

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE PROSPECTS FOR WYOMING—
"WE SHOULD NOT FEEL LONESOME"

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, last week Senator CLIFFORD HANSEN of Wyoming and I responded to a story in the Wall Street Journal which gave a gloomy forecast for the future of my district, the great State of Wyoming. We pointed out the article had missed many developments in our State and, more than that, had made an erroneous appraisal of our State's economic and demographic potential. Indeed, many of what the author called liabilities seemed to us to be assets.

It is heartening to know that there are observers whose assessments of Wyoming's future are optimistic. Therefore, I would like to insert at this point an editorial from the Casper Star-Tribune of October 14, 1969, which incorporates an editorial from the Denver-Post concerning the article on Wyoming:

WE SHOULDN'T FEEL LONESOME

The Denver Post had an editorial comment Sunday on the Wyoming population and economic picture. We believe it is a very fair appraisal of the situation. As an out-of-state newspaper, the Post can look at it with a somewhat more unbiased view than those of us who are in the midst of these problems.

The Post's editorial is quoted in full:

"Wyoming has lost population since the 1960 census which showed 330,000 residents and that's a disgrace in the usual up-and-at-em frame of mind prevalent since the pioneers decided the West had to be won.

"We think differently.

"Obviously, it is painful to lose population. A town that needs all the taxes it can possibly get to run its school system, or town hall, is hurt every time a house or business building turns up vacant.

"But thinking of Wyoming as a whole there's a lot to be said for having a small, manageable population—at least at this point in history.

"The entire country is just waking up to the fact that environment is a lot easier to protect from air and water pollution and urban decay before they start than to try to salvage affairs after the damage has been done.

"In that regard Wyoming has a wonderful opportunity to guide its development—to set standards for industry, to watch where the Atomic Energy Commission buries its bombs and, above all, to be selective in the type of industry it seeks out.

"Elsewhere in today's Denver Post there is a story detailing plans for a new uranium mining town to be built near Medicine Bow. Within a year there will be more than 1,000 residents, with more to come.

"If stories like that do not reassure develop-or-bust Wyomingites, we feel confident in assuring Wyoming that growth will come. The mathematics of U.S. population growth underwrite the inevitability of growth. Just as is the case with Colorado, the chance of locating new industry in a clean, recreation-rich Western state will prove an overpowering lure to more industrialists than we need.

"So to those Wyomingites who read disaster into last week's article in the Wall Street Journal entitled, 'The Lonesome Land,' we'd say, 'Cheer up.' You'll soon have more industrial suitors than a school marm in an oldtime Wyoming cowtown on Saturday night. It'll be a case of picking out the good-looking ones."

A MEMOIR BY FORMER SENATOR
CARL HAYDEN

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an article published in the September 1969 issue of Highway User. It was written by the former sheriff of Maricopa County, our beloved Senator Carl Hayden, who retired last year but who, it is refreshing to note, has maintained his interest in the national scene, in the Senate, and in Congress and its many problems—in this instance, highways.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator Hayden's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

IN RETROSPECT: "I FEEL FULLY REPAID"

(By former U.S. Senator Carl Hayden)

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, it was my job to see that the Interstate Highway System received a fair share of the money collected from the American taxpayers.

Since my final return from Washington, I have not failed to observe the thousands of automobiles that move with speed over an abundance of paved highways. This reminds me that when I was the sheriff of Maricopa County over a half century ago I pleaded with the Board of Supervisors to buy an automobile for official use by me and my four deputies. The supervisors turned me down cold. To serve a warrant or a summons we had to ride horseback and be compensated at a rate of 30 cents a mile.

My recollection is that in 1916 Congressman Dorsey W. Shackelford, of Missouri, sponsored a good roads bill, that passed the House of Representatives, which authorized Congress to appropriate funds to assist in the building of State roads. When the bill came over to the Senate, Senator John Bankhead of Alabama took charge of it. It became known as the Bankhead Act of 1916.

TO THE WHITE HOUSE

One day, Senator Bankhead said to Senator Kenneth McKellar of Tennessee: "President Wilson doesn't like me, but he likes you. I want you to go with me to the White House to see if he will agree to the appropriation of money in accordance with my road bill." Senator Bankhead told Senator McKellar that he would be glad to obtain \$5 million for that purpose.

When they brought up the subject with President Wilson, he said that he had grave doubts about whether he should have signed that bill—that it was a State, and not a Federal, function to build roads.

The First World War was then going on in Europe. Senator McKellar said that in the

event of war, good roads would expedite the movement of troops. The President said he had not thought of that, and asked how much money they wanted. McKellar replied that they would leave that to his judgment. They were delighted when President Wilson suggested \$15 million, and that was the beginning of Federal aid to highway construction in the United States.

After I became a member of the Senate in 1927, I was made chairman of the Committee on Roads, and in that way, became acquainted with officials of the State highway departments, who appeared each year to ask for Federal aid for the construction of roads.

When Franklin Roosevelt became President, the nation was in what was called the Great Depression, and he was anxious to provide work for the unemployed.

I went to the White House and told him that there was no better way to accomplish that purpose than by the construction of highways.

He asked me how much it would cost, and I said \$400 million. The President wanted to know how I arrived at that figure. I told him that I had asked each State highway department how much it could usefully spend and \$400 million was the amount recommended. He said to go tell Bob Wagner to put it in the Work Relief Bill, which became a law on June 14, 1933.

NATIONAL SYSTEM

In 1934, Congressman Cartwright of Oklahoma sponsored the customary Federal aid to roads bill. When the State highway officials appeared before my Senate committee, I told them to go home and come back within a month with a draft of a bill providing for a national highway system. They did that, and the bill became a law on March 26, 1934.

Indian reservations make up so much of the area of Arizona and New Mexico, that I inserted a provision in the Federal Highway Act, which provides that the States do not have to match Federal funds expended on Indian reservations. One year, the Arizona State Highway Commission was "hard up," so a highway was constructed within the San Carlos Indian Reservation which passed over the top of the Coolidge Dam. A more direct and much better highway connecting Gila and Graham Counties has since been constructed.

I have been asked a number of times why Arizona needed Interstate highways. My answer was that in northern Arizona we have the Petrified Forest and the Grand Canyon, which we want the American people to see, and in southern Arizona we have one of the finest winter climates anywhere in the United States, to which we want all of those who ride in automobiles to have access.

When on a hot summer day I get seated in an automobile and can be up into a pine forest in less than two hours, I feel fully repaid for all the time I devoted to Federal aid to the construction of highways.

MR. AGNEW DOES NOT UNDER-
STAND

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday at a Republican fundraising dinner in New Orleans, the Vice President—although he did not use my name—said I was an effete, impudent,

and masochistic snob. He also managed to include in that invective countless Americans, perhaps even a majority of Americans.

My crime, and theirs, was to support, and in many cases, take part in the October 15 moratorium to protest our involvement in Vietnam.

As one who has often found humor in the Vice President's antics, I find this latest bit of sounding off both outrageous and incredibly stupid.

It is not the name calling that I mind so much as Mr. AGNEW's implication that I and many other Americans are disloyal to our country. I consider myself a loyal American, and I consider most of those in this country who supported the moratorium to be loyal Americans.

Mr. AGNEW is terribly confused; he equates policies to principles.

Mr. AGNEW does not understand that the test of loyalty is adherence to principles, not to policies. Whenever I believe our principles are not being reflected in our policies, I will protest—as every good American should and as many did on October 15.

I agree with the headline on an editorial in today's Washington Post that Mr. AGNEW is "no longer a laughing matter." I include it and an editorial from the New York Times entitled "Mr. AGNEW Doesn't Understand" into the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 21, 1969]

MR. AGNEW: NO LONGER A LAUGHING MATTER

By writ and by tradition the vice-presidency is an office in which there is practically nothing to do. The trick of course lies in doing it well—in standing back and learning, in reading oneself for any emergency, in supporting the President backstairs where one can and in doing nothing that goes against his interest. Clearly, then, in the case of Vice President Agnew we are faced with one of two possibilities. One is that Mr. Agnew with his ten-month roadshow of gaffes, goofs, and raw demagoguery hasn't caught on to his job. The other is that he has—that Mr. Nixon is authorizing and/or approving the Vice President's public dicta as part of some elaborate (and foredoomed) political game. Neither is particularly reassuring, but if the latter is the case, we should be told.

In New Orleans on Sunday the Vice President made this necessary with his comments on the war and on the motivations of those involved in last week's Vietnam moratorium:

"If the moratorium had any use whatever, it served as an emotional purgative for those who feel the need to cleanse themselves of their lack of ability to offer a constructive solution to the problem."

And again:

"A spirit of national masochism prevails, encouraged by an effete corps of impudent snobs who characterize themselves as intellectuals. It is in this setting of dangerous oversimplification that the war in Vietnam achieves its greatest distortion."

And again:

"Great patriots of past generations would find it difficult to believe that Americans would ever doubt the validity of America's resolve to protect free men from totalitarian attack. Yet today we see those among us who prefer to side with an enemy aggressor rather than stand by this free nation."

Mr. Agnew also let it be known that those who participated in the moratorium were guilty of the crime of supporting "a massive public outpouring of sentiment against the foreign policy of the President of the United States" and of not caring to "disassociate themselves from the objective enunciated by the enemy in Hanoi."

Now what is interesting in all this is certainly not the Vice President's line of thought or his ham-handed effort to discredit the motivation and question the loyalty of a large and respectable part of the political community: we have seen and heard all that before. It is not even to the main point to observe that Mr. Agnew has outdone himself in assuring the hostility of a part of the electorate Mr. Nixon has some interest in calming down. Nor does the subject upon which Mr. Agnew chose to discourse with such vehemence permit his remarks to be received with the national giggle they so frequently inspire. This time around the only question worth asking is what the President thought of what Mr. Agnew said.

Mr. Nixon is engaged in a highly chancy and complicated maneuver to end the war in Vietnam in a way which will not do utter violence to this country's interests abroad and which will not result in a terrible rending of the social fabric at home—in a right-to-middle uprising based on charges of betrayal and sell-out. At least that is what you can hear any day of the week from those behind the scenes in his administration who argue the case for his method of disengagement and who beg understanding of it. Simultaneously we witness Vice President Agnew out fomenting precisely the kinds of emotions others in the White House profess to fear and claim their strategy is designed in large measure to avoid. It really will not do for Mr. Ziegler, the White House spokesman, merely to indicate that vice presidential speeches for party gatherings are not cleared in advance by the White House. If Mr. Nixon wishes to be in any way convincing in this matter or to preserve the notion that he is acting in good faith, then he must repudiate the excesses of his Vice President or silence him or—ideally—do both.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 21, 1969]

MR. AGNEW DOES NOT UNDERSTAND

Vice President Agnew demonstrated a truly monumental insensitivity to the most profound concern of millions of Americans—and particularly the nation's youth—when he described last week's Vietnam Moratorium as the creation of "an effete corps of impudent snobs who characterize themselves as intellectuals." He has learned nothing from the remarkable demonstration in which idealistic young men and women from the nation's campuses were joined by Americans of every generation and from all walks of life in an urgent appeal that the United States Government follow a more effective path to peace.

The purpose of the Moratorium was to underscore the need for active pursuit of peace in Vietnam. Far from undermining the President's position of leadership, it presented him with a strengthened mandate to carry out with more vigor and more determination the basic policy he says he is pursuing. Neither he nor Mr. Agnew gives evidence of understanding what the Moratorium was all about.

Mr. Agnew darkly hinted at some treasonable duplicity because the planners of the Moratorium had failed to renounce support from Hanoi—a support they had never asked.

