotments; b—support price for farmers who did not comply with acreage allotments; c—Total support; d—Price-support payment; e—Price-support loan.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 132) extending the dates for transmission of the Economic Report and the report of the

Joint Economic Committee, and it was signed by the Vice President.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in accordance with the order Friday last, I move that the Senate now stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5

o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, January 23, 1968, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate January 22, 1968:

## SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Clark M. Clifford, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Defense.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Chester, Pa., Chapter, Order of DeMolay

## HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Chester chapter, Order of DeMolay, in my Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, has been honored as the world's most outstanding DeMolay chapter.

I believe that these responsible and dedicated teenaged men are much more representative of America's youth today than are those who capture the headlines with their antics.

As a Mason, I am proud of the young men in Chester County, Pa., who have earned this honor for our Commonwealth. Their accomplishments are outlined in the following news article, which was released at the time of the award.

I ask unanimous consent to have the above-mentioned article included in the RECORD at this point.

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

CHESTER CHAPTER, ORDER OF DEMOLAY RECOGNIZED AS WORLD'S BEST CHAPTER

KANSAS CITY, Mo., November 10, 1967.—The International Supreme Council of the Order of DeMolay announced today that Chester Chapter has been named the World's Best Chapter. The No. 1 ranking from among the 2,504 Chapters of the Order throughout the 50 United States, Canada, and 16 foreign countries, is conferred by the International Supreme Council upon the Chapter deemed to be the best all-round group in the DeMolay movement.

In making the announcement, George M. Saunders, the Grand Secretary, said, "This is certainly a notable distinction, and the Supreme Council is proud of your efforts."

Saunders cited some of the accomplishments of the Chester Chapter which were taken into consideration by the Order's gov-

erning body in making the decision. They included the following:

## MEMBERSHIP

Eighty-six new members initiated during the year 358.33 percent of membership quota made. Earned second consecutive Gold Honor Key.

Earned second consecutive Advisor's Honor Key.

Earned 3 Grand Master's Plaques. Membership plaque from Grand Commandery of Knights Templar of Pennsylvania.

Earned 9 Blue and White Honor Keys. Supreme Council Blue and Gold Ribbons. Net increase in membership of 48 percent. Eighth place in world membership competition.

## RITUAL

First place, Initiatory Degree Competition. First place, DeMolay Degree Competition. Conferred work before 7 Masonic Bodies. Public Funeral Service. Two Majority Services. Two Public Installations of Officers. Public conferral of the Degree of Chevalier.

## ACTIVITIES

First place Visitations Competition (traveled over 200,000 miles through six States and the District of Columbia).

First place Representative DeMolay Competition.

First place Chapter of the Year (Pennsylvania).

Second place Chapter Newspapers Competition.

Twenty-eight members completed the Leadership Correspondence Course.

Established Drill Team and Chorus.

Basketball and Softball Teams.

Sixteen members attended Leadership Camp in Becket, Massachusetts.

First place, Essay Competition (Pennsylvania).

First place, Oratorical Competition (Penna.).

Second place, Oratorical Competition (International).

Participated in dedication of George Washington Masonic Statue at Freedoms Foundation in Valley Forge.

District Winner, Grand Commandery, Knights Templar, of Pennsylvania Scholarship.

Civil Service Projects for: Delco TB Center, Chester-Crozer and and Taylor Hospitals, Salvation Army, Delco Blind Center.

Painted Masonic Temple during summer. Held 4 church services.

DeMolay Week exhibit in the Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania (first time in history).

Radio announcements about DeMolay.

Two Members elected to Honorary Degree, the Degree of Chevalier.

Chapter Advisor named Pennsylvania's DeMolay Advisor of the Year.

Member spoke before the Grand Holy Royal Arch Chapter of Pennsylvania in Annual Session.

Active Public Speaking Team.

Established Waiters Club and served many dinners, luncheons, banquets, and receptions, including reception for the Grand Commander of Pennsylvania.

Served as ushers and cloak room attendants for Concert of the Scottish Rite Choir.

Opened DeMolay Flea Shop business at Booths Corners Farmers Market and held numerous other fund-raising projects.

Promoted Safe-Driving Program throughout Delaware County.

Established DeMolay Rifle Team.

Sponsored and taught DeMolay workshop for three DeMolay Districts.

Member earned the Past Master Councilor's Meritorious Service Award.

Social activities included: Parties, picnics, dances, skating, bowling, swimming, trips, tours, shows, court trials.

Commenting on the announcement, the Chapter's Advisor, Robert F. Stark, said, "I strongly believe this title was earned by the almost unbelievable and tenacious dedication to DeMolay by our boys. Their sincerity and their unselfish devotion to good living, the practice of DeMolay virtues, and Chester Chapter's success are the most heartwarming examples of just how fine a group are teenagers."

"Credit must also be given to the hard-working and dedicated Advisory Council of Chester Chapter for the many hours of service to our young community in helping to make these boys better citizens. And we cannot forget those wonderful ladies of our Mothers Circle who have contributed so generously in so many ways to our success."

In 1966 Chester Chapter was ranked as the No. 2 Chapter in the world. Their motto of "We do better because we try harder" worked very well for them in 1967.

The Master Councilor of Chester Chapter is Charles A. Rothermel of Media; the Senior Councilor is Wayne L. Garrett of Aston Township; and the Junior Councilor is Walter H. Dzlik of Folcroft.

The Chapter was instituted in 1959 and is

sponsored by The Keystone Masonic Club of Chester.

The presentation of the plaque designating Chester Chapter "World Champions of DeMolay" will be made at a banquet on February 24, 1968, at the PMO Colleges, Chester. The public is invited.

## Medicine's Dressing-Room Talk at Halftime

### HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, because of my continuing interest in medical problems, I devote a portion of my reading time to medical articles.

It is no secret that private-sector medicine has been invaded by huge doses of Federal intervention—in my opinion some good and some extremely questionable.

I came across a speech made to an all-doctor audience containing much wisdom which could enlighten those who wish to analyze the changing medical scene. Let me, a family doctor with years of general practice caring for patients of all ages, say to nonphysicians, "this is a thoughtful, honest and forthright message containing advice needed to keep American medicine the world's best."

In spite of some Federal legislation unwelcomed by medicine this ballgame may end well and the following "pep talk" at the half made by my friend Dr. "Bing" Blasingame could make a great contribution toward that result:

#### PROBLEMS OF A FREE HEALTH MARKET

(By F. J. L. Blasingame, M.D., executive vice president, American Medical Association, Medical Society of the county of Monroe, Rochester, N.Y., December 19, 1967)

Any physician today whose interest extends beyond the immediate circumstances of his own career and encompasses the future of the medical profession as a whole must often feel that he could well declaim along with Shakespeare's Hamlet:

"The time is out of joint; O cursed spite,  
That ever I was born to set it right!"

Certainly the time does appear to be out of joint, and members of the medical profession must accept the responsibility of providing leadership in setting it right.

The situation of the profession and of the entire health care field seems to be a series of incredible paradoxes which defy easy solution.

As patients, people respect their individual physicians; but, as members of the public, those same people may seriously question the motives and methods of the medical profession.

More advances in the science of medicine and in the techniques of care have been developed in the last 20-odd years than in all of previous history; yet, it is during recent years that the clamor has arisen for changes in the functions of the medical profession.

There are now more physicians and more health care personnel than ever before; but many shortages exist throughout the field.

In summary, it can be said that in a large sense, medicine and its practitioners never had it so good. In another, equally large sense, however, medicine and its practitioners never had it so bad.

As individuals, physicians enjoy a great many advantages.

The individual physician of today is well-accepted by his patients, his colleagues, his peers, and the public. He is looked upon as a highly educated and well-trained person; as an effective practitioner of the science and art of medicine. He enjoys a prestigious position in society; has a good life with a good income; and has a busy, demanding but rewarding career from the standpoint of intellectual and emotional satisfactions as well as economic and material rewards.

However, in spite of the favorable recognition they enjoy as individuals, members of the medical profession collectively are facing bad times. The social, political, and economic climate of today is not favorable; and there are indications that it may be worsening.

One reason is the dichotomy of opinion that people hold toward the single physician and the medical profession. As a fairly simple documentation of that contrast, consider the results of the survey taken in more than 400 randomly selected households right here in Monroe County, as reported in a November issue of JAMA.

Regarding their own physician, respondents reported overwhelmingly that their doctor does not keep them waiting too long . . . spends enough time with them . . . is willing to listen to problems . . . is sympathetic about personal and medical problems . . . and provides a good examination. From 83 to 97 per cent of the respondents affirmed those positive features of their personal medical care.

By contrast, answers to questions about medicine in general made the same respondents sound like a different group of people.

Slightly more than half said yesterday's family doctor gave better care than today's modern specialist. Six out of ten accused doctors of being selfish and interested in their own financial gain. Forty per cent said doctors are so impersonal and scientific that they do not take a great deal of interest in their patients' problems. Half reported that the way medicine is practiced today, the patient often is sent from one costly specialist to another without finding out what is wrong. And a little more than 40 per cent said the AMA works to protect the interests of the doctor more than to maintain a high level of health care in the nation.

In view of that kind of evidence, the wise physician no longer can believe that because he is a dedicated, well-informed practitioner, he is doing everything necessary to assure continuation of his present practices and those of his colleagues.

Today's physicians—and even more, their successors—may be in real jeopardy of social pressures that could relegate future physicians to a far less noble role in society than they traditionally have played. And although the pressures undoubtedly will be exerted for the ultimate good of society, as the public sees that good, the end result probably would be less desirable and could be disastrous, not only for the profession but for the very public which our profession is trying to serve.

One of the most significant and most frustrating of the paradoxes in the present situation is that the pressure to revise the system of delivering health care has developed during the period of the greatest medical advances and most outstanding successes.

A truly impressive array of victories has been scored in the last generation in science, in medical research, in medical education, and in medical services. But that very success has been one of the major factors in the growth of a vastly increased demand for health services—not only by individuals, but also by both private and governmental agencies and organizations seeking medical benefits for their members or those for whom these groups feel responsible.



Increased demand—brought about also by such additional factors as increasing population and the growing affluence of the majority of citizens—has generated another of the paradoxes: shortages of health facilities and personnel in the midst of plenty.

The United States today has more health facilities and more health manpower than it ever has had. This country has more hospitals than all the remainder of the world. The number of physicians has increased more rapidly than the general population, and the same is true for allied professions and occupations.

The ratio of physician to allied personnel, which was 1 to 10 not long ago, has reached 1 to 13; and is expected to reach 1 to 17 early in the next decade.

Yet, the demand for services has outstripped both the facilities and personnel available to provide these services. The health field now faces the third largest market in the United States; a market that very likely will become the largest by 1975. Expenditures for health care approach \$50 billion a year and will continue to rise.

This situation of rising demand creating shortages of facilities and personnel has brought about the public pressure for newer and better methods of providing care to all of society.

To prevent that pressure from overwhelming and constricting medical practice to the point where both physicians and their patients may suffer irreparable harm, physicians must enlarge their sense of responsibility. They must be knowledgeable in more than the scientific techniques of medicine; they must be knowledgeable also of all the circumstances under which medicine is being practiced and be well acquainted with the variety of questions being raised about medicine's mission and how society might want that mission modified.

Furthermore, physicians must provide leadership in formulating answers to those questions.

This problem is not unique to the United States. Because of this nation's heritage of freedom, private enterprise, and individual initiative, the problem is only late in arriving. It has already developed in many other countries, particularly in Western Europe.

An outstanding example is Great Britain, whose system of health care has been cited as ideal by virtually every proponent of national medical programs for this nation. In Britain, the arguments of physicians were successfully interpreted as being self-seeking and were overwhelmed by political and public pressure for universal health care financed by the government.

This was done, and its implementation has impaired research; has failed to create educational facilities; has lessened the amount and often the quality of care available to patients; and has placed such restrictions on the life of the physician that many have found it intolerable and have left their country.

The result has been the lessening of the availability of medical care because the patient load on remaining physicians became overbearing; and of the quality of care because some of the emigrants had to be replaced by foreign physicians who were less well trained and less qualified to serve. Gresham's Law that the bad drives out the good under certain circumstances does not apply only to monetary systems.

There are indications—much to the dismay, I'm sure, of anglophiles among this nation's advocates of federal health care for all—that the government of Britain has serious doubts whether that country can continue to afford luxuries such as universal, "free" medical care, particularly when combined with many other welfare programs. British economists have pointed out that heavy social spending has used up treasury

funds that might have been spent better on more pressing national problems, such as developing export industry.

Britain's Minister of Labor was recently quoted as stating that it is time for what he called a "constructive argument" about the way vast sums are paid in social benefits. In a speech, he asked whether such benefits should be provided—to quote him directly—"to those whose financial position makes them unnecessary? Or, alternately, should not the available resources be concentrated on those in the greatest need?"

The United States is faced with a developing situation which could become similar. Already there is a plethora of health legislation, for the implementation of which the federal government is spending huge amounts of its tax resources—while conducting a war and supporting simultaneously a wide variety of other welfare programs.

Physicians and others in the health field must be aware that there is an agglutination of forces in this country supporting the expansion of federal involvement in, and intrusion into, the health field. Even giving those forces credit for being sincerely well-meaning, some of their premises can be questioned.

They see medicine as the entitlement of all citizens, regardless of economic status, location, or other factor.

They say medical care should be available under all conditions, in all locations, around the clock and around the calendar, to satisfy health needs.

Most significantly, however, their belief is that some other party—sometimes unnamed, but usually designated as the federal government—should pay for the services rather than the patient himself being responsible for any of the cost.

The latter premise is supported by certain labor leaders; by an apparently large group that has been accumulated in the executive branch of government; by members of the so-called liberal sector, in education and in the press; and by some among the public.

Their contention looks good at short range. Certainly they have done a marvelous job of marketing their point of view: that it is in the public interest and is the rightful role of government to finance all health care. But, they appear to have given little or no thought to the ultimate cost to the taxpayers of this nation.

They also have not considered the strictures that such a system could impose on the profession and its ability to serve the people.

There is little reason to believe that results here would be significantly better than those in Great Britain, where there is virtually a scientific sterility; with very few new ideas in science having been developed since the imposition of national controls over the field of medicine.

The medical profession has not made itself popular with many persons by its opposition to universal governmental health programs. We have been accused of seeking only to maintain a so-called antiquated status quo; and to strengthen our own financial position. Such accusations are not true.

Regardless of the immediate consequences in adverse public opinion generated by medicine's opponents in this matter, the medical profession is on solid ground, both morally and economically, in continuing to press for recognition of the fact that tax money spent on health should be limited to those who can demonstrate need; and further, that need should be determined locally.

There are a number of ways to pay for health care. The most economical and prudent is cash. In addition, there is postpayment, which people use every day when they buy appliances, automobiles, or anything else they want. Another is insurance or the prepayment mechanism. And finally, tax funds are—and should be—available for those not

able to meet their medical needs in any of the other ways.

With that much background of the problems that exist and the problems that are developing in the form of solutions with which our profession and many others cannot be in sympathy, let me turn to some of the answers the medical profession can and must give to questions that are being raised.

One of the most serious problems, and one of the most visible problems, facing the medical profession and its allies is how to help the public face the problems of inflation of health and medical care costs.

In this crucial time, every physician has to recognize that not only is he caught up in the general inflation that affects every aspect of life, but he also is caught up in the very special inflationary effects that come to bear particularly on the health care field. This circumstance has come about because of the insatiable demands of a society that has committed cash, insurance, and tax dollars in huge amounts to a field in which the available amount of talent and facilities is relatively limited.

One thing that makes the problem worse is the attitude of surprise with which the supporters of federal health programs have publicly greeted the inflation of health care costs. These proponents act as though there were no possible suspicion that anything like that could have happened; and, because they have access to a great deal more space and time in the news media than medicine has, they have been able to pass their shocked indignation along to the public.

What is not remembered by much of the public and is ignored by those who are seeking to put all of the blame on to medicine is the fact that for years the AMA predicted that medicare, if passed, would be highly inflationary. It has been.

Medicaid also is inflationary, along with the two dozen or so other bills passed by the 89th Congress to involve the direct expenditure of federal tax funds for health care for various segments of the population.

Medicine already was in a rising market, because of other factors which had increased demand, when all of this legislation was passed. When an additional five to six billion dollars was infused into the medical marketplace, economic stress was put on the profession and the institutions of medicine that could reasonably have been expected to have an inflationary effect. This is exactly what has happened.

Now, however, in an effort to draw attention away from the effect of the programs they support, and to find a more convenient focus for public indignation, proponents of federal health programs are blaming physicians for rising medical care costs.

Among those who are pointing a well-publicized finger at usual and customary charges, and talking about fee schedules, are the administrators of some third-party entities, who have long been involved in the financing of health care through private insurance and prepayment plans and now are involved also in federal funds through their function as agents of the government.

Physicians have the awesome responsibility, first, of recognizing these facts; and, second, of showing their truth to the public.

In addition to whatever can be done on national and state levels by the organizations of medicine, the individual physician can play a vital role in this task.

His most important responsibility will be recognition of the fact that he is the purchasing agent of health and medical care for his patient.

Physicians traditionally have been trained to do their very best for patients by thinking only scientifically and only in terms of results. That must now change. Every physician must now add another responsibility of equal importance.

He must recognize at all times that every



decision he makes carries a price tag! If he puts a patient in the hospital, it costs money. If he prescribes, it costs money. If he advises a vacation or retirement, it costs the patient money. Every test, every treatment is a matter of money as well as a matter of science.

The individual physician is in the best possible position, and the only real position, to help his patient make the most of whatever economic resources are available to him—whether they be in the form of cash, insurance, prepayment, or taxes.

It is essential that physicians understand and accept these facts and utilize every opportunity to help patients understand what is being done by the profession to assist them to make most prudent use of their dollars.

Such opportunity certainly is not lacking. Physicians in the United States see 2,225,000 patients every day, which means, statistically, that the total population of this country is seen four times a year.

The second urgency to which physicians should give their attention is the need to increase the numbers of graduates from the medical schools of this country. This is a matter that particularly concerns me, and certainly is of equal concern to all physicians and to society.

Recently, a report was prepared at the AMA comparing certain figures for the medical schools of 10 years ago with corresponding data for the same schools today. It was disturbing to see that while the budgets of the schools have risen dramatically, and the size of their faculties has gone up substantially, the output of medical graduates has increased relatively little. In three instances, the number of graduates actually had decreased. In 44 of the schools, the increase in the number of graduates over the 10-year period was only five or fewer.

Over-all, of course, the number of physician graduates has increased because of larger enrollments in some of the older schools and because of the addition of new schools, a process which is continuing.

However, medical manpower needs for the foreseeable future are not going to be met by present procedures. Innovations in medical education are going to have to be developed.

The AMA has an opportunity—indeed, it has an obligation—to call public attention to this very special problem. Only public understanding and the resultant public demand can bring about the necessary changes in present attitudes.

The AMA has been subjected to unfair criticism for having limited the number of physicians, whereas the Association has been doing much to stimulate expansion of physician education through helpful legislation, creation of facilities, and a full-scale careers program. The success of the recruiting efforts is reflected in the fact that twice as many qualified students apply for admission to medical schools as there is room for in those schools. It would seem, therefore, that the next move is up to the schools.

The one thing that has not been done is to put AMA and public pressure on medical faculties and on those responsible for the administration of major universities to the degree that they will respond to the need.

We should get on the side of the public more positively in this matter; which is on the side of the angels. The benefits of having more physicians are so many as to be almost beyond counting. To name only a few, the quality of care would improve because each physician would have fewer patients and more time to spend with each. The convenience of medical care would improve because more physicians would be available when needed. Areas that do not now have physicians could be served.

To reach these highly desirable goals, however, requires understanding and effort of our own profession, of the universities, and, above all, of the public.

There is no one simple answer to how this job can be done. But there are some suggestions that make sense to me.

A basic necessity is that administrators and faculties of medical schools return to the concept that the prime mission of the school is the education of medical students so they can practice medicine.

At least partly because of the generous amounts of federal money available for research grants, research—essential and as important as it is—has become an important—or more so—as teaching to the school as a whole; and more important than teaching to many faculty members. It is not always the fault of the faculty member. Like teachers in other fields, he is a victim of the "publish or perish" syndrome of most colleges and universities. Faculty reputations and advancement are based not on the ability to teach, but on research and its publications.

Research must continue; but it is necessary that it be placed in a more balanced position in medical schools and that major financing arrangements permit such a change. Recent policy positions adopted by the American Medical Association at its Clinical Convention could assist in influencing such a shift in the relationship between teaching and research in medical schools.

It takes relatively few brilliant researchers, with good facilities and financing, to turn out fresh new ideas which can be adapted to the teaching of students. While fewer papers might be published, it is reasonable to expect that those of real and significant content would continue to be produced.

Another suggestion is that medical faculties utilize the facilities of the school more around the clock and around the calendar. There seems to be no good reason, except for tradition, why medical school must consist of four years of eight months each when a total term of three years of 11 months each would afford just as much education and would save a year of the life of both the student and his faculty.

Another aspect of better utilizing facilities would be to use laboratories more fully. The bottleneck in medical education comes in what is now the first two years, in the teaching of such subjects as anatomy, physiology, and pathology. But consider this possibility: a school with 100 students now could put them into the laboratories from 8 a.m. until noon. They would then be dismissed; and a crew would put the labs back in order for another 100 students from 2 to 6 p.m. under another set of teachers.

A school could double its student body without increasing its facilities. The only significant additional expense would be another set of instructors, assistant professors, and associate professors. Doubling or tripling the salaries of these younger faculty members would attract good ones into teaching and keep them there, and would prove a great deal more economical in the long run than building another entire school, equipping it, and seeing it raid existing faculties to create its own teaching staff.

The clinical years of teaching could be made more efficient by utilizing more hospitals in the cities where medical schools are located. Modern transportation makes this easily possible; and such a program not only would make more beds available for teaching but also would upgrade the services available to patients in those hospitals.

In these and other ways, more medical graduates could be turned out, beginning very soon. But, before it can be done, there has to be acceptance by medical faculties that such procedures are necessary and in the public interest. It is up to the medical profession and the public to stimulate that acceptance.

The third and final point to be made with respect to physician action is that every physician make himself a part of the solution to problems affecting his profession.

One cause of justifiable concern to the medical profession is the physician who considers himself so busy with his day-to-day

work that he has no time for any of the activities of organized medicine, which he seems to think of as extracurricular.

His feeling, too often, seems to be that he will go along the way he wants because nothing is going to happen in his lifetime, or that he will let somebody else worry about what happens.

Such a man is more of a problem to the profession than the one who is called a radical because of his strenuous activities either at the far right or the far left. At least, the man who definitely is at the right or left, and working at it, is well-informed and knows precisely why he stands where he is. The ones that cause more worry are now those in the middle who have no convictions, who are not aware of the ramifications of the problem, and appear not to care.

Often, when something does go wrong; when a bill is passed that is detrimental to physicians; when a regulation puts uncomfortable restrictions on the profession; these are the men who scream the loudest and demand to know why something was not done to stop that from happening!

It is the time for everyone to be concerned about what is happening; and to try to do something about it. If a desire for the betterment of the entire profession is not sufficient motivation, certainly self-interest alone should be reason enough for action.

Medicine could well gain by observing the struggle others are making to establish and maintain a position.

Consider the optometrists. They are having a relatively rough time, but they are highly organized and are making much of every opportunity. Their views are strongly felt in their communities, among their legislators and among their patients. Why? The answer in one state is that dues to the optometric society are about \$100 per month. In at least one state, the budget of the optometrists is greater than the budget of the state medical society.

With organization, money and—most particularly—individual activity, chiropractors have made themselves felt to the point that the Senate of the United States attempted to include them in national health legislation in spite of opposition from many distinguished sources.

Osteopaths are a small group and appear to be struggling for their very existence. Yet the contribution to osteopathic education of the average osteopath is four or five times as great as the contribution of the average physician to medical education.

It is time for physicians to re-examine two aspects of what they give to help their profession.

One is financial.

More important is what they give of themselves to design and carry out the programs of those organizations.

The medical profession is not without resources or talent. But those resources and talents are not presently deployed in the manner they should be in order to face confidently the complicated situations of the day, and to influence effectively the public attitudes and public opinion without which the profession cannot succeed in its efforts to protect its patients and itself.

Indeed, medicine never had it so good; nor so bad. If too many of us take the good for granted, however, without working to support it and overcome the bad, our apathy will lead to controls on the profession which the public believes are necessary because the profession itself did not solve the problems that need to be solved.

It is absolutely vital that every physician become clearly aware of the situation that faces his profession and its services; and aware that if he wants to strengthen and preserve what he now has . . . and improve conditions for the future . . . it is his obligation to get the job done.

Nobody can do it for him. "The time is out of joint." But the physician—in part—"was born to set it right."



**Perserverance of the Don Blanc Family,  
Caldwell, Idaho**

**HON. FRANK CHURCH**

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, a heartwarming article published in the Caldwell, Idaho, Times-News came to my attention recently. The story of Mr. and Mrs. Don Blanc's struggle to reach the goals they have set for themselves reads like a modern-day "Pilgrim's Progress." Through all the everyday troubles which serve to obscure the real meaning of life for so many of us, the Blancs have persevered in their beliefs.

This family has never allowed daily activities to obscure their goal, but instead their faith in themselves and their beliefs have determined the nature of their actions. I think it is important that, more than this, the Blancs find fulfillment during their struggles, and not just after they reach their goal. Work never became drudgery for this family, but is instead a part of their creative life.

I think that all of us can learn from the lesson these Idaho people can show us.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

IT TOOK MORE THAN 20 YEARS: EASY THING  
NOT THE NORM FOR THIS FAMILY

(By Dorothy Huckabay)

The easiest, the normal thing, would have been to sit back, relax, and say, "My job is done."

But Afton and Don Blanc, currently Emmett fruit ranchers, have seldom done the easiest thing.

Now, with their family raised, at a time when most people begin to think of retirement and relaxation, they are entering new fields. To them, it is simply phase two of a plan began long ago.

Since their marriage 22 years ago, family responsibilities came before personal gratification. But while personal desires and goals took a back seat, they were not forgotten.

Now both have joined their four children in the world of academic pursuit. Counting in-laws as part of the immediate family, there are eight of them now represented in five different colleges—three in Idaho, one in Oregon and one in Washington.

Don is now enrolled in evening liberal arts courses at Boise College to complete requirements for a bachelor of science degree and to earn a teaching certificate, in his quest for a school administrative position.

Afton is currently commuting to the College of Idaho as a full time senior student. She wants to be a children's librarian in a public school, a job that requires a master's degree.

Their children, two of whom are now married, and their daughters' husbands, are all enrolled in college, preparing for professional careers.

Trennis, 21-year-old Palute Indian, a foster son who came to live with the Blancs' when he was eight, is studying art at Treasure Valley Community College on a full academic scholarship.

Richard is attending Western Washington State College on an athletic scholarship in basketball and is one of the starting five on the varsity basketball squad. He went to

college to play ball, but now he says, "I play ball while I'm going to college to study."

Barbara and her husband, Jerry Walton, are attending Boise College, both education students. They have a six-month-old baby daughter, Tiffnie, whom they call "Lil Drop-out."

Ann and her husband, Robert Teeter, are students at the University of Idaho. She is enrolled in the school of education, studying drama, and he is a senior in the school of business.

Mrs. Blanc states that when she and Don began their lives together after World War II, "Both of us wanted to continue our educations, but we were faced with a choice that had to be made. We had to decide whether to go on to school, become involved with careers, and have our family later, or take up our homestead in Black Canyon, have our family, and go back to college when our land was productive and our children grown."

"We chose the latter."

Keeping the goal in sight was not always easy. Often it seemed lost or out of reach, buried in the routine and necessities for daily living and the inevitable hardships that develop.

Again, as Mrs. Blanc puts it, "A family's philosophy involves the actions and thoughts of both the parents and the children, in considering what each individual is free to do in directing his own life, while at the same time making positive contributions to the direction taken by the others."

On their Black Canyon homestead, where they remained until two years ago, their three children were born and their foster son came to live with them.

"It was there, on our farm, that our philosophy of 'if each of us is to be a "someone," then all of us must do something toward that goal' began to grow and to become an affirmative influence."

"To make our row crop farm go, it required the efforts and interest of each one of us. Yet, Don and I knew that our children must be allowed time and activity for themselves. When the boys went with their dad into the fields, they knew he would show them what to do and that he would tell them what he expected them to accomplish. They also knew that he would leave them free to do the job in their own way—and that when the job was done, there would be equal time for play."

"During this time (when the children were small) I snatched at college courses where and when I could (an evening class and a couple of special daytime classes at the College of Idaho, some extension courses from the University, and a summer session.)"

"Then came a testing time for our philosophy. Just as I completed my sophomore year, I came down with rheumatic fever. I was sick and my husband was tired. The increasing needs of a growing family, medical expenses and several crop losses placed a tremendous financial burden on us."

"But as our 11 and 12-year-old daughters took over the cooking and cleaning and our boys willingly helped, we knew that our philosophy was working. Through the experience of giving, they would feel the strength of family unity—because each had accepted his individual responsibility."

"As our children entered high school, and made plans for college, their activities constantly reminded us and challenged us to renew our determination if only to keep up with them."

"Our sons went on to college, and our daughters followed after marrying boys who were also college students."

"Then, this fall, we knew it was time for us. The farm was productive; our family was raised. We knew we must act now on our decision of 20 years ago, if we were going to act at all."

"Don had just received word that Congress had commissioned the academies to award bachelor degrees to their war-time graduates

upon completion of the liberal arts requirements for that degree."

"He enrolled for these courses in the evening classes at Boise College."

"Before I re-entered the College of Idaho as a full-time student, I thought 'Half my life is before me and I can live it anyway I choose. But the years ahead have to be as meaningful and as productive as the years before.'"

"It was then I realized that more than the goal of the degree challenged me. It was the realization of what I could do with that degree that made my decision for me."

"Don is really making the greater change. He, too, needs the challenge and stimulation of entering a new field."

"With both of us entering the field of education, we can work together, and not be limited by geographical boundaries. We've discussed the possibility of entering Civil Service for the federal government, as a teaching team."

"I'll enter teaching somewhere in Treasure Valley next fall, while Don finishes his requirements. And then we'll go on from there."

**Law-Enforcement Agencies and Staffs  
Require Greater Public Backing**

**HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the great problems of our day is the rising incidence of crime.

It is essential that we provide our law-enforcement agencies with the tools necessary to protect life and property in our country.

Most important, we must give our law-enforcement officers the respect and backing which they deserve and require. This includes improved pay scales, better training, and clear authority.

Our distinguished Senator from the State of New York, the Honorable ROBERT F. KENNEDY, a former U.S. Attorney General, has proposed a three-part program to stem the tide of lawlessness. He outlined his views very clearly in a speech at Buffalo on January 16 to students of the State University of Buffalo Law School.

I concur wholeheartedly with Senator Kennedy in the three points he makes:

First. Full citizen participation "to make our law enforcement agencies as modern and effective as possible."

Second. Broadening of police work, especially in high-crime, low-income communities, "to turn the police into the natural allies of those seeking better lives."

Third. An effort to free the police from burdens which can best be treated outside the criminal process—drug addiction and alcoholism.

With permission, I include the text of Senator KENNEDY's speech to the law school students as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY, TO STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK LAW SCHOOL, TUESDAY, JANUARY 16, 1968

St. Thomas Aquinas once defined freedom as "willing obedience to law." It is in this sense, more than any other, that the growing crime rate in America is a major national issue. It is not simply the staggering financial cost of crime—although last year crime cost

Americans more than \$22 billion. It is not the effort and energy diverted from other tasks—although in 1967 more than 4 million criminal offenses known to the police were committed, and millions more went unreported.

The critical danger of crime is what it does to the quality of our own lives. A community infected with crime is not free: for it is paralyzed by fear and mistrust. And this paralysis has begun to infect American communities. The President's Crime Commission reported last year that "the existence of crime, the talk about crime, the reports of crime, and the fear of crime have eroded the basic quality of life of many Americans."

Fully one-third of all Americans now fear to walk alone at night in the streets of their own neighborhoods—and the Commission reported also that the same number, in two large American cities, no longer speak to strangers. And a full-page ad in one of our most influential papers warns of criminal attack, writing, "you know in your heart and soul, you might be next."

This, then, is the urgency of the fight against crime: not the simple preservation of our property or our safety, but the preservation of our national character and heritage—that sense of trust in our fellow citizens and in our community. No nation which honors personal freedom and security can survive an erosion of that trust; no nation rooted in public participation can survive as a nation of citizens behind locked doors. This fight is thus the same as the fight for our cities, our natural resources, and the reassertion of individual worth.

But it is also a fight which can be won; a fight in which powerful tools of crime prevention and control are at hand—if we have the will to use them.

What are the elements of a program to combat crime? They form three essential parts:

First, full citizen support to make our law-enforcement agencies as modern and effective as possible.

Second, an intensive broadening of police work—particularly within high-crime, low-income communities, to turn the police into the natural allies of those seeking better lives.

Third, an effort to free the criminal process from those burdens which can best be treated outside this process—thus freeing our police to tackle the genuinely criminal elements in our life.

The first duty is effective citizen support for the police. But support does not come with a slogan; nor by urging the police to violate historic constitutional rights.

It comes instead from a willingness to give them the most modern, effective techniques of crime prevention and detection—and that means at heart the willingness to spend money for them.

To a large extent, we have—now—methods which have already worked in cutting back crime. When Chicago put single-man patrol cars into high crime districts, it dramatically reversed a rising crime rate. In New York City's parks, the use of mobile police cut muggings by more than a third; and in its subways, the appearance of uniformed patrolmen reduced subway crime by more than 50 per cent within a few weeks.

Almost every city, we learn from a National League of Cities survey, needs more police—anywhere from ten to thirty per cent more. But we also need police who are freed from the burden of clerical duties, and bureaucratic paperwork; we need police who can reach their counterparts across the nation to check crucial information. We need police who are not forced to fight 20th century crime with the facilities of the village constable.

Here, again, the potential already exists. New York has begun a new state Intelligence and Identification System, joining the 3600 law enforcement agencies in the state within a combined information network. This idea

has promise; but crime today does not respect state boundaries. Such information networks—under careful controls to insure protection of the rights to privacy—should be established regionally and nationally, to provide police with the intelligence they need.

From my experience as Attorney General, I can state that coordination does work. By combining the information of more than 25 investigation agencies in the Federal Government, we were able to increase convictions by 1600% in three years. And we can gain that same success on state and local levels.

But the police, it is clear, cannot modernize in a vacuum. They need the training and the personnel to become fully modern agencies. Yet despite this need—and despite the growing national fear of crime—we have been unwilling to make police work a professional, attractive work. The average starting salary is under \$5000—and promotion is often so stultified that no one with professional training would consider a law-enforcement career.

To change this condition again requires money: money to recruit new kinds of police with knowledge of the science and technology of crime detection; money to train those already on the force in these new methods, so they can accelerate their advancement instead of being forced to moonlight to earn extra funds; money to raise the disgracefully low salaries of those who now bear the danger and the burden of law-enforcement.

Improving the quality of police work is a vital first step. But it cannot ignore the broader problems of our police: most particularly, their work in the ghettos of our large cities. It is here that resentment and mistrust—on both sides—flourish. It is here that police-citizen incidents have helped trigger all of America's major urban riots. And it is here that we must take rapid, fundamental steps of change.

We know that in these ghettos are the principal victims of crime; that those with incomes under \$3000 suffer more crime than any other group. And we know also that, in the Negro and Puerto Rican neighborhoods of New York, a recent poll showed that the principal demand of the residents—despite all their other deprivations—were for more police protection.