He sought easy applause from a Republican fund-raising audience in New Orleans by ascribing the success of the Moratorium to "a spirit of national masochism."

In the same speech, he lambasted the nation's youth in sweeping and ignorant generalizations, when it is clear to all perceptive observers that American youth today is far more imbued with idealism, a sense of service and a deep-humanitarianism than any generation in recent history, including particularly Mr. Agnew's.

The ominous strains in Mr. Agnew's words are that they equate support of the war with manliness, while describing as effete those who call for a redoubling of the nation's ded-

ication to peace. It is the mark of insecure nations and politicians to mistake unquestioning support of military ventures as the test of patriotism. This is exactly the approach to the American destiny which the most articulate and politically alert sector of the nation's young intellectuals have questioned and rejected. Mr. Agnew's incredible obtuseness can only add to the frustration of millions of Americans—young and old alike—who believe that rational dissent must be given a fair hearing. His insensitivity to this principle of American democracy will give comfort to those who preach the gospel of disruption and violence.

AWARDS PRESENTED FOR HANDICAPPED EMPLOYMENT EFFORTS IN WEST VIRGINIA—EUGENE T. TURNEY DELIVERS THOUGHTFUL ADDRESS

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, recently the first annual awards dinner of the Monongalia County Advisory Committee on Rehabilitation and Employment of the Handicapped was held in Morgantown, W. Va.

This event was truly an outstanding event, calling attention to the strides made in overcoming misconceptions about the ability of handicapped persons to be useful and productive members of the community. It also was the occasion for citing farsighted employers who have been willing to include handicapped people on their staffs.

More than 300 people attended the dinner, which itself was a tribute to the Monongalia County committee for its diligent work in advancing the cause of the handicapped in the area. Members have devoted considerable time and energy to the very worthwhile goal of opening new doors of opportunity.

I was privileged to have assisted J. Richard Downes, chairman of the advisory committee, and an untiring leader in its work in the presentation of awards.

For making special efforts to employ handicapped persons, awards were presented to Dr. James G. Harlow, president of West Virginia University; J. Wesley Ruby, president of Sterling Faucet Co.; James Berry, owner of Berry's Office Service; and Glenn W. Thorne, president of Kelly Cab Co.

Individual awards were made to Stanley Lee Dixon, who was injured in a coal mine accident and now works for the J. P. Hanger Limb Co., and Viola Elizabeth Smith, a medical secretary at West Virginia University who has been blind since birth.

Honors also were presented to two Fairmont, W. Va., men, Jack Martin, a victim of cerebral palsy and a barber, and Robert J. Helmick of the Helmick Corp.

Michael A. Oliverio, Morgantown supervisor of the West Virginia Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, was toastmaster for the dinner. Morgantown Mayor Terry T. Jones made the welcoming address.

Robert C. Goodpasture of New York,

executive vice president of National Industries for the Blind, spoke on the development of his organization as a result of the 1938 Wagner-O'Day Act under which the Federal Government purchases goods manufactured in sheltered workshops. He reported that a feasibility study is being made concerning establishment of such a workshop in West Virginia.

I commended Mr. Goodpasture for his cooperation in this evaluation in West Virginia.

Mr. President, the principal address was delivered by Eugene T. Turney, president of Anodyne Inc. of North Miami Beach, Fla. Mr. Turney has long been an advocate of hiring handicapped workers in business and industry. Sixty percent of his firm's workers could be classified as handicapped, and he has earned many awards for his leadership in this field. Mr. Turney is a member of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped and vice chairman of the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce Committee on Total Employment.

Mr. Turney's remarks were truly thought provoking and inspiring. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS OF EUGENE T. TURNEY, JR.

I certainly appreciate the opportunity of addressing this most distinguished gathering, for in this audience are the epitome of this Nation, people who have come to realize that they will only get out of life what they put into it.

This last week, as it has been so for many years, people all across the Nation were prompted and urged to think of those who were handicapped, and what they and we might do for them.

But for each of you, the problems of the handicapped are not problems which you pause to recognize once each year. On the contrary, we must and we will fight for the handicapped each and every day.

In fact, in the hands of this audience rests much of the hope of the handicapped, and because this is so, you and I have a grave and very serious responsibility to do much more than to merely meet here and then adjourn.

As you leave here today, you must be fully charged with new ideas, for no matter how hard you have worked in the past, no matter how imaginative you have been in the past, the old ideas and the old energy have been, in reality, only sufficient to barely keep pace with—but not overcome—a mighty rising tide.

This tide is rising, of course, because the people of the Nation, and particularly the people of this area, continue to rise.

Now, in addition to the natural population growth, we are in the middle of a savage war which each hour, each day, each month, each year returns to us hundreds upon hundreds of men who must join the ranks of the handicapped.

Many of these men left home as boys, boys full of the promise of the future, who viewed Vietnam as a dangerously unpleasant interruption in the pursuit of their lifetime dreams and ambitions.

But somewhere along the way a land mine, a booby trap, a rifle slug, or sharpnel from a mortar destroyed those dreams and ambitions, and if he was not killed outright, he then returned to us as a handicapped American veteran, his boyish looks and eagerness replaced by the hardened facts of war.

It is our job to make absolutely certain that when these boys who are now men come home, we are prepared to offer them hope—hope for effective readjustment; hope for jobs, so that they can look to a meaningful and productive future.

We can and we must reassure these young men who have given so much that, after all, what really matters is ability, and we must show them that we have the capability to help develop specific abilities irrespective of their handicaps.

Now, by the very virtue of your being here, this is the job that you have been doing, but isn't this meeting the right place and right time to ask yourself how well you are doing that job? And if the answer to that question is something less than 100%, then you should easily be able to identify where you have failed, where your weaknesses have been, and that you will leave here tonight committed to do a better job in every conceivable way and in any conceivable manner.

The biggest obstacle you face today is not the handicapped person, not rehabilitation, not preparing the handicapped for employment, but the public; specifically, the employing public—the employers.

There is, throughout America, a gap, a wide gap which separate handicapped men and women from full participation in our world of work. It is a gap, a chasm, based on years of old prejudice, on ancient myths, and in many areas stupid bigotry.

And for just as many years as these prejudices and myths have prevailed, men and women just like you and me have been trying to bridge that gap, trying but never quite fully succeeding. Unemployment and underemployment among the handicapped continue to run unnecessarily high.

Bridging the gap—educating the employing people and convincing them—is at least one-half, and possibly more of a mammoth battle. Until misconceptions can be penetrated, until the prejudices can be overcome, until the bigot can be out-bigotted, and until all the phony myths can be completely destroyed; you will never be successful in winning the other half of the most important part of the battle.

We have to prove to employers everywhere and, believe me, this is one area where there is tremendous room for improvement in our efforts, we have to prove to would-be employers all of the facts about the handicapped which you and I know to be true. We have to be better salesmen and display our industrial diamonds, our handicapped person who tolerates no lateness, no absenteeism, no tardiness, and produces 21% more production, for here indeed are untapped reserves of profit.

We have to sell the proven virtues of the handicapped worker, facts and figures have for many years clearly pointed out that the handicapped worker is tops in reliability, diligence, punctuality and, taken collectively as a group, there are just no handicapped people, only people. For every type of job there is someone within the ranks of the handicapped who can handle it. Consequently, for the handicapped person, there is always a job that fits his or her disability.

In this space age when nothing seems impossible, there really are one-armed paper hangers, blind persons with their acute sense of smell testing chemicals, deaf school teachers, handicapped potato peddlers, and telephone operators with no hands, but with two good feet and ten good toes.

There is, then, absolutely no reason why there should be unemployment—or even underemployment based solely on an alleged handicap.

And equally true, there is no earthly reason why you and I should not be able to sell these facts to the employing public.

Think of yourselves, then—if you will—as salesmen. This is the message I would leave with you. Be merchandisers; not merchandisers of pity or sorrow, but merchandisers of

ability, and sell the outstanding abilities of the handicapped. Use the telephone—go door to door—never take no for an answer—and by all means, never be discouraged should someone slam the door in your face. Keep going back and back until you have made a sale, for truly, the more calls you make, the more the odds are in your favor.

I hope to again visit with you next year, and I know without a shadow of doubt, that if you will pursue this hard sell, and I repeat hard sell, for that is just what it is, that you will find great encouragement, not only among those for whom you are performing this service, but also in your own soul, and that as you rise in the morning and you look at yourself in the mirror, you will not only feel a better person but you will actually be one, for bread cast upon the waters returns its rewards in many intangible areas.

I thank you.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in introducing Mr. Turney, I pointed out that some of the attitudes of the public toward the handicapped were indicated by a recent poll. It showed that 50 percent believe that the only way to take care of blind people is in an institution; only 45 percent approved of sheltered workshops; 44 percent think blind people cannot hold regular employment; and 50 percent believe industry should not give regular jobs to the blind.

Handicapped people not only possess the proper attitude toward employment, but they also have the aptitudes necessary for work. They have been shown to be superior employees in many instances. They are regular in their habits, work safely, are punctual, change jobs infrequently, and give an employer a full hour of work for every hour of pay.

I commend Turney and other employers like him for their hard-nosed good business sense in employing the handicapped without any feeling of paternalism.

YOUNG LIVES OUTWEIGH OLD MEN'S PRIDE

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I stated last week during the national student moratorium that I did not support any spirited effort to stampede the President to a decision in Southeast Asia. However, I did think it appropriate to take an inventory of our position in relation to time, our economy, and the enemy order of battle.

I stated that the alternative to being pushed into the Tonkin Gulf in 1965 was not exclusively a \$40 billion per year war in 1969 and through the 1970's. I noted Mel Laird's criticism of administration policy in 1966 as chairman of the Republican policy committee when he stated in "The War and Vietnam" publication that no SEATO treaty required our massive Vietnam involvement in men and dollar expenditure.

My colleague, the gentleman from California, JOHN TUNNEY, gave a short inspirational address also on moratorium day at the Occidental College campus in California. He emphasized that old men's pride in the war should not be bal-

anced with the lives of our young men. His statement follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN V. TUNNEY

I am deeply honored to participate in this peaceful assembly of free men. It is eloquent rebuttal to those who say that the outcry sweeping our land today is un-American.

This responsible, nonviolent exercise of our basic freedoms will go far in winning back friends around the world who have been repulsed by our persistent, blind arrogance.

But we must make clear that today's moratorium on the war is not—as some have suggested—an attempt to bring down a President, but rather an attempt to encourage the adoption of policies that will end a war.

President Nixon has written of his "six crises." And now, many Americans—including possibly Mr. Nixon himself—have come to think of the war which he inherited as his "seventh crisis."

But this is not his crisis—it is ours. It is shared by all of us who feel its adverse impact on our society, not just by young men being sent into South Vietnam or by the families of the men who have died there.

This crisis manifests itself in a deep division that threatens our national fiber. It has shaken our economic foundation and has prevented us from attending to serious social problems at home.

And it poses a significant crisis for our representative, congressional form of Government. Those who today support this expression of national discontent, must also recognize that the war is a symptom of a serious national illness which must be checked.

In this era of push-button undeclared warfare, our governing processes have lost contact with reality and with humanity.

To prevent other catastrophic mistakes—be they in Laos, Thailand, or in Latin America where we today are bankrolling military dictatorships which ignore the will of their people—we must reform our Government so that priorities for national commitments truly reflect the will of our people.

I recognize that because of the inherent split-second decisions necessary, the power to retaliate must rest in the hands of the President in the event of a nuclear attack on our country. But in the case of the movement of troops overseas in advisory or combat roles, Congress must have the power to approve or disapprove. There must be thoughtful debate and dialogue, not merely a rubber-stamped fiat accomplish.