But it is also clear that police cannot work effectively in neighborhoods where they are treated as outsiders, alien enforcers of unjust laws. The single most effective way to change this image is to develop far closer ties between police and all our neighborhoods.

The techniques for this fusion are diverse. We can begin with the use, as the President's Crime Commission recommended, of "community-service officers"—citizens who work with the police in determining how the police can better function. We can start civilian auxiliaries, using the resources of the neighborhood—particularly the younger members, who helped keep the peace in East Flatbush, Tampa, and Chicago—to learn about police work and to join the police closer with ghetto residents. We can hire unemployed ghetto residents as sub-professionals, and free police from the clerical, routine duties of the station house.

These kinds of citizen involvements have multiple benefits. They give to ghetto communities a stake in law-enforcement, because they become part of the process, instead of just the objects of it. To the police, they offer a valuable new source of police recruiting, with effective roots into high-crime neighborhoods. And they give to both policeman and ghetto-dweller the sense that they need not be implacable enemies, but that the safety and decency of a community is a common effort.

Finally, we must seek to remove from the criminal process those who do not belong in it. Far too much of our police work is spent combatting ills which the police cannot effectively fight. These ills: drug addiction and alcoholism in particular—cause a startling

amount of crime. In New York City, drug addicts account for almost half of all crimes against property—and in one upstate New York community, alcoholics commit more than that per cent in all criminal offenses.

Clearly, we cannot permit those who are addicts or alcoholics to threaten our safety and our property. Clearly we must free the urban citizen from this fear of sick men. But just as clearly, we cannot simply put these men in jail, only to have them return to their habits and their crimes.

We need to begin developing effective alternatives to criminal treatment of sick men. One such hope is the Narcotics Addict Rehabilitation Act, which I helped sponsor in the Senate. This Act gives to state and local governments funds to give addicts effective therapy in attempting to free themselves of the drug habit. Its goal is not simply to confine, as some civil commitments laws may be doing. Instead, it seeks to give back to the addict a sense of control over his own life. Similar projects must be developed for the alcoholic, as well as for the victim of mental illness, who we are only beginning to understand. But understand—and act—we must. For a criminal process which is based on false understandings of why men commit crime cannot act effectively in fighting it.

Finally, we must act to stop the appalling rate of repeat offenders—particularly among our youth, where the crime rate is rising fastest. Here again, we can develop programs to fight recidivism. The Halfway Houses we established under the Department of Justice—in which youthful offenders left jail for counseling and job training—worked; participants were three and a half times less likely to commit further crimes than those without such help. We are beginning to expand this program; I was pleased to see that my bill to involve VISTA and Teacher Corps workers in criminal rehabilitation is now part of the poverty program.

But all of us—local and Federal official as well as citizen—must understand that this work of rehabilitating those who have committed crimes must be the work of a citizenry which believes what it says about a second chance—in hiring, in schools, in acceptance. A man whose first offense leaves him no route back to society has no reason not to break the law again.

These are some of the tasks we must do; some of the directions which are now most promising. To make them work we need money—we need effort—we need the support of all our citizens, and especially those of you who will be shaping the legal order of the future. The goal we seek—willing obedience to the law—cannot be won by repression, nor by indifference. It will be won by the building of communities in which men respect the law because they have helped to make it, and because it gives them the chance of self-fulfillment. That kind of a community will not be won without your help. But I believe it will be won—because you will help.

## Fino Introduces Bill To Extend Income Averaging Federal Tax Provisions to New York State Lottery Wins

**HON. PAUL A. FINO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to allow taxpayers to average out State-conducted lottery winnings for Federal income tax purposes over a 5-year period instead of paying taxes on the lump sum in 1 tax year.



At present, people who win State lottery prizes have to pay all their taxes in 1 year. If the prize they have won is \$50,000 or \$100,000, taxes will thus take a hefty bite of the prize money.

I believe it would give the average taxpayer more incentive to participate in the lottery if his winnings could be stretched out over a 5-year period for income tax purposes. Most lottery prize winners are low- or middle-income people and their normal tax brackets are reasonably low—most of them are also married. Thus, if they can average their winnings over a 5-year period, simultaneously splitting the income with their spouses in joint returns, the tax impact of lottery winnings could be greatly minimized. Not only would this be fairer to the prize winners—to let them share some of the tax benefits enjoyed by the rich—but it would increase the attractiveness of lottery participation.

I hope that Congress will see fit to extend this small cost benefit to lottery-minded taxpayers.

### U.S. Supreme Court Ruling Gives TVA Right To Determine Communities To Receive Power Within Its Overall Service Area

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Supreme Court in an important decision has affirmed the right of the Tennessee Valley Authority to determine the communities and areas it will serve within its overall service area.

The Nashville Tennessean, in a recent editorial, described the ruling as a victory for the TVA. Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this matter, I include the newsstory outlining the ruling and the editorial—both from the Nashville Tennessean—in the RECORD at this point:

#### HIGH COURT GIVES TVA A VICTORY

The Tennessee Valley Authority has won a legal struggle in the Supreme Court over Kentucky Utilities Company, and, apparently, the right to determine the precise regions it may service under congressional authority.

During the Eisenhower administration, the Congress put what was, in effect, a wall around the region beyond which the TVA couldn't expand. Under the amendment to the TVA act, the agency could supply power to the area for which it was the "primary" source on July 1, 1957. At the same time it was barred from supplying municipalities within a five-mile "peripheral" area who were receiving power from private sources.

It has been TVA's contention that Congress left it up to the TVA board to determine what was meant by "primary" and "peripheral" areas. In a 6-1 decision, the Supreme Court agreed, noting that the "area" concept is intrinsically vague and complex. Justice Hugo L. Black, who wrote the decision, said that courts should set this determination aside only when it lacks reasonable support in relation to the law.

Justice Black said the purpose of the law

was to control but not to completely prohibit territorial expansion of TVA.

The Supreme Court ruling may set the pattern for other court cases that deal with extension of TVA power along its primary service area. It at least clarifies the right of the board with respect to a rather murky situation about the Authority's service area.

#### COURT SUPPORTS TVA IN SERVICE AREA RULING (By Edmund Willingham)

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Supreme Court ruled yesterday that the Tennessee Valley Authority can determine its service area as long as it has "reasonable support" for its decisions.

The TVA's determinations of its service area must, of course, be made within the limits of the 1959 self-financing act.

The Court's 6-to-1 decision came in a case involving whether TVA could serve Tazewell and New Tazewell in Claiborne County, Tenn.

The court, affirming the district court judgment and reversing the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals decision, said TVA could serve the communities.

"We have heard of the decision but have not received an official copy of the ruling, therefore can not comment at this time. There may possibly be after ruling is studied," Paul Evans, TVA spokesman, said in Knoxville.

Malcolm Marshall, Louisville, attorney for Kentucky Utilities, which opposed extension of TVA power, said during argument of the case last month that the stakes in the suit were much greater than service of the two towns. He said the decision could affect 200,000 customers now supplied by several investor-owned utilities.

The 1959 self-financing act barred TVA from expanding its sales outside "the area for which the corporation (TVA) or its distributors were the primary source of power supply on July 5, 1957"—with some exceptions.

TVA argued it supplied two-thirds of Claiborne County's electric service in 1957 and thus could serve the communities. KU, however, said TVA provided almost no service in 1957 in a corridor that dips down from Kentucky into Tennessee and includes the Tazewells.

The issue was how to determine TVA's primary area.

Delivering the court's opinion, Associate Justice Hugo Black said "the initial determination as to the extent of the 'area' under (the statute) must be made by the TVA board in every case . . ."

"We think it more efficient, and thus more in line with the TVA's 'area' determinations as their starting point and to set this determination aside only when it lacks reasonable support in relation to the statutory purpose of controlling, but not altogether prohibiting, territorial expansion," Black wrote.

Associate Justices William O. Douglas and Thurgood Marshall did not participate in the decision.

In a sharp dissent, Associate Justice John Harlan said protection of private utilities from TVA competition was the primary objective of the 1959 service area limitation, and that "an orderly system of law does not place the enforcement of a restraint upon discretion into the unfettered hands of the party sought to be restrained . . ."

The effect of the decision, he said, is to restrict severely the scope of judicial review of TVA area determinations because the majority opinion forbade courts from setting aside these determinations unless they lacked "reasonable support."

"Certainly Congress did not wish or expect that, as this court now holds, the question should be left largely, if not entirely, in the hands of (TVA)," Harlan wrote.

TVA did not win on every point, however. It had contended that KU lacked standing to challenge the legality of TVA activities and should turn to Congress for relief.

But the court agreed with both the district and circuit courts that that contention "is without merit." The court said protection of private utilities from TVA competition was the primary objective of the 1959 area limitation and that since KU was a private utility it has "standing" to bring the suit.

The majority opinion said the "facts" in Claiborne County supported TVA's position. It said TVA served most of the county's rural areas and had a substantial minority of the customers in the Tazewells.

In a footnote, Harlan suggested that the majority used the descriptive phrase "a substantial minority" to cover the fact that KU had 95.3% of the two communities' customers, according to district court.

The majority also noted that "the great disparity of rates in the villages had resulted in significant economic dislocations." In a footnote, the majority said the owner of an electrically heated home might pay \$30.50 a winter month for TVA power, compared to \$75.53 for an identical amount from KU.

In seeking review of the case, the solicitor general said there had been "considerable confusion (about the issue) and the prospect of mounting litigation."

### Fifth Column Delays Victory

**HON. BOB WILSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Dec. 23, 1967]

#### FIFTH COLUMN DELAYS VICTORY

The battlefield of Vietnam is as much in the United States of America as it is in the humid swamps of Asia. The war for freedom of the Vietnamese people can be won or lost on American soil right here at home as much as it can in Vietnam itself. But there appears to be no Christmas truce at home.

Perhaps through stupid symbolism of misguided protesters blood will again be poured over selective service files. But this, too, has its significance.

As the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff warned this week: "In a very real sense, the major campaign of the war has been and is being fought in the United States."

Gen. Earle G. Wheeler emphasized his point by adding that the "single most important factor in prolonging the war" is Hanol's incredible belief and mistaken calculation that there is a reasonable chance United States policy will change.

The Viet Cong manpower situation is reaching the stage where the enemy's only hope for victory is by United States default in its obligation and weakening in its determination to see the campaign through.

There are, of course, those who refuse to listen to military minds on this matter of America's conscience and duty. There are those who consider only some academic minds, by contrast, have the answer. For them there was an important announcement this week, too. It came from non-military minds; even non-militant minds.

A group of Asian scholars—professors—meeting for two days under the sponsorship of the Freedom House Public Affairs Institute reported in terms almost identical to Gen. Wheeler. They said the conflict is "being decided on the streets and in the homes of

America as much as in the jungles of Vietnam."

They referred to the "crucial importance" of the U.S. presence in Asia which "has bought time for some 200 million people to develop without their being ceaselessly confronted with combined external-internal communist threats of growing proportions."

We are, as President Johnson said again this week, always ready to negotiate. We are, of course, prepared to achieve peace honorably and in the best interests of the people of South Vietnam.

But this does not mean we are prepared to "negotiate our defeat or a face-saving withdrawal which would invalidate the sacrifices," as Gen. Wheeler expressed it.

The current tragedy of this war is that many American and allied lives are being lost because of fifth column voices at home. If Hanoi did not interpret the antics of the anti-war factions as national lack of purpose, Ho Chi Minh would be more disposed to come to the conference table. Until he gets another impression, he will hold back. And men will continue to die.

The Christmas truce in Vietnam could be a permanent one if only that lesson was learned. Let the dissenters demanding peace sing their songs to Hanoi instead of to Washington.

### Slippery Rumors of Peace

**HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, peace in Vietnam and Southeast Asia will not come easily, but that does not mean that we should not try with all our might to reach that goal as soon as possible. An excellent statement was broadcast by MBR Radio, a leading station in Knoxville, Tenn.

This radio editorial speaks well for those of us who believe in honoring our commitments for peace and freedom, and I place it in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SLIPPERY RUMORS OF PEACE

Once again rumors are afoot that Ho Chi Minh is willing to talk peace and is fishing about for a suitable meeting place or an intermediary. Let us hope that this is so.

But hoping it is so is quite different from assuming that the negotiations will be productive and from acting as if the negotiations were practically under way. And that is just what a lot of people are doing when they demand, as they have upon every hint of a softening in Hanoi, that we promptly let up on our pressure, especially the bombing of North Vietnam.

They welcome the rumors of peace, yet act as if we are obstructing peace by our behavior. If Ho Chi Minh is really softening, as they think, then what do they think has caused him to do so? The weather? The tea leaves? The stars? The rapid pleas, well-meaning and otherwise, of people all over the world? Nonsense. If Ho Chi Minh is softening, it is because the war is hurting. And the last way to make him want to stop the war is to stop it from hurting.

To the Communists, negotiations are like bombing pauses—something to fall back on when things are going badly, a means of stalling off the enemy while they prepare new offensives. Only last week, Maj. Gen. Richard G. Ciccolella recalled his frustration as senior United Nations member of the Korea armistice commission. The peace talks, he said were used by the Communists "to wage war in the form of psychological and political propaganda." More than half

of our casualties in Korea took place after the peace talks had begun.

To call off the bombing of North Vietnam on the basis of rumors or tentative feelers would be, in effect, to give Ho the respite he wants. If he should still be willing to negotiate, it would only be to obtain further concessions. And we would be in danger of sacrificing the cause for which so many Americans have died.

Negotiations with Ho are likely to be a slippery business under the best of circumstances. To let up on the pressure now would be to forfeit any chance that they would bring a sincere and constructive response.

### Will 1968 Be Just Another Weary Year?

**HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the American cattle industry has just completed a year of depression in the midst of one of the greatest economic upsurges this Nation has ever experienced. The editorial in the January issue of the American Cattleman analyzes this predicament and makes some excellent suggestions. I believe this editorial will be of interest to those who recognize that continued depression in one of the Nation's most important industries ultimately will have an adverse affect on us all.

The editorial follows:

#### WHAT VALUE 20-20 HINDSIGHT?

The new year has arrived. For cattlemen the question is: Will it be just another weary year, or will the lessons of the past serve to create sufficient shift in thinking to brand 1968 as the milestone of marketing history?

Looking backward, there can be no doubt in anyone's mind that the whole structure of agriculture as we have known it has been crumbling. The so-called agricultural revolution, combined with the urban-sociological concept of government planners, leaves few of the familiar and trusted "truths" in operation in this latter half of the 20th Century.

New thoughts are crystallizing to replace the accepted situations of even a year or two ago.

Food producers have often been prone to blame their farm organizations for failure to take the initiative and remain ahead of the problems. But, is this an honest appraisal? Producer associations have pretty well reflected the bewilderment and desire of men and women in agriculture to hang onto old traditions at any cost.

As proof of changing thought, however, there are now hundreds of intelligent voices rising from the soil. In the total they represent thinking that must prevail . . . that producers must first accept the premise that patchwork repair of old ideas and ideals can be erased from our planning.

If, like the alcoholic, we acknowledge that we are at rock bottom; that we need help beyond our individual abilities; that the problem can be solved by adopting an entirely new outlook—then we are in line to be cured.

We may deeply regret the changed status of agriculture. The feeling is comparable to shooting a favorite but aged and enfeebled horse. But, when our individual economic lives are at stake, sentiment ought give way to hard headed action . . . no matter how intensely we may wish that the old traditions could remain.

The final decision of producers in the American National Cattlemen's Association to enter the marketing battlefield was a long time in coming. The giant step was taken grimly, with cattlemen realizing that there would be pitfalls and many battles . . . but with valid chance of winning the marketing war as has been so dramatically done on the production front.

As every producer knows, the production battle was not whipped by any individual cattleman. Thousands of researchers working together, along with hundreds of private companies, and thousands of innovators of the industry, all combined to provide the ideas, the planning, the know-how, and the practical application.

It should be equally obvious that cattlemen cannot win an even tougher and more complex marketing battle as individuals or as members of small groups.

However, if we admit that long accepted marketing and pricing methods now are outdated; if we agree that there are enough determined people within the industry voluntarily to band together in a tight organization for survival—then we will be well on our way to achievements once believed impossible.

Attrition of good producers to the onslaught of unrelenting change has been a sad period in our national life, but at this point in history opportunity beckons to those remaining. The time to fight is while we have sufficient strength and can still acquire the working knowledge which will help us think our way along.

To achieve an effective marketing goal is going to demand a lot of thinking, a lot of changed attitudes, and an immense amount of cooperation.

The will to survive is strong among cattlemen. As yet many may be too engrossed with the traditional little local skirmishes. These dissipated efforts, if combined, could win the marketing war and place the cattle business on a sound business basis along with other facets of the national economy.

How the battle progresses is entirely up to the producers themselves. Foresight is the key. There can be no looking back to the "good old days." Enough cattlemen must marshal money, efforts and full cooperation in the total endeavor to get a difficult job done. There can be no other way.

#### MOTTO FOR CATTLEMEN

"Whatever your line of work, one fact soon emerges with crystal clarity—you either get involved, or you soon find yourself ignored and forgotten."—Sterlin Hurley, president, Arkansas Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts.

### Lesson From Britain

**HON. BOB WILSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Jan. 19, 1968]

#### LESSON FROM BRITAIN

So Britain, the "right little, tight little island," pulls even further into its shell. The nation of 55 million people, squeezed on land one-fortieth the size of the United States, is in the final sad stages of relinquishing its position as a major world power.

Socialism, loss of empire, demands of labor and rising costs, postwar economic malnutrition—all have taken their toll. Perhaps the most important single factor in the collapse



has been labor's strength which grew with Socialism, and helped to turn British enterprise into euphoric lethargy.

For the United States of America there are many lessons and manifold new problems.

An elementary lesson is that inroads of socialistic programs on the economy and vigor of our country must be checked before they become fatally expensive. In Britain and the United States, unbridled government spending coupled with excessive control of the economy can lead only to economic chaos.

Among the new problems is the power vacuum being created around the world by the withdrawal from strategic areas of this nation's major ally in two world wars. The vacuum will be filled. We must not watch it go by default to the Communists.

Finally, the lesson of the devalued pound and near bankrupt Britain is the clear danger signal to the dollar. The one affects the other. Our dollar deficit balance of payments is one of the alarm bells.

The fiscal policies of this great nation must be removed from socialistic theory and reshaped into capitalistic practice. We can learn from Britain's mistakes.

### Drift From Individual Responsibility Causing National Ills

**HON. E. Y. BERRY**

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, one of South Dakota's most talented editorial writers is Donald Cammack of the Buffalo Times-Herald. I was especially impressed with a recent editorial, "Drift From Individual Responsibility Causing National Ills." It very accurately reflects what has been happening to our form of government, and I would urge my colleagues to read it with care.

The editorial follows:

#### DRIFT FROM INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY CAUSING NATIONAL ILLS

Many of the nation's ills which are becoming more serious year by year may be traced to the time many years ago when the responsibility for a citizen and his future began to be transferred to the government. As the individual abdicated more and more of his responsibility, government was there to take over. In the field of savings, in the field of welfare, in the field of agriculture, in the field of industry, and in the field of education, ambitious politicians stood ready to act as empire builders, until gradually the responsibility of the individual citizen toward his family, toward his community and state, lessened and weakened and Americans looked more and more toward Washington for the answers to their problems.

It is perhaps in this area that breakdown of individual responsibility is felt most. A great decrease in moral responsibility and civic responsibility has resulted from millions of people demanding that Washington solve the problems of the family and the community. Protest demonstrations and riots have become a way of life for malcontents, and actions such as the recent "crucifixion" of a female member of a lawless gang in Florida have shocked the nation.

Even in the quiet, usually conservative midwest, outbreaks of violence in protest of "conditions" have occurred.

In our opinion, the solution of many of the nation's gravest domestic problems will come not from pouring more federal tax money back into troubled communities, but

by allowing more of the money earned to remain in local communities where it can be used by people acquainted with local problems and local conditions.

People with pride in their way of life and pride in their local communities do not riot. People who actively participate in governing their home, their community and their state, are better able to handle affairs in that area than political appointees, backed by unlimited taxing authority, far from the responsibility of facing up to the people whose money they are using.

Straws in the political wind are beginning to indicate that Americans are nearing the end of their love affair with the all-powerful "Great White Father on the Potomac" theory of government.

Increased taxes and increased government interference in private affairs have come gradually, but nonetheless, there is scarcely an American citizen who does not feel the heavy hand of government on his shoulder as he goes about his daily work. The hand of government is in his pay envelope, and his preparations for his future involve the vagaries of government regulated funds and restrictions on his future retirement income. The farmer must look to Washington for regulations, and his choice of crops and methods involves government regulation. Education and industry are affected strongly by government.

Evidence that bureaucratic regulation of the American way of life has been somewhat less than successful is on every hand. The practice of looking to Washington has resulted in greatly reduced influence of the people on the actions of their government, which has in turn resulted more and more in government by edict and order than in government originating in legislation responsive to the wishes of the people. The rise in power of the judicial branch of government has resulted in court rulings which have adversely affected law and order throughout the nation.

### A View of the State of the Union Message

**HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE**

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal, Friday, January 19, 1968:

#### WASHINGTON WASTELAND

If it did not touch so many serious matters, the State of the Union message would be almost laughable. At best it underscores the intellectual poverty of latter-day liberalism.

That, we might add, is not just a reflex response on our part; it is a sentiment conspicuously present among the more thoughtful liberals themselves.

Consider just a couple of outrageous propositions in the address:

The Chief Executive, constrained by the cost of Vietnam, says (tongue in cheek?) he will submit a "tight" budget of only some \$186 billion, including trust funds not counted in the old-style administrative budget. The figure is over \$10 billion above estimated spending in the current fiscal year. It would leave a deficit of about \$8 billion assuming taxes are increased; otherwise \$20 billion.

Now it is undoubtedly true that, but for Vietnam, the Administration would want to spend a lot more on domestic welfare programs. All the same, to call \$186 billion a tight budget is really stretching things, especially when Mr. Johnson insists that most of

the increase is "mandatory." Mandatory only in the sense that the Administration and Congress are profligate with the people's money.

Spending of such scope, coupled with perpetual deficits and a super-easy money policy, is the prime cause of the inflation the nation is suffering. Naturally, therefore, the President blames the inflation on business and organized labor. And how's this for a wonderful line, in connection with inflation and his demand for a tax boost: "Congress can repeal it . . . if the need has passed, but Congress can never repeal inflation. . ."

Well, it just so happens that Congress is about the only institution that can repeal inflation. No matter how orgiastic the Administration's spending drive, no matter how loose the Federal Reserve, Congress—if it would employ its Constitutional prerogatives—can hold the line. Not by raising taxes, which this Administration would probably only dissipate, but by getting these wild expenditures under control.

But it's when you come to the content of some of the spending that the aridity of the Administration's thinking becomes glaringly apparent. Same old programs for public housing and urban renewal, which in practice have been so disastrous Negroes rightly call them "Negro removal"; for farm subsidies, which enrich the rich while speeding the migration of the rural poor to the overwhelmed cities; for ostensible aid to consumers, which mostly needs additional harassments for business.

Still, there's one more or less new idea, and it's a safe bet that it wouldn't have occurred to Washington's planners except for the cost pressure of Vietnam. Mr. Johnson wants a \$2.1 billion manpower program partly "to start a new partnership between Government and private industry to train and to hire the hard-core unemployed persons"—as he says, the hardest to reach.

Of course private industry has, on its own, vastly enlarged the job market over the years, far beyond the dreams of earlier Government planners. Thus it was waging the war against poverty long before the thought blossomed in the politicians' minds. Nowadays many companies are actively trying to recruit the poor; indeed, even those rated as unemployable.

The effort can have, and has had, a certain amount of success for the simple reason that a number of those considered unemployable are not in fact so, given training and motivation. Yet, human nature being what it is, a hard core of actually unemployable people will always remain, and the trouble with the Administration's sweeping proposal is that it ignores that unhappy circumstance. Steadfast to sentimental liberalism, it assumes that the dispensation of enough money can make everyone a solid and productive citizen.

Such is the tone of the message: Spend more and tax more, and its' too bad Vietnam keeps us from spending and taxing a great deal more. The weary old liberal theme, uninspired and uninspiring—and, for the well-being of the nation, not amusing at all.

### Commemoration of the 50th Anniversary of Ukrainian Revolution

**HON. GUY VANDER JAGT**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, in observance of the 50th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic, I salute efforts of the Ukrainian people for their spirit of freedom in resisting tyranny and

oppression. Struggles for individual liberty provide inspiration and purpose as we seek a lasting brotherhood of man. I have the deepest sympathy for the hopes of the people of Ukrainian lands.

### Congress Applauds President's Determination To Assure Law and Order Throughout America

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson in his state of the Union address declared:

We, at every level of government, know that the American people have had enough of rising crime and lawlessness.

Certainly the President correctly reported on the mood and temper of our people—truly they have had enough of riots, violence, and lawlessness.

Law and order are uppermost in their minds—just as it is uppermost in the minds of the Congress.

In this connection I include an editorial from the Nashville Banner in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD, because of its broad general interest and its interest to my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, Jan. 18, 1968]

LOUD RESPONSE BY CONGRESS PROOF AMERICA HAS "HAD ENOUGH"

Although President Johnson and others charged with the responsibility of maintaining law and order throughout a troubled nation should not have needed any confirmation that America is fed up with rioting and lawlessness, the fervent, ringing applause of Congress accorded that proof Wednesday night.

The Chief Executive apparently sensed the mood of that legislative body—and of the country at large—in his State of the Union Message to the second session of the 90th Congress, which gave him a cheering ovation, the longest and loudest of the 52-minute address, when he declared:

"The American people have had enough of rising crime and lawlessness."

Mr. Johnson's speech, in the main, simply was a repetition of grandiose federal spending outlays, many of them rejected, delayed, or trimmed during the 1967 session. But both Congress and the public—whose fear of recurring threats of violence against life and property is mounting daily—can, and should, approve wholeheartedly the overdue measures the President outlined to deal with crime in the streets or wherever it may occur.

To help strengthen local police forces, through improved training, higher salaries and advanced technology in the "war on crime," the President renewed his plea that Congress clear his \$100 million Safe Streets Act, a proposal which has been bottled up since last year.

Especially heartening was his request to provide 100 additional FBI agents "to strengthen law enforcement in the nation and to protect the individual rights of every citizen."

While the President emphasized the law enforcement was, and is, a primary responsibility of local and state governments, it was reassuring to hear him declare that Federal authorities "can and should help the

states and cities in their war on crime. This we shall do . . . Those who preach disorder and violence must know that local authorities are able to resist them swiftly, sternly and decisively."

In addition to pledging cooperation for development of state and local plans to combat crime, Mr. Johnson also called for vigorous enforcement of drug laws, additional federal prosecutors, mail-order gun control legislation and "help and financial support" to local law enforcement agencies.

Other phases of the President's assessment of problems at home and abroad, and his proposed solutions therefor, sparked a less-than-enthusiastic response on both sides of the political party aisle, both within and without the legislative halls.

In reiterating his strong plea for a 10 per cent hike on personal and corporate income, and at the same time submitting proposals for even greater expenditures by the Federal Government, he chose not to recognize congressional demands by Rep. Wilbur Mills, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, and others that appropriations should be reduced as a curb against higher prices, rising inflation and interest rates. Unless Mr. Johnson adopts a more realistic approach by slashing unneeded and often extravagant outlays for non-military purposes, his tax bill—in this election year—may never see the light of day.

Many members of Congress have reached the sound conclusion that this nation cannot afford skyrocketing programs of federal outlays at home while spending the necessary billions to finance the war in Vietnam. Although the increased budget proposals outlined by the President are smaller than usual, he has not given up on his plan for both guns and butter.

With the presidential election only a few months away, Mr. Johnson passed up an opportunity to use the appearance before Congress—and millions of others via television across the land—to launch his campaign for reelection.

In addition to the men and women in Congress—many of whom also go before the voters this year—a concerned electorate watched and listened, in most instances with a feeling of considerable let-down.

### Boost for the Great Society

**HON. BYRON G. ROGERS**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Denver Post in a recent editorial agrees with President Johnson that there is still much unfinished business awaiting the Nation and the Congress, but it adds that the President can find reasons for satisfaction with the 1967 legislative accomplishments.

Two of these reasons are the expansion of social security benefits and the record \$9.3 billion authorization for elementary and secondary education.

The Post says:

These obviously pleased the President, as well they should, for the two measures are key parts of his administration's Great Society program.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Post's statement that "the social security program is accepted by a large majority of Americans as decent way for providing sustenance for our elderly citizens," and I trust the education bill will open the

way for improved Federal-State cooperation in school affairs.

I am certain that both measures, while they do not contain all the President requested, are boosts for the Great Society. Mr. Speaker, I include the Denver Post editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

### BOOST FOR GREAT SOCIETY

"Exhilaration and frustration." These contradictory words were used last year by President Johnson in describing the mood of the nation.

Without doubt, they also reflected his own mood as he signed three measures into law.

The first two—bills calling for expansion of Social Security benefits and a record \$9.3 billion expenditure for elementary and secondary schools—obviously pleased the President. As well they should, for the two measures are key parts of his administration's Great Society program.

The ease with which the education bill, once considered too controversial for passage, was steered through Congress is a tribute to Johnson's political skill. And more than ever, the bill opens the way for improved federal-state cooperation in school affairs.

There is no question that the Social Security program is accepted by a large majority of Americans as a decent way of providing sustenance for our elderly citizens. Yet the lengthy debate on Capitol Hill reflected some of the misgivings over the payroll tax hike needed to pay for increased benefits.

The groans of taxpayers will be heard from later as the new payroll tax takes effect. But despite certain built-in regressive aspects of the tax, the over-all impact for pensioners and for the economy is decidedly beneficial.

The third measure signed Tuesday by the President pained him into uncharacteristic silence. The bill—setting a \$2.3 billion ceiling on foreign aid, the lowest in the 20-year history of the program—epitomized Johnson's frustration in the field of foreign policy.

And more than anything else, the sharp cutback in foreign aid underscored the isolationist undertone in Congress. If this disturbing trend continues, it could well mean the end of such aid as a meaningful instrument of foreign policy.

But despite this reminder of his setbacks, with the recalcitrant 90th Congress, the President can still find reasons for satisfaction in his 1967 legislative accomplishments.

Congress, at his prodding, approved consular and outer-space treaties with the Soviet Union; expanded air pollution controls; approved a meat-inspection bill; enacted a flammable fabrics measure; approved a public television bill.

There is still much unfinished business, but these are accomplishments that the President can energetically build on as the new session of Congress gets under way.

### Liberia's Durable President

**HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, one of America's best friends in Africa, President William V. S. Tubman of Liberia, was just inaugurated for his sixth term as President of that country, of which Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, who represented the United States at the inaugural ceremony, recently said in Monrovia: "The bond between us is one century and a half old."

The Chicago Tribune in a recent editorial paid a tribute to "Liberia's Durable



President." I should like to make it available to my colleagues, and I submit it for reprinting in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune,  
Jan. 6, 1968]

#### LIBERIA'S DURABLE PRESIDENT

The sixth inauguration of Liberia's President William V. S. Tubman, which Vice President Humphrey has just attended, calls for some comments about democracy in Africa.

Liberia's constitution, adopted more than a century ago when the country was founded by emigrant American slaves, is patterned after ours. It does not follow that Liberia is what we would call a model of democracy in action. Most of its 1.5 million people are primitive tribesmen living in jungle villages. They are represented in Monrovia by their chiefs, who have formed a working relationship with the governing clique and are for the most part interested in preserving the status quo. The status quo means Mr. Tubman, who has been president for 25 years, giving him a seniority exceeded only by the emperors of Japan and Ethiopia and by Generals Franco and Salazar in Spain and Portugal.

Mr. Tubman is referred to on the street, with awe but usually also with respect, as "the old man"—like Germany's late Chancellor Adenauer. The chances are that nothing but retirement or death will move him out of the president's modern gold palace, set in [correct] an artificial lake on a hill overlooking Monrovia and the ocean.

But if these things don't quite conform to our ideals of democracy, Liberia shows up in a vastly better light when compared with the other African states. Under Mr. Tubman it has enjoyed a political stability remarkable for the continent. The country has had its economic troubles [as what African country hasn't?], but it has accepted several years of austerity and seems to be recovering.

Above all, Mr. Tubman has confined his attention to Liberia instead of trying to set himself up as a nationalistic, pan-African hero. This has enabled him to remain a friend of the United States, tho some of his ranting neighbors denounce him as an African Uncle Tom. All in all, he has contributed to the progress of his country—slowly, perhaps, but certainly more effectively than other African leaders to whom democracy is nothing but a political slogan, to be shouted at the United Nations but never applied to their own countries.

#### Atomic Energy 1992: Realistic Optimism

**HON. CRAIG HOSMER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, when the atomic age began almost a quarter century ago, our imagination was stimulated to envision an almost endless list of benefits which would accrue to all men. Many of these dreams have not yet come true, but looking at the spectrum of nuclear applications in 1968, it is clear to me that atomic energy has come further in the past 25 years than we had dared hope.

Electricity is not yet free, as predicted, but nuclear powerplants are now competitive with fossil fuel plants. We have forgotten the nuclear automobile, but the promise of large quantities of cheap electricity gives us increased hope for the electric automobile. And advancing technology in the aviation field has

renewed interest in another prediction of the past: the nuclear-powered airplane.

As we move into the second 25 years of atomic energy, two members of the nuclear industry have looked at atomic energy today and in the next 25 years.

The Westinghouse Electric Corp. has just published an attractive magazine on atomic power called *Infinite Energy*. I understand that copies have been presented to all Members of Congress, and I commend it to your attention.

And in the January 1968 issue of *Nuclear News*, the magazine of the American Nuclear Society, John J. Flaherty, president of the Atomic International Division of North American Rockwell Corp., takes what he calls a "realistic optimistic" view of the next 25 years for nuclear energy in the following guest editorial:

#### OPTIMISM IS REALISTIC

(By John J. Flaherty)

Man's first self-sustaining chain reaction 25 years ago stimulated exciting forecasts about revolutionary changes that would come as a result of this new energy source. We know how few of them came to be true right away. Nuclear energy in its civilian applications did not immediately change the way we went about our lives. In 25 years, though, it has progressed a great deal farther than those early forecasters could think possible.

This proves a truism about long-range planning: We tend to be too optimistic about short-term progress and too pessimistic about long-term development.

We have come a long way in our 25 years—from a pioneering experiment in the Midwest to a highly developed industry; from totally governmental research to a maturing industry. And we are probably going to go farther in the next 25 than either you or I can imagine. Nevertheless, let's chart our progress thus far in the major applications of nuclear energy and then, for a moment, be realistically optimistic in considering how far we might go in the next 25 years.

#### ELECTRIC POWER GENERATION

We have progressed through experimental and developmental stages to water reactors, which reached economic usefulness in the 1960s. Accompanying this were important steps in the development of breeder reactors. During the next 25 years, we can expect an acceptance of the fast breeder reactor by the electric generating industry as a compatible successor to the water reactor. Also likely is the continued development of compact, highly reliable reactors for such uses as unattended generating stations in remote areas.

#### POWER COST

With the water cooled reactor, we have achieved a first goal: nuclear-generated power at a cost competitive with that using other fuels. The introduction of fast breeder reactors should take us to a second goal: keeping nuclear power competitive in price and, at the same time, making it an inexhaustible source of energy. We're well on the road toward this second goal:

#### SPACE

SNAP-10A proved the feasibility of reactor power source for space vehicles. In the future, the concept should be put to actual use to supply power for landing parties on the surface of the moon, as compact long-life sources of power for unmanned flights to Mars and Venus, and in communications satellites, TV broadcast satellites, and laboratory satellites.

#### UNDERSEA

Nuclear power found one of its earliest successes in providing power for United States submarines. For future explorations

of the ocean's depths, including undersea colonies and permanent scientific laboratories, I expect that more attention will be paid to nuclear power's compactness, reliability, long life, and ability to operate without oxygen.

#### DESALTING

Work is underway to make use of nuclear power in turning sea water into fresh, including a recently signed contract for a nuclear power desalination and electrical generating plant on an artificial island off the coast of Southern California. The construction and operation of this plant and others of its type will provide information on which the future use of nuclear power in this field can be based.

#### MEDICINE

Tracer chemicals ingested by patients and the treatment of tumors through irradiation have shown that medicine can successfully make use of nuclear materials. More important, however, might be the use of actual nuclear power sources in compact and long-lasting applications such as artificial hearts.

#### PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE

We are earning a steadily increasing public confidence in our work and our installations. Much of the credit for this goes to the Atomic Energy Commission's education program and to our excellent safety record. The public's esteem should continue to grow as nuclear uses become more common and as it is more widely realized that nuclear powerplants possess the outstanding property of not contributing to air pollution.

One more point: As important as our progress has been in research, in application, and in overcoming economic barriers, one of the most significant signs has been our industry's growing maturity. When work with civilian nuclear energy began, it was by necessity totally government controlled. With the encouragement and help of the AEC and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and our own hard work, private industry has begun operating in all segments of the industry except uranium enrichment. This, I submit, has to be considered among our very important achievements of the last 25 years.

#### America Should Give Moral Support for Ukrainian Independence

**HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, today is the 50th anniversary of the Ukraine's declaration of independence from Russia on January 22, 1918. This independence turned out to be short lived, since by 1920 the Soviet Union had taken complete control of the Ukraine, denying to the Ukrainian people their basic human right of self-determination. American citizens of Ukrainian descent, earnestly hoping that the Ukraine will soon be independent once more, celebrate this day annually with meetings in their home communities. One of the most impressive of these gatherings is held in Philadelphia, the birthplace of our own independence as a nation. I was honored when the Philadelphia branch, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, invited me to address its rally this past Saturday evening which was attended by some 1,500 Ukrainian Americans.

In my address to the rally, I paid tribute to the courage of the Ukrainian people in their quest for freedom. I urged

that the United States lend its moral support to the cause of self-determination and independence for the Ukraine's more than 40 million people. I include in the RECORD that portion of my speech dealing with Ukrainian independence:

**AMERICA SHOULD GIVE MORE SUPPORT FOR  
UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE**

In recent months we have had a steady stream of magazine stories, newspaper articles and television shows devoted to the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution in the Soviet Union. Now I would like to see a lot more attention to the 50th anniversary we are celebrating here tonight—the anniversary of Ukrainian freedom.

It's ironic that when the Czars were overthrown fifty years ago, the result was not freedom for the peoples of the Soviet Union. The result was simply more enslavement, this time under the Soviet masters. No people have learned that lesson more painfully than the brave people of the Ukraine. No people have fought harder for their national independence. To this day, no people inside the Soviet Union's borders are more independent in mind than the Ukrainians.

In the face of overwhelming obstacles, the Ukrainians of 1918 formed their own parliament, their own schools, their own courts and their own national army. France and England recognized the Ukraine as an independent state. But almost immediately the Ukrainians had to start defending themselves against the Bolsheviks. By 1920, the Soviets had taken control. Ukrainian independence was crushed.

During World War Two the Ukrainian spirit came through again. Ukrainians fought not only against the Nazis but against the returning Red Army as well. Again the Ukrainian forces were overpowered by the vast numbers of the Soviets. But the Ukrainian spirit, whatever the odds, has not died. It was surely alive last November, when the first World Congress of Free Ukrainians met in New York City. And it is very much alive here tonight, in the hearts of all who have gathered here.

As Americans we all value our own independence. Our nation is fighting today to contain Communism in Southeast Asia, so that Asian countries and ourselves might safeguard our independence. We are standing here only a few blocks from Independence Hall tonight, but even here the word "independence" seems not too close to us. The word is more of an abstraction than a concrete reality in our lives. But those of you who know the Ukrainian struggle first hand know what independence means. You know how precious it is, and how hard one has to fight to keep it, or achieve it in the first place. May America always have her independence, and may the day come soon when the Ukraine can take her place in the family of independent nations.

I would urge, here and now, moral support by the United States for self-determination and independence for the Ukraine.

**How You Can Change the Law**

**HON. DONALD E. LUKENS**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that a male Member of Congress finds himself in a position in reading a magazine aimed at the other sex. In a startling exception to this, however, I have found through an old friend, Mrs. Adele B. Friedrichs, public relations director for Glamour magazine, my attention drawn

to an article which I think is exceptional in its purpose, content, and introduction to effective politics.

Each of us who is an elected representative of the voter knows how important it is that we stay in touch with the voters and that they stay in touch with us. We realize that politics and government cannot be separated and that each depends upon the involvement and active participation, particularly on the part of individual voters.

This Glamour article by Ellen Switzer entitled "How To Change the Law," is one which I think should be read by every American who cares about his government and cares about the impact of his government on his own life.

Mr. Speaker, I commend it to the RECORD so that it will be available to an even wider range of individuals because I feel its contents are outstanding:

**HOW YOU CAN CHANGE THE LAW**

(By Ellen Switzer)

Lobbying involves playing politics. If the adjective "dirty" invariably precedes the word "politics" in your vocabulary, you'd be better off to forget lobbying and join a Great Books discussion group instead. The highway department announces plans for a four-lane expressway right through the best park in your area. There's another newspaper exposé (with suitably gruesome pictures) of overcrowding, understaffing and general degradation in your state's institutions for the elderly, the mentally ill or the mentally retarded. A sociologist (or Senator Robert Kennedy) tells us again that our present welfare system doesn't seem to work very well, either for the poor or for the taxpayer. There's another serious accident at the corner of Route 1 and Main Street that might have been prevented if a stoplight, recommended by the town planner six months ago, had been installed on schedule. Somebody, you reflect, ought to do something about it. Indeed, somebody should. But wishful thinking rarely solves problems. Political action can.

Lobbying—which means the efforts of private citizens, or groups of citizens, to influence legislation—is a time-honored American political practice. Giant industrial interests do it, so do varied special-interest groups ranging from conservationists to animal lovers to prohibitionists. If you feel strongly about a cause, if you see clearly the need for the repeal of an old law or the forging of a new one, and if you're willing to throw yourself wholeheartedly into the effort—and there's work involved: reading, studying, informing yourself and others—you can join the action too.

Of course, the closer the problem you are trying to solve is to home, the better your chances of influencing legislation. It's certainly more likely that you will be able to get that stoplight at the corner of Route 1 and Main Street than change United States policy in Vietnam. This does not mean that you should concentrate on local problems to the exclusion of national and international ones. But realize that your influence on the community and state legislative scene can be enormous, while on the national and international one it is likely to be minute.

We tend to minimize the influence of state legislatures. But every child in school, every patient in a hospital for the mentally ill or retarded, every camper in a state park, every welfare recipient, every tax-paying citizen is affected by the collective wisdom (or stupidity), fiscal responsibility (or irresponsibility), concern for people (or lack of it) shown by state legislators doing their job well (or badly). Citizens can exert an enormous influence on state legislators, and therefore this can be an area in which an individual can really make a mark.

You can't, of course, do it alone. First step is to join an organization that is interested in your particular legislative area—the PTA for education, a garden or hiking club for conservation, the Mental Health Association for better psychiatric facilities. Florence Nightingale, Clara Barton and Dorothea Dix may have succeeded in changing laws all by themselves, but doing battle as a loner usually produces nothing but frustration.

You must have faith in the political process as a means of effecting change. Sometimes that is not easy. State legislatures are usually slow, inefficient and sometimes downright infuriating. They often seem apathetic about such vital issues as urban blight, crowded prisons and overcrowded hospitals, poverty and racial injustice, while debating endlessly about naming the state flower or the state fish or voting a congratulatory message to Senator Joe Brown from upstate who has just been made president of the local Elks lodge. State legislatures can spend weeks and months discussing and passing incredibly useless laws. For several years the California legislators debated a bill which would have provided that cows at state fairs must be arrayed so that their heads rather than their behinds face the audience. And a Texas legislator recently introduced a bill to prohibit any barber from discussing "atomic or nuclear energy . . . or any other subject in which he is not learned." Faced with a daily dose of silly doings at the state capitol, it's sometimes easy to forget that most legislative bodies do get a great deal of important work done.

Lobbying involves playing politics. There is no way around this fact. But politics can be a rewarding, exciting experience for those who are willing to learn the rules of the game, abide by them and add a few creative, imaginative touches of their own.

Don't bother with legislative action at all unless you feel that you can understand and appreciate politicians. If the adjective "dirty" or "corrupt" automatically precedes the noun "politics" in your mind, you will either have to change your basic attitudes or forget about political action entirely and join a Great Books discussion group instead.

Legislators, like all human beings, sense distrust, hostility and superciliousness, even if they are not directly expressed. Understandably enough, they'd rather not deal with anyone who assumes that they are venal or stupid or both. It's best to assume that the legislator with whom you are dealing chose to run for office because he wished to serve the people of his state to the best of his ability. Usually this turns out to be true. Even if it doesn't, a constituent's faith in a legislator's integrity and concern has often brought out the best in even the most selfishly ambitious one. He may surprise himself and you by voting for your bill. Often he'll tell you afterward in a half-pleased, half-embarrassed manner that he still doesn't understand why he did it.

Don't scatter your shots. There may be ten different areas in which you would like to see new and better laws. You may be able to think of twenty-five bills you would like to see introduced and passed. But your ultimate success is probably directly related to your ability to limit your goals. Pick out one, two, or at the most three goals, in related areas, that you really want to achieve. Then become an expert in the field.

Let's say that you want to see a community college established in your area. First find out all you can about community colleges. Are there any in your state? If so, how are they working? If not, how are they working in a neighboring state? How many potential students have shown an interest in such an institution already? Where would you find the staff? What made you decide your area was the best location (besides the fact that you live there)? How much will it cost the state this year? Next year? Who favors the college in your area? Who opposes



it? Why? These are all questions an intelligent legislator will ask, and you will have to have the answers.

Charles Weaver of the Mental Health Association in Indiana (which has been notably successful in getting good mental health laws passed) takes the process of becoming an instant expert one step further. Every year, right after election, he finds at least one freshman legislator who is intelligent and apparently dedicated to his job but who has no special commitment to any interest, either education, welfare, conservation or even mental health. Then he offers to help him become truly expert in mental health legislation. If the offer is accepted, Weaver goes to work. The legislator is taken on a tour of the state's mental health facilities. He is given opportunities to interview mental health professionals, families of patients and volunteers. He is given literature on the subject and assured that appropriate consultants will be available to him (free of charge, of course) whenever he has any questions. By the time the gavel falls on opening day, the new man really knows a great deal about mental health in general and mental health legislation in Indiana in particular. He can discuss such legislation intelligently on the floor of the legislature and in the committee room. He is often asked to speak before women's groups, service clubs and other citizen organizations on mental health laws. Soon he is no longer "that freshman senator from upstate" but "that senator who is so knowledgeable in mental health." He has gained status with his colleagues and constituents, and the Mental Health Association has a friend.

Before you try to get your bill introduced, collect as many allies as possible. It can be assumed that you have already joined whatever organization is most interested in your particular legislative area; however, one group may not be enough. You may need two or three or ten groups to support you. It's important to find allies wherever you can. If you can get one political party to put your proposal into its election platform, you are one step ahead of the game. If you can persuade both political parties to approve your project, you are halfway home. But other nonpolitical groups are also important.

Let's assume that you are still working on that community college bill. Besides the PTA Council, support might well come from the Regional Planning Authority, the Jaycees, church groups and labor unions, as well as the Chamber of Commerce. The more unlikely your allies seem to the legislators, incidentally, the more effective their support may be. For instance, if you are advocating the abolition of capital punishment, the president of the local Patrolmen's Benevolent Association is a far more effective ally than a clergyman whose interest in such a law is well known. If you are trying for a gun registration law, your most effective ally would be the president of the state hunting and shooting club. The president of the Chamber of Commerce would be a far more impressive advocate of improved welfare benefits than a social workers' organization.

In order to get the necessary allies, you must sometimes compromise on a less than perfect law. It's important to get a legislative principle enacted; you can always come back in subsequent sessions of the legislature to improve details or get larger appropriations for the new program. For instance, citizens who are interested in laws abolishing capital punishment have sometimes found it expedient to present a law which does not provide for a total ban but allows the death penalty for killers of policemen and prison guards or kidnappers of children. Those interested in liberalizing abortion laws often start by introducing bills to legalize abortion in cases of rape or incest, rather than a broader bill that would permit abortion if the physical or mental health of the mother would be impaired by the birth of a child.

A good concrete example of a compromise bill is Connecticut's new narcotics law passed during the 1967 session of the General Assembly. A Hartford attorney, Peter Costas, became interested in narcotics legislation when he was president of the Connecticut Civil Liberties Union. In search of allies, he first turned to his state's bar association and was appointed chairman of a committee to propose a whole new legal setup to deal with the problem of addiction. Subsequently, he collected more allies: the Medical Association, the Mental Health Association, the PTA Council, the Council of Churches, the Archdiocese of Hartford, the Hartford Jewish Community Council, etc. He realized that he would get nowhere, however, without the support of the State Police. He knew that any drug bill which the police opposed (or just didn't support) would not get past the first committee hearing. So he made compromises in order to get this support.

Under the new law the sale of marijuana is still a felony, not a misdemeanor as many of the original supporters of the bill had wished. But the principle that addiction is a medical and not a criminal problem is spelled out in the first sentence of the bill. The law goes much further in supporting this principle than any similar legislation anywhere in the United States. For instance, it allows certain outpatient facilities (private and public) that are designated by the State Department of Mental Health to maintain addicts on drugs if this is medically indicated. It also provides for civil (not criminal) commitments for addicts to these outpatient facilities. Psychiatrists call the Connecticut law the most progressive in the U.S., but to those who originally wrote it, it represented a compromise.

Once you have established exactly what you want your legislation to accomplish, have your bill drafted clearly, accurately and, above all, legally. If your group can get an experienced attorney or an ex-legislator to serve on your committee, you are in luck. If that is not possible, and even if your group has only a very limited amount of money to spend, pay an expert to draft the bill. Too frequently individuals or groups work months and sometimes years to get a bill passed into law, only to find out that it is legally unsatisfactory. The governor may then veto it or the attorney general of the state may refuse funds for the enacted program; in either case the group is right back where it started.

Only a legislator can introduce a bill, so choose your legislator carefully. Some legislators will introduce almost anything a constituent requests, but that does not mean they will fight for your bill. Naturally it is a good idea to get a committee chairman or a house or senate leader to introduce your bill, but it's even more important to get a fighter. One truly persuaded and persuasive legislator can do wonders to get a program through. An unconvinced and unconvincing sponsor will drop your law in the legislative hopper and feel that he has done his duty.

Get individual legislators to commit themselves, preferably in writing, to your bill as early in the session as possible. The League of Women Voters holds candidates' meetings in many states. One of their best legislative ploys is to send questionnaires to candidates (even before they are elected) to elicit their stands on certain issues of interest to the organization. The group usually requests that the answers be in writing. They are then printed in newspapers in the candidate's district. If the elected candidate tries to get out of a commitment made before election, they can make political life rather rough for him.

The best people to approach legislators are those from their own district. Most legislators, especially early in the session, will listen politely to nearly anyone. But they pay most attention to the hometown voters. Legislators also pay a surprising amount of attention to

mail. Sometimes they don't read letters from beginning to end, but they certainly count the pros and cons. Individually written letters are much better than mimeographed ones. Legislators suspect the origins of a mimeographed mailing piece. They know that only too often it comes not from truly interested citizens but from Bill's Multiple Letter Shop in Capital City with a well-financed lobbying organization footing the cost. But blizzards of letters can and do get bills passed or defeated.

Don't underestimate the opposition. Just because you think that your bill is reasonable, necessary and in the public interest, don't automatically assume that everyone will agree with you. State Senator Gloria Schaffer of Connecticut's 14th district tells of her first major defeat; a bill to make stray dogs available for medical research. She introduced the bill at the request of the Yale Medical School and checked it out with the Humane Society and other animal-loving groups. It was full of safeguards for dogs and dog owners. The bill went down in resounding defeat when an avalanche of mail hit the governor's office within days of its introduction. Antivivisectionists, dog lovers and other assorted opponents converged on the capital for the hearing. Closely reasoned testimony given by research scientists, veterinarians, representatives of the Humane Society and the kennel clubs did not impress the legislators as much as the tales of horror about suffering animals they read in the letters from the home folks.

"I never made the same mistake again," Senator Schaffer said. "The next session we were prepared. We marched out our own troops. Since the bill was so reasonable and necessary, we obviously had more supporters than opponents. The first time around no one had bothered to mobilize the supporters. This time animal-loving legislators were taken on a tour of the Yale laboratories and shown that the horror stories they had heard were just not true. The governor and members of the legislature were taken on a tour of a children's hospital ward where youngsters who would have been doomed only a few years ago were recovering from heart operations which would not have been possible without previous experiments on dogs. This time the bill passed with flying colors."

Be prepared for the public hearing on the bill. Senator Schaffer, who is chairman of the powerful Joint House and Senate Education Committee (and, incidentally, as unlikely appearing a legislator as one is apt to meet—she looks like a blond Audrey Hepburn), advises that testimony should be short, unpretentious, accurate and preferably in writing. Witnesses who present the testimony should be well enough informed to answer questions from committee members. This is one place where the mimeograph machine can come in very handy. The witness may find that he is talking to a temporary chairman and twenty empty chairs. At that point the organization sponsoring the bill might send out mimeographed copies of the testimony to all committee members, preferably at their home addresses, and include a little handwritten note from an influential constituent indicating that "although you couldn't make the committee hearing, undoubtedly due to your heavy legislative schedule, we were sure that you would want to know something about our point of view on this bill." Some legislators will tell individuals and groups that it is not necessary for them to send mimeographed statements—committee hearings are recorded and transcribed and they can read the testimony as part of the record. But the record runs to perhaps 1,000 pages, and few legislators are likely to pore over it looking for your testimony.

Keep in touch with the status of your bill—right up to the time the governor signs it. Bills literally get lost between committees, between houses of the legislature and on their way to the governor's office. Controversy



slal bills have been known to make the rounds of committees without landing on a hearing schedule in time for a real discussion. Some committees are known to be burial grounds for unpopular legislation. Other committees make it a point not to vote their recommendations until the last day for committee report deadlines. If there is no report, your bill is either dead or it will take a cumbersome procedure to appeal it out of committee and onto the floor of the legislature.

If you've had your hearing before a committee and there is no report in a reasonably short time, get in touch with the chairman. He may tell you that everything is going along swimmingly, he just hasn't had a chance to call for a report. Keep after him. After the reports are out, keep after the clerks of the house and senate to make sure that your bills get on the calendar of both houses. Bills that are not scheduled until the last few days sometimes don't make it just because the legislative bodies run out of time. Most have a statutory deadline for closing, and any bill that has not been voted on before then is dead.

Watch out for amendments. An amendment can improve a bill. It can also utterly change its intent. It can be used as a flank attack on your law by an opponent who cannot defeat it by direct means. He may promise to improve your law beyond your fondest hopes, but in doing so, make it so costly that it has no chance of passage. As a general rule, when a legislator offers to increase the appropriation on a bill drastically, watch out! He may be killing you with kindness.

Amendments can also be used to postpone a vote on your bill until it is too late. Generally speaking, except in cases where your bill was badly drawn in the first place or where changes are needed as a compromise to assure passage, amendments are bad news.

Just because a bill has passed one house, it will not necessarily pass the other. In many states the house of representatives includes many more legislators from rural districts than the senate. (This is no longer quite as true as it was before the Supreme Court "one man, one vote" ruling, but it still applies in many places.) You may have an easy time with one house and a very hard time with the other. You may have to change your tactics, your testimony and your legislative approach. This is one of the reasons why it is a good idea to have friends in both houses as well as in both political parties. Get their advice and use it.

Remember, however, that such advice is usually confidential. *Never betray a legislator's confidence.* It's very flattering to a lobbyist's ego to be able to tell her friends that "the majority leader asked me to wait until after the caucus before writing to the governor about the bill. . . ." But you are not even supposed to know there is a caucus. You can get a majority leader in trouble by blabbing. And a majority leader in trouble is dangerous.

Cultivate some friends in the governor's office and in the various commissioners' departments. The governor's top administrative assistants can be invaluable in getting you last-minute appointments with important legislative leaders or even with the governor himself. One Mental Health Association representative is sure that an important bill passed her state legislature partly because she burst into tears in the anteroom of the governor's office. The administrative assistant felt so sorry for her that she arranged a five-minute interview with her boss. And the governor, surprised that anyone could feel so strongly about a bill, arranged appointments with legislative leaders. The bill, which had been scheduled for an early death in the house, passed.

If your bill passes, thank everyone in sight: the governor, his executive assistant, the secretaries, the legislators who helped you and even a few of those who didn't. Make sure that, whenever possible, your gratitude

is nonpartisan. If you belong to an organization that gives out citations, prizes or other forms of recognition for public service, try to get a few legislators included on the award program. Invite the newspapers, radio and TV stations for the presentation. (Incidentally, you might consider giving a few prizes to the news media that have supported you as well.) Legislators say plaintively that they never hear from their constituents after they have helped to pass their favorite bill. Remember the legislator will probably be around again in the next session. So stay in touch.

If your bill is defeated, don't roll over and die. Retrench, reconsider your strategy and resolve to do better next year. Remember that legislation is a dynamic process. Nothing drastic is likely to happen in just one session of the legislature. It may take two or three or even five sessions to produce sweeping changes. But when it finally happens, it can be one of the most exhilarating and satisfying moments in a tired lobbyist's life.

### Congressman Otis G. Pike Reports to His Constituents on First Session, 90th Congress

#### HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, only the fact that I promised the people who elected me to Congress 7 years ago that I would report to them as frankly as I could on the activities of Congress and their Congressman each year compels me to file this seventh annual report. Honestly, I would just as soon not talk about it.

The first session of the 90th Congress in the history of our commonwealth convened on January 10, 1967, and was still going on December 14. It was not going anywhere. It was just going.

When the first session of the 90th Congress adjourned at 6:50 p.m. on December 15, 1967, it had run for 340 days, making it the 13th longest in history and the fourth longest in the last 20 years. It seemed even longer. Twenty thousand three hundred and eighty-seven bills and resolutions were introduced, allowing Senators and Representatives to issue 20,387 press releases. Of the 20,387 bills and resolutions which were introduced, 207 became law, or one in 98. This does not necessarily mean that 99 percent of the bills and resolutions introduced were introduced largely for the purpose of impressing the folks back home; it does not necessarily mean that they were not, either.

The House set another record in having 245 rollcall votes last year, in substantial part on trivia. The pattern of the session was set on the opening day, when administration forces won the first vote—the election of the Speaker—and then promptly lost the next four in a row. The pattern throughout the year was that of a House of Representatives in the rather effective control of a coalition of conservative and moderate Republicans and Democrats, the latter largely from the Southern States, and while this became obvious on the opening day, Congress spent 11 months trying to ignore the obvious. There were a

few highlights—or lowlights, depending on how you look at it—of the year. One of the most emotional issues came on opening day, when the issue of the seating of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL was voted on. After that day 4 weeks elapsed before the House had another vote, which is a somewhat clear indication of why the session took 11 months. Of the 245 votes we had during the year we had only five in January, and only six in February. In March we did get cranked up a little, had five votes on the first day of March—again all pertaining to ADAM CLAYTON POWELL—and through the remainder of the month had a total of 19.

Among these was the first really significant measure, an appropriation in the sum of \$12,196,000,000 in supplemental funds for fiscal 1967 for the war in Vietnam. We passed a bill providing emergency food assistance to India, appropriated \$7,499,230,000 for the administration of the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and expressed our support for the concept of a Latin American common market.

In April we continued at about the same pace with 16 votes, many of which were simply housekeeping votes providing funds for the operation of committees of Congress, and one of which established a new bipartisan committee to draw up standards of official conduct for Congressmen. During that period one of the few genuinely significant actions of the year was the passage of a bill making a general overhaul of the Nation's copyright laws. We also passed a bill designed to create equally populated nongerrymandered districts for the House of Representatives, which might have been a good bill had it ever survived, but it suffered a long and painful death during the remainder of the session.

In May again we continued along the same modest pace with 15 votes, of which the most significant, and perhaps the most significant of the year, was the bill extending the military draft for 4 years. I thought the bill which we passed in the House of Representatives was a bad bill, and I tried unsuccessfully to get three separate amendments accepted by the House which would, in my opinion, have made the draft procedures more equitable. The bill was passed late at night on the eve of a long Memorial Day weekend, and no one was in the mood to listen to amendments of any kind. I voted for the extension of the draft as passed by the House even though I thought it was a bad bill, because I thought its necessity exceeded its inequity. The Senate, however, passed an even worse version, removing some of the few minor improvements the House had managed to get into the existing law, and when the conference report on the compromise version between the House and Senate bills subsequently came before the House, I felt obliged to vote against it.

In May we passed another bill from the Armed Services Committee authorizing appropriations of \$21,481,000,000 in fiscal year 1968 for the procurement of missiles, aircraft, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, and for defense research and development. We voted on the con-



roversial rent supplement program, appropriated \$10,013,000,000 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and 15 lesser Federal agencies and executive offices and authorized \$3,500,000,000 for programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in fiscal 1969.

In June the pace picked up and we had 24 votes. We started what turned into an interminable round of hassling between the legislative branch and the executive branch over Government spending. The issue, as usual, had to do with an increase in the ceiling on the national debt.

What Congress and the President fought about for the rest of the year was the question of whose responsibility it was to cut Government spending. Time after time the Republicans would offer motions on appropriations bills seeking to reduce expenditures by 5 percent but never specifying where the cuts should be made. The President always responded by saying that if Congress wanted to cut the budget it was up to Congress to cut the budget and not shirk the responsibility by passing it on to him. This particular issue wound up in dozens of votes through the year. While I voted against many specific appropriations, such as the farm price subsidies, the rent supplement program, the military construction bill, and the Appalachian development program, I do believe that it is the responsibility of Congress to say where cuts should be made if they want to cut Government spending; and voted against taking the easy course of trying to pass this responsibility on to the executive branch.

In June we passed the biggest appropriation bill in the history of our country—\$70,295,000,000 for defense appropriations for fiscal 1968. At a time when so many voices are raised against our military efforts it might be appropriate to point out that the defense appropriation bill, which contained the money for procurement of equipment and salaries to be used in our effort in Vietnam, passed by a record vote of 407 to 1.

By a similar lopsided vote of 385 to 16 the House expressed its views on those who publicly desecrate the American flag by making it a Federal crime to do so. Toward the end of the month we passed a Teacher Corps bill and a \$4,790,000,000 space program authorization.

In July we lapsed again into a more leisurely pace, having only 15 votes, none of which were particularly earthshaking. We did pass a bill appropriating \$4,623,000,000 for public works projects of the Army Corps of Engineers, which included several projects of interest to Long Island. These involved an additional appropriation of \$2,000,000 for erosion control work on the South Shore, \$150,000 for advanced planning on the dredging of Moriches Inlet, and \$500,000 for the dredging of Lake Montauk Harbor.

July was also the month in which the House decided not even to consider a bill providing Federal grants to aid local governments in developing and carrying out programs of rat control and extermination. Nineteen days later we reversed ourselves on that one.

The first bill which we considered in

August was a military construction authorization of \$2,379,000,000 in fiscal 1968 for construction of barracks, libraries, officers' clubs, addition of air conditioning, et cetera, at military bases in the United States and abroad, which passed the House on August 1 by a vote of 394 to 2. In this case I was one of the two and made a speech on the floor against the bill. While it is always very difficult to vote against anything which has anything whatsoever to do with national defense, I felt that this bill was full of fat and said so. Subsequent developments backed me up as the Appropriations Committee cut \$236,000,000 from the amount which we authorized on August 1. I voted against this reduced appropriation because I was still convinced that there was a great deal of fat in the bill. This time 26 people voted with me, and I believe that we did vote hundreds of millions of dollars in this bill which will not be spent by the executive branch.

In the remainder of the month of August we had 16 votes, which included an anticrime bill which bore little resemblance to the administration's anticrime bill, and passed a minor civil rights bill providing protection for all persons exercising or attempting to exercise their civil rights.

A much more major bill that month was the one which increased social security benefits 12½ percent across the board and limited the payments for which States would be reimbursed by the Federal Government under the medicare program.

We passed the smallest foreign aid authorization in the history of the program—\$2,815,000,000, and passed it only by a hair, 202 to 194, which speaks a great deal for the general popularity of the foreign aid program in this country at the present time.

In September we had 19 votes, including an authorization of \$887,000,000 for Appalachian regional development and a new educational TV program. In general the votes in September were on very minor issues.

In October the quantity of the legislation picked up greatly, but very little happened to the quality. We had 38 record votes in the month of October, many of which were appropriations for which we had previously voted the authorizations. Others were conference reports on issues over which we had already debated more than adequately. Other than such matters, which were essentially repeats of prior votes, we did pass a bill increasing postage on all classes of mail, appropriated \$1,582,000,000 for the new Department of Transportation, and voted to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration. We continued to have record votes on each item in each bill pertaining to such controversial programs as the rent supplement program and the model cities program, although it was very obvious that the results of these votes were going to continue to be the same as the initial votes on these same programs had been. We passed a military pay increase bill and watched the death of the congressional redistricting bill by voting for a meaningless substitute. We did strengthen existing Federal regulations for the inspection of meat.

In November we had 36 votes, and some of them were significant. As the first order of business we passed a \$428,000,000 air pollution control bill and passed a \$1,600,000,000 poverty program authorization which was \$460,000,000 under the President's request. We authorized \$116,000,000 for the Peace Corps in fiscal 1968; we authorized the creation of a National Visitors' Center and authorized the Secretary of Commerce to prevent the marketing of flammable fabrics.

The final month of a long and dreary session saw us go through 18 votes in 2 weeks, almost all of which concerned amendments made by the Senate to bills which we had previously passed for appropriations to carry out the provisions of bills which we had already passed. Almost uniformly the more liberal Senate appropriated substantially higher amounts. Their agriculture appropriation was \$2 billion higher than ours, their poverty program appropriation \$367 million higher, their foreign aid appropriation \$534 million higher, their housing and urban development appropriation \$500 million higher, their National Aeronautics and Space Administration appropriation \$95 million higher, their public works appropriation \$153 million higher, and so on. The total by which the Senate figure exceeded the House figure was \$4,289,190,718 and we spent most of December reconciling the different amounts. We wound up the session on a somewhat higher note on December 15 by looking ahead to fiscal 1969 and 1970 and authorized \$1,250,000,000 for aid to elementary and secondary education in those 2 years.

Much too late in view of its meager accomplishments, the Congress adjourned. I did not attempt to file this annual report to my constituents at that time because I did not want it to get lost among the Christmas cards, nor did I want to burden the postmen in their busy season. For this Congressman personally it was a good year. I attended international conferences as an official representative of the U.S. Congress in both England and Canada, was active on the Armed Services Committee, particularly in the field of aircraft procurement, and made a strenuous effort to cut down waste in defense spending which received national recognition. These efforts in regard to wasteful defense spending are continuing because I am convinced that at a time when more than half of every taxpayer's dollar goes into defense procurement and other defense activities that is where most of the waste will be found.

Of the 245 votes which we had this year I was present and voting on 234, or 95 percent. I missed a few when I was overseas as an official delegate, a few when I was hospitalized, and three which were held on a day when I was receiving an honorary degree at Southampton College. My record of attendance was not the highest in the State of New York, but it was the second highest, and over the 7 years which I have been in Congress it continued to average the highest.

Whether the voting was satisfactory as well as plentiful is something which every constituent will have to decide for himself and here, as in years past, is a

summary of the major votes. Because of the number and the fact that so many of them were trivial, this does not pretend to be a complete list. It is, however,

an accurate list, including votes on all of the tough issues, although it does not include votes which were merely repetitions of votes previously cast.

As always, I will be delighted to have my constituents' views on both the record of Congress and the record of their Congressman.