Congress must regain the constitutional power—and accompanying responsibility—which has slipped by default into the hands of the President. He has the power to listen to the Pentagon or to the people; he must listen to the people.

Americans, through their elected Representatives, should be able to tell the Pentagon that saving a corrupt foreign regime from its own people is not worth the investment of 39,000 American lives and \$30 billion a year.

The tragedy of Mr. Nixon's apparent war policy is that the goal he seeks is unattainable.

In September, he said America's principal goal was to assure "the right of the people of South Vietnam to choose their own leaders without outside imposition—either by us or by anybody else."

However, the Thieu-Ky government wants to maintain its own power by means of a U.S. military victory. So long as we support their efforts with American lives and dollars, there is no incentive for them to make the accommodations necessary to achieve the goal set by the Nixon administration.

In short, the goals of the Saigon regime are inconsistent with the avowed policy of Mr. Nixon.

The time has come to call an end to this travesty. The Saigon regime must be con-

vinced that we will no longer protect them from their people through our military and financial assistance.

For that reason, I propose that we withdraw all our military and civilian force on a systematic calendar basis over the next 18 months.

This is more than enough time for a winning regime to reach accommodations with all political and religious factions necessary to its survival.

A frightening aspect of the war is the disunity it has caused among the American people.

Mr. Nixon's administration, like that of his predecessor, has tried to make support of its war policy synonymous with patriotism. As a result, those who dissent are accused of giving aid to the enemy.

Americans thought they were expressing dissent one year ago at the ballot box when they voted for Mr. Nixon because he said he had a plan to end the war. But now, after being in office 10 months—during which time, 9,500 American men have been withdrawn from the war in coffins—Mr. Nixon should not be surprised by the public's desire to be heard once again, to ask where is the plan, to demand action—not rhetoric—to end the biggest mistake this country ever made.

In addition to the spectre of a congress unable—perhaps unwilling—to represent the will of the people, we have a president who says he will not listen to the people.

During his campaign, Mr. Nixon stated that the office of the President should be "a place of moral leadership." He also said, "a President cannot stand aside from crisis; he cannot ignore division; he cannot simply paper over disunity."

Yet, now that an issue has reached the point of obvious crisis—now that public disaffection with the endless war builds higher and higher—his reaction is to do just what he said a president should not do.

He has stood aside; he has ignored division; he has glossed over disunity. He has remained passive, plugged his ears and retreated into himself. He has shrugged off the burden of action. He has given the warning that he will under no circumstances be affected by today's outcry.

He has closed his mind to the rising concern of millions of Americans who want to speed the vietnamization of the war, and who want to stop the senseless slaughter of our young men.

Our soldiers fight today—not to gain a military victory—but only to underscore a point at the conference table, only to give bloody substance to the statement that we are tough, that we mean business.

The list of the dead and maimed grows longer as the President asks us to table the whole issue and to avoid public discussion for 60 days. Is this when the next White House meeting will take place, when the issue of Vietnam will again be taken up?

Unfortunately, the war now has become a case of old men's pride and young men's lives.

THE VISIT BY DR. FRANZ JOSEF STRAUSS TO SOUTH CAROLINA

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, last week Dr. Franz Josef Strauss, who was then Finance Minister of West Germany, appeared in the capital of my State of South Carolina and delivered an extremely interesting address concerning American-European partner-

ship. The morning newspaper of Columbia, the State, took time to reflect upon the message that Dr. Strauss brought to South Carolina and to the United States. The State's opinion is particularly timely in light of yesterday's change in the West German Government in which Willy Brandt was elected as the new Chancellor. The State says "Americans should heed the Strauss evaluation."

Although the new Chancellor has indicated that he does not intend any drastic change in German foreign policy, it is well known that he is at odds with Dr. Strauss on many issues, including that of NATO defense. Brandt has long emphasized a policy of closer relations with the Soviet Union, characterized by a warm feeling of détente.

Dr. Strauss has also favored dealing with the Soviets, but on a realistic, eyes-open policy which would take note of the fact that the Soviets have not given up their desire to dominate the world.

In its editorial, the State says that Strauss reads the common interest of the United States and West Germany clearly.

He sees the continued threat of Soviet aggression—by whatever means available—in Western Europe. He appreciates the necessity of maintaining NATO as a cohesive and powerful force-in-being to counter the Soviet threat. And he knows that a firm collective will must undergird that force if NATO is to be an effective and credible deterrent.

Americans must keep the Strauss evaluation in mind as they observe developments in Germany. The State has produced a very fine and thought-provoking editorial on this topic. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From The State, Oct. 14, 1969]

AMERICANS SHOULD HEED THE STRAUSS EVALUATION

Eight years ago, as West Germany's defense minister under the late Konrad Adenauer, Franz Josef Strauss stood before a group of American newsmen visiting Bonn and warned that the long-range goal of Soviet Russia was to split the unity of Western Europe and thereby split West Europe away from the United States.

Sunday, speaking here in Columbia as the finance minister of Kurt Kiesinger's outgoing government, Strauss brought the same message in person to the people of America.

Now, as then, the burly head of the Christian Social Union sees the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as the prime and irreplaceable force to thwart the Soviet aim of dominating Europe. But today he feels that Western Europe should be playing a larger role within NATO—militarily, politically, and financially—than it has done in years.

It is understandable that an individual with strong feelings of German nationalism and Western European regionalism should advance that idea. But Strauss is prompt to spell out his conviction that United States participation must continue to be a major, if perhaps diminishing, ingredient in Western Europe's defense posture.

Strauss plainly recognizes, that the United States, as he puts it, is not now "inexhaustible paradise" capable of financing the security and the development of the rest of the Free World.

The United States, he says, can well ask why Europeans do not assume a greater

share of the burden. He goes on to provide his own answer, attributing Europe's failure to its "anachronistic political organization." Not yet, or at least not here, is he specifying just what sort of a regional reorganization he has in mind, but he does give this much of an indication of his thinking:

"Europeans must cooperate more closely in the field of defense, and must step up their military effort, gradually integrating their armed forces. On this basis, a new shape of the Alliance will have to be worked out with the United States within the framework of NATO reform."

Such talk occasionally has brought charges of his being anti-American, charges which he labels, with characteristic bluntness, "stupid." From what we know of the man, we agree with his assessment. Franz Josef Strauss impresses us as being a friend of the United States, but not just for the sake of friendship.

"Friendship," he says, "is the superstructure on the infrastructure of common interests."

Strauss, we are persuaded, reads those common interests correctly. He sees the continued threat of Soviet aggression—by whatever means available—in Western Europe. He appreciates the necessity of maintaining NATO as a cohesive and powerful force-in-being to counter the Soviet threat. And he knows that a firm collective will must undergird that force if NATO is to be an effective and credible deterrent.

He is a man of strong will himself, this Franz Josef Strauss, and Americans can watch—indeed, they can hope—for his further involvement in the affairs of West German, Western Europe, and the North Atlantic Alliance.

RESULTS OF POLL CONDUCTED ON VIETNAM WAR POLICY BY CHICOPEE, MASS., HIGH SCHOOL

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Chicopee High School in Chicopee, Mass., a community within my congressional district, has conducted a poll among its students on this Nation's war policy in Vietnam. The poll—part of Chicopee High School's observance of moratorium day—showed most students oppose further military escalation in Vietnam and feel the administration should strive harder for a negotiated settlement to the war.

The results of the poll:

CHICOPEE HIGH SCHOOL VIETNAM POLL,
OCTOBER 16, 1969

We ask you to complete the following poll as part of the schools Peace Day program. The results of the poll will be published in all area newspapers and will be entered in the United States Congressional Record.

[All answers in percent]

- (1) Do you favor an immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops in Vietnam?
 - Yes ----- 50.5
 - No ----- 43
 - No opinion ----- 6.5
- (2) Do you favor an escalation of our war effort in Vietnam?
 - Yes ----- 25
 - No ----- 54
 - No opinion ----- 21

(3) Do you favor President Nixon's Vietnam policy?

- Yes ----- 53
- No ----- 55
- No opinion ----- 19

(4) Do you think President Nixon is pushing hard enough for peace in Vietnam?

- Yes ----- 22
- No ----- 70
- No opinion ----- 8

(5) Do you feel that matters of war and defense should be handled solely by the military chiefs?

- Yes ----- 28
- No ----- 58
- No opinion ----- 14

(6) Do you feel that the Paris peace talks will lead to a negotiated settlement of the Vietnam War?

- Yes ----- 15
- No ----- 71
- No opinion ----- 14

(7) Do you feel our government should concentrate on domestic rather than foreign problems?

- Yes ----- 68
- No ----- 15
- No opinion ----- 17

(8) Do you believe the presence of the U.S. in Vietnam is morally justifiable?

- Yes ----- 33
- No ----- 49
- No opinion ----- 18

(9) Do you think the national moratorium will: (a) bring about a quicker settlement to the war in Vietnam?

- Yes ----- 23
- No ----- 61
- No opinion ----- 16

(b) hinder our efforts for a settlement?

- Yes ----- 31
- No ----- 50
- No opinion ----- 19

(10) Are you as an individual really concerned with the problems facing the world today?

- Yes ----- 86
- No ----- 7
- No opinion ----- 8

PRESIDENT NIXON'S APPROACH TO EDUCATION

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, not too long ago, Attorney General Mitchell, speaking on desegregation, said he wished we would pay less attention to what the administration says than to what it does. I believe that perhaps the Attorney General should not have confined his statement to one issue, for it aptly describes President Nixon's approach to education.

Recently brought to my attention was an October 1968 solicitation by the National Committee of Teachers for Nixon-Agnew, asking for help in the closing days of the presidential campaign. The main body of the solicitation consisted of a letter, over Mr. Nixon's signature, and addressed: "To My Fellow Americans." Of one of the goals to which he

and Mr. AGNEW were dedicated, Mr. Nixon said:

When we talk about cutting the expense of government—whether Federal, State, or local—the one area we can't short-change is education.

I have not forgotten that, as Vice President, Mr. Nixon voted on February 3, 1960, to break a tie in the Senate to block the reconsideration of a proposal to authorize increased aid for school construction and teachers' salaries. But I had hoped that since casting this vote against a major Federal education bill, Mr. Nixon would have learned a little. I am afraid my hope has been dashed.

In that October solicitation, Mr. Nixon said that we cannot talk about cutting the expense of government when it comes to education. Yet that is exactly what the Nixon administration proposes to do. In fiscal year 1969, the Office of Education received \$3,669,358,967 in Federal funds. The Nixon budget for fiscal year 1970 proposed that the Office of Education receive \$3,221,745,455 in Federal funds. This was a proposed reduction of \$448,613,512.

Mr. President, if the area of education was not being shortchanged by the Nixon administration, I would like someone from the administration to explain how this is so. We can, of course, be sure that the administration will forbear to point with pride to the fact that House liberals, by restoring more than \$1.2 billion for the Office of Education, have held Mr. Nixon to his campaign promise in spite of himself.

Interestingly enough, the headquarters for Teachers for Nixon-Agnew was located in the now defunct Willard Hotel. Mr. President, I am afraid the Willard is not the only thing that is now defunct.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

I ASK YOUR HELP

(By Richard M. Nixon)

WASHINGTON, D.C.,

October 1, 1968.

TO MY FELLOW AMERICANS: As we wind up the 1968 campaign, I ask your help in achieving the goals to which Governor Agnew and I are dedicated:

American opportunity begins in the classrooms of this nation for young and old alike;

When we talk about cutting the expense of government—either federal, state, or local—the one area we can't short-change is education;

Education is the area in which we must keep doing everything that is necessary to help achieve the American Dream;

We call upon every citizen to join with us in an Action Program for Education.