Date (1967)	Issue	Vote	Date (1967)	Issue	Vote
Jan. 10	Election of Speaker (McCormack, 246, Ford, 186).....	McCormack.	July 19	Antiriot bill (yea 347, nay 70).....	Yea.
	Resolution to administer oath of office to Mr. Adam Clayton Powell (yea 126, nay 305).....	Nay.	20	Rat Control and Extermination Act of 1967 (yea 176, nay 207).....	Yea.
	Resolution to refer seating of Mr. Adam Clayton Powell to special committee (yea 363, nay 65).....	Yea.	26	Recommit increased Special Operations Fund of Inter-American Development Bank (yea 185, nay 217).....	Yea.
Feb. 8	Provide temporary increase public debt limit (yea 215, nay 199).....	Yea.	27	Extend authority for exemptions from antitrust laws to help safeguard balance-of-payments position of United States (yea 308, nay 66).....	Yea.
20	Strengthen Reserve components of Armed Forces (yea 325, nay 13).....	Yea.	Aug. 1	Authorize \$2,378,843,000 for military construction (yea 394, nay 2).....	Nay.
Mar. 1	Resolution to accept special committee recommendations regarding seating of Adam Clayton Powell (yea 202, nay 222).....	Yea.	8	Anticrime bill (yea 377, nay 23).....	Yea.
8	Authorize supplemental defense appropriations for war in Vietnam of \$4,548,200,000 (yea 364, nay 13).....	Yea.	10	Authorize mid-decade population census (yea 255, nay 127).....	Yea.
9	Resolution to support emergency food aid to India (yea 312, nay 63).....	Yea.	14	Appropriate \$92,380,000 for San Felipe water project (yea 235, nay 83).....	Nay.
15	Extend interest equalization tax (yea 261, nay 138).....	Yea.	16	Provide penalties for certain acts of violation or intimidation (yea 326, nay 93).....	Yea.
16	Appropriate \$12,196,520,000 supplemental Defense Department funds for war in Vietnam (yea 385, nay 11).....	Yea.	17	Provide 12.5 percent increase in social security benefits (yea 416, nay 3).....	Yea.
	Restore 7 percent investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation practices (yea 386, nay 2).....	Yea.		Increase benefits and pensions for veterans of earlier wars (yea 404, nay 0).....	Yea.
20	Extend compensation and pensions to veterans of Vietnam period and their dependents; expand educational assistance (yea 360, nay 0).....	Yea.	21	Authorize grants to States for basic vocational rehabilitation services (yea 340, nay 0).....	Yea.
22	Appropriate \$7,499,230,000 for Treasury and Post Office Departments for fiscal 1968 (yea 371, nay 7).....	Yea.		Authorize \$2,815,408,000 for foreign economic and military aid (yea 202, nay 194).....	Yea.
	Resolution supporting concept of Latin American common market (yea 234, nay 117).....	Yea.	Sept. 11	Provide disability and death benefits for State and local police officers enforcing Federal law (yea 310, nay 0).....	Yea.
Apr. 5	Provide funds for House Un-American Activities Committee (yea 350, nay 43).....	Yea.	14	Reduce Appalachia funds for nonhighway programs (yea 199, nay 161).....	Yea.
11	Extend period for mediation pending railroad strike (yea 396, nay 8).....	Yea.		Authorize \$886,700,000 for Appalachia (yea 189, nay 168).....	Nay.
	Revise copyright laws (yea 379, nay 29).....	Yea.	Sept. 19	Food stamp program (yea 196, nay 155).....	Yea.
13	Create House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct (yea 400, nay 0).....	Yea.	20	Authorize grants to States and nonprofit private agencies for health programs (yea 395, nay 7).....	Yea.
20	Establish nuclear desalting plant in California (yea 315, nay 38).....	Nay.		Extend grant programs for construction mental retardation facilities (yea 389, nay 0).....	Yea.
27	Appropriate \$1,365,310,150 for Interior Department (yea 377, nay 11).....	Yea.	21	Extend Educational Television Facilities Act (yea 265, nay 91).....	Yea.
	Establish congressional districts on basis of equal population, non-gerrymandered (yea 289, nay 63).....	Yea.	Oct. 4	Provide for stop-mail orders in cases of mail fraud (yea 353, nay 32).....	Yea.
May 3	Appropriate \$2,041,826,133 supplemental funds for military and civilian pay increases, etc. (yea 391, nay 6).....	Yea.	11	Postal rates-Federal pay increase (yea 319, nay 89).....	Yea.
9	Authorize \$21,481,032,000 for missiles, aircraft, naval vessels and tracked combat vehicles, and research (yea 401, nay 3).....	Yea.	17	Establish Independent Federal Maritime Administration (yea 326, nay 44).....	Yea.
17	Delete rent supplement program from housing and urban development appropriation (yea 232, nay 171).....	Yea.	19	Strengthen laws governing conduct in Capitol buildings (yea 336, nay 20).....	Yea.
	Delete model cities program from housing and urban development appropriation (yea 193, nay 213).....	Nay.		Make it Federal crime to obstruct Federal criminal investigations (yea 275, nay 47).....	Yea.
	Appropriate \$10,013,178,782 for 16 Federal agencies and Department of Housing and Urban Development (yea 347, nay 56).....	Yea.	20	Transfer legislative jurisdiction over military and national cemeteries from Interior to Veterans' Affairs Committee (yea 225, nay 0).....	Yea.
24	Authorize mental health centers through 1970 (yea 354, nay 0).....	Yea.	24	Increase House allotment for model cities program (yea 156, nay 241).....	Nay.
	Authorize \$3,500,000,000 for programs under Elementary and Secondary Education Act in fiscal 1969 (yea 294, nay 122).....	Yea.		Restore rent supplements contract authority denied by the House (yea 151, nay 251).....	Nay.
25	Extend draft for 4 years (yea 362, nay 9).....	Yea.	26	Increase military pay (yea 386, nay 2).....	Yea.
31	Direct executive branch to cut 5 percent from State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary and other agency appropriations, except the FBI (yea 171, nay 156).....	Nay.		Adopt congressional district standards as recommended by the House (yea 82, nay 283).....	Yea.
June 5	Provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for members of the Armed Forces (yea 316, nay 0).....	Yea.	31	Wholesome Meat Act of 1967 (yea 403, nay 1).....	Yea.
6	Appropriate \$4,770,580,950 for Department of Agriculture (yea 357, nay 38).....	Nay.	Nov. 2	Air Quality Act of 1967 (yea 362, nay 0).....	Yea.
12	Authorize adjustments outstanding silver certificates (yea 234, nay 109).....	Yea.	6	Extend term of existing copyrights (yea 309, nay 6).....	Yea.
13	Appropriate \$70,295,200,000 for Department of Defense.....	Yea.	15	Authorize \$1,600,000,000 for antipoverty program (yea 283, nay 129).....	Yea.
19	Establish Federal Judicial Center (yea 230, nay 97).....	Yea.	21	Authorize \$115,700,000 for the Peace Corps (yea 312, nay 32).....	Yea.
	Extend Older Americans Act (yea 332, nay 0).....	Yea.	27	Create National Visitors Center (yea 316, nay 34).....	Yea.
	Extend Wetlands Acquisition Act (yea 329, nay 8).....	Yea.		Improve Flammable Fabrics Act (yea 345, nay 0).....	Yea.
20	Increase cost of migratory bird hunting stamps (yea 238, nay 97).....	Nay.	28	Redefine functions of Subversive Activities Control Board (yea 269, nay 104).....	Yea.
	Conference report on extending draft (yea 377, nay 29).....	Nay.	Dec. 4	Extend adult education program through 1970 (yea 352, nay 0).....	Yea.
21	Prohibit desecration of American flag (yea 385, nay 16).....	Yea.		Prohibit employers and others from discriminating against workers or potential workers between age 40 and 65 because of age (yea 344, nay 13).....	Yea.
21	Raise national debt limit (yea 217, nay 196).....	Yea.	6	Establish Federal Judicial Center (yea 231, nay 126).....	Yea.
27	Authorize Teacher Corps (yea 312, nay 88).....	Yea.		Adopt conference report on Wholesome Meat Act of 1967 (yea 336, nay 28).....	Yea.
28	Recommit NASA authorization with instructions to make specific cuts (yea 239, nay 157).....	Yea.	11	Adopt conference report on Antipoverty Amendments of 1967 (yea 247, nay 149).....	Yea.
July 11	Extend Civil Rights Commission (yea 284, nay 89).....	Yea.		Adopt provision for \$9,000,000,000 reduction in budgeted fiscal 1968 obligations for executive branch agencies (yea 368, nay 26).....	Yea.
12	Establish National Water Commission (yea 369, nay 19).....	Yea.		Adopt conference report on postal rate-Federal pay bill (yea 327, nay 62).....	Yea.
13	Recommit lottery bill prohibiting banks from selling lottery tickets (yea 135, nay 257).....	Yea.	15	Appropriate \$2,295,000,000 foreign aid program (yea 198, nay 158).....	Yea.
17	Provide for settlement railway labor dispute (yea 244, nay 148).....	Yea.		Adopt conference report on Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments (yea 286, nay 73).....	Yea.
				Protect veterans and their dependents from pension cuts when social security benefits increase (yea 354, nay 0).....	Yea.

## President Cites Challenges Facing Union in His State of Union Address

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson in his state of the Union address gave a comprehensive report on domestic and world affairs, underlining our prosperity and pinpointing the challenges facing our Nation.

In this connection I include my newsletter, Capitol Comments, in the RECORD, because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in the President's annual address.

The newsletter follows:

### PRESIDENT CITES CHALLENGES FACING NATION IN STATE OF UNION ADDRESS

The Second Session of the 90th Congress met in Joint Session following its reconvening to hear President Johnson deliver the traditional State of the Union Message. The President gave a comprehensive report on domestic and world affairs, underlining the Nation's prosperity and pointing out the challenging problems that confront the Nation today.

Among the major points stressed, the first was that there will be no retreat from this Nation's commitment to repel Communist aggression in South Vietnam nor from the commitment to support our troops and forces in Southeast Asia. "But," he emphasized, "our goal is peace—and peace at the earliest moment," adding that the reported peace feelers from North Vietnam are being thoroughly explored.

The President's second major emphasis was that rioting and violence in our cities cannot be tolerated. "We, at every level of government, know that the American people have had enough of rising crime and lawlessness," the President said. He pointed out that law enforcement is primarily a local responsibility but emphasized that the Federal Government can and must support and assist local law enforcement agencies by helping to provide training and equipment to assist in coping with riots and violence. He called for enactment into law two bills passed by the House last year—the Anti-Riot Act and the Safe Streets and Crime Act. He also asked for authority to hire 100 additional assistant district attorneys for speeding prosecution of Federal law violators and 100 additional Federal Bureau of Investigation agents for investigations.

The President's third major emphasis was on the funding of existing programs which he believes will assist in the solution of the



Nation's problems. He made few recommendations for new programs.

The President called for the passing of a temporary surcharge during the Vietnam War emergency period, explaining that without this tax the budget deficit for Fiscal 1969 will reach \$20 billion—but would be only \$8 billion with the surcharge tax proposed.

The President said he is confident this Nation will meet its challenges. "We have the strength to meet our every challenge," he said, "the physical strength to hold the course of decency and compassion at home—the moral strength to support the cause of peace in the world." The annual messages of the President and the Federal Budget Message are setting the stage for the work of the Congress in 1968.

### Secretary Weaver Deserves Commendation for Establishment of Small Town America Office in Department of Housing and Urban Development

#### HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend and congratulate Secretary Robert Weaver and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the establishment of a Small Town America Office in the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This step will mean much to the growth and progress of our smaller communities which have been handicapped in applying for Federal grants and assistance because of their limited resources and staff.

The creation of this office is designed to bridge this information and assistance gap.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations, I had urged the creation of such a department, pointing out that smaller cities and communities need expert assistance in availing themselves of Federal programs.

Because of the great interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, under unanimous consent, I include my letter to Secretary Weaver on January 19, 1966, requesting creation of this Office, an article which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean on January 20, 1967, and Secretary Weaver's press release announcing this action, in the RECORD:

JANUARY 19, 1966.

HON. ROBERT WEAVER,  
Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you assume your duties as Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, I am reminded of the emphasis being placed on the development of small-town America by various municipal organizations throughout the country, including the Tennessee Municipal League.

It is the feeling of these municipal officials—and I share their viewpoint—that there should be established in your Department a special Small-Town America Division to concentrate on the problems of the medium and smaller towns.

In this connection, I wrote President Johnson a letter last July, in which I urged a national, concentrated effort to strengthen

small-town America. It is my feeling that small towns are the backbone of America and the democratic concept—and that a strengthened small-town America will help solve some of the current, pressing problems of urban areas by broadening the base of growth.

The proposal to set up a special small-town America division in your Department is a further step in this direction. As you are aware, the laws providing for various programs of municipal aid do not limit the benefits to large municipalities. Your favorable consideration of this proposal for a specific division and for increased attention to the problems of small towns generally will be most appreciated.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Very sincerely yours.

JOE L. EVINS.

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Jan. 20, 1966]

#### EVINS ASKS SMALL-TOWN UNIT IN NEW HOUSING DEPARTMENT (By Jim Squires)

WASHINGTON.—Rep. Joe L. Evins asked yesterday for establishment of a special division within the new Department of Housing and Urban Development to concentrate on the problems of "small and medium-sized towns."

"It is my feeling that small towns are the backbone of America and the Democratic concept," Evins said. "A strengthened small-town America will help solve some of the current, pressing problems of urban areas. . . ."

The 4th District congressman made the request in a letter to Robert Weaver, newly appointed head of the department.

Evins said municipal organizations throughout the nation "including the Tennessee Municipal League" are placing increased emphasis on the development of small towns.

"It is the feeling of these municipal officials—and I share their viewpoint," Evins said, "that there should be established in your department a special small-town America Division to concentrate on the problems of the medium and smaller towns."

Evins said development of the smaller municipalities would solve the population, transportation and housing problems which now face large cities because it would "broaden their base of growth."

The letter emphasized that "laws providing for various programs of municipal aid do not limit the benefits to large municipalities."

Evins wrote a letter to President Johnson last year urging a national, concentrated effort to strengthen "small-town America."

That letter contended that cities have outgrown their governments and their original concepts.

#### HUD SETS UP NEW SMALL COMMUNITIES OFFICE

Underscoring his concern for the needs of the Nation's small communities, Secretary Robert C. Weaver of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development today announced the appointment of Charles B. Sonneborn, as Special Assistant to Charles M. Haar, Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Development. His responsibility will be to familiarize the small towns with the HUD programs operated under Mr. Haar.

These activities include, among others, water and sewer facilities, public works planning, public facility loans, planning assistance, mass transportation and open space land.

Mr. Sonneborn's appointment is another step in HUD's continuing effort to strengthen its working relations with state and local governments in the context of Creative Federalism. Specifically, it complements the activities of the Office of Governmental Relations under H. Ralph Taylor, Assistant Secretary for Demonstrations and Intergovernmental Relations. This unit, under Francis

C. DeLucia, works closely with Federal, State and local agencies as well as professional organizations to identify and meet community needs for specialized information and technical assistance.

"HUD has always been concerned with problems of communities under 50,000 population," Secretary Weaver said. "For example, of nearly 850 communities participating in HUD's renewal program, 621 are in that category. Almost one-third of the low rent public housing units under reservation or in development at the end of last year were in small communities. More than 83 percent of grants under the Water and Sewer Facilities program have been to small communities."

"They face many of the problems of our big cities, as well as problems unique to them because of their size and character. In addition, small communities often lack the technical staff and experience to cope with the growing perplexities of urbanization."

Mr. Sonneborn, 36, former Director of Public Affairs for the National Farmers' Union, is a native of Washington, D.C., a graduate of the University of Florida and a former newspaper reporter and naval officer. He joined HUD in June, 1966 as Chief of the Metropolitan Development press desk. He lives with his wife and three children in Silver Spring, Md.

Mr. DeLucia, 36, has been a senior systems analyst with a local consulting firm, a budget and program analyst for the U.S. Department of Commerce, and an administrative officer for former Governors David Lawrence and William Scranton of Pennsylvania. A native of Bradford, Pa., he is married and lives in Vienna, Va.

### Marine Scorns Viet Critics

#### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

#### MARINE SCORNS VIET CRITICS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following letter was written to the editor of the San Diego Union by a man who immigrated to the United States from Germany 16 years ago. He enlisted in the Marine Corps in January, 1952, and has lived in San Diego County on and off for 12 years. He has asked that his name be withheld, preferring to be known as "a proud Marine." The editor honors this request.)

DEAR EDITOR: I really don't know how to start this letter. There are thousands of people who read your paper and especially your column page, so I hope you'll print this so Americans of all colors, creeds and nationalities may read (it).

"I am a confused, disgusted and bewildered American of sorts. I came to America about 16 years ago from Germany. At first I was stunned by America's vastness and prosperity. Then I became thoroughly shocked when I witnessed Americans degrading other Americans through use of picket lines, sit-ins and protest marches, particularly concerning Vietnam.

#### "IN VIETNAM TO FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

"I am here in Vietnam to fight for the freedom of other human beings. This way I can get first-hand knowledge of the situation. Now after being in Vietnam I sincerely believe that we (the U.S. Forces) are needed here.

"The pickets and protesters in America, particularly those like Stokely Carmichael, are protesting in ignorance and in fear, instead of in patriotism.

"Do they think that any of the men over here want to die?? Do they think we enjoy living like animals?"

"Here's news for them: Yes, we all are afraid of death in one way or another, and no, we don't enjoy living like animals. But if this is the price of liberty, then we are willing to pay for it."

"Some Americans say, 'Well, what are we doing over there? We owe them nothing. The Vietnamese don't want us over there.'"

"They're wrong! We are in debt to Vietnam. Most young Americans seem to forget that America was once a small country fighting for its independence. These people (the Vietnamese) are fighting for their freedom, too!"

#### "THEIR ENEMY MORE RUTHLESS"

"Only their enemy is much more ruthless than the Americans' was. And concerning the (Vietnamese) people not wanting Americans over here, they're wrong again. Most young Americans have never seen the look on the faces of the old people and the young children after we have liberated their village. Most young Americans have never seen the little children standing by the trail-side, hands outstretched, big brown eyes, undernourished and semi-nude bodies. The children's eyes projecting help me. In any language the look is still the same and universally understood. They are human beings in desperate need of assistance."

"And then why all the fighting (in the United States) between the Negroes and whites? I thought the Declaration of Independence stated that all men are created equal. Doesn't it apply today?"

"Here in Vietnam I have seen (men of) all colors, race and creeds and religions die fighting. And believe me they all bleed red blood! Don't people believe that the color of a man's skin doesn't determine the color or size of his heart? God Help Us."

"Will Americans continue to progress at this rate? Or will it heed the warnings that are so clearly evident—and continue to be 'The Land of the Free and the Home of the Brave?'"

"FROM A PROUD MARINE."

### The 50th Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

**HON. WILLIAM D. FORD**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 50th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Ukrainian National Republic, and the 49th anniversary of the Act of Union, whereby all Ukrainian ethnic lands were united, if only briefly, into one independent and sovereign state of the Ukrainian nation.

Instead of being a joyous national holiday, however, this anniversary serves only to remind Ukrainians that their cherished goal of independence still lies in the future.

The Ukrainian people living under a Communist government, and their more fortunate compatriots who have found refuge in the United States and other nations, still dream of an independent, free Ukraine.

Russian leaders for centuries have sought to undermine the national consciousness of the Ukrainian people, and

to impose Russian control over the rich natural resources of the Ukraine. Russia has claimed that the Ukraine forms a part of Russia—culturally, historically, and traditionally.

Although the Ukrainians were subjugated by czarist Russia, by the force of arms, and through terrorism, the sense of identity and hope for independence has never faded.

This desire gained in momentum in the late 1800's, and the combined events of World War I and the Russian revolution provided the Ukrainian people with their opportunity.

Independence was declared in 1918, and the Russians, preoccupied then with internal power struggles, were unable to meet the challenge. The new government was even officially recognized by the Bolsheviks.

Once Communist control of Russia was insured, however, Soviet leaders terminated, with military might, the brief glory of Ukrainian independence.

As our mighty Nation moves toward the 200th anniversary of its own independence, let us remember that the Ukrainians and many other people of the world do not yet enjoy the benefits of independence and freedom from external control. Let us continue to set an example to the entire world as proof that there is hope for self-determination for all peoples.

And let us offer our heartfelt moral encouragement to the Ukrainian people, whose indomitable spirit has merited our deepest admiration.

### Sun Sets on British Empire

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the devaluation of the British pound coupled with other moves taken by the British Government to protect their currency have naturally produced a great deal of commentary, some of it exaggerated and oversensational. One of the most objective realistic editorial commentary I have seen appeared in the January 18 Chicago Sun-Times, which I feel expresses sober judgment. The editorial follows:

#### SUN SETS ON BRITISH EMPIRE

The British Lion wearily sheathed its claws this week. Prime Minister Harold Wilson told the House of Commons that essential fiscal retrenchment would, by 1971, require that British military forces be withdrawn from all bases outside of Europe and the Mediterranean, except for a token garrison at Hong Kong and a few outposts. The proud British Navy will give up its aircraft carriers and nuclear submarines.

The harsh facts of economics are responsible for the demise of Britain as a world power. A growing and dangerous deficit in Britain's balance of payments, the refusal of British management and labor to meet the challenges of world trade with capital investment and increased productivity, the failure of economic ties with the Common-

wealth—and many other factors—combined to put Britain in the position where it had to accept the inevitable—it could no longer afford to be a major world power.

The spending cutbacks go across the board and will affect the United States as well as the British. For example, a \$1 billion order for the latest U.S. jet fighters will be canceled. Domestically, British citizens will have to pay for medicine they have been getting for no charge, there will be no more free milk for schoolchildren and major cutbacks in public housing and road building are planned.

The British have never shirked bad news. While this particular cup of tea must be bitter brew indeed, it is made the more palatable by the knowledge that as a nation and a people Britain retains the respect and admiration of the world for its courage and accomplishments.

Nor will Britain lose its fast friends and allies. Britain and America are bound by close ties. British and American blood has been mingled in mutual sacrifice on scores of battlefields around the world.

Britain will always be Britain. It will retain and enlarge its glory. As Winston Churchill said, "We have not journeyed all this way across the centuries, across the oceans, across the mountains, across the prairies, because we are made of sugar candy."

No, indeed.

### Senator Birch Bayh: Public Works Champion

**HON. RAY J. MADDEN**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Indiana and the Nation can be proud of the work and effort Senator BAYH has made for the Nation's prosperity, employment, and progress in his constant fight for vitally necessary public works.

The following is a news comment recently published on his continued activity on public works and conservation programs:

#### BAYH VERSUS FREEZE ON PUBLIC WORKS FUNDS

Briefly, the situation is this. As a member of the Senate Public Works Committee, I worked along with my colleagues to develop what we believe is a reasonable and vitally necessary public works program. Our recommendations were, we believed, modest, for we were well aware of over-extended federal spending in the past few years.

Our program was approved by the public works committees and the appropriations committees of both houses of Congress. But then the President decided to put a freeze on the money. His order permitted work to continue on any contracts already obligated, but it stipulated that no new contracts should be entered into by the Army Corps of Engineers.

As a result, unless the freeze is lifted in the next few weeks, several of our projects in Indiana could fall well behind schedule.

It is important to understand, as I pointed out in my letter to the President, that projects such as dams, reservoirs and locks are, in the long run, investments. For every dollar spent for such projects, the return is often two dollars or more—not including the savings from destruction of property, not to mention occasional loss of life.

The Congress has issued a mandate to the Administration to spend the funds appro-



priated for Indiana's water resource development projects—an amount exceeding \$44-million.

These are funds for planning and construction of the Big Pine Reservoir, the Brookville Reservoir, the Cannelton Locks and Dam, the Clifty Creek Reservoir, the Huntington Reservoir, Island Levee, Lafayette Reservoir, Levee No. 5 on the Wabash River, the Michigan City Harbor, the Newburgh Locks and Dam, the Patoka Reservoir, and the Uniontown Locks and Dam.

In addition, I have appealed personally to the Army Corps of Engineers to issue a favorable report on the canalization of the Wabash River, a project which would reap enormous economic benefits to Indiana.

For years, Indiana has lagged behind other states in public works projects—due, I am sorry to say, to short-sighted leadership. For example, in 1960, Indiana received an authorization of only \$6 million for dams, reservoirs, locks and river development projects. In 1962, we received not one red cent.

But when I sought election to the United States Senate in 1962, I promised the people of Indiana there would be a new day in seeking and acquiring funds needed to preserve our land from erosion and protect our people from the tragedy of floods.

In 1965, I had a chance to keep that promise. Indiana received an authorization of \$98 million for such projects. I do not intend to allow false economy to delay the dream of water development and conservation that so many Hoosiers have labored so long to achieve.

#### Costs of the War in Vietnam

### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, a most penetrating and hard-hitting analysis of the costs of the adventure in Vietnam is that which appears in the Washington Post recently by columnist Joseph Kraft. Mr. Kraft pulls no punches in outlining the incalculable price at home and abroad of our involvement in Southeast Asia—next to which we all ought to carefully weigh and measure whatever supposed gain we might seek. I urge my colleagues' attention to this essay, which follows:

VIET "SHELL GAME" BREAKS UP; STAGGERING RESULTS REVEALED

(By Joseph Kraft)

The state of the Union, which is not to be confused with the President's message of the same name, is marked at this time by the end of a tour de force. The Vietnam shell game is breaking up, and a tired Administration, at the fag end of its days, has nothing good to put in its place.

For years now a heroic display of pasting and stitching of dazzling footwork and overhead shots, of palming off here and building mirages there, has worked to obscure the burden of Vietnam. But now, abroad and in this country, the true costs are coming home.

They turn out to be staggering. As the British defense expert, Alastair Buchan, a consistent friend of this country and of its broad postwar strategy, writes in the current issue of Encounter magazine: "The Vietnam war is the greatest tragedy that has befallen the United States since the Civil War."

Abroad, the war has worked to dislocate

in a dangerous way a delicate process of international accommodation. This process has featured a gradual and mutual winding down of the high postures taken up by both sides at the height of the cold war.

But the Vietnamese war and notably the bombing of a fellow Socialist country, has brought the Soviet leadership under the strongest pressure to take a harsh stand against the United States. In response, the Soviet Union has steadily stepped up assistance to North Vietnam and moved forward in penetration of the Near East.

At the same time, Moscow is obviously disengaging from Washington. The Russians have refused to act as conduit for sounding North Vietnam on the meaning of recent statements about negotiations. They have avoided efforts to bring them into talks on Laos and Cambodia.

The nonproliferation treaty that the Russians want as a stopper on the Germans is about the only important business now outstanding between the Big Two. Ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin, an important agent of rapport who went home on consultation last week, will probably not be back.

But even as the Soviet stand is hardening this country's allies continue to unwind apace. Britain's decision to shut up shop East of Suez is only the latest step. Another reduction of troops in Germany is plainly in the works.

At one time, this country could have used its influence and reputation to coordinate the retrenchment. But the Vietnamese war and its financial drain has dulled both the reputation and the influence the United States can bring to bear across the Atlantic. It is typical that Prime Minister Harold Wilson, normally so eager to get together with President Johnson, has this time put off a scheduled meeting.

At home, the awful consequence of the war that cannot be hidden is a cruel division of opinion. A very large portion of the most intelligent and sensitive young people who are being called on to fight regard the conflict as an unmitigated horror expressing what they like to call a sick society. They are showing their feelings in a kind of protest demonstration that projects dramatically the revulsion they feel.

Dissent has inevitably generated antipathy. There has been set in motion a wave of folk malevolence bringing to the surface some of the least lovely of the national traits—the taste for violence; bitter feelings of racial antagonism; and know-nothing hostility toward intellectuals and universities.

In response to that feeling the President is now emphasizing, in not unmenacing tones, the issue of crime in the streets. For the same reason, he has had to cut back on programs for education and welfare. Even the emphasis on consumer issues smacks of Naderism—an appeal to exaggerated suspicion of industry.

These devices can avail little. The root of the trouble is something for which the President has no remedy—the Vietnamese war. And the best hope during the coming year is that the war will not get worse—that the trouble can be held in present bounds.

#### Frank E. Pinder Received AID's Highest Award

### HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Agency for International Development has re-

cently presented its Distinguished Service Award—its highest honor—to Mr. Frank E. Pinder, director of the U.S. foreign aid mission to Ghana and a former resident of Florida.

The AID award was made to Pinder "in recognition of his many years of unselfish service and sacrifice to the people of west Africa and for his unusual dedication and devotion to the service of his country."

I am proud to note that Mr. Pinder served as secretary of the Florida Agriculture Extension Service during 1929-33 and was later appointed county agent for the service at Gainesville where he worked until 1941.

A graduate of Florida A. & M. College in 1933, he was named to that institution's hall of fame in 1962 and presented with its Outstanding Citizen Award the following year.

In recommending Mr. Pinder for the award, U.S. Ambassador to Ghana Franklin Williams said:

Few Americans are held in higher personal or professional regard by West Africans of all nationalities at every level, in and out of government. Both he and his wife, Mrs. Jean Pinder, have been unusually efficient ambassadors for America to millions of Africans and others residing in this part of the world.

I, along with my fellow Floridians, am most proud of Mr. Pinder and commend the Agency for recognizing his talents with this honor.

#### Ukrainian Independence

### HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in saluting the courageous people of Ukraine, whose 50th anniversary of independence occurs today.

The State of Illinois is particularly fortunate to have among her citizens a sizable number of Ukrainian Americans who have contributed so much to the advancement of our Democratic ideals and our American way of life.

I am proud to say that the offices of the League of Americans of Ukrainian Descent, Inc., 841 North Western Avenue, Chicago, an outstanding civic and welfare organization, are located in my own Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, which encompasses the Loop area of Chicago.

There are many other prominent Ukrainian groups and organizations located in my congressional district which are making a significant contribution to the civic, social, educational, and cultural life of our community. These include the Ukrainian-American Civic Center, Inc., 845 North Western Avenue; the Ukrainian American Club, 2234 West Chicago Avenue; the Ukrainian American Publishing & Printing Co., Inc., 2315 West Chicago Avenue; the Ukrainian American Social Club of UNA, 2435 West Chicago Avenue; the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, 841 North Western Avenue; the Ukrainian Life, Inc.,

2532 West Chicago Avenue; the Ukrainian National Association—Lions, 2353 West Chicago Avenue; the Ukrainian National Museum, 2453 West Chicago Avenue; the Ukrainian Youth Association of America—Odum, 2516 West Division Street; and the Ukrainian Youth Camping Organization, Inc., 2147 West Chicago Avenue.

It is entirely fitting that we observe the 50th anniversary of that eventful day in 1918 when the brave Ukrainians declared their independence from their oppressors. In the face of overwhelming military opposition by the Red army, the noble Ukrainians fought for their country and their culture. Through their untiring and relentless efforts and their devotion to the sacred cause of liberty, the Ukrainian independence endured for more than 3 years.

It is with a feeling of real kinship in my heart and genuine admiration for the dauntless spirit of the Ukrainians that I join in this commemorative ceremony, for it was not so many years ago, in 1776, that we Americans claimed for ourselves the right to determine our own destiny.

We were truly fortunate, for we won our struggle for independence and today we enjoy the fruits of liberty and self-determination.

But we have never forgotten the sacrifices we made to achieve our national purpose, and today our hearts go out to the gallant Ukrainians who seek to achieve the self-same goal which we claimed as our inherent right almost two centuries ago.

It is with great pride today that I join my colleagues in the Congress in congratulating the Ukrainians on their steadfast efforts to regain their freedom and in restating America's historic commitment to the principle of self-determination and to the profound hope for the eventual peaceful liberation of the Ukrainian people.

### Police Chief Rejects Philosophy of Idiocy

**HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Mobile Register, whose able editorial policy is a distinct credit to the newspaper fraternity, has recently commented in detail on the work of Miami's chief of police, Walter Headley, in curbing crime in that great and growing city. Chief Headley's effective policy of law enforcement is indeed commendable and I am delighted to see the support given his actions by a great newspaper such as the Mobile Register.

I submit the article for reprinting in the RECORD:

#### POLICE CHIEF REJECTS PHILOSOPHY OF IDIOCY

When firmness of policy is proposed or used in law enforcement to curb crime, the sparrow-brained and muddle-headed rush to the side of the lawless with horrified cries of brutality and infringement upon rights.

Don't dare approach a ruthless mugger, rapist or killer with anything more equal to the need than kid gloves.

Treat the victims with contempt but apologize to the criminals for putting them to the slightest inconvenience.

Things must be done differently now. This is not the America of old, remember. It is the new America—the America which the idiots are doing their best to make over in their own image and succeeding to an unfortunate degree. There is no shortage of idiots. They are on the loose in all walks and stations of life.

Most of the nation's worst troubles got their start from the idiot breed. Except for this breed, violent crime would not be what it is, nor would disrespect for vital institutions such as law and order and sound principles. Communism would not have escaped the crackdown vital to its extinction as a menace on American soil.

Except for the idiot breed, America would not be writhing in the toils of welfare statism. The nation was set on the course of welfare statism by the idiot breed. The philosophy of this same breed, utterly indifferent to the value of a dollar and wantonly irresponsible in spending the dollar, engineered the nation into the most woeful orgy of extravagance man has ever known. Billions of tax dollars down the drain each year.

The idiot breed dislikes to be called by its true name, but too much reluctance to call it by its true name has played squarely into its hands, making it bolder and more persistent in the pursuit of its baneful goals.

But now and then the philosophy of idiocy is slapped down hard, bolstering hope that one day, before it is too late, the predatory incursions of that philosophy will be halted with enduring sureness.

Our nominee at the moment for nationwide applause for slapping down the philosophy of idiocy is Miami's Chief of Police Walter Headley.

Hoodlumism had become an intolerable pestilence in parts of Miami. Gangs of thugs invaded the streets, running riot in acts of violence and spreading terror. Lawabiding citizens were unsafe. Constant danger took over where security once prevailed.

Chief Headley saw more than enough to convince him that the time had come in Miami for a showdown between law enforcement and lawlessness. At year-end he declared a get-tough policy against crime. The tone in which he spoke and the methods he ordered into practice when necessary to deal effectively with criminals preying on society filled the terrorists with terror.

Within three weeks the exodus of hoodlums from the streets had brought a decrease of 60 to 65 per cent in crimes of violence. Their flight left it plain that the thug gangs that had been merciless in their outrages against their victims were not willing to face a get-tough policy in law enforcement. Anything even remotely akin to their own medicine was too severe for them. They vamoosed in fright when challenged by the authority of law.

Chief Headley has not determined whether the distraught criminals have been leaving town or have "just gone underground." But he knows they have been leaving their accustomed haunts in Miami, to the relief of lawabiding citizens.

The swift change which has taken place in Miami is proof that law enforcement can be made to mean something when administered with the allegiance to duty and fulfillment of responsibility shown by the Miami chief of police.

Law enforcement is capable of triumphing over lawlessness anywhere in the United States if administered with the courage, resolution and firmness necessary to its triumph.

When criminals find examples of weak-kneed, apologetic and wavering law enforce-

ment—or so-called law enforcement—they will attempt to overrun it, as they have done in too many instances.

Crime triumphs only where permitted to triumph. It has been permitted to triumph too often and too widely in the United States.

Echoing incessantly all over the nation is the need for more policemen and more or better police equipment. This need is unmistakable, and we have emphasized it long and loudly in the local case of Mobile.

But inadequate police machinery can be used as excuses for inaction or too little action against crime. We do not doubt that this happens constantly in many jurisdictions.

Chief Headley undoubtedly would like to see a strengthened police department for Miami. But he challenged crime with what he had and the results stand out as a great credit to him.

Miami's chief of police did not take a vacation from duty and responsibility to plead for a stronger police department while criminals ran wild, and he did not let the philosophy of idiocy in law enforcement interfere with him.

If this nation is to prosper and feel secure to the extent that it should and can, it must rid itself of the influence of the philosophy of idiocy in every aspect and phase of government at all levels.

The philosophy of idiocy is a philosophy of calamity for those who are forced and kept beneath its heel.

### Mistaken Vietnam Analyses Accepted as Fact

**HON. RICHARD BOLLING**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Howard K. Smith in the January 13 issue of the Washington, D.C., Sunday Star, has again successfully undertaken to separate fact from fiction in respect to President Johnson's position on Vietnam and the antipoverty effort. I found the column a useful antidote to misrepresentation in these vital areas that are currently circulating.

The column follows:

#### MISTAKEN VIETNAM ANALYSES ACCEPTED AS FACT

(By Howard K. Smith)

When a leader has fallen heir to a mission as vital as President Johnson's—which is nothing less than fighting to win time for Asia, as Churchill had to do for the Western world in 1941—and when, with the bulkiest pulpit in the world at his disposal, he has not convinced the nation, then something is wrong. But I have a quarrel with most of the commentators, and it is that in trying to find what is wrong, they have led us down irrelevant paths to wrong conclusions that have now congealed beyond remedy.

Time magazine's Man-of-the-Year report on Mr. Johnson indicates that the practice of finding the wrong answers is likely to persist.

Time describes two basic flaws in the President's behavior. First, it quotes approvingly a scholar as saying that he "has made the huge mistake of implying, by way of rhetoric, that this (i.e. solving big problems like the ghettos) could be done quickly and easily."

Then Time states the second flaw: "This has been particularly true in the case of Vietnam. In the past his forecasts were hyperbolic."



In fact, in four years of pretty thorough records I can find no evidence for either assertion. But the evidence for the opposite is overwhelming.

In Mr. Johnson's first State of the Union address, he said, for example that the war on poverty "will not be a short or easy struggle; no single weapon or strategy will suffice." In his first War on Poverty message he said, "We are fully aware this program will not eliminate all poverty . . . poverty is deeply rooted and its causes are many."

In his original Great Society speech in Michigan and in his 1965 message on city problems, he elaborated on the theme that "we do not have all the answers. We are still groping." I have at my elbow another round dozen of such statements. But I can find no clear evidence that he ever said or implied that the job could be quick or easy.

Regarding Vietnam, he said in his Freedom House speech of 1966, "some ask how long we must bear this burden. To that I give no answer . . . it may well be long." In a press conference he said, "now we will have a long and hard road. I don't want to try to repeat Mr. Churchill's phrase of 'blood, sweat and tears,' but it is not going to be easy and it is not going to be short." In his last State of the Union address he did in fact paraphrase Churchill, offering only "more cost, more agony." This theme is constant and repetitious—and I can find no exceptions to it.

This is not meant to single out Time for an attack. The practice of repeating mistaken analyses until they are accepted as fact seems to be endemic. Thus my favorite TV commentator recently said that back in 1965 we got embroiled in Vietnam because "acting was easier than thinking." The facts show that if Mr. Johnson made a mistake in 1965 it was the opposite one: he thought, conferred and discussed almost too long before finally acting. Yet, to this day the notion persists that he stumbled into Vietnam without much thought.