In the final weeks ahead, the campaign will be an exciting adventure. I ask you to participate in that adventure by volunteering to help me and Governor Agnew. People who are committed to our goals of a better America can reach out to their friends and neighbors and enlist them in our campaign.

Only through people-to-people contact can we hope to restore decency and stability to our national life and create a better society for all. Your influence in our behalf is our most powerful campaign tool.

Will you volunteer to help? Write me in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD M. NIXON.

THE MEANING OF MORATORIUM DAY

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, as the events of October 15 pass into memory and perhaps into a page of our Nation's history, many differing opinions have been voiced as to the meaning and effect of these observances. I was particularly impressed by the views set forth in the October 19 Maine Sunday Telegram, the most widely read newspaper in my State. The editorials of this newspaper have achieved a reputation for integrity and independent thinking, as well as for their rich journalistic style. It was especially encouraging to read that the "message and meaning of moratorium day should not be negatively interpreted by President Nixon as hostile criticism to be ignored," for this is a view fully in accordance with my own objectives in joining several moratorium observances. This editorial stated further that moratorium day was "a finely motivated display, for the most part, to urge the President to show more convincingly the overriding priority he is giving to finding a peace." These opinions are also in full agreement with my own, as I stated recently in my own position paper on Vietnam, in which I pointed out that the President has inherited a war not of his own making, but that he still has the opportunity to avoid the divisiveness which has surrounded our Vietnam involvement in recent years.

There are of course many other interpretations as to the meaning of this day, but I am very proud to bring this example of Maine thinking and writing to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

MEANING OF MORATORIUM DAY

Four days after the rallies and the marches have dispersed, after the tolling of church bells and the reading of lists of war dead have ended—what, is the lasting meaning, if any, of Moratorium Day?

We think these points have lasting meaning.

1. Protest about Vietnam is not, as Agnew and Reagan, for example, stupidly and scrofulously imply, the work of disloyal, maladjusted, young malcontents. The demand for swifter political and military action to get America out of the war is coming from all elements of the nation. The Administration, elected to achieve peace, should welcome, rather than rebuff, this.

This fact was clearly, and bitterly, seen by President Johnson. Because he realized the feeling was strong enough to swamp him at the polls, Lyndon Johnson was smart enough not to run against it. This lesson should be pasted on every White House wall.

The victory of Richard Nixon last November, by a nose, was less his personal triumph, but the defeat rather of Johnson's Vietnam policy.

2. The phenomenal number and diversity of the participants in last Wednesday's protests signaled that the policies of Nixon, as seen by the public, do not yet add up to the degree of change they wanted when they changed Presidents. We doubt that Nixon will indeed turn a deaf ear to the Moratorium, as it was executed, though he implied such a course at his news conference before the event.

Our view is that Nixon, rightly, will not be stampeded to risky action merely by the size or fervor of the Moratorium Day demonstrations. However we think, having witnessed the unparalleled number and diversity of its participants, Nixon is likely to hurry faster along the course he has already set to end the war.

Politically, this would be wise. For ending the war, at best, will be a perilous and humiliating business for the President of the United States. Any President doing it, especially one elected in a hair-breadth victory, will surely need the full support and confidence of the nation behind him. Nixon can now gain this support by hurrying his pace toward the goal of peace, for which he was elected.

3. It is bad enough that the North Vietnamese so grossly misunderstand the meaning of Moratorium Day, as being support for their side, as claimed in their gross letter to the American public last Tuesday.

But it is infinitely worse that our own Vice President Agnew should commit the same error as the leaders of North Vietnam.

Agnew unjustly and harshly implied that those supporting the Moratorium would be aiding the enemy and prolonging the war. This mistake in his reading of the motives of millions of Americans harmed the Administration, by further alienating much of the nation which he should be seeking to unite.

4. Finally we ask—why the Moratorium, why the dissent?

One part of the answer is that no Administration yet has been able to justify the size of U.S. participation in this war as a necessity to U.S. security.

This war has never been accepted as an "American" war by the American people, though it is labeled as such by friend and foes alike overseas.

Second part of the answer is that this war has lasted far too long, without achieving any worthwhile goal. Whatever the rights and wrongs of the American part in the conflict, the root of widespread opposition to the war today is less a moral one than a pragmatic one.

The war has cost too much in lives, in money, in lost opportunities to better America at home; and, despite all this, America has not come close to winning. The thousand billion dollars spent on the military establishment since World War II has not given us a military machine able to extinguish this kind of guerrilla conflict. The American people are growingly opposed to more lives, more money, being spent in a war which the President himself has said we can never win. There is no moral fervor in support of this war among the American people. Indeed, there is mounting doubt in America whether American lives and money are being spent to support a South Vietnamese government which merits neither.

The people who protested on Moratorium Day are criticized because they do not have a practical new plan for ending the war. It is not fair to demand that the man in the street should develop such a plan. This is the job which he pays the President, and the millions of workers under his jurisdiction, to perform.

On the other hand, it is not fair for protesters to ask the President to show his negotiating cards out for all to see.

Moratorium Day did not demand any "bug-out", as some say. It was, we think, a finely motivated display, for the most part, to urge the President to show more convincingly the overriding priority he is giving to finding a peace; to encourage him to demand more effort toward peace by the leaders in South Vietnam.

Obstacle toward peace may line in some areas around the White House and in the Pentagon. But a bigger obstacle lies in Saigon. Probably the biggest lies in Hanoi.

Over this last obstacle, we have no direct

influence. But over the first obstacles, in Washington and Saigon, American opinion most certainly does have influence.

The message and meaning of Moratorium Day should not be negatively interpreted by President Nixon as hostile criticism to be ignored. Rather, he might better harness this display as support for him to move more swiftly than he has hitherto moved, toward achieving the goal of peace for which he was elected.

Here is a tool for him to prod himself, prod his advisors, and above all prod South Vietnam to end the fighting and arrive at the best settlement feasible. We doubt that a settlement everlastingly postponed while fighting goes on, will be as good as one that might be negotiated before next November rolls around.

TOOTHLESS TIGER OR DEFENDER OF THE WEAK?

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, the Capital Journal of Salem, Ore., one of our leading Oregon newspapers published an editorial concerning Vietnam and moratorium day which I commend to my colleagues:

TOOTHLESS TIGER OR DEFENDER OF THE WEAK?

It's mighty difficult for a democratic government to wage any but a self-defense sort of war, as Vietnam Moratorium Day illustrates.

The right, even the duty, to debate public issues is at the heart of democratic government.

Yet the sort of debate that has raged over Vietnam almost assures the failure of our government's objectives there. For, given continuing dissent in this country, the Communists know the Americans won't have the political strength to stick it out. So why should they negotiate seriously, much less concede South Vietnam the right to determine its fate by free election?

We don't suggest our democracy wouldn't prove cohesive if the United States itself were under attack. When the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, for example, few disagreed with our declaration of war. (Would the same have been true if the only aggression involved Hitler's Nazis in Europe? Would it be true today if the Soviet Union moved against West Germany?) But given significant internal dissent—which seems almost inevitable in a long and costly struggle to defend anyone but ourselves—our government can hardly fight effectively.

Many Americans will say that's a good thing, that the U.S. has no business fighting in other than self-defense wars. And we would agree, if there were somebody else to protect weak nations from aggressors.

But there isn't.

If U.S. will to defend South Vietnam continues to wither, American defense commitments to dozens of foreign nations won't have much value. The leaders of these countries will quit counting upon significant U.S. help. More importantly, potential aggressors will recognize they have a hunting license to prey upon weakly defended peoples and territories. They won't continue to be held in check by fear of or respect for American might. They will recognize the world as a jungle and the U.S. as a toothless tiger.

The critics will continue to argue that South Vietnam isn't worth all the lives and dollars we have invested there. Viewed by itself, few would argue the point. But if

South Vietnam isn't, then what foreign land is? India? Israel? West Germany?

The United States has been a powerful force for stability and order for more than two decades. Those who cry today for a rapid and irresponsible withdrawal from South Vietnam are threatening far more than a few million South Vietnamese.

FIFTY YEARS OF PROGRESS FOR THE AMERICAN WORKING WOMAN

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, National Business Women's Week is being observed this year from October 19 to 25 and, as this is the 50th anniversary year of the founding of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, it is fitting that we should mark the progress of America's working women in the past half-century.

In 1919, there were about 8 million women workers over age 14, and women made up 20 percent of the American work force. Today, 37 percent of our workers are women age 16 and, as of 1967, there were 26.6 million female workers in America.

Women began to gain opportunities in the labor market during the First World War, when the Armed Forces claimed the service of many of our young men, and workers were needed to fill vacant jobs and to contribute to the war effort in munitions factories and related fields. By 1919, 50 years ago, women had proved that they were capable of filling many positions believed earlier to be solely within the male domain. Thus, in the 1920's, it was no longer shocking for young girls to finish high school and go to the city to become secretaries or file clerks, as well as staying home to become teachers, or work in the local factory, on the assembly line, or in dressmaking shops.

During the depression, jobs were unavailable to much of our population, but the first to be fired and last to be hired were women, along with other minorities. Upon America's entry into World War II, women were again called upon to fill the jobs vacated by our soldiers, and they were also allowed to fill places left in our colleges and universities. By the end of the Second World War, women had again broken into professions once barred to them, as well as gaining education that would ordinarily have been denied them. While many of our veterans returned to school to complete an interrupted education, their wives continued to work to support the family.

Thus, women gradually gained access to many fields of employment. However, the expanding participation of women in the labor force has not been accompanied by improved utilization of their abilities, as evidenced by women's disproportionate and increased concentration in the lesser skilled, less rewarding, and less rewarded occupations. In 1940,

women held 45 percent of all professional and technical positions. In 1936, they held only 36 percent of such jobs. On the other hand, the proportion of women among all service workers has increased by 14 percent since 1940.

The problem is not a legal one. During this decade much progress has been made in implementing the needs of working women. Legislation to assure women equality of pay and nondiscrimination in employment has been passed at the Federal and State levels. The Federal Equal Pay Act of 1963 assures women equal pay for equal work. Title VII of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination in employment on the basis of sex.

Yet, all of us are aware that, in reality, women are not afforded the same occupational opportunities afforded men. The reasons for this cannot be changed by acts of Congress, for they consist of the traditions and folkways of our people. We are used to the idea that woman's place is in the home; that her role is that of homemaker and mother, and not career woman and breadwinner. But in these changing times, a combination of conditions, such as the move from rural to urban living for the average American, the growth of industry, improved working conditions and shorter working hours, labor-saving devices in the home, and the emphasis on education in our society, are all working to press our women toward the working world. They have gained, in the past 50 years, some opportunity, the desire to work, and legal equality with men. The obstacle that remains is one of attitude, and it is the most difficult to overcome.

I should like to take this opportunity to salute the working women of America and to wish them the best of success in the years to follow. We need the talent and dedication of all our citizens if we are to meet and overcome the grave challenges that face this Nation today.

FUEL SHORTAGE

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have warned of a possible fuel shortage in New England this winter have received soothing words from the Department of the Interior and the oil industry denying there is any real danger. Unfortunately, these words and assurances are not supported by the most recent figures on distillate—heating oil—stocks. October 10, 1969, compared to October 11, 1968, according to American Petroleum Institute:

In districts I-IV, the area east of the Rockies, total distillate stocks are 14.1 million barrels, or 7.1 percent below last year.

Along the east coast, total distillate stocks are 10.3 million barrels, or 11.3 percent below last year.

On the gulf coast—Texas and Louisi-

ana—the area from which New England is also supplied—total stocks are 8.3 million barrels, or 20.6 percent below last year.

RECENT MORATORIUM EDITORIAL COMMENTS

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the recent Vietnam moratorium activities resulted in some interesting editorial comment in Indiana.

The editorials should provide reassurance that mid-America has not lost its perspective of the principles that made the United States the hope of the free world.

Newspapers in Indiana called the Communist-inspired general strike for what it was, "a toy in the hands of unbelievably inept, the criminally treasonous, the incredibly naive."

I believe a careful reading of these editorials will provide an insight into what Americans really believe in this critical period of American history.

The editorials are from the Kokomo Tribune, Hartford City News-Times, the Lebanon Reporter, Marion Chronicle, and the Hammond Times as reprinted in the Logansport Pharos-Tribune. The editorials follow:

[From the Kokomo (Ind.) Tribune, Oct. 15, 1969]

BLAMING AMERICA

One of the national figures who spoke up in support of the Vietnam day of protest was W. Averill Harriman, former chief U.S. negotiator at the Paris peace talks. He endorsed Wednesday's anti-war demonstrations as a "move toward peace."

This presents an odd spectacle. The protests against the war were anti-Nixon expressions because they represented disagreement with the President's policy of trying to end the war. So, in effect, Harriman was joining in criticism of Nixon.

What made this such a strange spectacle was the fact that Harriman himself wasn't able to make any headway toward getting the war stopped when he was talking with the Communists at Paris. Here is a man who failed to achieve anything like a "move toward peace" now criticizing a President who has moved much farther in trying to end the war than Harriman did.

We suspect that Harriman, who has been in the national and international limelight so long, is loath to be out of it. We wouldn't want to say that he was not motivated by sincerity, but some national figures like to get on a bandwagon when they think they see one, and the peace drive could have looked like a bandwagon to Harriman.

It seems significant to us that the Wednesday protesters directed their reproaches to their own government and not to the real barrier to peace—Hanoi. Most Americans know that it takes two to make peace, and they know that up to now the North Vietnamese have shown no interest in it.

The tendency to blame the United States for failure to end the war follows the odd posture of those critics who have always set up a clamor over U.S. bombings and U.S. "war brutality," but remained silent whenever a shocking Communist atrocity like

the mass murders of civilians at Hue came to light. Maybe there's some sort of rationale to this strange attitude, but if so a lot of Americans can't perceive what it is.

There never was a time in American history when so much fault was found with the United States and so little with the enemies of the United States. Is the U.S. the giant villain so many liberals are painting it? We can't believe a majority of the American people think so.

Usefully, Columnist David Lawrence brings up a point worth considering at this juncture in history. It is that the American people as a whole have not been given an opportunity to say whether they want peace at any price. No public opinion poll has directly asked the question whether the people favor surrender.

The customary queries have been whether the war is being handled properly or if it should be brought to an end, without reference to how this could be achieved. The issue has not been clearly put to the people. If it were, in Lawrence's view, Americans would reject any humiliating policy amounting to "peace at any price."

None of the resolutions offered in Congress or proposed by various organizations which planned demonstrations Wednesday, insisting that the U.S. make peace at once, required as a condition any reciprocal action to be taken by North Vietnam. Yet 17 senators and 47 House members supported the demonstrations.

Little wonder that Hanoi rejoiced over Wednesday, Oct. 15, which marked a show of disunity in America.

[From the Hartford City News-Times,
Oct. 15, 1969]

MORATORIUM'S FOLLY

It is with great sorrow that we see so many Americans turning their backs on our great country. Many are sincere in their belief that withdrawal of United States troops from Vietnam would solve our problems. Many others know this is not true, but because of political expediency or outright communistic leanings support the idea.

We feel that politicians, who should know better, yet still try to further their own political ambitions by advocating immediate withdrawal are coming perilously close to treason.

All of us would like to see an end to all wars. We would like to see a world where all men could live in peace with their neighbors. A world free of hunger, disease, discrimination and crime. The United States can lead the way to such a world, but we cannot be a leader if we are weak and divided in our aims. We must be strong. We must be able to say to all nations, "America stands for freedom and justice for all men," and we must be able to prove it.

To those who would have us retreat each time there is a confrontation with communism we can only say, "God help you," for you are aiding and abetting the greatest enemy to freedom the world has ever known.

The danger of communistic aggression should be plain to every citizen. They have shown in their treatment of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, East Germany, Cuba and many other countries that when communism wins all freedom is lost.

Communism knows but one creed, force, and we must be strong enough to say, "you will go this far and no farther," and be able to make it stick.

The very fact that the communistic leader of North Vietnam would send an open letter to those Americans who are pressing for immediate withdrawal of our troops, encouraging them in their efforts, should make all of us realize the folly of such a decision.

America, to survive, must be strong and must be united in her aim of Freedom for All Men.

[From the Lebanon (Ind.) Reporter,
Oct. 15, 1969]

FLYING FLAGS PLENTIFUL IN LEBANON MORATORIUM—BOONETTES SHOW SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES

Boone County flags flew in place of moratorium marches and defense of the president superseded any prayers or protests.

No demonstrations marred the cool, autumn day in Lebanon in connection with the nation-wide planned marches, seminars and demonstrations against the Vietnam war. Business went on as usual. Few people showed concern with what had been hoped to be a nation-wide move.

On on-the-street-interviews various Lebanonites expressed views opposing the demonstrations. Said Mrs. Tom West, housewife, "I think the president should run the country. I'm not in favor of the war but he knows more about it than I do."

A retiree, who said he had several grandchildren in the war also commented, "It's nutty! I don't believe in walking out with a job only half done. This is just helping the enemy."

Mrs. Donald Sloan, housewife and mother, said, "I agree with the demonstrators in principle, but not in their actions. Certainly I'm against the war but these people are jumping to the wrong conclusions."

Schools throughout the county conducted a normal class day.

Lebanon American Legion commander, Bob Laffin commented, "I don't agree with a lot of people today. I am in favor of peace, but not this way. It plays right into the North Vietnam's hands. I definitely am opposed to the demonstrations."

Adjutant of Disabled American Veterans, Ernie Cross said, "This is a great defeat for the sacrifices made by our men in Vietnam. It can only help Hanoi. We're all opposed to war but sometimes it is necessary to maintain freedom. President Nixon is moving in the right direction and will get it settled if we give him enough time."

Many said that they made a special point to fly the flag today.

It was also noted that those interviewed under the age of 30 preferred not to be quoted or expressed "no comment" or "no opinion." Several, who expressed opinions against the demonstrations, said they preferred not to become involved because of possible reprisals.

Indiana colleges and universities peacefully observed the nationwide Vietnam war moratorium today, highlighted by a candlelight march on the Indiana University campus at Bloomington with 3,000 participating shortly after midnight.

But despite the quiet tenor of the observances, State Police Supt. Robert K. Konkle had his trooper forces on the alert for possible disturbances, saying "this sort of thing is totally unpredictable—you never know when someone not directly associated with the observances could inject trouble."

Konkle said he had observers on duty "in college towns and the major metropolitan centers which is where the greatest activity is."

Indiana's candlelight march preceded a "peace fair" on Dunn Meadow, featuring talks, entertainment and distribution of literature. Most of the activities were scheduled for later in the day, including an address by Bishop James Armstrong of the North and South Dakota United Methodist Church.

[From the Marion (Ind.) Chronicle Tribune,
Oct. 17, 1969]

HELP FOR HANOI

Now that the Hanoi sympathizers, left-wing liberals and political opportunists have

had their Vietnam War moratorium and while the promoters of surrender are crowing about the "success" of demonstration, two points are quite clear: The national government does not intend to allow the protesters to force it to accept less than an honorable peace in Vietnam and the vast majority of America's citizens did not support the demonstrators.

The total turnout for the protest movement over the country can be numbered in the thousands. The population of the United States, is over 200 million.

While many of those involved in the demonstrations no doubt are sincere in their beliefs and their efforts to end the war, the fact remains that they have been duped. The leaders of the moratorium claim they are peacefully dissenting, but they did not reject—did, in fact, welcome—the support of North Vietnam, domestic Communists and the infamous Chicago Eight, now on trial for conspiracy in the Chicago riots last summer.

Some of the events were disturbing, such as former Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg, addressing a crowd of moratorium demonstrators and refusing to renounce the support of Hanoi.

Some were ludicrous—Sen. Ted Kennedy, whose brother started the Vietnam escalation, demanding that President Nixon bring home the troops within a year.

Some of it was insulting—Radical David Dellinger reading the names of honorable men killed in the service of their country.

Around the country, others read the names of the 40,000 Americans killed fighting for freedom to advance their own ends, a shameful maneuver. The father of a serviceman killed tried to get a court order to prevent the protesters from reading his son's name.

Here in Indiana, the Viet Cong flag was run up a flag pole at Indiana University after the American flag had been removed. How's that for "loyal citizens honorably dissenting"?

And the whole thing played into the hands of the Communists, just as President Nixon said it would. Within hours, Hanoi was demanding that President Nixon give the Reds a timetable for withdrawal of all American troops.

A great many of those involved were lending support simply to try to gain political gains and discredit the President if possible, including Indiana's two senators.

The fact is that President Nixon is moving to get the Americans out of Vietnam as rapidly as possible without leaving the South Vietnamese at the mercy of the murdering Communists. On the day of the moratorium, hundreds of more bodies of murdered Hue residents were uncovered. They were executed when the Reds briefly held the city last spring.

If all U.S. troops pull out immediately, this is what will happen to thousands of Vietnamese who have fought to remain free. Is this what the "humanitarians" taking part in the moratorium seek?

President Nixon appears to be doing more to get American combat forces out of the war than his two immediate predecessors, which makes the true motive of the moratorium sponsors all the more suspect.

The Nixon Administration should continue on its course to bring home American troops, but at the same time training and equipping the South Vietnamese to bear the burden of the war. This program meets with the approval of the vast majority of Americans, but those who support a constructive proposal are not so outspoken or demonstrative as those bent on destruction.

[From the Logansport (Ind.) Pharos-Tribune
Press, Oct. 17, 1969]

THERE'S A PRICE WE PAY FOR LIVING

For each of us, there is a price for living. Getting up at crack at dawn . . .

Smiling through the boredom of 40 years at one job . . .

Growing old . . .

Suffering sickness, pain and death . . .
For all of us, in the community we call a nation, there is a price for living.

Selflessness, sometimes at great personal cost, for the common good. . .

Postponement of dreams . . .

Smiling through the frustrations of collective bargaining and group decision-making . . .

Abridgment of individual rights . . .

That's part of the cost of living together. It's called "responsibility."

We do not escape, no matter our twisting, our walling, our Niagaras of tears. The toll is as old as the planet, on the one hand; as old as civilization, on the other.

Because we are "aware" and able, we try to escape.

We "improve" our environment; pollute the air and the waters, eviscerate the watersheds.

We introduce the rabbit to Australia, LSD to the dormitory, the SDS to Chicago.

We replace the horse and lose our horse-sense; our vaunted "awareness."

Now we would fight a war from the streets; let poets map strategy; coeds protect our flank; pivot the fate of the nation on the temper of the mob.

Wednesday's so-called "Moratorium Against the War" is a fancy name for a general strike. Indeed, it was originally conceived as a general strike; an arbitrary paralyzing of America. It evolved by scheme to the less incendiary term because "Moratorium" is more palatable to Americans who have not yet forgotten who or what or why they are.

This "Moratorium," no matter its fancy decor, aids and abets an enemy.

In high glee the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese in Paris have ignored our negotiators and appealed directly to the American people for further discord.

The very hope of Paris has died in the heat of Hanoi's belief that the anti-war mob here will win the war for the Communists.