The whole complex new science of Peace-feeler-ology was founded on a reporter's garbled account of the talk Ho Chi Minh had with two Italians in 1965. Though the State Department later published all the documents to make it clear Ho offered nothing, the false view that Ho sought peace and we rebuffed him is now a settled "fact" which whole, erroneous, books have been written to prove.

It is also a settled part of public knowledge that the President suffers from a "failure to communicate." And there is something to that. But there is more substance to the contention that it is the commentators who have failed to communicate the complex elements of one of the most meaningful periods in American history. As a group we have become mass victims to the old adage that it is easier and more fun to ask Whodunit than the more rational, if far more difficult, question—What did it?

### The 53d Anniversary of Kiwanis International

**HON. JAMES F. BATTIN**

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, January 21, Kiwanis International celebrates its 53d anniversary of service to this Nation and to the world. I am proud to be an active member of the Kiwanis Club of Billings, Mont., and to be identified with this organization which has as its motto for this year—"Be a Builder, Get Personally Involved." Certainly all of

us can and do subscribe to this philosophy, and I am sure that all of us are grateful for the work of Kiwanis.

Throughout most of these 53 years of building, Kiwanis has continued the same objects, since their adoption many years ago. They are—

First, to give primacy to the human and spiritual, rather than to the material values of life;

Second, to encourage in the daily living of the Golden Rule in all human relationships;

Third, to promote the adoption and the application of higher social, business, and professional standards;

Fourth, to develop, by precept and example, a more intelligent, aggressive, and serviceable citizenship;

Fifth, to provide, through Kiwanis Clubs, a practical means to form enduring friendships, to render altruistic service, and to build better communities; and

Sixth, to cooperate in creating and maintaining that sound public opinion and high idealism which make possible the increase of righteousness, justice, patriotism, and good will.

Each year the objectives, as distinguished from the objects, change to give specific emphasis to areas in which Kiwanians throughout the world are encouraged to make a special extra effort during that year, while continuing Kiwanis programs in all areas. For 1968 the objectives are to—

First, building spiritual and moral values by personal example;

Second, safeguard our heritage of freedom;

Third, demand respect for law and order;

Fourth, conserve our human and natural resources;

Fifth, communicate and work with Key Club, Circle K, and other youth of our nations; and

Sixth, advance international friendship through person-to-person contacts.

Mr. Speaker, I am equally certain that none of us would find it hard to actively support these objectives, as they are worthy of the fullest effort.

As a Kiwanian of several years standing, I want to include at this point the 53d anniversary message of the president of Kiwanis International, James M. Moler of Charles Town, W. Va., a personal friend of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Mr. HARLEY STAGGERS:

TO KIWANIANS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD:  
GREETINGS ON OUR 53D ANNIVERSARY

As I write this message I am sitting in the Davao Insular Hotel at the southernmost tip of the Philippines, where within two hours I will charter the Kiwanis Club of Davao City, the sixth club in the Philippines and a club of fifty extremely enthusiastic young men. The average age is 34 years.

While in the Philippines I have been asked two questions again and again: Why was Kiwanis so long getting to the Philippines, and how can Philippine Kiwanis help to improve international relations? I can report in very positive terms that the mission of Kiwanis is extremely attractive to people all over the world. Our facilities for managing the expansion of Kiwanis fall far short of the demands and the desires of anxious people. As we mark the beginning of a new Kiwanis year, I compliment you upon your success

with International Extension and I suggest that there is much yet to be done.

Throughout the past fifty-three years, Kiwanis has made many contributions to communities and their people. We have emphasized freedom, liberty, leadership, responsibility, duty, action, and a host of other wonderful themes, which, to my way of thinking, are all coming into blossom in Circle K and Key Club.

You must sense with me the tremendous accomplishment in having 100,000 young men in our sponsorship. Your dedication to the objects and objectives of Kiwanis is reflected in the leadership that has been developed in these young men. Your investment of man-hours and funds in these sponsored youth is an investment in the security of the future. If every dollar we spend in International and district dues were to be spent on Key Club and Circle K, it would not be too much of an investment for what we are producing. Our goal in the coming year must be nothing less than one Key Club or Circle K member to match every Kiwanis member.

It is refreshing to know that out of the tumult and unrest exhibited in so many places, there is a serious call for a strengthening of family life. One of your recommended projects for the new year is to develop within your community a special emphasis on the importance of the family unit. You may want to observe a special week, but above all every one of you should make your family an example that will serve to motivate others toward self-discipline, community pride, and higher standards of decency and respectability.

Kiwanis has no national project or projects. All our activity is focused at the local level. It is our belief that if every family and every community accepts seriously the responsibility of citizenship, our nations will be the kind of places we want them to be. Improve the man and you improve all else. May I suggest that you use many of the projects and programs presented by our International committees? You may need to adapt them to your local needs, but you will find them tremendously worthwhile and useful.

This year during Kiwanis Birthday Week, we will honor the Kiwanis International Foundation, Incorporated. The Foundation will undertake several projects that focus on freedom and young people. A Freedoms Foundation Seminar at Valley Forge will be proposed for Key Club men. Other projects directed toward young people will be announced by Foundation President O. E. Peterson early in January. Every Kiwanian will be given an opportunity to make a voluntary Birthday contribution to the Foundation during Kiwanis Birthday Week.

There is a new spirit, a new enthusiasm in Kiwanis for 1968. Two influences have brought Kiwanians to a new dedication—namely, civil disobedience in the states and the addition of other free peoples to the Kiwanis family. It would not surprise me if projects in the area of international relations do not double in number and intensity during the coming year. A new emphasis on man-to-man understanding is developing among the business and professional men that make up Kiwanis from Asia to Europe. Private enterprise, individual initiative, and rule by law are themes being discussed in many, many clubs.

Lack of respect for law and order has caused Kiwanis great unrest, as seemingly undisciplined people destroy property and cause bloodshed in demonstrations widely publicized throughout the world. All of us should accelerate our civic participation in ways that will demonstrate complete faith in a representative government.

Never has Kiwanis faced greater challenges—especially those that call for the use of competencies of dedicated men working

together. No longer can a club's community service be measured by one active committee on Boys and Girls Work or Public and Business Affairs. The strength of our activities in 1968 will be directly related to the strength of individual cooperation and individual participation.

Thus our theme: Be a Builder—Get Personally Involved.

My personal good wishes to every Kiwanian and his club for fulfilling every undertaking during 1968.

JAMES M. MOLER,  
President, Kiwanis International.

Mr. Speaker, Kiwanis International has grown from its beginning 53 years ago in Detroit, Mich., to an organization of active workingmen in 26 nations. During 1967, clubs were organized in Panama, Italy, Taiwan, Nicaragua, New Zealand, Australia, Colombia, and Sweden. This makes a total of 77 clubs outside of the United States and Canada and is the largest annual increase in new countries joining the Kiwanis family of nations since Kiwanis began its policy of extension beyond the United States and Canada in 1961.

While it is my privilege to speak out to wish Kiwanis International and my fellow Kiwanians a happy 53d birthday, I would not want to leave the impression that I am the only Kiwanian in this Congress. There are 85—64 in the House and 21 in the Senate. At this point I would like to list these active and honorary members of Kiwanis International now serving in the 90th Congress, along with their home Kiwanis Clubs:

The above-mentioned list follows:

#### KIWANIANS IN THE 90TH CONGRESS SENATE

Baker, Howard H., Jr., Onelda, Huntsville, Tennessee.<sup>1</sup>  
Boggs, J. Caleb, Wilmington, Delaware.<sup>1</sup>  
Brewster, Daniel B., Reisterstown, Glyndon, Maryland.<sup>2</sup>  
Carlson, Frank, Concordia, Kansas.<sup>2</sup>  
Ervin, Sam J., Morgantown, North Carolina.<sup>1</sup>  
Griffin, Robert P., Traverse City, Michigan (Past Pres.).<sup>1</sup>  
Hansen, Clifford P., Cheyenne, Wyoming.<sup>2</sup>  
Hatfield, Mark O., Salem, Oregon.<sup>2</sup>  
Hruska, Roman L., Omaha, Nebraska.<sup>2</sup>  
Javits, Jacob K., Manhattan West, New York City, New York.<sup>1</sup>  
Lausche, Frank J., Cleveland, Ohio.<sup>2</sup>  
McGovern, George S., Mitchell, South Dakota.<sup>2</sup>  
McIntyre, Thomas J., Laconia, New Hampshire.<sup>1</sup>  
Mundt, Karl E., Madison, South Dakota.<sup>2</sup>  
Pastore, John O., Providence, Rhode Island.<sup>1</sup>  
Randolph, Jennings, Elkins, West Virginia.<sup>2</sup>  
Russell, Richard B., Winder, Georgia.<sup>2</sup>  
Smathers, George A., Miami, Florida.<sup>1</sup>  
Sparkman, John J., Huntsville, Alabama.<sup>1</sup>  
Talmadge, Herman E., Hampton, Lovejoy, Georgia.<sup>2</sup>  
Tower, John G., University, Wichita Falls, Texas.<sup>1</sup>

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Adair, E. Ross, Fort Wayne, Indiana.<sup>2</sup>  
Addabbo, Joseph P., Ozone Park, New York.<sup>1</sup>  
Ashbrook, John M., Northwest Licking County, Johnstown, Ohio.<sup>1</sup>  
Bates, William H., Salem, Massachusetts.<sup>2</sup>  
Battin, James F., Billings, Montana.<sup>1</sup>

Belcher, Page, Enid, Oklahoma.<sup>1</sup>  
Biester, Edward G., Jr., Doylestown, Furlong, Pennsylvania.<sup>1</sup>  
Broomfield, William S., Royal Oak, Michigan.<sup>2</sup>  
Brown, George E., Jr., Lincoln Heights, Los Angeles, Monterey Park, Calif.<sup>1</sup>  
Burke, J. Herbert, Hollywood Beach, Hollywood, Florida.<sup>1</sup>  
Clawson, Del, Compton, California.<sup>1</sup>  
Conte, Silvio O., Pittsfield, Massachusetts.<sup>2</sup>  
Corbett, Robert J., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.<sup>1</sup>  
Cramer, William C., Boca Ciega, St. Petersburg, Florida.<sup>2</sup>  
Curtis, Thomas B., Webster Groves, Missouri.<sup>2</sup>  
Davis, Glenn R., Waukesha, New Berlin, Wisconsin.<sup>1</sup>  
Dellenback, John R., Medford, Oregon.<sup>1</sup>  
Derwinski, Edward J., South Holland, Chicago, Illinois.<sup>1</sup>  
Dole, Robert, Russell, Kansas.<sup>1</sup>  
Duncan, John J., Northside, Knoxville, Tennessee.<sup>1</sup>  
Edmondson, Ed, Muskogee, Oklahoma.<sup>1</sup>  
Flynt, John J., Jr., Griffin, Georgia.<sup>1</sup>  
Fountain, L. H., Tarboro, North Carolina.<sup>1</sup>  
Ford, Gerald R., Grand Rapids-Southkent, Michigan.<sup>1</sup>  
Galifianakis, Nick, Durham, North Carolina.<sup>1</sup>  
Gardner, James C., Rocky Mount, North Carolina.<sup>1</sup>  
Gray, Kenneth J., West Frankfort, Illinois.<sup>1</sup>  
Halpern, Seymour, Bellerose & Queens Village, Forest Hills, New York.<sup>2</sup>  
Hansen, George, Alameda, Pocatello, Idaho.<sup>1</sup>  
Harsha, William H., Portsmouth, Ohio.<sup>2</sup>  
Herbert, F. Edward, Mid-City, New Orleans, Louisiana.<sup>2</sup>  
Hicks, Floyd V., Parkland Area, Tacoma, Washington.<sup>1</sup>  
Hosmer, Craig, Long Beach, California.<sup>2</sup>  
Hungate, William L., Troy, Missouri.<sup>1</sup>  
Jarman, John, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.<sup>2</sup>  
Latta, Delbert L., Bowling Green, Ohio.<sup>1</sup>  
Leggett, Robert L., Greater Vallejo, California.<sup>1</sup>  
Lipscomb, Glenard P., Los Feliz District, Hollywood, Los Angeles, Calif.<sup>1</sup>  
Lloyd, Sherman P., Salt Lake City, Utah.<sup>2</sup>  
Machen, Hervey G., Prince George's County, Hyattsville, Maryland.<sup>1</sup>  
McClure, James A., Payette, Idaho.<sup>1</sup>  
Meeds, Lloyd, Everett, Washington.<sup>1</sup>  
Miller, Clarence E., Lancaster, Ohio.<sup>2</sup>  
Mills, Wilbur D., Searcy, Kensett, Arkansas.<sup>2</sup>  
Natcher, William H., Bowling Green, Kentucky.<sup>1</sup>  
Patten, Edward J., Perth Amboy, New Jersey.<sup>1</sup>  
Pepper, Claude D., Coral Gables, Miami, Florida.<sup>1</sup>  
Price, Robert, Top O'Texas, Pampa, Texas.<sup>1</sup>  
Reinecke, Ed, Los Feliz District, Hollywood, Tujunga, California.<sup>1</sup>  
Rogers, Paul G., West Palm Beach, Florida.<sup>1</sup>  
Rostenkowski, Dan, Northwest Town, Chicago, Illinois.<sup>1</sup>  
Roush, J. Edward, Huntington, Indiana.<sup>1</sup>  
Roybal, Edward R., Boyle Heights, Los Angeles, California.<sup>2</sup>  
Satterfield, David E., III, Richmond, Virginia.<sup>1</sup>  
Schneebell, Herman T., Williamsport, Pennsylvania.<sup>1</sup>  
Shriver, Garner E., East Wichita, Kansas.<sup>1</sup>  
Sikes, Robert L. F., Crestview, Florida.<sup>2</sup>  
Sisk, B. F., North Fresno, California.<sup>1</sup>  
Springer, William L., Champaign-Urbana, Illinois.<sup>1</sup>  
Steiger, Sam, Mile-Hi, Prescott, Arizona.<sup>1</sup>  
Stratton, Samuel S., Amsterdam, New York.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Active.  
<sup>2</sup> Honorary.

Van Deerlin, Lionel, Chula Vista, San Diego, California.<sup>2</sup>  
Whitener, Basil L., Gastonia, North Carolina.<sup>1</sup>  
Wylie, Chalmers P., Columbus, Worthington, Ohio.<sup>1</sup>

#### Yale Psychiatrist: It's on the War in Vietnam

#### HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Arthur Blank, Jr., assistant professor of psychiatry at Yale-New Haven Medical Center, was the subject of an interview by Ned Thomas, staff reporter of the New Haven, Conn., Register in a recent issue.

The interview with Dr. Blank follows:

A "significant" number of U.S. enlisted men and officers fighting in Vietnam are opposed to American involvement in the war, a former Army psychiatrist who served a year in Vietnam says.

In addition, Dr. Arthur Blank Jr., now an assistant professor of psychiatry at Yale-New Haven Medical Center, contends many South Vietnamese army officers fighting alongside American troops are only pretending to be doing their part in the war.

Dr. Blank said the military personnel he saw at two hospitals in Vietnam gave him the impression that "their opposition to the war is extensive as it is among the population of this country."

He estimated that at least one-fourth to one-third of the American soldiers in Vietnam are "very much opposed."

They do not believe "in the righteousness of our cause," and therefore feel that the war is unjustified, said Dr. Blank.

Further, Dr. Blank pointed out, many U.S. troops see the conflict "as a civil war." They have been told by the South Vietnamese that their lack of enthusiasm for the war stemmed, in part, from the fact that they do not relish fighting against their brothers and relatives who happen to live in North Vietnam.

However, he added, the soldiers are driven by a sense of duty to do what the U.S. government orders them to do and by their wish to avoid punishment for not doing it, regardless of their personal beliefs and feelings about the war.

Regarding the participation of the South Vietnamese, Dr. Blank, who held the rank of captain during his Army service, said:

"The ratio of casualties of men under arms is greater among Americans than it is for the South Vietnamese soldiers."

"Furthermore, the number of casualties among the American officers is far higher than it is among the South Vietnamese officers, who are not exposing themselves (in battle) as much and are not participating to the same degree in the fighting, as are the Americans."

Dr. Blank said he knows of at least three occasions in which South Vietnamese officers claimed their units were engaged in heavy fighting with the Viet Cong, but when the localities were inspected by American advisors, "no evidence" of battle was discovered, indicating that the reports were false.

"These false reports," Dr. Blank explained, "were turned in presumably to earn promotions for certain South Vietnamese officers."

<sup>1</sup> Active.  
<sup>2</sup> Honorary.



## NOT COMMITTED

One of the major reasons for this, he said, is that the South Vietnamese Army officers and the general population there are "not committed" to the war against the North Vietnam, and the American soldiers know this.

Another reason for the South Vietnamese apathy toward the war, Dr. Blank noted, is that most of them are more dissatisfied with the conditions under which they are forced to live, than they care about the form of government that is going to run their country. It doesn't take much for Americans to observe this, he added.

Despite the disillusionment, Dr. Blank said, the morale of the U.S. troops in Vietnam seems to be good, and the psychiatric casualties or battle exhaustion (fatigue) victims are, in fact, relatively low. He noted that the political ambiguities of the war are not manifested in psychiatric problems.

What causes combat exhaustion (psychiatric problems), Dr. Blank explained, is sustained combat in which a man is subjected to attack for a long period of time. In Vietnam, he added, combat is intermittent and this does not occur.

## MEASURE OF SUPERIORITY

The fact that the U.S. has complete air superiority, he observed, also tends to maintain confidence among the U.S. troops that they enjoy a measure of protection.

He said there is "a strange but sophisticated" rapport between the junior officers and the GIs. Both agree in "doubting the value of the war."

However, they are ready to fulfill their "obligation" to the U.S. government and comply with the orders given them. He said:

"Thus, the bond between the immediate field commanders and their troops, which is most important to good morale, is thereby preserved."

A New Haven resident, the Yale psychiatrist served for six months as chief psychiatrist at the 93rd Evacuation Hospital at Bien Hoa and for an equal amount of time in the same capacity at the 3rd Field Hospital at Saigon.

## HYPOCRISY

Dr. Blank asserted that President Johnson, his Administration and the Army hierarchy, in particular, are practicing "hypocrisy" in an attempt to justify the American position in Vietnam.

He said the hypocrisy lies in the American claim that North and South Vietnam are two separate countries, and that the war is therefore "an example of North Vietnamese aggression."

The first article of the new South Vietnamese constitution, Dr. Blank asserted, claims that Vietnam is one country, including both the North and South sectors. The last article of the same constitution, he added, states that the first article cannot be amended.

## QUESTIONS FIGURES

Commenting on the casualty figures reported in the war, Dr. Blank said that those for the American troops are probably accurate, but he questioned the accuracy of those for the Viet Cong reported in the American press.

He termed them "highly speculative," for a variety of reasons. Among these are:

1. Warfare creates inevitable and utter confusion and soldiers cannot go about calmly counting casualties on the opposite side.

2. This results in the need to make educated guesses on inconclusive data, such as how many of the Viet Cong casualties were carried away by their own people and how many of them were able to move out of the combat zone under their own steam.

3. It is impossible to determine whether a dead Vietnamese was a fighting man or an innocent civilian caught in the line of fire if he is not wearing a soldier's uniform and if he does not have a weapon in his hands.

## Pull Out of Vietnam? "No," Declares Marietta Marine

## HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the debate on Vietnam continues to resound about Capitol Hill, I would like to take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues, the text of a recent article written by Mrs. Geraldine Muscari of the Parkersburg News, about the views and observations of a brave Marine who has recently returned from the war.

The article follows:

## PULL OUT OF VIETNAM? "No," DECLARES MARIETTA MARINE

(By Geraldine Muscari)

Tall, lean, hazel-eyed Sgt. Leroy Gutberlet, 23, Rt. 5, Marietta, just out of hospital after a serious leg wound in Vietnam last May, thinks the United States should not pull out of Vietnam.

"Too many good men gone," says Sgt. Gutberlet (pronounced Goodballot), who lost several very close friends in the war. "We've got to fight communism somewhere, and better there than in the United States. I'm not in favor of halting the bombing of North Vietnam. If we can stop supplies coming into North Vietnam, it will win the war in six months."

Holder of the Bronze Star for valor, with accompanying Presidential citation praising his inspiring leadership, calm presence of mind, exceptional professionalism, courage and selfless devotion to duty at great personal risk, the cheerful, articulate young man was wounded by enemy fire May 9, 1967, while returning from a combat patrol near Quang Nam Province.

"We were on a search and destroy mission," he recalled the day of the Viet Cong ambush. "We had killed three and headquarters had some information and called us back in, and we got ambushed by 25-30 Viet Cong. There were 42 of us, and eight casualties: no one was killed. I was sergeant and second in command."

## CITATION

"Quickly assessing the situation," in the military terminology of the Presidential citation, "he fearlessly led his squad against the enemy position by fire and maneuver, displaying outstanding leadership and aggressiveness."

"After the platoon's advance was temporarily halted by the rapidly increasing enemy fire, he moved among his men, constantly exposed to the heavy fire, in disregard of his own safety, and while directing effective suppressive fire, sustained a serious leg wound."

"I was shot at 5:30 p.m.," the sergeant continued his own version. "We had come across several acres of rice paddies to get back to our battalion area, and saw a lot of movement and everybody was alerted."

"They dug into the tree line and smashed us from two sides, an L-shaped ambush," he described the surprise attack. "They had M-1 carbines, U.S. Army model. They got these weapons if they overrun a group of ARVIN soldiers, and on the black market."

"I got shot with an AK-47 Chi-Com (Chinese Communist) weapon. It tore a hole in the right knee just above the joint, didn't bleed much. We tried to get fire superiority to advance to the tree line called in support mortars and artillery. What were left, they ran."

## REFUSED MEDICAL AID

"Despite his painful wound and his inability to move," in the language of the citation,

"he steadfastly refused medical aid and continued to control his squad's fire until the entire platoon reached covered positions, gained fire superiority and routed the enemy forces."

"I didn't walk," Sgt. Gutberlet recalled his plight, "kept crawling around, crawled and hobbled to the tree line, kept giving orders to the men in front until we got into the tree line and got fire superiority over them."

"Four hours after it happened, I got out, was hauled out on a truck," he continued. "I was in the Repose, the hospital ship in Da Nang in three or four days. They flew me back on May 14, Mother's Day, in a hospital plane to Philadelphia Naval Hospital. They try to put you in the hospital nearest your home. My parents, Mr. and Mrs. Glen Gutberlet, were there the day I arrived, and some friends came to see me, too."

"His inspiring presence and calm presence of mind throughout the attack," the citation paid tribute, "gained him the respect and admiration of all who observed him and contributed significantly to the accomplishment of his unit's mission."

"Sgt. Gutberlet's exceptional professionalism, courage and selfless devotion to duty at great personal risk were in keeping with the highest traditions of the Marine Corps and of the United States Naval Service."

## COMBAT DECORATION

"Sgt. Gutberlet is authorized to wear the Combat 'V,'" concludes the citation issued by Lt. Gen. V. H. Krulak, U.S. Marine Commandant, in the name of the President of the United States. This was awarded to the Washington county Marine in the Philadelphia hospital where he underwent extensive therapy for the leg wound. On convalescent leave, he flew into Wood County Airport on June 9, hobbling on crutches but happy to be home.

The young man joined the Marines Jan. 3, 1966, and received his basic training at San Diego, where he won a suit of dress blues as honor man of his platoon. From El Toro Marine Base he flew to Da Nang, where he became a squad leader with Company G, 2d Battalion, 1st Marines, First Marine Division. His outfit moved into the DMZ (Demilitarized Zone) and was on Operation Hastings, in combat for 30 days of heavy fighting without relief, without a shave, a bath or a change of clothing.

"On Operation Hastings, we had quite a bit of hand-to-hand combat," he mentioned. "That was the only time I ever used the bayonet. I have killed my share, it isn't hard after one or two of your buddies get shot. I lost my closest buddy, a boy from Mansfield, like a brother to me, killed by a sniper November 15. A lot of buddies were killed, like members of my own family to me."

## KEPT RIFLE CLEAN

Asked about the controversy about the M-16, the sergeant said he was carrying one when he was shot on May 9. "Mine was always kept clean, but has jammed on me. When these weapons get broken in, they are the best in the world, lightest ever made 6.5 pounds, .223 calibre, with plastic stock and handgrip, easy to take care of. They are a lot faster and more powerful than the M-14, which the Army calls AR-15."

Defining the "search and destroy missions," the young man said, "We have a lot of these. We go in with helicopters and try to get all the civilians out. We have new housing developments for them, much better than anything they ever had before. We get them out of the field, then a company of Marines goes out in a line search for caves, weapons, booby traps; search and burn all the huts. Nothing is left. The Viet Cong keeps filtering back, but this has a great effect on them."

"The Marines try a lot of civic affairs, people are investigated, given food and clothing and supplies and care, which builds

up good relations between the American fighting men and the Vietnamese.

"The Marines are all in the farthest north, where he finds we have Air Force, Navy jets, air strikes, and naval gunfire if close enough.

#### SLIPPERY CUSTOMERS

"The Viet Cong are local farmers. They are much smaller than we are and can slip around. They are experts in mines and booby traps. The North Vietnam regulars are well-trained soldiers, also good at guerrilla warfare. They are definitely committed to the war, doped up when they go into combat. In the DMZ fighting is with the North Vietnamese regulars, and in South Vietnam, it is mostly with the Viet Cong. In the DMZ, if you're on a trail, you have to hold on to the man in front of you, it is so tangled and dark, and the heat is so great you can't get any air in the jungle.

"In Vietnam, you are in danger all the time, no one is too safe," he pointed out. "Everyone knows exactly how many days he had left. I was there 11 months and 14 days when I was shot. Boys grow up mighty fast over there. Most are young boys, average age 19 or 20," commented the 23-year-old sergeant. "We are supposed to have the best officers, too, well trained, smart men with good education and good common sense. The Marine tour of duty in Vietnam is 13 months, and I was there 11 months and 14 days when I was shot.

"Living conditions in Vietnam are very poor compared to ours," he thought. "The Buddhists seem to have more facilities and the Viet Cong better health. There is a very small percentage of illegitimate children sired by GI fathers as compared to other wars."

#### INSTANT MEDICAL CARE

In the Marine Corps tradition of never leaving its wounded behind, injured men are whisked off immediately by helicopter after being treated on the spot by the corpsmen (medics), two to a Marine platoon. One goes in front of the platoon and the other to the rear, armed with .45's, but seldom doing any fighting.

The helicopter crews get in as soon as possible in their "Med-Evacs" choppers to carry off the wounded. "A risky business," commented Gutberlet. "Their casualty percentage runs high. The big percentage of our casualties comes from mines and booby traps, up to 75 percent."

Another annoyance to the troops is "immersion foot," caused by prolonged standing in water and wet footgear. Gutberlet himself spent two weeks in the hospital last November from this cause.

Although "everything is lighter now and more easily carried," the average Marine must tote 35 pounds at minimum, while others, burdened down with machine guns, pack and ammunition, struggle along under loads of up to 75 pounds.

As for the dead North Vietnamese and Viet Cong, they are left on the field by the American troops, while the American dead are sent back to the States for burial. "We never leave any of our men behind," said Sgt. Gutberlet.

He thinks we are doing the right thing by fighting: "It is a political war and better over there than over here, and will last until the politicians decide to end it, probably by a treaty. I think our civilian attitude could be better. It makes good propaganda for the Viet Cong. They put out handbills for our soldiers about how many casualties the South Vietnamese have taken, and how many planes shot down, and how our own nation is divided . . . Peace could be in the near future; it is up to our government. The fighting men have to obey orders."

The sergeant had one personal regret in leaving Vietnam: "I had to leave behind a VC flag I got when we took the top of a hill. I just hooked the flag." Somehow it

was lost before he was flown home, but he remembers with pride that "our whole battalion got the Presidential Unit Citation for Operation Union I."

### Invasion of Washington by Martin Luther King

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, notice has been served by Martin Luther King that he will stage an invasion of Washington this spring. Whatever motivation the program may really have, many will include the need to compete for notoriety with other headline habitats. Suburban Life, published in La Grange Park, Ill., which has a well-deserved reputation for thoughtful objective journalistic practices and reflects an unbiased editorial policy, carried a most thoughtful editorial on January 4 which I believe merits the consideration of people generally interested in civil rights. The editorial follows:

#### KING'S NOT ROYALTY

Planning sessions for Dr. Martin Luther King's "massive civil disobedience" campaign are to be documented on film and shown on television after the campaign against northern cities is launched in Washington either in March or April.

The sessions are to be filmed by Public Broadcast Laboratory and released over a National Education Television Network which in this area means via WTTW, Channel 11.

What unabashed effrontery!

In the first place, who or what gives Dr. King the right to conduct a massive civil disobedience campaign? Are he and his followers above the laws of the country and the cities? If this is true we might just as well scrap all the law books and go whole hog on the survival of the fittest theory.

We assume that his disobedience campaign will be patterned to show how the Negroes in this country are being deprived of their civil rights, and that they have the "rights" to disobey civil authority in any way they choose to gain their "rights" regardless of the general populace to a peaceful way of life. In other words, their wrongs will create rights.

We believe this civil disobedience campaign will greatly harm and set back the civil rights campaigns of the responsible Negro leaders who have done much for the welfare of their people in peaceful ways.

If Dr. King persists in his civil disobedience he will be no more than an insurrectionist. He has shown leanings in this direction for some time.

Other minority groups in this country are obliged to, and do, obey the laws of the land. Why should Dr. King be allowed to do otherwise? The laws are for all to obey whether they be black, white, yellow or green.

Films of the planning sessions are to remain secret until Dr. King launches his campaign. Showing of the films on television is purported to give the public a better understanding of what's to be happening during the disobedience campaign.

If understanding is the goal, then why the disobedience? Why don't Dr. King and the FBI prepare a comprehensive picture of the Negroes' plight and show it without Dr. King going on a binge to disrupt the peaceful movements of society and its laws?

Why has Dr. King chosen Washington for the campaign's kickoff? Things are so tense in Washington right now, we hear, that the police are travelling four men to a squad car. The attention King seeks in Washington could come in the form of Congressional legislation setting back the Negro cause many years.

Channel 11, which will show the films in this area, has done many fine things in the past, and the public has shown its appreciation by donating funds to help the station continue in its educational and public benefit projects.

In our opinion, Channel 11 is jeopardizing its reputation by giving Dr. King exposure and encouragement in this case. If Dr. King's campaign were to be in the public interest, in the peaceful interest of helping the Negro, or if it were of an educational nature we would have no objections. But if Channel 11 cooperates in this venture it will be on the wrong wave length.

The plight of the Negro in this country has been lessened greatly and it will be lessened more and more as responsible Negro leaders and the white population reach greater understanding. It will not be lessened by civil disobedience.

Dr. King, who earned his Nobel peace prize through many fine peaceful workings on behalf of his people, should be the last to veer the way he has.

We don't understand his switch, but we believe he should be stopped in his civil disobedience leanings.

### President's State of Union Address Testimony to His Faith in America's Future

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's state of the Union address was living testimony to his great faith in America's capacity to meet—and conquer—the challenges of the 20th century.

I believe that most Americans share the President's faith that united we can forge an era of opportunity for every citizen.

President Johnson's address was a renewed pledge to make the American dream a reality for every American. It reaffirmed the President's—and the Nation's—goal of freeing Americans from the strictures of poverty, from the burdens of poor health, from the weight of ignorance, and from the frustration of discontent.

Lyndon Johnson's memorable state of the Union address will give renewed confidence to our people that their country's future is in good hands.

It also demonstrated to Americans that this President and this administration is determined to act on the rising crime rate. The President was well advised to recommend tighter controls on narcotics trafficking, and his request for the Safe Streets Act and gun control bill passage will not, I predict, fall on deaf ears this session.

All in all, this was a memorable state of the Union message. I am proud to join with my colleagues in applauding a great President.



# "Old Put," a Great American Revolutionary War Hero

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD a fascinating feature article on Gen. Israel Putnam written by Bernard A. Du Pont, which appeared in the November 26, 1967, Worcester Sunday Telegram. In his fine account of this hero of the Revolutionary era, Mr. Du Pont, notes that while Putnam was practically a legend in his own lifetime and the subject of the first American biography, he is not as well known as some of his contemporaries, such as John Paul Jones or Patrick Henry.

This is rather unusual, in view of the fact that General Putnam was second only to General Washington in command of the Continental Army during the Revolution, and it was Putnam who issued the famous order at the battle of Bunker Hill: "Don't fire until you see the whites of their eyes." In addition, his name has been given to about 30 counties, towns, and villages throughout the country, including my own hometown of Putnam, Conn., as well as to numerous buildings, schools, and organizations.

This year marks the 250th anniversary of the birth of this great American patriot and Revolutionary War hero. During the first session of this Congress I introduced a bill calling for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in his honor. It is my hope that early action may be taken on this measure during this session.

I am sure that my colleagues will be interested in the article on General Putnam whose life was filled with thrilling exploits which endeared him to his countrymen, and serve as an inspiration for our Nation today.

The article follows:

"OLD PUT"

(By Bernard A. DuPont)

Who said, "Give me liberty or give me death?"

Easy—Patrick Henry.

But how about, "Don't fire until you see the whites of their eyes?"

John Paul Jones? Robert E. Lee? George Patton?

Israel Putnam said it.

But the name doesn't strike a bell for too many Americans today. Unlike his famous quote, which is generally attributed to someone else at first, Putnam is a shadowy figure in the minds of most of his 20th-century countrymen.

Yet, during his lifetime, Putnam, Conn., and other places are named for him, and he was an authentic hero—almost a legend. One biographer described him as "a hero from his cradle." Most historians say he was the subject of the first American biography, in fact. It was written by David Humphreys, former aide-de-camp to both Putnam and George Washington. Yet today, even schoolboys and students might have to think twice in attempting to place Putnam.

"I think that's all changing," says Galo Putnam Emerson Jr. of Danvers, Mass., who represents the 10th generation of Putnam's descendants. "Because of the interest in

American history today, men like 'Old Put' are becoming more widely known."

Emerson runs a confectionery business named "Putnam Pantry" on Route 1 near the intersection of Route 95 in Danvers, next to the house where Old Put was born. The 250th anniversary of his birth will occur Jan. 7.

Steps are being taken to observe the anniversary. U.S. Rep. William L. St. Onge of Putnam has introduced a bill in Congress for the issuance of a commemorative U.S. stamp. Other events are expected to be scheduled to help honor the man who, though lacking much formal education, rose to be second in command of the Continental Army during the American Revolution. Only General Washington was his military superior.

In itself, this might be enough to insure a certain immortality for Putnam. That, plus the fact he gave his name to about 30 counties, towns and villages throughout the country in addition to Putnam, Conn., not to mention countless buildings, schools and organizations.

But there was much more to Old Put than that. Some of the episodes in his life are the stuff that legends are made of. As Galo Emerson advertises on the cover of one of his circulars for his candy store: "They just don't make generals like that anymore."

So who, and what, was Israel Putnam?

He was a barrel-chested, athletic man of medium height—slim and muscular in his younger days, rather fleshy during the time of the Revolution. He was nearly 60 years old when he uttered his immortal words at the Battle of Bunker Hill.

His face was good humored, but marked by many deep scars he received during the French and Indian War. He lost the joint of his right thumb during a farming accident and walked with a limp (from another farming accident). He occasionally stammered, but his voice and attitude were commanding. Fearless, he was yet known to have fainted at the sight of blood.

Old Put was also kind and generous. He never held a grudge. He had the typical Yankee's resourcefulness. Most of all, he knew how to lead men. One of his fellow generals said of him: "A man of strict truth who can be entirely trusted."

Israel Putnam was born in New Salem (now Danvers) in 1718, the 12th child of Joseph and Elizabeth Porter. The house in which he was born, behind the Putnam Pantry, was erected in 1648 by his grandfather, Thomas Putnam. It is believed to be the oldest house in the country retained down through the years by a single family.

His father was a man of conviction. During the witchcraft hysteria in Salem, which he denounced, sermons were preached against him and even his own half-brothers stormed at him. His mother was a niece of Magistrate John Hawthorne, from the line that would eventually produce Nathaniel Hawthorne. The original family name was Puttenham, which could trace military ancestors back to Charlemagne.

Israel loved outdoor life and learned to shoot and fish early. One of the first legendary accounts of him concerned the time he climbed a big oak for a bird's nest while a boy. A branch broke and he fell ahead downward, but another branch caught him halfway down by the seat of the pants. Hanging with his head down, he directed a friend who had accompanied him to get his rifle and shoot the branch off, otherwise he'd be dead "before a half hour's out."

His nervous friend managed to split the branch with one shot. Putnam calmly thanked the boy after he got up from the ground, patted him on the back and said he knew he could do it.

He also went back the next day, climbed the tree again and got the nest.

He wed Hannah Pope in 1739 at the age of 21, and with money from his share of

the sale of the farm (his father died when he was 5, his mother when he was 9, he moved southwest to Connecticut and bought Mortlake Manor in Brooklyn, then part of Pomfret. The property included 514 acres.

Within a year, he had paid off the mortgage on the farm and was quickly on his way to becoming prosperous. He became one of the largest wool growers in all the colonies.

The most famous incident in his non-military life came out of his concern for his sheep herd. During the winter of 1742-43, he lost many sheep—as his neighbors did—to a wily she-wolf.

With five men, he set out one day after her in light snow. She led the hunters in a day-and-night chase all the way to the east bank of the Connecticut River and back to Pomfret again, where she took refuge in a den. The men had tracked the wolf more than 40 miles.

When dogs sent in after her came out bloodied, and when attempts to smoke her out had failed, Putnam decided to go in after her. The passage was narrow—two feet wide—and extended about 40 feet into the ground. It was about 10 p.m.

Putnam's companions tied a rope to his legs and he shinned in, holding a torch. At the end of the tunnel, he saw the brute's eyes shining and promptly ordered his friends to haul him out. Loading his musket with buckshot, he went back down, pulled the trigger and was quickly dragged out once more by his friends.

After the gunsmoke cleared, he went in a third time and found the animal dead. He grabbed it by the ears, kicked the rope that signaled his friends and both were dragged out.

That exploit won him another nickname—"Old Wolf." Against the base of his large equestrian statue in Brooklyn today are mounted heads of open-mouthed wolves—both fore and aft. Later on, in Brooklyn, he ran the General Wolfe Tavern. Located across from the eventual site of the monument, it later burned to the ground.

It was as a provincial in the French and Indian War that he rose from the ranks to become a lieutenant colonel of the 4th Connecticut Regiment. Some criticism was directed against him in later life because of his confusion in commanding large groups of men. But he was superb as a guerilla leader.

He went through several hair-raising (and almost hair-losing) incidents during the Seven-Year War, which began in 1755. He was once captured by the Indians and tied to a tree between opposing forces, but survived the crossfire.

Two Indians came along as the battle moved away and practiced throwing their tomahawks to see how close they could come to his head. Then they tried to burn him at the stake, but a sudden downpour drenched the first attempt, and a second effort was prevented by a French officer.

An instance that showed his resourcefulness came when in the dead of night, he rowed out to a large French vessel on Lake Ontario and drove a wedge in its rudder, causing the ship to founder and be captured the next day.

Another time, a fire broke out in a barracks at Ft. Edwards, above Albany, N.Y., just 12 feet away from a magazine containing 300 barrels of gunpowder. Putnam headed a bucket brigade for several hours. When the fire was eventually put out, his companions pulled mittens from his hands which he had put on to protect them. The skin came off with them.

After the war, he returned to his farm, where he seethed along with other colonists over George III's edicts. He was an important member of the Sons of Liberty.

On the day he received word about the outbreak of the Revolution at Lexington, he left his plow in its furrow, mounted his horse and

rode 100 miles to Cambridge, still in his work clothes. He was commissioned a brigadier-general of Connecticut forces there one week later.

It was Putnam's responsibility to plan the battle at Bunker Hill. Actually, the name of the battle is a misnomer. It should have been called the Battle of Breed's Hill. Bunker Hill was situated a half-mile behind Breed's Hill and, although the former was a part of the defensive redoubt thrown up by the Americans, the important stages of the battle were fought at the base and on the side of Breed's Hill.

The British eventually drove the Americans from the site, but at heavy cost. They lost more than 1,100 regulars to the Yankee sharpshooters, while the Americans lost only about 400 men. Putnam was all over the place during the fighting. Seldom off his horse, he spurred on his men, and although much in the thick of the fighting, he escaped unhurt.

His immortal call had a matter-of-fact setting. "Men, you are all marksmen," he began. "Don't fire until you see the whites of their eyes. Powder is low. Don't waste it."

Washington Irving, the author, later wrote: "Putnam was one of the first to prompt and one of the last to maintain the battle." He called him "that brave old man."

Putnam received his commission as a major-general in the Continental Army from the hands of Washington at Cambridge on July 4, 1775—exactly one year before the adoption of the Declaration of Independence.

He was one of only four such high-ranking officers, and the only one of the four to receive the commission from the Continental Congress unanimously.

Washington later sent Putnam to fortify New York City. The British drove the Americans from Manhattan, but Putnam was credited with a masterful job of directing the retreat. He was also given the job of fortifying Philadelphia, and later given charge of several brigades in the New York highlands.

Another example of how wily Putnam was came at Princeton, N.J., where he gave permission to an English officer to enter Princeton to receive the last will of an injured Englishman the Americans were holding.

But Putnam ordered the officer to enter the city only at night. He directed his small force to put lights in all the windows in all the buildings, and paraded his men in full view while the officer was in town, changing their uniforms at different times to give the impression of a large force.

When the officer returned to his camp in New Brunswick, N.J., he reported that Putnam had a force of about 5,000 men who could not be dislodged with less than 10,000 regulars. Putnam actually had about 50 men.

It was while he was returning from Hartford during an attempt to recruit more men to the cause that he was paralyzed by a stroke, which numbed his right side, in December, 1779. He retired to his farm and settled into a full life for the next 11 years. He died at 73 on May 29, 1790, after an attack of an "inflammatory disease."

Considering that Putnam was nearly 40 when he took part in the French and Indian War, and 57 at Bunker Hill—when anyone over 40 was considered old—his achievements are all the more remarkable.

He had 10 children and married twice—his second wife was Mrs. Deborah Lothrop Gardener, whom he also outlived. His oldest son, Israel, was born in New Salem. Three other sons and six daughters were born in Connecticut. The oldest boy and a kinsman, Gen. Rufus Putnam, founded Marietta, Ohio.

On his gravestone in Brooklyn are these famous words, composed by Dr. Timothy Dwight, who went on to become president of Yale College:

"Passenger, if thou art a soldier, drop a tear over the dust of a hero who, ever

attentive to the lives and happiness of his men, dared to lead where any dared to follow."

### It's a War Unlike Any Other Conflict

## HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the *Record* the following editorial which recently appeared in the *Bristol, Tenn., Herald-Courier*.

Much has been said and written about this most difficult of wars, but I believe this editorial expresses the concern of the American people most effectively and concisely:

### IT'S A WAR UNLIKE ANY OTHER CONFLICT

A television roundtable discussion of Vietnam, including several of that medium's most experienced and knowledgeable news reporters and analysts, degenerates from a dispassionate examination of the facts into an emotional, verbal brawl.

Dr. Benjamin Spock, distinguished American and the most respected man in his field, is indicted by a federal grand jury on the charge of conspiring to counsel young men to evade the draft.

Sweden reports that a total of 11 U.S. servicemen, protesting the war, have so far asked for political asylum in that country.

These three items, noted in as many days, are only the latest to underscore how deeply Americans are divided over the question of Vietnam—or if not absolutely divided, certainly confused, frustrated, pessimistic.

Imagine, at the height of World War II, a congressional inquiry to determine if the attack on Pearl Harbor justified the nation's going to war. Yet three years after the beginning of active U.S. involvement in the Vietnam conflict, here is Sen. J. William Fulbright's Foreign Relations Committee trying to find out if North Vietnamese torpedo boat attacks on American destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin in August 1964 really took place.

But the Vietnam War is not like World War II. It is not like any other war this nation has engaged in.

The Tonkin Gulf was not Pearl Harbor. The infiltration of North Vietnamese troops into South Vietnam was not the equivalent of Japanese landings in the Philippines. President Johnson's lack of candor with the American people, his attempts to placate both the hawks and the doves, his constant reiteration of his readiness to negotiate a peace while committing more and more of the nation's human and material resources to the conflict, are far different from President Roosevelt's plain call for a girding of the national loins.

Little wonder the war is unpopular, its purposes unclear, its outcome doubtful.

Paradoxically, the closer the nation comes, if not to victory at least to overwhelming military dominance on the soil of South Vietnam, the more the nation searches its soul and the more extreme becomes the opposition of the dissenters.

It is easy—and not unfair—to criticize the administration for its failure to foresee the possible consequences of American entry into the war, or to honestly prepare the people for those consequences when they became apparent.

It is also easy—and not unfair—to fault the President for attempting to dispense guns to Vietnam while at the same time promising no cutback in butter at home. It is possible to understand the sense of betrayal felt by many who voted for him as a peace candidate in 1964.

But how difficult it is, in the face of so much restless history that will not lie still, to caution against leaping for the bait of proffered peace negotiations. How difficult it is to say that now is the time for national unity, for firmness, for perseverance.

Yet, unless we have faith in the basic ideals we give lip service to—unless we have the courage to see that those ideals are given a reasonable chance for life in this little foreign land we have become so deeply involved with—unless we have the resolve to build a just peace over whatever mistakes we may have made in the past—then, truly, Vietnam will have been the most colossal blunder in our history.

### Communications Technology as a Social Force

## HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, it is a well-established fact that the strides of the communications industry since the turn of the century have truly caused a worldwide information revolution. The continuing and overexpanding progress of the industry has led to the development of technologies of unbelievable speed, power, and scope. Through the knowledge it has discovered in transmitting and analyzing all types of information through electronic signals and data processing techniques, the communications industry has eliminated the distinctions of the past which once separated broadcasting and press, publishing and recording, and speech and graphics.

The current technology of the communications industry surmounts all barriers of time and distance and future developments point to even better, faster, and more comprehensive services. Satellite networks will soon extend around the world to provide global transmission of every type of electronic information. Broadcast electronic printing will be available to home, office, and classroom; and, electronic reference centers will expand greatly to be utilized for increasing professional and educational needs.

With these impressive achievements continuing, how can the communications industry best contribute its efforts in solving the many domestic and international problems which face our world society?

On this very issue, I request permission to insert in the *Record* excerpts from a stirring address delivered by Mr. Robert W. Sarnoff, president of the Radio Corp. of America, to the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce on October 10, 1967. In his address, Mr. Sarnoff discusses the most pressing challenges facing the world and the ways in which communications technology can effectively meet them.

### COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY AS A SOCIAL FORCE

Communications technology has contributed much to growth and change. It has extended ideas, knowledge, and customs outward from the urban centers to all areas through the television receiver and the classroom. Now it offers powerful new weapons



for an assault on major social and environmental problems. . . . You know them well: urban congestion, environmental pollution, persistent poverty, faulty education.

#### THE CHALLENGE IN EDUCATION

The most urgent task is to salvage the uneducated. Our problem is not unemployment, but unemployables. Nearly one million Americans—one-third of all the nation's jobless—lack elementary job skills and in some cases, cannot even read or write. Even greater numbers are condemned by lack of education or skill to a life of sub-employment, unable to find full-time work or earn enough money to support their families.

Quite apart from the cost in human distress, the extent of joblessness and sub-employment bears a shocking price tag. In 1966 alone, according to leading economic authorities, the cost to the nation was some \$28 billion. This is the estimated amount that would have been added to the Gross National Product if all Americans had the minimum education needed for a productive role in the economy. It is apparent that ignorance is more costly than education.

It is here that communications technology may perform its greatest service. Computer-based instructional systems will soon give our teachers the capability of providing everyone, regardless of age, with the basic education needed for full participation in modern society. . . . An intensive program using such systems in the slum areas of our cities might enable us to wipe out within five years a knowledge-gap which sociologists have said might take several generations to close.

#### THE NEED FOR INDUSTRY-GOVERNMENT PARTNERSHIP

It is now generally recognized that government and business share a common interest in maintaining a climate for economic expansion, and that each has a part to play in the process. It is also recognized that some of our vital national needs can be met only with efforts so large that the active partnership of industry and government is essential to their success.

Progress in technology is now bringing us to this point in the field of communications. In the assault upon major social ills, we must mobilize all of our new informational resources. This demands an effort comparable to national defense or the exploration of space. Like these, it requires the planning, design, development, and application of large and complex systems.

The creation of systems to meet our national needs will require major enterprises involving diverse relationships among industries and among public and private agencies. Industry must lead in the organization of these enterprises because of its technical and managerial competence and its great productive capacity. Government must be enlisted as a working partner at national, state, or local levels, according to the nature of the project and its objectives.

#### THE NEED FOR CHANGED ATTITUDES

Let us recognize that the full development and use of new technology will require a purposeful change of attitude and direction both within and outside the communications industry.

We cannot adhere to the fragmented pattern of yesterday in dealing with today's problems. In the context of education, for example, we can no longer separate broadcasting, computers, publishing, newspapers, or telephones. These are all related means of communicating information, across the spectrum from job printing to satellite communications. Their effective application to our

needs requires improved systems competence. This is a primary reason for today's expanding pattern of concerted action involving elements of this greater communications technology.

In the face of these needs to achieve a useful education, to restore the vitality of our cities, to purify our environment, we must abandon old prejudices and outworn traditions that encourage the fragmentation of our efforts. Let no one doubt that these are goals worthy of a great national effort.

#### Pollution of Great Lakes

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the Chicago metropolitan area and for that matter all throughout the Great Lakes region there is concern over the problem of pollution of the Great Lakes and specially Lake Michigan. There has been a concerted effort in the Chicago area to develop public awareness of the problem and it has been sparked by thoughtful editorial commentary such as the following which appeared in the January 13 edition of the Chicago Daily News:

#### CLOSER TO A CLEAN LAKE

The meeting here of business leaders from the four states bordering Lake Michigan marks an important milestone in the fight to save the lake. Representatives of some of the largest industries in the Midwest attended the conference called to "promote understanding and concerted action."

The fact that most of those invited came to the conference sponsored by the Chicago Assn. of Commerce and Industry dispels a widespread notion that industry generally is antagonistic to antipollution measures.

Some industries have been correctly tagged as prime polluters. But they are less culpable on the whole than the municipal and other governments that pour their untreated wastes into the lake, either directly or through tributary streams. Out of the misunderstanding has sprung sensitivity on the part of the industries. This week's conference is a step toward bridging the understanding gap.

We hope the leaders who met here can get together with other interested groups to form the nucleus of a four-state citizens' committee to wage a continuing war on further pollution.

The meeting this week can also serve as a useful preliminary to the pollution control enforcement conference called by Interior Sec. Udall for Jan. 31. Since a final solution depends upon co-operation between government and private industry, an informed delegation of concerned private citizens should prove an asset and an impetus to that meeting.

#### Little Englishmen

### HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, during the last few weeks we have been confronted by the serious steps our most

loyal ally has had to take to preserve its economic viability. Great Britain has had to devalue its pound, reduce its overseas forces and commitments and has now been told of drastic belt tightening in the budget message of Prime Minister Wilson. The Washington Post in its lead editorial on Wednesday, January 17, 1968, discussed Great Britain's reduction from a world power to a position of "little Englishmen."

The editorial in question draws attention to the contribution British forces have made in the past to the preservation of peace on the periphery of the Indian and Pacific Oceans. Not only has the British defense budget been cut drastically and orders for American fighter aircraft been canceled, but also Britain's territorial army is being reduced. In addition, social services, particularly for those who bore the brunt of World War II and the postwar deprivations, are being slashed.

As the editorial states so succinctly, the British presence outside the British Isles has always been a powerful factor for peace and stability. The hauling down of the British flag east of Suez is sad indeed, but sadder is the fact that some of her strongest former allies are now not stepping in to help her. However, the British Prime Minister ascribes Britain's dilemma not to the exigencies of war or peace, but rather to the fact that Britain is "living beyond her means." To offset her balance-of-payments difficulties Britain is retrenching on all fronts.

Mr. Speaker, a most vital question arises. Does living within one's means automatically entail a lowering of the levels of living? The question is directed to us since we are also approaching a similar period of payments difficulties. Are we developing a mentality similar to that obtaining in England? Instead of retrenching should we not rather explore newer methods of raising our means of living? Surely in our forward-looking capitalist society, that is the only way to face our future optimistically. England is cramping her own outlook and as a result is withdrawing to an insular position. Should we give way to similar thinking, it will mean for us a similar contraction.

And yet at the same time fiscal irresponsibility can only lead the United States to the same dilemma that caused Britain to take these harsh steps. Let us look to ways to stimulate our economy by private venture rather than the planned governmental approach. Plans are necessary—but not to the point of restricting the very freedom that caused our country to become great. We need not fear that U.S. business and labor will not spend the available money—but we do need to recognize the true effect of deficits in Government spending—we need to realize that our national debt is more than an accounting figure. We need to recognize that the world must first have confidence in the fiscal policies of our Government, in order to have confidence in our dollar. We have not seen this confidence under President Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend that this editorial be read and studied by all thinking people in the United States, particu-

larly by our policymakers concerned with maintaining our preeminent stature in this modern world. I insert this editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 17, 1968]

#### LITTLE ENGLISHMEN

There is no use blinking the fact that the news from England is bad—bad for England, bad for the United States and bad for the whole free world. No one can rejoice to see the withdrawal, from the whole East, of forces that have contributed to peace and stability from Suez to Hong Kong. To pretend that this were now no disaster would be to demean and diminish the contribution these forces have hitherto made to avoiding disaster. No one can be pleased that Great Britain is not to have the fifty F-111 aircraft that were to be the mainstay of the RAF after 1970. No one can find any solace in the reduction of the British defense budget by \$624 million by 1972-3 except on the premise that the forces sustained by this budget made no contribution to peace—for they did indeed make a contribution.

Nor can anyone be gratified at the reduction in social services extended by the government to a loyal and hard-working citizenry who have not had the good things or even the necessities of life in proportion to their merits or desert.

Those who love England must be pained as well by the abandonment of the auxiliary fire service and the territorial army. They are surely not the backbone of British defense—but they remained a means of service to country still available to the ordinary citizen in a day when all other military contributions are professionalized. And a citizen in a free society needs some hooks on which to hang the cloak of his patriotism. It is hard to grow sentimental about a nuclear missile.

What this means in the matter of defense is yet to become apparent. In this age of technology maybe the British forces being reduced make no decisive contribution. But sheer fire power apart, the British presence, backed by long training and experience, has been a powerful factor for peace and stability.

In any logical arrangement of Western power there would be such a pooling of resources and such a distribution of men, energy and talent that those who have the most to give, for the least in cost, in any quarter of the world, would be enabled to stay and perform their appropriate and useful purposes. To see being hauled down from staffs around the world a flag that has been at the service of the free world because the financial burden no longer can be borne, and to know that closest allies have helped to make that burden unbearable, is a tragic thing.

Some will say this is not so bad and may even make for peace but more will worry that we "give those that mean us ill the opportunity of effecting that under the notion of peace which they could not bring to pass by war."

It is not considerations of war or peace alone that make this bad news. It is the knowledge that this is being done because the government of England thinks the country is "living beyond their means." Is it indeed? Who lives too well in England? Who works too little? Who spends too much? Job for job, trade for trade, skill for skill, craft for craft, English labor does not do as well as labor in other Western societies.

A case can be made for the argument that England ought to live a great deal better than it is living. A brief can be held for the idea that England's spending and producing (which is the same thing) ought to be increased instead of diminished. A banking mentality is partly to blame for the fatal notion that by spending less and getting less the economic machine can be cranked up.

The specters and goblins of payments deficits have been permitted to frighten into retrenchment a country and a system to which retrenchment has ever been debilitating and enervating.

England is not living beyond its means. It is living beyond its mental attitudes, beyond its imagination, beyond its initiatives. It will be said that the time is not ready for the policies that could set the machine once more upon an upward course. This is not so. "All things are ready, if our minds be so." And minds in England and in the United States, preoccupied with making the people of this great Atlantic community live within their means, ought to be turned away from schemes to lower the level of living and turned toward the methods of raising the means. This is the only constructive and affirmative way that the people of a capitalist society can be made to "live within its means."

### Rebuttal to Republican Congressional Committee Statement

#### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am astonished by the incredible statement issued last Friday by the Republican Congressional Committee to the effect that President Johnson pressured Israel Prime Minister Eshkol into helping him win Jewish votes.

This unprincipled statement is malicious, totally without foundation, and will be deeply resented by every fair-minded American. Apparently the Republicans think of American Jews as a political commodity. I can assure them that President Johnson does not.

I can also assure the Republican Congressional Committee that President Johnson does not consider the security of Israel to be negotiable on the basis of partisan American politics.

I have recently returned from a 2-week trip to Israel, where I met with nearly a hundred government and political leaders, as well as the man on the street. I am pleased to report—and, in fact, have already done so to President Johnson—that to a man those with whom I spoke are deeply appreciative of the Johnson administration's help, friendship and support.

The American Jewish community will not soon forget or forgive this blatant Republican attempt to equate Israel's security with American election year politics. I would hope that more responsible Republican voices will strongly rebuke this ill-conceived statement by their congressional committee.

### Our Social Security Is Sound

#### HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it appears that there has been misunderstanding—and in some cases—inaccuracy, concerning our social security system and

the legislation recently passed by Congress.

Last September I commented on this in an article entitled "Your Money's Worth in Social Security Value," and inserted an excellent backup article at that time by Sylvia Porter.

Miss Porter again attempts to set the facts straight in her article of December 14 in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, which confirms the actuarial soundness of our system, as well as the certainty of continued benefits to our younger workers.

Under unanimous consent I include both articles at this point in the RECORD:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 12, 1967]

#### YOUR MONEY'S WORTH IN SOCIAL SECURITY VALUE

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, during the lengthy deliberation and hearings in the House Ways and Means Committee concerning the recently passed social security bill, there seemed to be a mood of opposition expressed by the heavily taxed younger workers.

Writing in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of August 25, Sylvia Porter explains very clearly how the social security bill is designed to provide their money's worth—in benefits and protection—not only for the younger worker, and the older worker, but also for the employer in terms of goods and services.

I commend this thoughtful article to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

#### "YOUR MONEY'S WORTH: SOCIAL SECURITY VALUE WEIGHED FOR WORKER

(By Sylvia Porter)

"Will you, the young American worker who is now contributing the maximum Social Security tax, get back your money's worth in Social Security benefits when you retire?

"Or, as has been charged repeatedly in the past few months, will you lose on the deal by paying a bigger tax total than your expected future benefits?

"Take, for instance a young worker who began working last year at age 21. Assume he has been paying and will continue to pay, the maximum Social Security tax until he retires at age 65 in the year 2010. Under today's law, the total value of this worker's contributions over his working lifetime, including interest on the contributions accumulating at the rate of 3½ per cent, would amount to \$31,692. Yet the total value of his retirement benefits over his expected lifetime would be only \$19,761—\$11,931 less than the total value of his contributions.

"This worker, who is typical of millions now pouring into the labor force, is on the surface getting an abominable deal in Social Security.

#### "Disability protection

"But consider the fact that in addition to his retirement benefits, he will be protected against disability throughout all but five of his 4 working years. Consider also that his wife and children will be eligible for survivors' benefits in the event of his death before he retires. The value of this additional protection is estimated by chief Social Security actuary Robert J. Myers at many thousands of dollars.

"Moreover, today, a man retiring at age 65 has an 81 per cent chance of having a wife and the total value of a retired worker and wife's combined benefits, including widow's benefits, is figured at \$34,023. This is in addition to disability benefits and to benefits payable to survivors if the breadwinner dies before 65.

"If this worker became totally disabled sometime in the next few years, he would get back many times the amount of his Social Security tax contributions in disability benefits alone. If this worker died at a young age, leaving a widow and several young chil-



dren; his survivors might get as much as \$30,000 to \$40,000 in survivor's benefits.

"On average, says Myers, today's young worker will contribute 80-85 per cent of the total value of his benefit protection, counting the interest that would accumulate on his contributions. The average young worker just entering the labor force could not possibly buy, for his Social Security contributions, a private annuity that would pay as much as his expected Social Security benefits.

"Myers concedes that the higher income worker who begins working in 1973 or later, when maximum Social Security contribution rates under present law take effect, will 'no more than just about pay for the value of his protection.' But this, he adds, does not take into account the certainty that Social Security benefits will continue to be increased in the years ahead.

#### "Different for elderly

"Far different is the situation of the elderly worker who reached retirement age at the beginning of 1967 and who had paid maximum Social Security taxes since they were first deducted from his paycheck in January 1937. He is way ahead. He has contributed a total of \$3,355, including interest, his benefits will amount to many times this.

"In sum, you, the young American worker, will get at least your money's worth in protection before and after you retire.

"You, the older worker who is due to retire soon, will get a lot more than your money's worth.

"And you, the employer, are by your contributions, helping to make it possible for millions of older Americans to avoid dependency and destitution, and you are thereby guaranteeing a huge and stable market for your production of goods and services."

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Dec. 14, 1967]

#### MANY FRET NEEDLESSLY OVER SOCIAL SECURITY (By Sylvia Porter)

While Congress was completing details on 1967's omnibus Social Security bill in recent weeks, scare stories such as the following appeared from coast to coast:

"There's no guarantee of future payments, no reserve fund . . . Monthly benefit payments . . . may be downgraded or even discontinued at some future date . . ."

"Recent disclosures are raising grave doubts as to how much—if anything—today's taxpayer will get back when his time for retirement comes . . ."

"All that's left in the Social Security kitty for your old age are a bunch of paper IOUs signed by your own grandchildren . . ."

"The Social Security Administration is bankrupt."

"If any insurance company were administered as Government administers your 'Social Security Insurance' its resources would be impounded and its officers would be thrown into jail."

These denunciations, mind you, are being broadcast to 23,000,000 beneficiaries on the Social Security rolls. These accusations are being heard by the 80,000,000 of us who are contributing Social Security taxes toward our own future security.

The facts cry out for attention.

#### SOUNDLY FINANCED

Fact 1: Our Social Security system is studied regularly and exhaustively by Advisory Councils consisting of experts drawn from private business, insurance companies, labor unions and universities.

The most recent Advisory Council concluded in 1965, as did previous councils that the Social Security system is soundly financed; that its present trust funds can adequately meet all near-term obligations to beneficiaries; and that its expected income from taxes provided under law will be sufficient to meet its obligations in the distant future.

Projections for Social Security income and outgo are regularly made for as far ahead as the year 2050.

The next Social Security advisory council is due to be appointed next year. Meanwhile an exhaustive study of the entire program by the House Ways and Means Committee has again concluded the program is actuarially and financially sound.

Fact 2: The Supreme Court has ruled that present and future beneficiaries are guaranteed both present and future Social Security benefits under the due process clause in the 5th amendment to the Constitution prohibiting denial of rights by arbitrary governmental action.

#### FUND INFLOW ASSURED

Fact 3: The Social Security system is under obligation to pay present and future beneficiaries a total of \$350 billion—although it now has only about \$26 billion in the OASI and Disability trust funds.

But Social Security taxes are compulsory; the system is assured of a steady flow of new funds; it would be an obvious impossibility for the system even to try to maintain a reserve running into hundreds of billions.

Actually, the danger is that a huge reserve kitty could turn into a Federal financial "big brother" which could dominate and disrupt the nation's money markets. Many sophisticated students of finance argue that \$26 billion is becoming too unwieldy.

Fact 4: Counting disability insurance protection, widow's benefits and wife's benefits, Social Security actuaries estimate that total protection over the young worker's lifetime will amount to at least 15 to 20 per cent more than his total contribution. This doesn't take into consideration the virtual certainty that benefit levels will continue to rise over future years as they have over the past. The older worker is, of course, way ahead.

#### United States Is Israel's Friend

#### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Eilberg and I returned last Monday morning from a 2-week trip to Israel. Perhaps some of the Members may be interested in a brief report of that trip.

It is amazing what a sign can do for morale.

A few years ago, Philadelphians began to sit up and take notice when detour signs around building sites began to carry words to the effect: "Sorry for the inconvenience, we're rebuilding your city."

Almost as soon as my wife and I landed in Tel Aviv, we noticed a different kind of sign everywhere: "(Re)Built with American help." During our 2-week stay in Israel we could hardly help but notice such signs in every part of the land.

Nor were these expressions limited to signs. Unlike some places of the world, Americans are held in high regard in Israel. I picked up a newspaper, for example, and read a poll taken by Israel's leading public opinion sampler soon after the June war.

It listed world leaders in order of popularity: First, Lyndon B. Johnson; second, Gen. Moshe Dayan; third, Premier Levi Eshkol. And in order of unpopularity: First, Russian Premier Kosygin; second, General Nasser; third, Charles de Gaulle.

It is hard for an American, concerned

with the safety of Israel, to fully appreciate the esteem with which our leaders are held by Israel leaders and citizens. Foreign Minister Abba Eban told me, for example, in very undiplomatic terms:

L.B.J. has been better for Israel than your Presidents Kennedy, Eisenhower and Truman.

Eban, incidentally, was delightfully tongue-in-cheek during our appointment in his office one morning. He mentioned during a discussion of Israel's military needs as compared with the Arabs' that perhaps the Egyptians were better off with older airplanes than they would be with the new Mig-21's.

He reasoned that the more sophisticated planes need well-educated people to fly them. The "21" might even require a Ph. D. So, he reasoned:

Our army couldn't be happier; the better the airplane, the less they'll be able to handle it.

We discussed various proposals to end the crisis. The foreign minister had little hope for action by the United Nations. He felt even the survey by Special Representative Jarring might take until next year to be completed. And the Israeli philosophy about direct negotiations has changed not at all.

When they (Arabs) come and talk, we'll be happy to discuss what the boundaries should be. Right now, we are three minutes from Cairo. That's much better than the U.A.R. being three minutes from Tel Aviv.

We were impressed with a number of officials of the Israeli Government. One appointment we had, with Jerusalem's mayor, Teddy Kollek, was for 6:30 a.m.; there just was no other time to talk.

I was less impressed, however, by what seemed to me to be the unwieldy organization of the Knesset—Parliament or Congress. Members run on a party slate and represent no particular district.

They are elected in proportion to their party's share of the total vote in an election. They have no staffs to help and they seem to owe their primary allegiance to the Histadrut, which my mind compared loosely to a giant, all-encompassing lobby with members in all parties.

A real move apparently is being made to reduce the great number of political parties in Israel.

Since the June war, I have been in close, constant touch with both our own White House staff and officials of the Embassy of Israel in Washington. I have been satisfied that my information on developing situations has been as fast and accurate as anyone's.

My visit to Israel helped me develop a third perspective, however, a comforting one in some ways. Where I was worried about our commitments in the Middle East, I am now less worried. There can be little doubt in my mind now that the friendship is fast and will continue to be so.

Like others who have taken the time and trouble to see the situation for themselves, I am now more aware than ever of the fact that even friendly nations have roles to play in harmony rather than have everyone play the same exact melody.

I have seen first hand what a dedicated people can do with help, and what

help can do from friends. It is no longer an impersonal thing.

And I have seen, from our country's own point of view, an ounce of preventive medicine to communism, which in the long run may well be worth a pound of Vietnam-type "cures."

To be sure, I have seen problems, too, like a small nation's suffering from declining immigration plus low birth rate. Or like total exploitation of available or convertible farmland, because of a lack of water. Or like a serious refugee problem.

But who would expect the best political system in the world in less than 20 years? Or complete settlement of Arab refugees in months?

It may not have been much of a vacation from Washington, but it was a wonderful trip. A real eye opener. Even wider.

### International Synagogue Award to Rabbi Israel Mowshowitz

#### HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on January 16, 1968, the Honorable Charles H. Silver, one of New York's most honorable and respected citizens and president of the International Synagogue, made a presentation to Rabbi Israel Mowshowitz in recognition of his great service to that temple.

Rabbi Mowshowitz serves the Hillcrest Jewish Center and the International Synagogue and all know him as a man dedicated to the improvement of society. A past president of the New York Board of Rabbis he was instrumental in founding the International Synagogue at Kennedy Airport which I am privileged to serve as a director and as chairman of the library committee.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD at this point the remarks of the Honorable Charles H. Silver on making the presentation to Rabbi Mowshowitz:

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL SYNAGOGUE, AT PRESENTATION TO RABBI ISRAEL MOWSHOWITZ, JANUARY 16, 1968

Wisdom is not gotten easily or in a single day. It must be harvested throughout a lifetime, fed by a mind passionately devoted to the quest for truth.

A man of wisdom must possess much more than mere intelligence. He must acquire a vast knowledge of things. Most of all, his heart must be rich in understanding of his fellow man.

Such a man respects himself as being made in the image of God. He carries a spark of that Divine Spirit deep within. He tackles his appointed task with skill and understanding, with loyalty and devotion to duty.

Such a man wins the respect of all who work with him. He merits the love and praise and well-deserved tribute we pay him today.

Years of his life and energies have been given to the cause of our people and our heritage, he finds time for ministering to his own congregation, serving the Jewish community and guiding the destinies of an historic, world-famed synagogue.

Combining warmth and humanity with sincerity and eloquence, his words burn into the hearts of his hearers because they stem from the flame of his faith. His message echoes in many corners of the world as he guides the destiny of the Hillcrest Jewish Center and the International Synagogue.

There is no branch of community service, no broadening of opportunities for youth, no contribution to the social progress of our times and our people that has not known the benefit . . . yes, the blessing . . . of his energies, his wisdom and his spirit.

It was from the inspired vision of this present-day prophet who walks in the flame of his faith that the original dream of the International Synagogue was born. And it was through his tireless efforts and boundless determination that it became a brilliant historic reality.

As a spiritual leader and past President of the New York Board of Rabbis, he has demonstrated a remarkable blending of the practical and the visionary.

Our city, our people and generations to come are indebted to this scholar, preacher and prince in Israel for his devotion to the American way and the Jewish heritage.

He has held high the sanctity of his calling with a dignity and dedicated responsibility that brings new greatness to the name of Rabbi.

Fearless and foremost in the fight for human rights, firm in his conviction that men who were created equal by God deserve equal treatment from other men . . . there is no area of civic or spiritual service in which he has not earned the regard and esteem of all.

He has done as much as any man to stir the conscience of the world on behalf of the homeless, the hopeless and the oppressed.

There is a magic about his very presence. It rises from the depths of his being . . . a hidden place where you know that truth and honor dwell. You are sure that, while he walks with God, his arm remains firmly linked with his fellow man. As an inspired leader of his people, he is intensely and compassionately aware of their needs and problems.

His eyes may be fixed on the eternal wisdom of the Torah, but his hand is outstretched and eager to bring comfort and counsel to any who falter.

Beloved by Jew and Gentile alike, he has shown us the way to build a citadel of man's better self beside the sanctuaries of the other great faiths.