American democracy has—and has had for almost 200 years—effective machinery for dissent. It is the world's most responsive government to the opinion of its electorate. The machinery has maintained itself admirably; still responds with alacrity when there is bona fide stimuli.

This "Moratorium" is not part of that machinery. This "Moratorium" is a toy in the hands of the unbelievably inept, the criminally treasonous, the incredibly naive.

This "Moratorium" is part of the machinery of delay.

The delay spills American blood; spells more war.

We are tired of war, as all the American people and most people in the world are tired of war. But war will not go away just by virtue of our sticking our heads in the sand. A murderer will not desist just because we say "please," because we throw our guns away and say "we're not playing any more."

Please God someday we or our children can live in a world without war.

But today is not that some day.

Today we have to face the reality of a treacherous and desperate foe whose philosophies and mores and motives are totally alien to our historical experience.

He does not subscribe to the Sermon on the Mount.

And he views Wednesday's so-called "Moratorium" as a sign of ultimate weakness; the people partaking thereof as adde-pated idiots.

We're inclined to agree.

HAMMOND TIMES.

STUDENT FAST FOR FREEDOM

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, October 10, I had the privilege of speaking to a most extraordinary group of student peace demonstrators, known as the "Student Fast for Freedom." Unlike those who participated in the October 15 moratorium, these young men and women recognized that Hanoi, not Washington or Saigon, is the true villain in this tragic war we are fighting. Their call was for "Peace With Freedom" in Vietnam, realizing that the peace with slavery which would be imposed by an immediate American betrayal-by-surrender would be more frightful for the Vietnamese people than continuation of the war.

Their gathering on Friday night was small, but I daresay the first meeting of the SDS was at least as tiny. It grew from about 30 people on Friday to a more respectable 200 by Sunday night, so there is some hope that the so-called "silent majority" on our Nation's campuses has at last begun to break its silence.

At Friday's rally, the students distributed a handbill, which is perhaps the most lucid presentation of the anti-Communist position on Vietnam that I have ever seen. At this point, I am inserting the text of this handbill into the RECORD:

STUDENT FAST FOR FREEDOM

The participants in the Student Fast for Freedom include Democrats, Republicans, independents, conservatives, and liberals. Despite differences of viewpoints, we are bound together by a common belief in both the morality and the political wisdom of our commitment to the freedom of Southeast Asia.

Our commitment is morally right because there can be no morality without freedom, and because there has been no political system in history so mercilessly antithetical to freedom and human dignity as the communist systems.

Our commitment is politically right because the fate of freedom everywhere is bound up with the defense of freedom in Southeast Asia. Communist aggression must be halted in Southeast Asia in order to protect the security of the entire free world. It is as simple as this.

We do appeal to the American people at large on the basis of the values to which we know they adhere. And we also appeal to the many thousands of students who have joined the opposition to the war in Vietnam, not because they are nihilists but because they feel that the war is an affront to humanity and that it violates the values to which they are personally committed.

We share the belief of these students that human life and human dignity are sacred things, and that they are important factors—indeed, essential factors—in any equation of the Vietnam war.

Accepting this belief, we deplore the cost in human life and human suffering of the Vietnam war. But accepting this belief, we must also ask ourselves what the consequences of a Viet Cong victory would be.

If the expert estimates are true that com-

munist in Russia has exacted a toll of 75 million human lives and that communism in Red China, during its much briefer career, has taken a toll of some 35 million lives; if it is true that tens of millions in both major communist countries have been executed or incarcerated without any cause—then those who posit their opposition to the Vietnam war on humanitarian grounds have the moral duty to explain to us, and to explain to themselves, why they believe that communism in South Vietnam will be less bloody and less destructive of human life than it has been in other countries that have passed under the yoke of communist totalitarianism.

And those who invoke the sacred name of freedom to justify their opposition to the Vietnam war have the further duty to explain to us how this justification can be reconciled with the total tyranny of the North Vietnamese regime.

We know that the South Vietnamese government is not a perfect democracy. But democracy is essentially a matter of degree. Our own country, for that matter, is not a perfect democracy, although we probably come almost as close to this goal as any other country in the world. By American standards Vietnamese democracy still leaves much to be desired. But in terms of the freedom it grants to its citizens, we would have to rank it substantially ahead of most of the member nations of the United Nations—and this achievement is all the more remarkable in an infant nation which has since its inception been fighting a bitter war against communist subversion.

But while there is an imperfect freedom in South Vietnam, in North Vietnam there is not a scintilla of freedom. There is no free press. There is no freedom of expression, even of the most limited kind. There is no right of dissent for students or any other sector of the population. There are no free political parties and no free elections.

And those students who, in their thoughtless opposition to the war, have sometimes chanted "Ho-Ho-Ho Chi Minh," have in effect been endorsing a political and intellectual tyranny as total and as merciless as the Nazi tyranny at its worst.

American and European students who oppose the Vietnam war from a distance would do well to ponder the fact that, virtually without exception, the governments that are geographically close to the conflict support our commitment to the freedom of Southeast Asia.

The opposition to the Vietnam war on the campuses has been exceedingly vocal and well financed. Because of this, it has been able to create the impression that it represents the great majority of the student body. We are convinced from many things that this is not so.

In the period before the Tet offensive, this was demonstrated in numerous polls on campuses across the nation—which, for one reason or another, received virtually no publicity.

In the period since Tet, there has unquestionably been a weakening of support for the war, but this loss of support has been based not on any increase of affection for Ho Chi Minh's communism, but on an understandable weariness with a long and costly war that has had a particularly disturbing effect on the lives of American students.

We take the stand that, in determining our attitude toward the Vietnam war, we must above all be guided by principle, by moral values, and by an enlightened concern for the security of free nations throughout the world. In particular we believe that the epithets and violence which have characterized the opposition to the war must give way to a reasoned dialogue on our campuses between those who oppose and

those who support our commitment to the security of Southeast Asia.

All that is necessary for the forces of evil to triumph in the world, is for enough good men to do nothing.—Edmund Burke.

DRAFT BOARD LEGISLATION

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, later this week the House will be asked to consider the draft board legislation which was approved by our Armed Services Committee earlier this week. During hearings on this legislation, many individuals and organizations made their views on the draft known. One statement which I found to be particularly impressive was made by Mr. James R. Wilson, Jr., a representative of the American Legion. So that our colleagues who will be called upon to act on the draft reform legislation can have the advantage of the thinking of the American Legion on this subject, I include Mr. Wilson's statement in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT OF JAMES R. WILSON, JR., DIRECTOR, NATIONAL SECURITY DIVISION, THE AMERICAN LEGION, TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE DRAFT, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, OCTOBER 3, 1969

Mr. Chairman: The American Legion welcomes this opportunity to express its views on draft reform proposals.

Last March 15, our National Executive Committee created a Select Committee on Manpower to update its position on manpower and to prepare its views to present to the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force, to the public at large and to the appropriate committees of Congress. The responsibilities of the select committee were:

- (1) to investigate alleged inequities in the Selective Service System and to make recommendations for their correction;
- (2) to study all proposals for an All-Volunteer Armed Force and make a report on the feasibility of instituting such plans for the defense of this Nation; and
- (3) to study and make recommendations on all manpower needs of this Nation as they may relate to national security and defense.

Appended to this brief statement is the final report of the select committee which was submitted to our National Executive Committee at its meeting in Atlanta, Ga., August 24, 1969.

A brief summary of the select committee's recommendations, which also covered the six-points President Nixon requested Congress to approve, are:

I. ALLEGED INEQUITIES OF SELECTIVE SERVICE

Selective service throughout its history has proved to be an essential implement in the enforcement of the obligation of every male citizen of the United States to serve his country in its military forces whenever required by our national security. It is vital to the needs of the Nation that the selective service laws be continued in operation subject to minor variations by law or Executive order.

(a) Youngest first: The order of induction should be revised so that the youngest men, beginning at age 19, are taken first. Military service at this age causes less disruption in the life of the youth. From the military viewpoint, younger men are generally preferred for combat service.

(b) The lottery: The most extensive publicity of alleged inequities in the Selective Service System has been given to the uncertainties as to the time of induction. A lottery for class 1-A's (after deferments have been determined) should eliminate this uncertainty. Such a lottery is recommended. If it develops greater inequities in operation, it should be abandoned.

(c) Undergraduate deferments: Undergraduate deferments should continue as under the present act so long as the student is making normal progress toward a degree. The need of the military service for commissioned officers is largely met by college students obtained through ROTC and the officer training camps.

(d) Graduate deferments: Graduate deferments should be granted only in critical areas essential to national security as provided in the present act by standards adopted by the National Security Council.

(e) Occupational deferments: Occupational deferments should be continued in employment, apprenticeship, and training which are essential to national security, by standards adopted by the National Security Council.

(f) Conscientious objectors: The amendments to the 1967 Selective Service Act governing conscientious objectors have caused a multitude of controversies. Many of them could be eliminated by returning to the standards provided in section 5(g) of the 1940 act.

II. ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMED FORCES

(a) Feasibility: The history of this country from colonial days to the present date has shown that an all-volunteer Armed Force is not feasible. In no war has a volunteer army met the country's needs. Only two nations in the world do not have some form of conscription. Great Britain has failed to achieve the greatly lowered authorized strength of its military forces by volunteers and the army of Canada is too small relative to its population for comparative purposes. It is obvious that Canada relies upon the aid of the United States in time of international danger.

(b) Desirability: A volunteer Armed Force tends to become a mercenary one. If the rate of pay and other incentives are equal to that of private industry, then an enlistment becomes a job instead of performance of service to one's country. The quality of the personnel is lowered as demonstrated in the 1947-48 period when the Selective Service Act was permitted to expire. There was a distinct lowering in the average mental and educational level.

(c) Effect on Reserve components: The facts stated in this report are conclusive of the disastrous effect of the elimination of selective service upon the National Guard and Reserve forces. The external and internal security of the country would be imperiled by reducing them to skeleton forces which would inevitably result by the elimination of selective service and the establishment of an all-volunteer armed force.

(d) Economics: The cost of attaining and maintaining a volunteer armed force from 1½ to 2½ million men has been estimated by the Defense Department at from 4 to 17 billion dollars in additional annual expenditures. This would be a serious drain upon the economy of the country. Multiply these figures by 2, 3, or 4—the cost of an armed force which would be necessary in the event of conflict with a major power and the cost could be disastrous.

The committee concludes that an all-volunteer armed force is detrimental to the security of the United States and should not be established.

III. MANPOWER NEEDS OF COUNTRY

It is not wise to discard a system of military manpower that has served this country so well and had sufficient flexibility to en-

able the Armed Forces to expand and meet the emergencies of international warfare.

Since its infancy, this Nation has relied upon the "citizen soldier" to back-up a comparatively small Armed Force. This concept of reinforcement of combat troops has been accomplished by the National Guard and the Reserve forces. To continue this concept, the Reserve components must be manned with the aid of selective service and must be well trained and fully equipped.

ROTC must be continued in our universities and colleges to meet the demand for well-educated commissioned officers.

No one has the right to enjoy all of the freedoms and rights guaranteed to him by the Constitution of the United States unless he is willing to discharge his duties of citizenship. Paramount among these obligations of citizenship is to serve his country in time of war as well as in peace.

Because only a comparatively few are ever called upon to serve in the military forces, a host of others tend to forget and belittle their obligations.

A system of universal military training would make performance of military obligations uniform and all-inclusive. It is realized that universal military training cannot be established overnight. Recognition must be given to the demands now placed upon the manpower, equipment, and facilities required for our Armed Forces stationed in this country and throughout the world.

A different situation will confront us when peace is restored in Vietnam and hundreds of thousands of servicemen are returned to civilian life.