There, Rabbi Israel Mowshowitz, alongside our brothers who worship each in his own way, your dream has been fulfilled—the majestic fruit of your labors—the International Synagogue—the magnificent testament and eternal tribute to your skill and genius—

"A symbol of the faith that we embrace,  
A hall of worship raised for all who seek  
A sacred altar in a peaceful place  
Where men may walk with God . . .  
And think . . .  
And speak . . ."

### Positive Republican Action

#### HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, for months we have heard of the plight of our cities. We all recognize that some positive consideration, some positive action must be taken if we are to reverse disturbing and dangerous trends which, for one reason

or another, have been to a great degree incorrectly handled in the past.

I have just returned from Detroit, Mich., where I was honored to represent our Republican Congressional Task Force on Urban Affairs at a metropolitan seminar on urban affairs which attracted outstanding leaders from 16 States. I am proud that this meaningful seminar was sponsored by our Republican Party in Michigan.

Among the many statements and addresses in the 2-day seminar, I was particularly impressed by the words of Michigan's Lt. Gov. William G. Milliken. Because of his challenging message, not only to Republicans, but Democrats as well, I wish to insert his address in the RECORD. Following is Lieutenant Governor Milliken's remarks at the metropolitan seminar on January 19, 1968, in Detroit, Mich.:

ADDRESS BY LT. GOV. WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN, METROPOLITAN SEMINAR, DETROIT, JANUARY 19, 1968

It is a pleasure to welcome each of you to this Metropolitan Seminar, sponsored by the Republican Party of Michigan.

It is a particular pleasure to welcome my good friend and colleague Lt. Governor Jim Goetz of Minnesota as co-chairman of this seminar.

This is one of the most encouraging meetings I have attended in a long time.

It is encouraging because, to the best of my knowledge, this Republican-sponsored seminar on metropolitan problems marks the first such conference to be sponsored by either political party.

It is encouraging because this conference has attracted some of the nation's most innovative thinkers and doers in their areas of influence. Some of them I know well; others I am looking forward to hearing for the first time.

Above all, it is encouraging because out of this meeting can come stimulating thoughts and ideas that we can use to help solve the difficult problems of urban America.

Speaking for the Republican Party of Michigan, we are grateful to each of you for your attendance—particularly those of you who have come from other states—and we look forward, with you, to highly productive sessions over this next day and a half.

We are grateful to those representatives of the Republican Committee on Arts, Professions and Sciences, who will be lending their intellectual stimulation to the Seminar.

Too often the Republican Party has been a party of re-action rather than of action. Too often, instead of proposing realistic and comprehensive answers to the problems of urban America, we have reacted to answers proposed by Democrats. Too often, on the national level, we have combined forces with southern Democrats to beat back or water down proposals made by the majority party. Too often, on the state level, we have permitted rural-dominated legislatures to ignore city problems.

I submit to you that if the Republican Party is to meet its responsibilities on the national, state and local level, we must constantly search out, and put into practice, ideas that are practical and plans that are responsive to human needs.

In Michigan, as in some of your states, the Republican Party is the party of leadership. This means we have to have the courage to lead on the tough issues as well as on the easy ones . . . if, indeed, there are any easy ones.

We have here today the nucleus of a group which could begin to chart a course for a better America. In charting that course, we should be guided by mistakes of the past,



but only to the extent that we can profit from these mistakes.

What have been our mistakes? Why has this most affluent of all nations lost contact with our less affluent minorities? Why have we permitted the poor to sink constantly lower into hopelessness and helplessness? What have we learned that can guide our future actions?

Perhaps one of the most important lessons we have learned is that affluent America cannot plan for disadvantaged America without involving the disadvantaged directly in the planning. They don't want packages tightly bound with red tape handed down to them; they want to have the doors of opportunity opened so they can help themselves.

We have learned that the only doors to opportunity are through education, jobs and housing; and that the poor have a great deal of catching up to do before they can keep up. Every board and commission that has examined urban poverty has concluded that unemployment is our gravest problem. The longer a man's record of unemployment, the longer is his climb to a steady job.

We have learned that federal housing and highway programs have accelerated the move of middle-income families and businesses to the suburbs, leaving the core cities without adequate tax bases and with uprooted businesses and families which can only crowd into already over-crowded areas.

We have learned that our system of welfare services makes jobless men leave home so their families can receive more money; and keeps the poor behind bars of financial disadvantage from which it is increasingly difficult to escape.

We have learned that the American Negro will no longer be patient in his century-long wait to possess rights which should never have been denied him—including the right to buy or rent a home of his choice.

We have learned, as Governor Romney said when he returned from his tour of American cities, that the voices from the ghettos are calling for three things. They want human dignity; they want equal justice under the law; and they want equal opportunity. Certainly, those things are not too much to ask.

I have mentioned some of the failures from which we can profit; now I want to talk about some of the more positive aspects of our learning experience:

We have learned that to turn back the forces of poverty and despair we will need the combined forces of government at all levels and of the private sector; and we are showing an increased willingness to make this commitment.

We have learned, notably in the Bedford-Stuyvesant experiment in New York, the nation's second largest Negro ghetto, that even the most difficult problems of housing, employment, health, education, and economic development can be met. They can be met, and are being met there, through a program built on the community's strengths and tailored to meet all its needs.

We have learned, through the McClellan Committee in Los Angeles and the New Detroit Committee here, that the resources—both money and ideas—of the business community, can be brought to bear effectively to help break the chains of the disadvantaged.

We have learned, principally in Philadelphia, that lending institutions and private businessmen can combine their forces profitably and effectively to provide risk capital and management advice for struggling inner-city Negro businesses. We are bringing this program to Detroit.

We have learned, notably in Indianapolis, that persons who might otherwise never have been able to own a home, can build equity and acquire ownership through joint efforts in building whole blocks of new homes. This is the "sweat equity" approach we are bringing to Michigan.

We have learned, through the efforts of U.S. Gypsum and other companies, that rehabilitation of slum tenements, in which the inhabitants play a significant role, can result in better living quarters that the poor can afford to enjoy. Through the cooperation of U.S. Gypsum, with which I have been working, we hope to bring this approach to Michigan.

We have learned, in New York, Chicago, and St. Louis, that police-community relations can be vastly improved; and in Indianapolis we have learned that citizens can organize effectively to aid the police department and the courts, and to help young people who might otherwise be involved in street crime.

Perhaps most important of all, we are beginning to learn that the people of the slums need not be a drag on society, but are really an untapped resource . . . that there is much talent and leadership in the slums as in the suburbs.

The tragedy of the slums is that they need not exist.

We have the resources, we have the skills, we have the knowledge to mount a total national assault on the problems of the slums. What we have lacked thus far is the determination. Such an assault will require a massive personal and institutional commitment by the entire American community—affluent and poor, black and white, public and private.

The signs are not encouraging. Recent opinion polls show that a majority of white Americans think Negroes have as much opportunity as whites and enjoy comparable living standards. The evidence points toward a continued drawing apart of large segments of the American community into two antagonistic camps. Whites think Negroes are unreasonable, and Negroes think whites are unresponsive. In some cases, both are right.

Unless we can educate ourselves and one another by sound persuasion and positive example, we will condemn ourselves to a harsh and disastrous education by tragic events.

Without a new and positive sense of national urgency and determination, encompassing the entire American community, the tragedy of the slums will continue to mount. Unless we can find the means to forge a new and fundamental national consensus, we will be unable to marshal the forces that are available and waiting to be used to eliminate the slums.

This is where the Republican Party comes in. A political party's stock in trade is not just power, but principles. Its job is to help order the priorities of the community—to put first things first, and spearhead the drive for proper allocation of effort and resources to meet emerging challenges.

The job of the Republican Party is not only to listen to the people and reflect their wishes so that we may win power. Our job is to initiate two-way communication with the people, at every level and by every means we can, to mold opinion as well as mirror it, to involve the people directly in the shaping of a better state and nation.

Today, when more and more people have a growing sense of alienation, not only from each other but also from the decisions and decision-makers that intimately affect their lives, it is absolutely vital that we have at least one political party that is down there working at the grass roots—not just begging for votes, but championing the people's efforts to put meaning and hope back into their lives, involving the people directly in new approaches to the solution of our common problems.

Through the leadership of our State Chairman, Elly Peterson, we are experimenting in Michigan with this new role for the Republican Party. Through the Metropolitan Action Committee, we are drawing on the full resources of the urban community to help solve

the daily problems that confront the people of the slums.

We are showing the prosperous American that there are real problems in the slums—problems that he himself may unwittingly have helped create, and that he can help to solve. We are educating and involving what we think of as the traditional Republican constituency.

At the same time, we are showing the people of the slums that there are ways and means to lick their problems—sometimes by their own efforts; sometimes with an assist from their more fortunate fellow citizens. By involving ourselves in their frustrations and discouragements, we are opening doors of opportunity and widening horizons of hope. We are showing that we care. In this effort, I must add, we have important cooperation of both Democrats and Independents.

We are demonstrating, here in Michigan, that the Republican Party is capable not only of proposing programs at the state and local level, but capable of direct action to involve the total resources of our communities. We are building bridges of understanding and communication across the gap between suburb and slum. We are revitalizing the organizational infra-structure of our society, on both sides of the gap, so that people can take a direct hand in developing and implementing their own plans to build a New Detroit, a New Michigan, and a New America.

This Metropolitan Seminar is an extension of our efforts. We want to tap the best ideas that have been developed elsewhere. We want to share our insights—and our problems—with you who share our concern and our commitment.

It is not too much to hope that our meetings in Detroit this week may set a pattern for the Republican Party in other cities and other states, and even in the nation.

This is what our Republican Party needs to keep it stimulated. In short, we need to be jarred by the force of new ideas that can move us and move America forward.

We must involve ourselves at every level with the incredibly difficult and complex social, economic and political machinery that must mesh now for the common good.

We must be the architects of a new American community—united in its diversity, and strong in the strength of the people.

## Ukrainian Independence Day

HON. LEONARD FARBEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. FARBEIN. Mr. Speaker, the 22d of January marks the 50th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. On this date in 1918, the fledgling Ukrainian Government was among the first nations to declare its independence from the crumbling Russian Empire. Regrettably, this independence was short lived as the Ukrainian people were quickly conquered anew by the Communist regime in Russia.

This date is a time of remembrance for those of Ukrainian ancestry. It represents a feeling of pride in an independence declared, and a moment of honor in a battle gallantly fought to preserve that fragile freedom.

We in the United States have been fortunate to live in freedom for almost 200 years. On this date, it would behoove us to remember the not so fortunate history of the Ukrainian people, who carry in

their hearts the same burning hope for a free society. We can sympathize with the tragedy of this land; more importantly, we can take this opportunity to rededicate ourselves to the goal that every man has the irrevocable right to live, work, and worship in a free society.

Let us be reminded by their perseverance that the democratic way of life is not an irrevocable right but a living process which requires our daily attention. Freedom ultimately lives in the hearts of man. We salute the Ukrainian people on this day for reminding us of this spirit.

### Montana's Poor Mail Service Proves Post Office Wrong

**HON. JAMES F. BATTIN**

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, although I am not one who enjoys telling people "I told you so," a gross blunder by U.S. postal officials causes me to make just that remark. The Post Office Department went into Montana in late 1967 and arbitrarily took all mail from the railway postal offices. The officials were warned that their new method of transporting the mail—by truck or plane—would not be as efficient as the rail method and that their decision would also do great harm to passenger service on the affected lines.

Now after a few months of operation under the new system, Montanans can prove that their cautions were correct. The following news article was carried in the October 29, 1967, issue of the Montana Standard, a Butte, Mont., newspaper. In short, this experience with Pony Express effectively tells the Post Office Department "I told you so" for the many Montanans who vocally opposed the changeover from railway postal offices.

I have noticed press reports that Postmaster General O'Brien intends to implement this same type of service throughout the United States. He promises to provide airmail service for first-class postage. In other words, making the 10-cent airmail stamp worth the same as the 6-cent first-class stamp. Every Member of Congress can find a good example of what will result from Mr. O'Brien's plan through what has happened in my State.

The article referred to follows:

PONY EXPRESS FASTER THAN U.S. MAIL

(By Frances Denning)

THREE FORKS.—Shades of the old West—the pony express—rode again last week when four intrepid riders and their ponies carried the mail from Three Forks to Pony in record time.

It all started when Jack Zuelke, owner of the Three Rivers Bowl in Three Forks, sent an air mail special delivery letter to Bert Welch, Pony Bar owner. The letter carried 38 cents postage and was delivered to Mrs. Welch 47 hours and 25 minutes later. In talking it over with Al Amundson of the Town Club, the fellows decided the mail service could be somewhat improved with a modern day pony express.

The distance from Three Forks to Pony is 31 miles so, with the aid of Don Conner and

Sid Price, they determined the four riders and their trusty mounts could each ride approximately eight miles and beat the mail service by a couple of days.

Promptly at 9 o'clock Saturday morning Al Amundson, up on Miss Kitty whose owner is Corky Vandolah of the Three Lazy Sons Ranch, left for the ride to Willow Creek. Despite a head wind and a short delay to retrieve his hat which blew off, he mailed the first batch of letters at the Willow Creek Post Office at 9:55. Sid Price, on Wrangler owned by Don Conner, took off with the mail pouch over the old Yellowstone Trail. Eight miles and 30 minutes later, the pouch was handed to Don Conner up on Pecos who made the lap to Harrison in record time for 27 minutes. The mail was posted in Harrison in at 10:56 and the pouch taken by Jack Zuelke on his pony, Joey. The final batch of mail was in the Pony post office at 11:29 which was exactly 2 hours and 29 minutes from the starting point at Three Forks.

Amid the shouts of the welcoming committee at Pony, it was announced the modern Pony Express bested the time of the U.S. Mail special delivery letter by 45 hours and 36 minutes.

In true old western spirit, the riders and their followers spent a happy afternoon celebrating their feat with residents of Pony. Both horses and riders were reported in excellent condition the following day.

### How a Free People Conduct a Long War

**HON. RICHARD BOLLING**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, a president in wartime is particularly an object of abuse and calumny. It is true today. It was true in the Lincoln Presidency. Gus Tyler has written in the New Leader of January 1, 1968, an account of the terrible strains under which Abraham Lincoln worked. The article offers us a lesson in how to assess the unwarranted torrent of abuse and the irrelevant criticisms that now assault President Johnson.

The article referred to follows:

HOW A FREE PEOPLE CONDUCT A LONG WAR  
(By Gus Tyler)

(NOTE.—Gus Tyler, ILGWU Assistant President, is a national board member of Americans for Democratic Action.)

Late one night, a friendly Senator discussed the war with the President at the White House. The conflict was running wrong, and too long. The fighting was going into its third year with no end in sight. In recent weeks, the enemy had shown new strength, putting the great and powerful United States on the defensive. From the anguished bowels of the nation arose the cry for "peace." It came from the opposition and from the President's own party. But the man in the White House was obdurate.

The press did not spare him. They reminded him of the many men who had died in the uniform of the United States, and they reminded him again as the number mounted. They charged him with despotism, with a brutal draft, with suppression of dissension, with strangling civil liberties. They charged that the President's insane obsession with the war was bringing the country to ruin: internal rebellion, riots, inflation, outrageous taxation. They charged him with lying to the country getting it into a limited war on one pretext and then waging an extended war for his own crazy

crusading purpose. They charged that he had allowed his generals to take over the running of the war.

Within his own party, leaders were looking around for a candidate to run against him for the nomination. Challenging his conduct of an unconstitutional war, Congressional leaders were preparing impeachment proceedings.

The President himself was weary and without friends. Those who should have rallied to his support accused him of incompetence, faintheartedness, and even a sneaking sympathy with the foe. He was being pecked to death by doves and hawks alike.

These were the things that Senator Orville Hickman Browning mused about with the President of the United States. The slow-speaking Chief Magistrate reached for a pamphlet that had apparently been his bedside companion in these difficult days. He commended it to the Senator as proper reading for men laden with the responsibilities of carrying on the most unpopular war in the nation's history. The booklet was entitled, "How a Free People Conduct a Long War," and was written by a Philadelphian, Charles Janeway Stillé.

On the night of December 29, 1862, Mr. Lincoln read to Browning from the document for an hour or more. But he was reading for himself, too. The President was going through an ordeal other Presidents had experienced—Washington during the Revolution, Madison during the War of 1812. He was confronted with the fact that a freedom-loving people are also a peace-loving people, who consider it their right—indeed, their duty—to resist any ruler seeking to drag the populace into a war that is too pointless or too painful.

Things had not gone well for Lincoln in December of 1862. On the 13th of that month, General Ambrose Burnside saw the flower of his Army of the Potomac wither under the fire of Lee's veterans at Fredericksburg. In the West, the Army of the Cumberland was stalled in its tracks at Murfreesboro. Sherman was having difficulty at Vicksburg.

Lincoln sensed still more trouble ahead. And when spring followed winter, Lee moved his armies north into Pennsylvania, threatening Meade at Gettysburg. The conquest of the South seemed far, far away in a never-never land of Lincoln's fantasy.

Bad as the military situation was for Lincoln, the political situation was worse. When a military appropriation bill came before Congress on December 18, the Midwestern Democratic delegation pointedly abstained—almost to a man. They never wanted the war and were now doubly bitter at the thought that the President, who had said it was a war to preserve the Union, had turned it into a war to liberate the Negro.

In January 1863, the handsome, brittle, brilliant spokesman of the Midwestern Democrats, Clement Vallandigham, spoke the heart of the peace people on the floor of the House:

"Defeat, debt, taxation, sepulchres, these are your trophies. In vain the people gave you treasure, and the soldier yielded up his life. . . . The war for the Union is, in your hands, a most bloody and costly failure. The President confessed it on the 22nd of September, solemnly, officially and under the broad seal of the United States. . . . War for the Union was abandoned; war for the Negro openly begun, and with stronger battalions than ever before. With what success? Let the dead at Fredericksburg and Vicksburg answer.

"And now, sir, can this war continue? Whence the money to carry it on? Where the men? Can you borrow? From whom? Can you tax more? Will the people bear it?"

Vallandigham slashed at Lincoln's endless appetite for more and more men, for his endless escalation of the war, "Seventy-five thousand first . . . then 83 thousand more were demanded; and 310 thousand re-



sponded. . . . The President next asked for 400 thousand, and Congress gave him 500 thousand; and, not to be outdone, he took 637 thousand. Half of these melted away in their first campaign; and the President demanded 300 thousand more for the war, and then drafted yet another 300 thousand for nine months. The fabled hosts of Xerxes have been outnumbered."

Although a lame-duck Congressman, Vallandigham was no man to be pushed aside. The descendant of a conscience-driven Huguenot and a Scotch-Irish mother, he spoke for the "butternut" counties of the Midwest and for the "peace" Democrats. He ended his speech with the warning that "popular uprisings" are being readied in the North, and a new civil war is in the making between New England and the West.

Vallandigham was arrested on the order of General Burnside, as were others, for seditious utterances likely to interfere with recruiting. The ex-congressman was sentenced to jail for the duration; Lincoln commuted the sentence to exile to the Confederacy. In protest, the Democratic party of Ohio named Vallandigham unanimously as its candidate for governor.

The Illinois convention of the party adopted the following resolution: "That the further offensive prosecution of this war tends to subvert the Constitution and the government, and entail upon this nation all the disastrous consequences of misrule and anarchy."

The Iowa convention resolved "that our Union was formed in peace, and can never be perpetuated by force of arms, and that a republican government held together by the sword becomes a military despotism."

In Connecticut, the platform declared that "the time has now arrived when all true lovers of the Constitution are ready to abandon 'the monstrous fallacy' that the Union can be restored by the armed hand alone; and we are anxious to inaugurate such action, honorable alike to the contending sections, and unite all the States upon terms of equality as members of one Confederacy."

And in New York City, Democratic party leader Fernando Wood told an overflow meeting at Cooper Union: "This war of the General Government against the South is illegal, being unconstitutional, and should not be sustained if we are to regard the Constitution as still binding and in force."

Through the winter of 1862, Lincoln feared that the enemy was not the military foe without but the political foe within. "These are dark hours," wrote Senator Charles Sumner to a friend. "The President tells me that he now fears 'the fire in the rear'—meaning the Democracy, especially at the Northwest—more than our military chances." Before the next summer was ended, the "fire in the rear" came not only from the Northwest but more ominously from New York City.

When Lee attacked Gettysburg, Lincoln drained several Eastern states, including New York, of all ready soldiery as a stop-gap prior to securing new troops through a draft. The conscription call raised a storm of protest all over the country.

"For the nation as a whole," wrote a contemporary, "the Civil War reached its darkest military day and its point of greatest unpopularity in the spring of the year 1863. Every description of discontent and disaffection towards the Lincoln Administration controlling the National Government was at its climax in the early summer of that year. At no time before or afterwards was Mr. Lincoln himself so grossly underrated or so outrageously libelled by all his critics, patriotic or reverse."

New York City was up in arms—not against Lee but against Lincoln: The people would have none of the despised and despotic draft, especially at this moment when Honest Abe, at the nadir of his rule, was viewed as one of the most dishonest men of all times: killer, despot, abolitionist, liar, joke-

ster. The ugly volcano of hatred for the war and the President that had long been seething under the city now exploded. Opposition to the draft turned into a riot, bringing New York to near ruin. More than a thousand people were killed in three days; other thousands died later of wounds. Whole blocks were burned to the ground. Much needed troops were brought in to restore order.

Disaffection, however, was not limited to New York nor to the draft. In six months, Illinois arrested 2,001 deserters. In Mississippi, the Illinois 109th regiment got so involved with fraternization and was so depleted by desertions that the entire regiment was disbanded and placed under arrest. "They were disgusted with Lincoln and the Emancipation Proclamation, said they had enlisted to fight for the Union, not Negro freedom," records Sandburg in his long Lincoln study.

The peace theme was put to music:

"Abram Lincoln, what yer 'bout?  
Stop this war! It's all played out."

Nasty poems appeared regularly in a hostile press:

"How changed—how strange is everything—  
We had a Union once—  
A Statesman for a President,  
But now we have a dunce."

Or more heavy-handedly invective, such as:

"May Heaven's curses, dark and dire,  
Commingle with Almighty fire,  
Fall on your head and press you down,  
With dreadful torture to the ground."

While he was under attack from both doves and Democrats, the President's own Republican Radicals launched a dump-Lincoln movement. *Tribune* publisher Horace Greeley made it clear how he felt: "I can't trust your 'honest old Abe.' He is too smart for me." Greeley feared for the future of America in a protracted conflict. "During the next two years of war, the country, saddled with Lincoln, would be ravaged so that it would hardly be worth saving. But the Republican leaders had their backs up; he had talked with them; they would fight till Doomsday rather than consent to disunion. Every prominent Republican he had conversed with thought the only hope lay in defeating a reelection of Lincoln. Some suitable candidate should be at once decided upon."

Behind Greeley stood "Thaddeus Stevens, Senator [Benjamin F.] Wade, Henry Winter Davis, David Dudley Field, Governor [John] Andrew of Massachusetts and," according to a close associate of Greeley's "about all the more prominent Republican leaders."

When Greeley read the bitter news from Chancellorsville, where "130,000 magnificent soldiers [had been] cut to pieces by less than 60,000 half-starved ragamuffins," he was sure Lincoln was betraying the cause. Greeley insisted that the party leaders must get General William Rosecrans to run against Lincoln. To an emissary, he wrote: "If you find Rosecrans the man that is needed, I will go personally to Lincoln and force him to resign." Rosecrans was flattered by the offer to run but flatly turned it down, being convinced Lincoln was the right man in the right place.

In the winter of 1862-63, a quiet move was launched to impeach Lincoln. "There were Radical Republicans," notes Sandburg, "who wanted a man obedient to their wishes. There were reactionaries in both parties who hoped that the confusion of an impeachment would slow down the war, bring back *habeas corpus* and other civil rights. . . . They knew that in any final vote to impeach they would count on a large block of Ayes from the political opposition."

The success of the Confederacy gave rise to rumors that there was a Southern spy in the White House. The finger pointed at Mrs. Lincoln. A Congressional committee was appointed to investigate the matter. Hardly had the committee been called to order, when

the doorkeeper announced a caller: The President of the United States, who had come uninvited and unwarned. All six feet four inches of the harassed Lincoln loomed over the committee as he solemnly intoned: "I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, appear of my own volition before this Committee of the Senate to say that I, of my own knowledge, know that it is untrue that any of my family hold treasonable communication with the enemy." Having spoken, he turned and left.

In these days of despair, Lincoln frequently read Stillés "How a Free People Conduct a Long War." The 40-page booklet, subtitled "A Chapter from English History," drew its "lessons" from a conflict vastly different from the Civil War: England's Peninsula War of 1807-12.

Fought not on native soil but in a faraway place, the Iberian Peninsula, the conflict was almost irrelevant to England's well-being, since its sole object was to repel Napoleon's aggression into Portugal and Spain. The war was geo-ideologic, an effort to contain the Napoleonic epidemic sweeping Europe.

At the outset, all parties in Parliament and the country vied with each other in demanding that England should aid the [Iberian] insurrection with the whole of her military power." But with the very first failures, the mood changed. They "now spoke openly of the folly of any attempt of England to resist" Napoleon in the Peninsula. There was a mounting cry for unilateral withdrawal.

The ministry, however, "had sense enough to perceive that their only true policy was perseverance. They were strong enough to resist the formidable opposition . . . in Parliament and the country, and, undismayed by the experience of the past, concluded a treaty with the Provisional Government of Spain, by which they pledged England never to abandon the national cause until the French were driven across the Pyrenees."

The first year went very badly, largely because Wellington leaned on native troops. "Dependence upon the Spaniards was certainly, as it turned out, a fault . . . in which Wellington, made wise by experience, was never again detected." He anglicized the war.

Immediately, the "opposition in Parliament took advantage of this feeling to rouse public opinion to . . . compel the termination of the war in the Peninsula and drive the ministry from office." Weary of the badgering, the ministry "boldly challenged their opponents, if they were in earnest, to make a definite motion in the House of Commons, that Portugal should be abandoned to its fate. This move completely unmasked their game, and for a time silenced the clamor, for it was perfectly understood on all hands, that deep in the popular heart, undisturbed by the storms which swept over its surface, there was a thorough and abiding conviction of the absolute necessity of resisting the progress of Napoleon's arms, and that the real safety of England herself required that that resistance should then be made in Spain.

"Still this noisy clamor did immense mischief; it weakened the government, it prolonged the strife, it alarmed the timid, it discouraged the true, and it so far imposed upon Napoleon himself that, thinking that in these angry invectives against the government he found the real exponent of English sentiment, he concluded, not unnaturally, that the people were tired and disgusted with the war, and the privations which it occasioned were like a cancer, slowly but surely eating out the sources of national life."

It took three long years for Wellington to clean out Portugal and reach the Spanish frontiers, where he set up a holding operation: "People talked of 'barren victories,' because [the battles] brought no territorial acquisitions." Said Sir Francis Burdett: "No man in his senses could entertain a hope of the final success of our arms

in the Peninsula. Our laurels were great, but barren, and our victories in their effects mere defeat." General Tarleton "wished for the pencil of a Cervantes to be able to ridicule those who desired to enter upon a continental war."

"The following description of the opposition of that day," wrote Stillé in 1862, "bears so striking a likeness to the peculiarities of the leaders of an insignificant but restless faction among us, that omitting the old-fashioned drapery of the proper names, they seem to have sat for the photograph." Stillé then quoted the annual Register for 1812:

"Those persons in this country who profess to have the greatest abhorrence of ministerial tyranny and oppression, look with the utmost coolness on the tyranny and oppression of Bonaparte. . . . They are almost always ready to find an excuse for the conduct of Bonaparte. The most violent and unjustifiable acts of his tyranny raise but feeble indignation in their minds, while the most trifling act of ministerial oppression is inveighed against with the utmost bitterness."

"There is such a thing as public opinion, falsely so called," concluded Stillé, "which is noisy just in proportion as its real influence is narrow and restricted. One of the most difficult and delicate tasks of the statesman is to distinguish the true from the false opinion, the factious demagogue from the grumbling but sincere patriot, and to recognize with a ready instinct the voice which comes from the depths of the great heart of the people, in warning it may be some times, in encouragement, often, but always echoing its abiding faith in the ultimate triumph of the good cause."

"The only possible hope for the South," ended Stillé, in a return to the Civil War, "is in our own divisions."

On this note Lincoln concluded his reading on the Peninsula War to Senator Browning. Although the account dealt with another time when a great power sent troops to a faraway land to contain a hostile and aggressive ideology backed by a dedicated army, Lincoln found its "lessons" somehow relevant for his time.

Maybe he needed them to renew his courage. Someone had taken a shot at the President while he was riding in the woods. Thereafter he began to watch his personal movements more carefully.

### Hanoi Peace Now

## HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, newspapers and television devote four-fifths of their space and time to publicize the comments of the President's critics on war policy.

The following editorial, by Roscoe Drummond, is about the best commonsense I have read lately:

WHY HANOI SHOULD MOVE FOR PEACE NOW

WASHINGTON.—If Hanoi could open its mind to the political realities in the United States, it would open serious peace talks on Vietnam soon—instead of delaying them.

The odds are that the recent signal from Hanoi is a tentative feeler to find out how much it can get for nothing. But I suggest we ought not to be surprised if North Vietnam suddenly does whatever is necessary to get negotiations under way.

Perhaps the probability is that this won't happen, but it would be a grave mistake for the U.S. to allow itself to be surprised by a

quick and radical about-face on the part of Hanoi.

We had better be ready. I believe we will be.

It is a massive misreading of the U.S. political scene if Hanoi thinks that by harsh, last-ditch fighting in the next few months North Vietnam can soften up American opinion and that the smart thing is to hold off negotiations until after the presidential election.

A very strong case can be made that it will not be advantageous for Hanoi to delay peace talks. The far greater probability is that delay would be disadvantageous, and this is one good reason why the United States needs to be prepared for a sudden and acceptable go-ahead by North Vietnam.

Here are the reasons:

1—If there is a time when President Johnson might yield to soft-peace temptations, it would be in the next ten months, prior to November voting.

2—If Johnson is re-elected, which is not unlikely, then he will be secure in office for another four years and it will be his last term. There will be no political temptation to accept doubtful Vietnam peace terms.

3—If Hanoi thinks that any alternative President will be easier to negotiate with than Johnson, then it doesn't know Richard Nixon or Nelson Rockefeller. A peace-at-almost-any-price President is not going to be elected.

4—The opinion polls show growing public support for the President, for staying the course in Vietnam, and reflect awareness that the war may not be over for quite a time.

There is nothing in the state of American opinion or in the state of American politics to suggest that a contrived delay in serious Vietnam negotiations until after the presidential election will make it easier for Hanoi to get concessions by talking it is not getting by fighting.

I put the foregoing assessment just as forthrightly as possible because I believe it reflects reality and because I am convinced that delay in beginning serious peace talks is not good. There is absolutely no reason why the U.S. should welcome or court delay for its own sake.

One reason no harm can come from negotiations during the next few months—if Hanoi wants to undertake them under equally fair conditions—is that those who intimately know the President's thinking on Vietnam and what its defense means to the future peace of the world know he is not going to sell out South Vietnam at any price, including being President another four years.

Time is running out for Hanoi. In 1965 it was winning the war and saw no reason to talk peace. In 1966 there was a 37-day truce in the bombing of North Vietnam but no willingness to negotiate. In 1967 the co-chairmen of the Geneva Conference, Russia's Alexei Kosygin and Britain's Harold Wilson, tried to induce Hanoi to talk peace; they were spurned. And now in 1968 the North Vietnamese are talking about winning the war in the United States even if they are losing it in Vietnam.

Don't be too surprised if Hanoi decides to negotiate sooner rather than later.

### Lawrence Father on Second Trip to Vietnam

## HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there is in Lawrence, Mass., a

man whose courage and character I would like to bring to the attention of all my colleagues in the House of Representatives. After his son was killed by a sniper's bullet in Da Nang late in 1966, Mr. Joseph T. Gile traveled to Vietnam to seek the answers to his confusion about the war. Although the first trip was a difficult and ultimately futile one, filled with adversities, Mr. Gile has gone again this year to Vietnam to continue his quest. As he said:

I had to go before to get the answers, and I have to go now because I came home a saddened and frustrated father and American.

This time, with the help of the Marines and the Vietnamese Government, Mr. Gile will hopefully be successful in seeing for himself the war, our fighting men, and the country and people of Vietnam.

His spirit and his perseverance reveal the anxiety not only of a father who has lost a son there, but of a patriotic citizen who feels deeply involved in the Vietnam situation. His deep concern and his courageous personal initiative reflect the anxiety of all Americans who seek answers to their confusion about the war.

I include the article in the Lowell Sun on Mr. Gile's efforts in the RECORD for publication:

### LAWRENCE FATHER ON SECOND TRIP TO VIETNAM

(By Warren Carlson)

LAWRENCE.—"I firmly believe we belong in Vietnam, but I've got to be there," explains Joseph T. Gile.

"Maybe I can come home to my wife and say no, he did not die in vain."

Gile's son, Marine Pfc. Joseph T. Gile Jr., was killed by a sniper's bullet at Da Nang. The elder Gile made an unsuccessful trip to Vietnam last year three months after his son's death.

"I have to go," Gile said. "I had to go before to get the answers, and I have to go now because I came home a saddened and frustrated father and American."

Gile, a 43-year-old disabled veteran of World War II, was to leave Boston's Logan International Airport today for a few days' stopover in Honolulu before proceeding to Saigon.

Gile's plane departed at 9 a.m.

"I am going to Saigon with a briefing from the Marine Corps and the blessings of the South Vietnamese people in Washington."

"Maybe this year I'll get the answers I have to get. I want to see the war, the soldiers, the Marines, the fighting men. I have to get their view of the whole thing," Gile said.

He said he "hopes to see for myself whether the new civilian administration in Saigon is working for the people. And maybe I'll be able to see for myself whether these six years of fighting have been worthwhile."

"I pray to God this year will not be a repeat of my last trip," said Gile, who is a district commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The trip last year was a flop. Gile explains: "Everything went wrong from the beginning. It started out all wrong. 'I lost my luggage, landing in Saigon with two shirts and a pair of pants.'"

The only room he could find was in a hotel where nobody spoke English. "A real hole in the wall that place was, with a rat and lizard for company."

After two days of dysentery and desperate for a decent meal, Gile started posing as an American officer to eat in an officers' mess.



A major spotted him as an imposter. "I confessed, and this man took pity on me. He asked me where I wanted to go and I said Da Nang, where my boy died."

The major managed to get Gile on a flight to Cam Ranh Bay, two-thirds of the way to Da Nang, but Gile could get no farther and hitched a ride back to Saigon on a truck convoy.

He returned to the United States six days after he left it, "a disappointed man, a disheartened man because I did not achieve any of my objectives."

Gile, owner of a barbecue stand, has a wife and three children in Lawrence. How do they feel about the six-week trip?

"They are my family. They know I have to go and without their support and love I'd really not have a reason, would I?" said Gile.

### Has Anybody Seen a Patriot?

#### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. James A. "Eddie" Black, of Worthington, Tex., a constituent of mine, has written an article which, in her words "says something which she feels needs to be said." She is a young woman with an evident burning patriotism of the type which has seen our country through many crises. I am sure that people like her will help bring this country through its present trying times.

The article follows:

#### HAS ANYBODY SEEN A PATRIOT?

(By Eddie Black)

Has anybody seen a patriot? Probably a little help will be needed in locating one. Webster defines a patriot as "one who loves his country and zealously supports its authority and interests." What has become of good old-fashioned patriotism? It has given way, for the most part, to apathy on the part of the American people, and also to militant and open treason. Hardly a day passes that we fail to hear of a protest march either directed toward the administrators of our country, or our stand in Vietnam or the poverty problem in this country, ad infinitum. Do the participants in these spectacles meet the definition of "patriot?" Emphatically and obviously they do not! Indeed, their actions fulfill our Constitution's definition of treason, which is: "Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort."