Requirements, standards, times, and duration of training under universal military service may well be drawn to meet the needs of the Nation.

Universal military training will inculcate into the individual a realization of his obligations to his country and will, it is believed, develop into a most equitable and desirable long-range military manpower program.

I respectfully request that the printed record of the hearings of this subcommittee carry the full text of the report of the American Legion's Select Committee on Manpower.

LIVESTOCK PROCESSING COST HIKES ADVERSELY AFFECT BOTH CONSUMERS AND FARMERS

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, as a farmer I have read with more than passing interest the testimony given last week before the Special Studies Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee on retail beef prices.

The testimony given before the subcommittee shows that there is real need for the livestock and meat industry to achieve better public understanding of the economics behind price changes and why they frequently appear to be too high to consumers. One area to which I would like to address my remarks, as a contribution to bringing about a better understanding, concerns the problems of the beef packing industry, particularly in the Upper Midwest, in maintaining a satisfactory level of earnings and how these problems may well cause higher prices to consumers or lower prices to farmers or both.

Since the end of World War II the beef packing industry has undergone major adjustments which have resulted in the demise of the traditional terminal-market operations in Chicago, and the beginning of a trend toward locating slaughtering plants in small towns and cities in what has come to be known as the "Beef Belt" of Mid-America.

Accompanying this trend has been the modernization of beef packing plants and the introduction of automated, assembly line techniques. One plant recently opened has the capacity to process 10,000 head of cattle per week. Although this has resulted in greater efficiency and reduced operating costs, profits in the beef packing industry have continued to dwindle despite rising beef prices. A major contributing factor, apart from rising labor costs, has been the substantial increase in slaughter capacity without a corresponding rise in the number of cattle available for slaughter.

In the five-State area of North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, and Minnesota, for example, slaughter capacity today exceeds available cattle supplies by over 2 million head. The effects of this excess capacity on the earnings of three major independent beef packers in the area is clearly demonstrated in the following table:

SLAUGHTER CAPACITY AND AVAILABILITY OF FED CATTLE IN IOWA, NEBRASKA, NORTH AND SOUTH DAKOTA, AND MINNESOTA VERSUS NET EARNINGS OF 3 BEEF PACKERS

Year	Slaughter capacity ^{1,2}	Cattle availability ^{2,3}	Capacity coverage	Average earnings of the 3 largest regional packers in the upper Midwest, dollars per share ⁴
1964	8.8	8.8	-----	\$2.10
1965	9.8	8.9	0.9	1.74
1966	10.3	9.8	.5	1.38
1969 ⁵	12.7	10.5	2.2	.82

¹ Federally inspected plants on a 40-hour basis, varying dates, Apr. 1, 1964, Oct. 1, 1965, Nov. 1, 1966, Apr. 1, 1969. Based on Government reports.

² Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

³ Cattle on feed Apr. 1 multiplied by 2.3 to equal availability of cattle on an annual rate basis.

⁴ Based on published reports of 3 Midwest companies primarily engaged in beef slaughtering.

⁵ Slaughter capacity figures not available for 1967 and 1968.

As the table indicates, the ability of the packer to turn a profit is contingent upon the ratio of slaughter capacity to available cattle supplies. In 1964, for example, when capacity and supply were about equalized, the average earnings of the three packers, as shown in the table, peaked to \$2.10 per share. Since then, as the imbalance between capacity and supply has expanded, there has been a proportionate decrease in the earnings of these and other beef packers in the Upper Midwest.

This situation has created serious and far reaching economic problems for an industry which is vital to the prosperity of an important segment of the American economy. Instability in the industry has resulted in the closing of several major plants in the Upper Midwest region in the past 5 years. Recently a major packer canceled plans to complete the construction and opening of a new

plant at Tama, Iowa. Consequently, the investment community has shown a lessening of confidence in the viability of the industry.

In addition, there have been at least two beef packing plant bankruptcies in the past 3 years. Since investors in these plants are characteristically residents of the community where the plant is located, failure can mean regional economic disaster. In one instance, total losses amounted to \$1,800,000. Of this amount, some \$650,000 was lost by stockholders, and, just as significantly, livestock producers who were creditors of the plant lost in excess of half a million dollars.

But despite the closing of plants and a continued, but moderate increase in the growth rate of beef cattle throughout the Upper Midwest, the problem of excess of slaughter capacity over supply still remains a critical one to the beef packers in the area.

This can be better understood by looking at the relatively simple economics of the beef packing business. The packer buys the steer, slaughters it and sells the carcass and offal. The difference between the price paid for the live animal and the price received for the end products is gross margin. Gross margin, however, is largely a market function not entirely controllable by management of any one company. In periods when cattle supplies are reduced, prices normally and naturally trend up. Added to this price hike on the farm is the fact that since the plants are slaughtering at less than optimum level, the fixed cost per head for plant facilities also rises creating a double impact that has to be taken out of the farmer or the consumer.

To determine the profit a company makes per head in its slaughter operation, killing costs—which include direct and indirect labor costs, overhead, and so forth—are deducted from the gross margin. If gross margin shrinks, the profit has a tendency to be reduced even more percentagewise, as killing costs generally rise in periods of reduced supply since overhead costs are being spread over fewer units.

Some progress has been made by the industry in coping with the problem of excess capacity. However, in construction of new plants the further expansion of slaughter capacity will only serve to further aggravate the situation. If other capacity results in a higher cost per animal slaughtered this higher cost can only be passed on to the housewives—already marching in revolt against increasing beef prices—or far more likely to the farmer who is the one individual who cannot set his own prices and has to take what the market will give him. No one, thereby, benefits from this overconstruction of new plants.

Part of the blame for the growth in slaughter capacity must be laid at the door of newly formed management groups. With the great success of a few publicly owned regional slaughterers being widely publicized they have found it relatively easy to convince the investing public and financial institutions of the ease of profitability by exploiting theories of ability of producing cheaper and

more efficiently than existing facilities through construction of high-volume, highly automated slaughtering plants. The construction of these plants has led to some of the problems now faced by packers as well as unfortunate experiences for investors and communities which have aggressively competed for the construction of new plants within their areas.

The time has, therefore, come for both the industry and the investing community to more closely scrutinize their plans for increasing slaughter capacity beyond that which given areas can supply or are willing to supply in fed livestock, such as has happened in recent years in the upper Midwest.

IMPOSSIBLE DREAM

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include an editorial in the RECORD telecast by one of the leading TV newscasters and editors in Memphis, Tenn., Mr. Norman Brewer, news editor of WMC-TV.

I am extremely proud of the efforts of the Memphis Police Department in working for the total elimination of all crime, and would like to share this idea for a maximum effort for a one crime-free day with the hope that it could grow into 365 crime-free days.

Mr. Brewer's comments follow:

Each of us, I suppose, has his own "impossible dream." For me it's one round of golf under par. For Spook Murphy it's one season without fair-weather fans. And for Frank Holloman it's one day without crime.

Mr. Holloman is about to test his particular dream but he will need a lot of help. Tomorrow, October 10th, is the day the Memphis Police Department has chosen to work for the total elimination of all crime. For a couple of weeks now, the citizens have been urged to "light, lock and look" tomorrow. That means, light the houses and businesses, lock all doors, and look for suspicious people and suspicious circumstances. The police will have every available man and machine on the streets. The message has been carried to the people of Memphis in the newspapers, and on the radio and television stations. In addition, volunteers from the Memphis Real Estate Board and from several of the charitable agencies have taken the word in door-to-door marches through the neighborhoods. In short, Memphis has been informed. We hope Memphis is ready.

The idea for a maximum effort at one crime-free day is a good one. It is also unrealistic, but that does not mean that the police and the citizens of this city shouldn't try. There is no doubt that the level of crime can and will be sharply reduced. An alert city and an overwhelming force of police manpower can prove an effective, if not irresistible, combination. Together they can make a dramatic demonstration of how to fight crime, and not only for one day. The real hope and worth of this effort is that citizen alertness—lighted homes, locked doors, and watchful eyes—will continue after October 10th. If it does, Mr. Holloman will enjoy a measure of his impossible dream. For me, and probably for Spook, there's much less hope.

JUDGE JOHN L. NIBLACK, OF MARION COUNTY, IND., CIRCUIT COURT, WRITES ON VALUE OF NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the major, burning questions in education today is, shall we retain the neighborhood school concept, or shall we bus schoolchildren all over.

Hon. John L. Niblack, judge of the Marion County, Ind., Circuit Court, wrote an eloquent defense of the neighborhood school in a letter to the editor of the Indianapolis News, on October 16, 1969. The letter follows:

NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEWS: While the debate continues unabated as to the virtues of the neighborhood school as opposed to the virtues of busing children hither and yon, I would like to add one more note to the general discussion.

In the first place, it is apparent that most children and their parents are opposed to busing. People have pride in the neighborhood schools. It is convenient to attend and it is more convenient for the PTA Association, and to have the parents visit open house. Likewise, most people will object to the time consumed in having their children hauled from one end of the county to the other. Finally, there is the expense involved of buying buses and what not, when the schools do not have enough money to pay the teachers the salary they deserve.

In the second place, our reformers and liberal pundits who believe all ills of the nation can be cured by busing school children around blithely ignore the provisions of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which reads as follows: "Desegregation shall not mean the assignment of the students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance." To start drawing the school district lines in the face of this congressional act will invite more litigation.

As to the logic of the situation, these Northern "liberals" who would bus children all over the county away from their neighborhood schools are rowing in the same boat with the Southern gentleman of the Democratic party, who, for a hundred years, insisted that children of one color must go to certain schools while children of other colors must go to another school. They say, in effect: "You shall be assigned to a special school because your color is green, or your color is yellow." They refuse to recognize that all children as well as all adults stand equal before the law and that no child should be discriminated against because of his color or race.

One of the intense advocates of busing children, a while back, expressed a view that the neighborhood school was a "sacred cow" in the eyes of people who do not believe in progress and that it was not such an American tradition at all. The neighborhood school has been an American tradition ever since the schools have been instituted. Everybody went to the nearest school and took intense pride in their own local school. There has been too much destruction of American tradition in destroying the home and the church, and now the folks want to scramble the school system so no child would have his loyalty to his own neighborhood school.

Under the United States law and under the

law of common sense, the neighborhood school should be our ideal.

JOHN L. NIBLACK,
Judge, Marion County Circuit Court,
INDIANAPOLIS.

J. P. STEVENS & CO. AND JUDGE HAYNSWORTH

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, last year the Special Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor conducted hearings and rendered a report on the sufficiency of existing remedies under the National Labor Relations Act. The subcommittee concluded that these remedies are wholly inadequate to protect the rights the National Labor Relations Act purportedly confers upon workers to form unions and bargain collectively, if they so choose. Through wide areas of the country these supposed guarantees of the statute have become a mockery.

Some of the testimony before the subcommittee dealt with J. P. Stevens & Co. J. P. Stevens is the Nation's second largest textile manufacturer.

And it is the Nation's most flagrant and persistent violator of the National Labor Relations Act.

In 1963 Textile Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO, began a drive to organize Stevens' employees in over 20 of its North and South Carolina mills. Stevens responded with widespread violations of the National Labor Relations Act, including firing 71 workers for joining the union. (See J. P. Stevens & Co., 157 NLRB 869, enforced 380 F. 2d 292, cert. denied, 389 U.S. 292.)