Just imagine what comfort it must give the North Vietnamese, not to mention the Red Chinese and Soviets, when they hear of the American people rebelling against their own government! The Preamble to the Constitution states that the Constitution itself was written by the people of the United States "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity."

Yet these American citizens who so strongly oppose our country are quick to make use of the freedoms that permit them to express their opinions. And they use these freedoms to humiliate the United States of America before the whole world. Are these the actions of patriots, of people who possess a love of country? So our democracy is imperfect! But is there a more perfect one on the face of the earth? For in the very nations which these people "aid and comfort", how

long would these people be allowed their freedom, or perhaps their very existence, when expressing such militant disapproval of the actions of those countries? Would these "peace marchers" have their own country stand idly by while one country after another falls beneath Communist rule? It appears that they would! They carry on their "Peace Pickets" while television cameras grind away, recording for all to see their demonstrations of "love of country." Many of the protestors are young, and, given time, will perhaps develop into responsible American citizens . . . for this we must hope and pray. But meanwhile they are doing irreparable damage to our country.

Our country is being destroyed from within, and far too many of us who are not actively involved in our country's destruction, sit by watching with an apathetic eye. Those few Americans who openly and vigorously express their disgust at the Anti-American movement are branded as fanatics and crackpots. People look at them as if they were wearing a scarlet letter. If patriots are now considered fanatics and crackpots, then . . . Long live the fanatics and crackpots, and may their ranks grow in number.

### Crime and the Judiciary—II

#### HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during the last session I made some remarks on crime and the judiciary, and indicated that I would bring additional information before the House from time to time.

Crime is perhaps the number one domestic crisis today. The Nation is faced with criminal activity that ranges from purse snatching and petty larceny to international crime cartels which corrupt even the most circumspect public institutions.

The House has passed a number of important anticrime bills thus far in the 90th Congress. I am hopeful that the Senate will soon act on them. An alarmed public is giving more needed support to police forces. Yet the responsibility for the rising crime rate, and the solution to this vital problem, cannot be found only in looking at the police forces, or the social ills of the cities, or any of the other easy and obvious places. We must also look to the judicial system itself.

I ask that an editorial by Bill Gordon, news director of TV station WPTV, Palm Beach, be printed here in the RECORD. It states a real and present danger to our American form of government which is a part of the crime problem. Local, State, and Federal courts, with the encouragement of the Supreme Court, have too often abandoned their legitimate role of a balancing force and defenders of freedom and instead attempted to set themselves up as executive and legislative branches as well as judicial. They have too often tried to legislate a nonmorality and enforce it on the Nation without the consent of the people.

The editorial follows:

#### THE BILL GORDON REPORT

We cannot . . . of course . . . at this late date . . . some 192 years later . . . pretend to

know what was in the minds of those men who laid the foundation for the Federal government of these United States.

But we do know that a major result of their efforts was the establishment of three separate branches of government. The Executive . . . Legislative and Judicial.

It's distinctly probable that the Founding Fathers realized that . . . in the years to come . . . the Executive and the Legislative branches would . . . from time to time . . . find themselves in conflict. That . . . indeed . . . the two would engage in power struggles with each attempting to become the dominant branch of government.

And . . . we have seen this to be true as the nation has experienced periods where the Legislative branch . . . the Congress . . . appeared dominant . . . and similar periods when the reverse was true.

It would probably be fair to say that one role foreseen for the Supreme Court was that of an arbiter . . . a balancing force applying constitutional means to see that its fellow branches . . . Executive and Legislative . . . remained more or less in equal balance.

But possibly unforeseen in the shaping of the new government 192 years ago was the possibility that the high court itself might seek to become dominant among the three branches of government. That it might use its authority to interpret the Constitution to assume legislative powers in addition to its judicial powers.

Thus . . . no machinery was made available for either the Executive or the Legislative . . . or both working together . . . to curb the excesses in which the court might someday indulge.

However . . . such machinery is available to the people of the nation through amending the Constitution.

It is not a method which should be undertaken lightly . . . or too frequently . . . otherwise that document could become a confusing collection of inconsistent and conflicting provisions more subject to the whims of the moment than to serious interpretation.

But . . . nonetheless . . . should the balance of government ever tip too far toward the court . . . that method is available to set things right again.

### Buffalo Sets Pace With Pioneer Plan To Put Hard-Core Unemployed To Work

#### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, finding jobs for hard-core unemployed is one of the most pressing responsibilities of our communities today.

It is not an easy task, but I am proud to say that in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., the business leadership and the minority community leadership are working as a team to seek out jobs for hard-to-place unemployed.

Indeed, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has cited the Buffalo program to chambers of commerce throughout the Nation as exemplary in helping "those who want to work, those who need training, and those who might be employable if properly trained."

The Buffalo project known as "JET"—Jobs, education, and training—is operated by Opportunities Development Corp., created by 44 Buffalo area busi-

nesses which contributed \$40,000 toward the first year's operating expenses.

In citing the Buffalo program to its members, the U.S. Chamber said it provides useful how-to-do-it advice, particularly in these areas:

First. No job program should promise more than it can deliver. It is imperative that a careful inventory of job opportunities be made before any commitment is made on the number of people who can be helped. Serious problems have developed in some areas where the unemployed have been promised more than could be expected.

Second. A job program should clearly differentiate between two distinctly different problems; school-youth unemployment in the summer, and hard-core unemployment resulting from inadequate skills and education. It is one thing to offer a summer job to a student who will return to school in the fall, it is another matter to offer a part-time or temporary job to persons who want permanent employment.

Third. A job program, no matter how successful it may be, is no guarantee of community harmony. There is not necessarily a correlation between unemployment and riots. People who promote job programs as a guarantee of community harmony may be left embarrassed.

Fourth. Some individuals who would be hired in a job program totally lack employment experience. Hence, counseling, education, training, special attention, and encouragement may be necessary.

Fifth. Solving unemployment problems requires team effort on the part of businessmen and the chamber of commerce. This task, however, should not be attempted by the businessmen and the chamber alone. All elements of the community—labor, churches, schools, government, the poor themselves—have important contributions to make. To act on any other basis invites failure.

Mr. Speaker, since there is wide interest in ways to deal with hard-core unemployment, I am including with my remarks, the chamber's summary of the operation of our JET program in Buffalo:

**SUMMARY OF JET PROGRAM BY OPPORTUNITIES DEVELOPMENT CORP., BUFFALO, N.Y.**

The Opportunities Development Corporation is a non-profit corporation whose primary goal is to unify and coordinate existing services toward the training and employment of the area's economically deprived. In this way it seeks to achieve maximum manpower utilization in the Buffalo area.

Objectives—ODC attempts to place the disadvantaged in jobs by committing the financial resources of business to study and implement solutions. ODC means to solve the hard-core unemployment problem by:

1. Determining the present and future needs of industrial and business groups with the goal of securing skilled and semi-skilled employment for the unskilled unemployed, particularly members of minority groups.

2. Establishing a program for up-grading the employment levels of those already employed.

3. Conceiving and implementing remedial, educational, training and re-training programs for members of these groups.

4. Gathering and distributing information dealing with existing and anticipated needs and procedures in this project.

5. Being a unifying factor in efforts al-

ready being carried out by business community and governmental agencies.

Results—The program has shown these results:

1. The ODC, through its formation and subsequent active participation in community employment problems, has demonstrated that the business leadership and minority community leadership can work together to achieve common goals. Through their mutual actions a meaningful communication has been developed between the minority community and business leadership.

2. To fulfill their aim to provide job training, ODC conceived and sponsored a program of job placement and training called JET. This program is such a significant part of ODC that it will be described in full during the discussion of the development of ODC.

3. Through the JET program, 760 area men have been placed in jobs, 290 of whom were previously on welfare. It is estimated that by placing welfare recipients in jobs between \$800,000 and \$900,000 have been saved in welfare costs.

Program development—In 1964, the Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce formed a Job Opportunities Council. The purpose of the Council was to talk about ways that the Chamber might assist low-income people attain jobs. The members of the Council met with a group of Negro ministers from Buffalo to try to get a better idea of the needs of the minority community.

After a series of meetings, the delegation of ministers submitted a proposal to the Job Opportunities Council which called for the Chamber to contribute \$40,000 to construct a building in the ghetto area. The building was to be used as a community center. The Board of Directors of the Chamber gave preliminary approval to the allocation of \$40,000.

In the meantime, some of the Board members held further discussions with representatives from the NAACP and the Urban League. These representatives indicated that the real need was for meaningful employment, not for a building. The appropriations of the \$40,000 was delayed while meetings were held on the suggestion to develop a job program. The representatives of the Civil Rights groups joined the Chamber members and ministers for these meetings.

Out of the sessions, plans for the Opportunities Development Corporation (ODC) were developed. It was decided that a non-profit corporation consisting of an equal number of members from both the Chamber and the Negro organizations would be the best vehicle for launching a job program. A separate group would be able to draw on the strengths of its contributing organizations without being held back by any policies of the present organizations.

Program operation—By design, the ODC is a joint planning body to develop community programs related to job training and placement. The first year operation of the ODC was financed by \$40,000 raised through contributions from Chamber member firms.

The ODC hired as executive director a Negro, with many years of experience in the New York State Employment Service, to develop and coordinate planning.

ODC members jointly developed a program to meet employment needs. The result was a proposal for Project JET (Jobs, Education and Training).

JET was designed as a research and demonstration project, financed by the federal government, to assist 1,000 chronically unemployed heads of households to secure and maintain employment. The method was a special form of on-the-job training. Before enrollees were recruited for the program, local universities trained tutors to work with them. The tutors, who had to be at least high school graduates or have some college experience, were given intensive six week courses.

The JET trainees were recruited. After preliminary testing and counseling by JET staff, the trainees are immediately placed on jobs. They are paid the regular wage scale by employers. The employers agree to allow the JET employee to take two hours out of his work day to be tutored in reading, writing, and arithmetic. If possible, the education is related to the employee's job. Instruction is designed to cover a period of 44 weeks and raise the education level of the employee to at least the eighth grade level.

The employer pays the employee for the time he is receiving instruction. The wages are reimbursed to the employer by JET. It is significant to note that some employers don't request reimbursement. Those employers who are not able to allow instruction do permit counselors to give supportive services.

**OTHER ODC PROGRAMS**—Although much attention has been devoted to JET, as the first operational program, it must be kept in mind that it is only one effort, and not the sole purpose of ODC.

Having developed JET, and spun off its operation, ODC is now concentrating on an exploration of other methods which might be employed to achieve the corporation purpose.

For example, ODC identified transportation as a major impediment to employment of the ghetto unemployed. Therefore, the staff has developed a proposal for a transportation project.

**POSSIBLE AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**—Community support is a necessary ingredient for program acceptance. People should be cautioned against making flamboyant announcements and promises. However, realistic promotional efforts should be made to gain confidence and make the people aware that programs are being conducted on their behalf.

A corollary of community support is visible involvement by the key business leadership. This is best achieved by having the key businessmen associated with the program sell it to their fellow businessmen.

**KEY FACTORS TO SUCCESS**—The major benefit of ODC cited by all the members of the corporation, and other persons interviewed, is the personal commitment of the key community leaders. This commitment has enabled communications to be opened between groups that were previously unfamiliar with each other.

The avenues of communication, opened by ODC, have been extremely valuable to the community, particularly during the racial tensions experienced in the city in the summer of 1967.

Despite the difficulties experienced in the JET program, the Negro community has fought hard to support and maintain it. Community leaders say that this is because ODC allowed the civil rights leadership to develop the program themselves.

The local government has given an important show of support. In addition to verbal expressions of support, the Mayor's office has hired twelve JET trainees.

**Transferability of the program**—The concept of ODC—the establishment of a bi-racial board to evaluate community social needs—could be readily transferred to other communities. The specific programs of ODC, like JET, might not be applicable to every city because community needs differ. However, every community should have some mechanism for communication between various community interest groups.

**Key contacts**—Dr. Alan Bush, Executive Director, Opportunities Development Corporation; Donald Lee, Director Of Project JET; Robert Bennett, Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce, 238 Main Street, Buffalo, New York 14202; Miss Patricia A. Goldman, Chamber of Commerce of the U.S., 1615 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.



Reports and documentation available—"Chain of Hope" by Jack Dawson in *University Review* (Winter/Spring 1967, Vol. 1, No. 2) a publication of the State University of New York.

### Postal Reorganization

## HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, giving credit where it is due, the Madison, Wis., State Journal has saluted the postal service for the splendid job it did in handling the annual Christmas mail avalanche. But despite this achievement, the State Journal contends all is not well with our mail delivery system. The Post Office is desperately in need of modernization, and in a thoughtful editorial of December 27, 1967, the State Journal urges that Postmaster General O'Brien's proposal to convert the postal service into a Government corporation, and the forthcoming report of the President's Commission on Postal Reorganization be given serious attention.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the editorial in the *RECORD* as follows:

#### THE 20TH-CENTURY POSTAL SERVICE

The Christmas mail was delivered—the cards, the packages, and all the regular mail.

At least most of the two billion pieces of mail which were handled nationally during the week before Christmas made it on time if they were mailed reasonably early.

It was reported in Madison and across the country that the avalanche of holiday mail was handled "with hardly a hitch" although a late card or a lost package may result in a different evaluation by an individual citizen.

Postoffices nationally and in Madison deserve commendation for their accomplishment—a job apparently well done. It was a truly amazing accomplishment—another miracle of Christmas—to get the mail delivered in 1967 with outdated methods, equipment, and facilities.

It was aptly termed "a Nineteenth Century success." The U.S. Postoffice is making commendable efforts to modernize, but is straining to the breaking point under what has been termed as decades of technological neglect. The man who says it loudest is the postmaster general himself, Lawrence F. O'Brien.

"If we ran our telephone service this way," O'Brien quipped about the Postoffice, "the carrier pigeon business would have a great future." By comparison, the Postoffice system has failed to keep up with the rest of the communications industry. The postal service has been on a treadmill—using techniques which Benjamin Franklin may have questioned—while the volume of mail has grown so tremendously and continues to grow.

Back in the early days of the country, the average citizen received infrequent correspondence. Today the annual volume is 83 billion letters and parcels, an average of 415 for every American. Just two years ago when O'Brien took over, the average was only 365. And in the next 20 years, the volume is expected to increase by at least 75 per cent—if the Postoffice Department manages to survive that long. It was only a little more than one year ago that the mail jam-up in Chicago piled up 10 million pieces of mail and it

would surprise few people if it happened again.

If the Postoffice suffers from too little modernization, it is pained by too much politics. As a matter of fact, the excesses of politics accounts for a good share of its backwardness.

O'Brien has proposed to take politics out of the postal department and turn its operation over to a small government corporate panel modeled after the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA). Congress has been cool to the idea because some representatives enjoy rewarding political friends with postmaster appointments in their districts.

Looking ahead, a report is due in April from a special Commission on Postal Reorganization which is conducting "the most searching and exhaustive review ever undertaken" of the Postoffice. The report will certainly merit close public scrutiny because it may be the one opportunity to bring postal service operations into the Twentieth Century.

### Corsicana: City of Destiny

## HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the January 1968 issue of the magazine *Texas Parade* carries an article on Corsicana, Tex., county seat of Navarro County, which I represent in Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include this article:

#### CORSICANA: CITY OF DESTINY

Hunkered on the rich and black and prosperous hills of northeast Texas, the many-bled town of Corsicana was ill-prepared for the calamity that befell it that day in 1894. It struck oil. What Corsicana had wanted, see, was water. It had hired the Messrs. Johnston, Alken & Rittersbacher for one purpose only: to slake its exploding population's need for water. Corsicana's leaders therefore raised the dickens on learning that oil, not the cool clear, had been encountered at 1,035 feet. "We had contracted for water," they said imperiously, "and water we'll have." Disgruntled drillers accordingly bored down an additional 1,445 feet, sealed off the well from such noxious impurities as oil and gas, and collected a nominal fee. The city of Corsicana has not wanted for water since.

It has not wanted, it is worth noting, for oil, either. Historians tell us that somewhere within the foregoing tableau occurred the notable mistake by whose consequences the world most often assesses Texas. Here, Texas oil was born. Here, specifically, began the oil industry west of the Mississippi—a river the east of which has never been known as oil country, exactly.

Here, ageless oil came of age. Corsicana's discovery and development of its petroleum resources bridged oil's two eras—the era of illumination, and the era of energy. At Corsicana occurred the first oil boom in Texas history. And at Corsicana occurred the last one—or at least the last uncontrolled one: Here, as a result, the first effort was made to conserve the oil riches underlying Texas. For what it's worth, oil still pumps more than \$10 million annually into Corsicana's economy. And for what it's worth, many Corsicanans say we've seen nothing yet. Major oil companies are now exploring the deeps beneath the Corsicana area's already-discovered oilfields in the optimistic hope that there's more yet to be tapped.

Yet Corsicana is not an oil town. It defies so easy a designation, for it is a place of many

splendors. For example, one of its leading industries has been known, several times, to receive mail addressed to "Fruit Cake, Texas." There is logic in the fact, for Corsicana is the home of the Collin Street Bakery, which sells more fruit cakes annually (1.55 millions pounds a year) than any institution in the world (and which, to compound the confusion, is not located on Collin Street).

Quite as confusingly, Corsicana is not a peanut center. Yet the Tom Huston Peanut Company is an important industry here. It manufactures potato chips. Similarly, no oats are grown for domestic consumption hereabouts, yet Quaker Oats is a major employer. Quaker makes fine, Texas-style chili in Corsicana, and H. Allen Smith may make the most of it.

Corsicanans delight in the fact that two major oil companies were born within their city limits—the Texas Company (Texaco) and Magnolia Petroleum Company (now Mobil). It is a fact that the first commercial oil refinery in the Southwest was established here (in 1899). You will wonder of course, if oil is still refined in Corsicana, and the answer is yes. The Paymaster Oil Company of Corsicana refines a goodly quantity of oil. Cottonseed oil.

"Corsicana," says W. D. Wyatt, president of the First National Bank, "is almost impossible to sum up. I've been here six years and I still can't put my finger precisely on what makes it tick. But I do know it ticks, and it ticks lots faster than other cities of similar size. We're unique here by circumstances of history and geography—we all know that. But there's something else in Corsicana that nobody, myself included, can spell out exactly. I'm tempted to say 'pride' or 'civic spirit' but it's more than that. It's a certainty that we're moving positively toward something very fine." Banker Wyatt, who came to Corsicana from Oklahoma via Paris, Texas, is an earnest and persuasive spokesman for the delights of his adopted city. Chairman of the Chamber Industrial Committee, he relishes the privilege of guiding industrial prospects about his town to point out the joys of location there. "I am," he says, "an objective advocate of Corsicana."

He is, in this respect, like some 23,000 fellow Corsicanans. All of them take intense pride in their city and all of them seem equipped to detail its charms. Yet all of them are objective, and none is loathe to point out a foible or folly. "We've got so much going for us," says a waitress, "that we don't need to brag. And we don't need to hide anything, either."

A case in point: Behind the Collin Street Bakery flows a Trinity River tributary, Mesmerizer's Creek. Its name is admittedly strange. Corsicanans, though, rejoice in the nomenclature. During the first oil boom (as opposed to the second or the anticipated third), they will tell you, a hypnotist hit town. He swore he could use hypnosis to make the buffalo of the surrounding countryside as gentle as lady Longhorns. A herd of buffalo—some say 50, some say a hundred, and some say a passel—was driven to a site on the creek edging downtown Corsicana. The hypnotist fixed the buffalo with his uncanny eye, muttered a mystic imprecation, and waited. The buffalo were transfixed. For all of a second. Then they stampeded, knocking down nearly every jerry-built building in booming Corsicana. The creek whence they panicked (as did the hypnotist forevermore) is known to this day as Mesmerizer's.

Buildings in Corsicana are no longer jerry-built. Its downtown is spruced-up and modern, with scarcely a vacant storefront to be seen anywhere. Nor are downtown merchants especially bothered by the eminent certainty of a major shopping center at town's edge. "There's plenty of room for competition in this town," says a downtown clothier, supremely confident. Among reasons for confi-



dence downtown: Both Corsicana's two downtown banks (there's a third at downtown's hem) have major building programs underway. The Corsicana Sun has purchased a huge tract for a new downtown plant to be, according to its young publisher, "commensurate with the certain growth of this city." One of the most beautiful libraries in the state has just opened its doors in downtown Corsicana. And other developments, such as a striking new YMCA complex and a new Chamber of Commerce headquarters are near reality at the core of Corsicana.

Away from the brisk and heavily-trafficked heart of Corsicana, there's evidence aplenty too, of the city's vitality. New homes spring up daily in any of several fine subdivisions being developed amidst the gentle, oak-clad rises outlying older Corsicana. A handsome new \$3.5 million high school will be ready for occupancy in 1969 as a result of a recent bond issue voted by an overwhelming majority.

Corsicana High School is famous for the football players it furnishes to Southwest Conference schools, currently having more graduates holding football scholarships than any town its size in the state. One of the more famous was Bobby Wilson, quarterback for S.M.U. when the Mustangs played in the Rose Bowl.

A new wing has just been added to the city's fine county hospital (a splendid new clinic nearby is modern as tomorrow, boasting, among other things, bee-hives in the glass walls of children's waiting rooms to occupy tots' attention as they await treatment). New construction is constantly underway, it seems, at Navarro Junior College, noted as one of the finest and most complete facilities of its type in North Texas.

It was mentioned earlier Corsicana has not wanted for water since that unwanted oil well was drilled in 1894. For municipal supplies there are now three nearby lakes—Corsicana, Halbert, and Navarro Mills—which have a total capacity of more than 519,000 acre feet. The plant's treatment capacity now stands at 30 million gallons daily—some six times peak daily consumption in a recent year.

Corsicana's growth has been sure and steady from the moment of its beginning as a stagecoach stop on the Houston-to-Dallas run. Convenient transportation and easy access has been, and remains, a prime factor in the city's robust economy. As early as 1871 Corsicana was a rail center. By the 1880s, four railroads had converged on Corsicana and oldtimers recall a time when 25 passenger trains daily stopped here. Corsicana was a boom town long before it became an oil town. In 1890 it had an 800-seat opera house, two daily newspapers, and many commercial businesses. So certain were Corsicanans of their enviable position in the economy and affairs of Texas that they could reasonably complain at oil's discovery in 1894: they were in the midst of a population explosion, and the newcomers certainly couldn't drink oil!

Nevertheless, the reality of oil and its subsequent development at Corsicana is indicative, historically, of an ebullient, can-do spirit that imbues the town to this hour. Actually, the discovery of oil in the 1890s was not, in itself, so exciting a matter. There were few markets then for oil, fewer yet for unrefined crude. What distinguishes Corsicana in the saga of oil is that its leaders had the moxie to arrange the establishment of a refinery to process their plentiful crude. This courageous "first" for Texas and its foremost industry soon led to many another: Corsicana can lay historic claim to the Southwest's first sustained commercial production of oil, the world's first rotary drilling rig, the first oil for paving, the first oil for locomotive fuel—and also the state's first natural gas for lights and heat.

Fortunes, of course, were made during Corsicana's first shallow-oil boom and the

biggest one of the 1920s when gushers began coming in at about 3,500 feet, on a single day, November 13 in 1923, the Powell field a few miles from Corsicana yielded 354,893 barrels of oil. And happily, many of the fortunes remained in the town to benefit others. A number of wealthy oil men set up philanthropic trusts for the welfare of Corsicanans, with the result that many community improvements are due wholly or partly to the generosity and foresight of those wealthy petroleum pioneers. Other causes have benefited, too. More than 200 Corsicanans, for instance, have received 4-year college scholarships so far from just one of several endowments left by crusty old Jim Collins—who had only five years of schooling, himself.

Corsicana is nestled alongside the Balcones Fault Line that impounds the oils of the Woodbind Sands. Once Jim Collins brought in a dry hole. "Was it the Balcones Fault?" he was asked. "Hell no," he replied, "it was my own damn fault!"

Another time, though, Jim Collins illustrated just as forcefully that he was nobody's fool. A promoter approached the wealthy oilman with a surefire business scheme requiring his investment of a few hundred-thousand dollars. "And I guarantee that in a year's time you'll have your money back," the promoter promised. "Friend," Jim Collins replied calmly, "I have my money now!"

Not all the oldtime Corsicanans were as colorful as Jim Collins, but many of them matched his philanthropy. Frank Drane left several million dollars in trust for community benefits; the new \$450,000 science building at Navarro Junior College is just one result. Bessie I. Hoffstetter's fortune has benefited area churches, orphanages, and has provided low-interest college loans for more than 100 Corsicana youths. "This sort of example has made a tremendous impact on all Corsicana citizens," says Banker Wyatt. "They're more charitable, it seems, than the people of some other places. Our United Fund drives, for instance, always exceed their goals, and the 1967 goal was \$100,000. And our people are generous—which isn't to say spendthrift—in such things as passing bond issues when there's a genuine need for improvements. And I think this overall attitude of trying to make Corsicana a better place traces right back to the example of those oldtimers who chose to give something back to their community."

Will Rogers once said, "You can judge the character of a town by the quality of its chili." And he added, "Corsicana, Texas, has some of the finest chili in the world." He was speaking of that marvelous bowl of red you could get at the old Blue Front Saloon for a nickel a bowl in the early 1920s. The chili was a concoction of one Lyman Jones, who hit Corsicana in 1895 with 25 cents, parlayed a dish washing job into part-ownership of a chili parlor, made a fortune in oil on the side but never stopped making chili. In 1921 his product had achieved sufficient fame and praise that he decided to start canning it. A colorful character, Jones decided that the product would honor his pet wolf, "Kaiser Bill." Wolf Brand Chili was born, and it was quite literally a "howling" success from the start. To promote the product, Jones equipped his traveling salesmen with Model Ts modified to resemble a Wolf Brand Chili can. And in the rear of each vehicle was a live caged wolf. Sales soared.

Today the product, made in Corsicana in a subsidiary plant of Quaker Oats Co. and still bearing Kaiser Bill's picture, is advertised more sedately. But it still draws attention to Corsicana. No more so, though, than does the succulent fruit cake that is shipped throughout the world—customers include some who reside behind the Iron Curtain—from Corsicana. No wolves account for its success, but a pack about as colorful does. The invention of a German immigrant, Gus Weidmann, "The Original DeLuxe, the Fruit

Cake without An Equal" was first discovered by circus performers and other show people who played prosperous Corsicana at century's turn. And it was they who first spread its fame by word-of-mouth, and by ordering Corsicana fruit cakes for Christmas gifts. Fittingly, the Ringling Bros.-Barnum & Bailey Circus still sends a large order every Christmas. And when the Texas Historical Survey Commission unveiled a commemorative plaque at the famed bakery not long ago, it was Will Rogers, Jr., who headlined the event. "My dad prized Corsicana's fruit cake," he said, "about as much as he did its chili."

Chili and fruit cakes are only a hint of the remarkable diversity of Corsicana industry. Dr. Pepper and Coke bottles are manufactured here by the Chattanooga Glass Company, a major employer. Adam's hats are made in Corsicana, as are Tex-Sun gloves. Bricks, gypsum products, furniture, men's slacks, cotton duck materials, iron castings, television aerials, picture frames, and ice cream products are manufactured here. Yet leaders believe that Corsicana's greatest industrial growth is yet to come as more and more industries are migrating to well-located smaller cities. In anticipation of this seeming certainty, the Chamber of Commerce has organized the Corsicana Industrial Foundation which, in cooperation with the Cotton Belt Railway (one of four trunk lines connecting Corsicana with suppliers and markets), has developed a new industrial district that is ideally situated for rail and truck access. (Six major highways, including Interstate 45, criss-cross Corsicana; the city is served by three motor freight lines. And when the Trinity River canalization project becomes a reality, no city in Texas can boast a location more ideal. Meantime, Corsicanans have reason to be grateful for the Trinity's proximity as it and tributaries have contributed several large and well-developed lakes within a half-hour's drive.)

Still, Corsicana is not putting all its eggs into the attractive basket of industrialization. Much of its economy is still rooted in the lucrative agriculture of the surrounding blacklands, whose beef cattle, cotton, corn, small grains, dairy products and poultry account for some \$20 million of the county's annual income. The average Navarro County farm now surveys out at around 365 acres—sharply up from a couple of decades ago, reflecting the national trend of fewer but larger farms. Annual income from agriculture is about evenly divided between farm products and livestock operations.

Aggressive Corsicana merchants intend to see that the city remains a commercial center for a trade area with a population of about 150,000 prosperous folks.

Nevertheless, Corsicana leadership looks primarily to industry for its future growth possibilities. And it is doing a good job of making itself attractive to industrial prospects, too. The city won first place among cities of similar population in the Texas Manufacturers Association's 1967 competition on recognition of local industry during Texas Industrial Week. "Even as we beat the bushes for new industries," a Chamber of Commerce staffer says, "we like to recognize the ones that are already here, and to let them know they're appreciated."

Such an attitude can be a 2-way street, and the Chamber has an impressive file of "fan letters" from enterprises who have chosen Corsicana as a plant location. One of these, from a vice president of Texas Miller Products, Inc., which manufactures Adam hats, capsules nicely the reaction of many top executives to Corsicana. Addressed to a prospective industrialist, the letter said:

"Prior to deciding on Corsicana, we surveyed a large area in central and eastern Texas, looked at many possible sites, and talked with groups from many cities and towns. In all earnestness, and not just to



vindicate our judgment, it can truthfully be said if we had it to do over again, it still would be Corsicana. The city is large enough to afford a good labor supply, and draws labor from many surrounding small communities. It is close enough to the Dallas-Fort Worth area to afford the advantages and industrial conveniences of a large city, and yet just far enough away to constitute a separate labor market. Utilities in Corsicana are good, and the companies most cooperative. Transportation facilities are excellent. Labor is hard working, efficient, independent thinking, and cooperative. As a general rule workers learned rapidly—and our turnover has been about 75 per cent less than in some of our comparable eastern factories, truly a remarkable experience! Living conditions are good here. We found it necessary to move in some trained executive personnel, all of whom are well satisfied and happy with the relocation. Educational facilities are excellent, and the town is progressive and forward-thinking."

Such testimonials have attracted many newcomers to Corsicana, whose growth has been nicely-paced and orderly to now. One of the newcomers is the highly-regarded Harte-Hanks newspaper publishing organization, which purchased the venerable *Sun-Light* newspapers not long ago. "That in itself is

a considerable testimonial," says one banker, "for Harte-Hanks doesn't locate anywhere that chances aren't very good for growth."

Jerry Strader, the organization's Corsicana publisher, couldn't agree more. "Our group looks over a property and the community it serves very, very carefully and for a long time before it makes a move. We did this in Corsicana's case, too, and we liked what we saw. And since moving here, we're even more impressed—enough so that we're investing heavily in a new plant to be operating within a year. I believe Corsicana is on the verge of tremendous and dramatic growth, and I'm just delighted to be a part of it. It's a wonderful place to live, the folks are friendly and progressive, and a fellow just wants to help the town realize its destiny."

Meander the sidewalks of Corsicana and you'll find many such expressions of affection for the historic place, and confidence in its future. Drive through its lovely residential districts on wide streets pleasantly canopied by an amazing variety of trees, past modern schools and well-kept parks (in one of which is an extensive collection of restored log cabins, authentically furnished and equipped) and you'll see graphic evidence that Corsicana is indeed a good place to hang your hat—or put down your roots.

For there's both peace and excitement

in Corsicana. It is aware enough of its past that it honors, in a memorial, not only famous personages and sites but a race horse as well—a famous steed named "Charlie M." who was discovered pulling a wagon, was trained to race in three galts, never lost a race, and died at 26. His monument reads: "Charlie M., as honest a horse as the sun ever shone on." But Corsicana is aware enough of its certain future that leaders can seriously contemplate, as they now do, the establishment there of an oil museum as the core of an extensive oil research complex. "Can you think of a more logical place?" asks one of the planners.

Thus confidently does Corsicana sprawl upon its bountiful hills, secure in a past that's storied and a future that's secure. On the court house lawn a statue of the Texas patriot, Jose Antonio Navarro, seems admirably to express this confidence with eyes scanning far horizons. Although the county was named for him (and the city was named at his request to honor the homeland, the island of Corsica, of his parents), Old Don Jose never was in the county or its seat. It seems a pity, for Corsicana and Navarro County now exist as his foremost monument. If he could see them today, it seems reasonable to believe that he would be very proud.

## SENATE—Tuesday, January 23, 1968

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

Rev. Woodrow W. Kennell, pastor, First Evangelical United Brethren Church, Elkhart, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, for the universe, our great home, with its vast riches and for the manifoldness of the life which teems upon it, and of which we are a part, we give Thee thanks. Thou who hast given liberally to all men in all ages, grant unto us free and open intercourse between ourselves and Thee. Help us to trust where we cannot prove. Give us a willingness to believe our better moments in spite of all that contradict them. Open our eyes to see our duty to Thee and to our fellow men.

Inspire the men who meet in this Chamber from day to day, that they may be the instruments in Thine hand to literally make freedom and justice ring for all men in this land, and to actually become the harbingers of peace to all the world. Grant unto them victory over all doubts and fears, and give unto them patience through all darkness and disappointments, and be unto them a father and an eternal friend. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 22, 1968, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### PROPOSED MANPOWER AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY PROGRAMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 242)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the

President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

In this, my first message to the Congress following the State of the Union Address, I propose:

A \$2.1 billion manpower program, the largest in the Nation's history, to help Americans who want to work get a job.

The Nation's first comprehensive Occupational Health and Safety Program, to protect the worker while he is on the job.

#### THE QUESTION FOR OUR DAY

Twenty years ago, after a cycle of depression, recovery and war, America faced an historic question: Could we launch what President Truman called "a positive attack upon the ever-recurring problems of mass unemployment and ruinous depression?"

That was the goal of the Employment Act of 1946. The answer was a long time in forming. But today there is no longer any doubt.

We can see the answer in the record of seven years of unbroken prosperity.

We can see it in this picture of America today:

75 million of our people are working—in jobs that are better paying and more secure than ever before.

Seven and a half million new jobs have been created in the last four years, more than 5,000 every day. This year will see that number increased by more than 1½ million.

In that same period, the unemployment rate has dropped from 5.7 percent to 3.8 percent—the lowest in more than a decade.

The question for our day is this: In an economy capable of sustaining high employment, how can we assure every American, who is willing to work, the right to earn a living?

We have always paid lipservice to that right.

But there are many Americans for whom the right has never been real:

The boy who becomes a man without developing the ability to earn a living.

The citizen who is barred from a job because of other men's prejudices.

The worker who loses his job to a machine, and is told he is too old for anything else.

The boy or girl from the slums whose summers are empty because there is nothing to do.

The man and the woman blocked from productive employment by barriers rooted in poverty: lack of health, lack of education, lack of training, lack of motivation.

Their idleness is a tragic waste both of the human spirit and of the economic resources of a great Nation.

It is a waste that an enlightened Nation should not tolerate.

It is a waste that a Nation concerned by disorders in its city streets cannot tolerate.

This Nation has already begun to attack that waste.

In the years that we have been building our unprecedented prosperity, we have also begun to build a network of manpower programs designed to meet and match individual needs with individual opportunities.

#### OUR MANPOWER PROGRAM NETWORK

Until just a few years ago, our efforts consisted primarily of maintaining employment offices throughout the country and promoting apprenticeship training.

The Manpower Development Training Act, passed in 1962, was designed to equip the worker with new skills when his old skills were outdistanced by technology. That program was greatly strengthened and expanded in 1963, 1965, and again in 1966 to serve the disadvantaged as well.