While the legal proceedings stemming from Stevens' first wave of violations were underway, Stevens engaged in a new series of blatant violations, including discharging employees who had testified against it. (See J. P. Stevens & Co., 163 NLRB No. 24, enforced 388 F. 2d 896, cert. denied, 393 U.S. 836.) In this second proceeding the NLRB trial examiner stated:

The record of the 1965 hearing reflects the continued, systematic determination of this employer as revealed by the record of the 1964 hearing, to destroy the union root and branch by discharging its most active members on any pretext which might come to hand, or could be intended, by threatening to discharge others unless they came to management and renounced the Union, and by provoking the resignation of still others from Respondent's employment. No other conclusion can be drawn than that Respondent has largely succeeded in its purpose.

While the second round of hearings was in progress Stevens engaged in yet further flagrant violations of law. In this third round of legal proceedings the trial examiner was Boyd Leedom, Chairman of the NLRB during President Eisenhower's administration and former judge of the South Dakota Supreme Court.

Judge Leedom found that 13 more workers had been discharged either because of their union activity or because they had given testimony in the prior board proceeding, and he declared that company witnesses were almost uniformly untruthful on the witness stand. And he pinpointed the true nature of Stevens' plot to deny its workers the right to have a union:

It is clear to me that substantially all the law violation of the Respondent, as I have found it to exist from the record of the evidence here and my best interpretation of it, must stem from the decision of one man or a very few men at the top would not only correct the offenses committed against the employees, but would relieve personnel in the lower levels of management of the obviously distasteful duty of participating in an active program of perversion of justice.

And so it has gone. Incredible as it may seem, the NLRB is now issuing a complaint on the ninth series of unfair labor practices committed by Stevens in this one organizing campaign. In addition contempt proceedings have been brought by the Board in Stevens I, and the court of appeals in New York has designated a special master to hear these proceedings.

In Stevens I the company has, under court order, paid out \$654,673.56 in back-pay, and has offered reinstatement to 70 illegally discharged employees. However, at last report only 16 of these workers were working in Stevens plants. Most had declined to come back. Thus Stevens has effectively destroyed the union cadre in the plants, and presumably it regards that as worth the cost.

A few days ago the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit decided what is called Stevens V—it deals with the fifth successive round of unfair labor practices by that company. The court's decision substantiates everything that the special subcommittee found.

Here is what the court said:

Brown, Chief Judge: Only three things distinguish this case from the run-of-the-mill §§ 8(a)(1), 8(a)(3) labor cases. The first is the tenacity with which the Employer persists in the exercise of deep seated anti-union convictions. The second is the succession of formal cases culminating in the present one bearing five service strips in which, except for minor variations, the Board's findings of spectacular Employer violations of §§ 8(a)(1), 8(a)(3) and 8(a)(5) of the Act have been upheld by three Courts of Appeals. The third is the Board's efforts to devise some character of remedy which has at least some prospects of keeping the recalcitrant Employer's intransigence within the bounds of vigorous but lawful opposition to Union attempts to organize units in a multistate industrial complex.

As Stevens V, this case, joining the list of predecessors, has a like outcome. We enforce.

Stevens has been engaged in a massive multistate campaign to prevent unionization of its Southern plants. This campaign has involved numerous flagrant unfair labor practices including coercive interrogation, surveillance, threat of plant closings, and economic reprisals for Union activity. Moreover, the threats have been made good by extensive discriminatory discharges.

I have asked permission that the entire

opinion be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

This latest revelation about the lawless, union-busting activities of J. P. Stevens is of particular interest in connection with the nomination of Judge Haynsworth to the Supreme Court.

For Judge Haynsworth has held stock, and a substantial block of it, in J. P. Stevens ever since he has been on the Federal bench. It was a principal client of his, and he continued to feel so close to it, even after he went on the bench, that he would not have sat on its cases, he said, even if he had not held stock.

Judge Haynsworth does not feel that degree of intimacy with any other company, for he has sat on lots of cases involving former clients and lots of cases where he held stock in one of the litigants.

I think it is nice that Judge Haynsworth does not seem to have sat on any cases involving Stevens itself, but he has sat on cases of vital importance to the whole textile industry, such as the famous Darlington case. And I find it disturbing that a Federal judge has chosen throughout his judicial career to hold stock in a company which habitually and flagrantly violates the National Labor Relations Act as a deliberate corporate policy.

That sort of association raises the gravest doubts in my mind whether Judge Haynsworth is capable of enforcing the Nation's labor relations laws fairly and impartially.

The opinion referred to follows:

[In the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit]

J. P. STEVENS & CO., INC., PETITIONER-RESPONDENT, v. NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, RESPONDENT-PETITIONER—No. 26246
(And reverse title)

(Petition for review and cross-application for enforcement of an order of the National Labor Relations Board (Georgia case) (October 3, 1969))

Before Brown, Chief Judge, Ainsworth, Circuit Judge and Comiskey, District Judge. BROWN, Chief Judge. Only three things distinguish this case from the run-of-the-mill §§ 8(a)(1), 8(a)(3) labor cases. The first is the tenacity with which the Employer persists in the exercise of deep seated antiunion convictions. The second is the succession of formal cases culminating in the present one bearing five service stripes in which, except for minor variations, the Board's findings of spectacular Employer violations of §§ 8(a)(1), 8(a)(3) and 8(a)(5) of the Act have been upheld by three Courts of Appeals. The third is the Board's efforts to devise some character of remedy which has at least some prospects of keeping the recalcitrant Employer's intransigence within the bounds of vigorous but lawful opposition to Union attempts to organize units in a multistate industrial complex.

As *Stevens V* this case, joining the list of predecessors,¹ has a like outcome. We enforce.

The Board concluded that Stevens had violated §§ 8(a)(1) and (3) by discriminatorily discharging four employees, engaging in surveillance of Union activity, interrogating employees about Union activity, and making threats of discharging employees for Union activity and threats of closing plants if the Union² was recognized.

To the usual, traditional requirement of reinstatement and back pay for the § 8(a)(3) discharges and cease and desist order of

§ 8(a)(1) violations with posting for a specified period, the Board's order additionally required that (1) the notice to employees be read to the assembled employees on shift-time, (2) it be mailed to the employees homes, (3) the Union, upon request, be given access for one year to the company bulletin boards and (4) the Union be furnished a list of the names and addresses of all Stevens employees working in the plants where the violations occurred.⁴

We focus on requirements of the order (d), (e), (f), and (g) since the §§ 8(a)(1) and (3) violations warrant no detailed treatment. In the first place, with no real concession at all, Stevens has apparently abandoned its attack on the record support for the findings of coercive surveillance of Union activity, interrogation and threats, which are classic, albeit crude, unlawful labor practices.⁵

Although Stevens does claim that there is not substantial evidence to support the finding that the four employees were discriminatorily discharged,⁶ our examination of the record convinces us that in these run-of-the-mill incidents on which the Board, not the Court, has to pass upon the credibility of the witnesses, we cannot say the findings are unsupported by substantial evidence on the record as a whole. *Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. v. NLRB*, 5 Cir., 1966, 354 F.2d 707, 709. Nor can we say the record reflects bias or unfairness on the Trial Examiner's part as Stevens seems to contend. See *NLRB v. Bush Hog, Inc.*, 5 Cir., 1968, 405 F.2d 755; *NLRB v. Dixie Gas Inc.*, 5 Cir., 1963, 323 F.2d 433, 437.

But to the special requirements of the Board's order (see note 4 *supra*) it once again levels its full but unsuccessful broadside.

Stevens has been engaged in a massive multistate campaign to prevent unionization of its Southern plants. This campaign has involved numerous flagrant unfair labor practices including coercive interrogation, surveillance, threat of plant closings, and economic reprisals for Union activity. Moreover, the threats have been made good by extensive discriminatory discharges. As a result of these practices, several unfair charges have been brought before the Labor Board (see note 7 *supra*) and, except for slight variations, the orders of the Board have been enforced by two other Circuit Courts of Appeals in *Stevens I, II, and III and IV* (see note 1 *supra*). As the Fourth Circuit said in assessing the company's conduct in *Stevens III and IV*, "the Board properly took into consideration the unfair labor practices that *Stevens I and II* disclosed, and we, in turn, cannot ignore this evidence. *Maphis Chapman Corp. v. NLRB*, 386 F.2d 298, 303 (4th Cir. 1966)". *Stevens III and IV* at 1019. Nor can we, in our subsequent turn, ignore the unfair labor practices disclosed in *Stevens III and IV*. To these we add the incidents and violations found by the Board to have occurred in the Georgia plants. Thus we assay the order in this atmosphere of persistent, long continued, flagrant violations occurring after and in spite of repeated declarations of illegality by Board and reviewing Courts.

In determining whether a particular affirmative action ordered by the Board pursuant to its powers under § 10(c), 28 U.S.C.A. 160(c), is appropriate, the reviewing Court must pay an unusually high degree of respect to the Board's conclusion—these remedies are "peculiarly a matter of administrative competence." *Fibreboard Paper Products Corp. v. NLRB*, 1964, 379 U.S. 203, 216, 85 S.Ct. 378, 406, 13 L.Ed.2d 233. In *Virginia Electric & Power Co. v. NLRB*, 1943, 319 U.S. 533, — S.Ct. —, 87 L.Ed. 1568, the Supreme Court stated it in stringent terms: "[The order] should stand unless it can be shown that the order is a patent attempt to achieve ends other than those

which can fairly be said to effectuate the policies of the Act." at 319 U.S. 540, — S.Ct. —, 87 L.Ed. 1574. Fresh emphasis on the peculiar respect due Board determination of remedies has been given by the Supreme Court in *NLRB v. Gissel Packing Co., Inc.*, — U.S. —, — S.Ct. —, 23 L.Ed.2d 547:

"It is for the Board and not the Courts * * * to make [the] determination [of remedies], based on its estimates as to the effects on the election process of unfair labor practices of varying intensity. In fashioning its remedies under the broad provisions of § 10(c) of the Act * * * the Board draws on a fund of knowledge and expertise all its own, and its choice of remedy must therefore be given special respect by reviewing Courts." at — U.S. —, 89 S.Ct. —, 23 L.Ed.2d 577, n.32 (emphasis added).

And, in upholding a Board's order compelling the payment of fringe benefits as a part of the remedy for a § 8(a)(5), violation the Court said of § 10(c) this "Grant of remedial power is a broad one." *NLRB v. Strong*, 1969, — U.S. —, 89 S.Ct. —, 21 L.Ed. 546.

The policy behind *Virginia Electric, supra*, *Gissel Packing Co., Inc., supra*, and the many others, see, e.g., *Phelps Dodge Corp. v. NLRB*, 313 U.S. 177, 194, 61 S.Ct. 845, —, 85 L.Ed. 1271, —; *J. H. Rutter-Rex Mfg. Co. v. NLRB*, 5 Cir., 1968, 399 F.2d 356, as § 10(c) expresses, is to require the recalcitrant offender "to take such affirmative action * * * as will effectuate the policies of this [Act]." That sweeping permissive command brings into play the equally broad declarations of the basic rights of employees under § 7, 29 U.S.C.A. § 157.⁹ In order to enable employees to enjoy these rights, especially in lawful efforts to organize for collective representation, there are many instances in which the inescapably negative cease and desist order will not suffice. Nor is the reinstatement with backpay order universally and fully effective. In the first place, this merely assuages the direct economic injury suffered by the victims of unlawful discrimination, except to hold out some hope that the incidents will not recur because each will be met by this mild sanction, the backpay order's impact on the efforts of the remaining employees to organize is at best uncertain.⁹

In many instances the combination of a cease and desist order with reinstatement and backpay and a traditional posting of the notice will be adequate. But where the employer demonstrates not once or twice, or three or four times, but five times that it will not abide by the demands of the law, to limit the Board to these remedies would leave both the Board and the Court of Appeals in frustrating helplessness. This would be to deny the obvious Congressional purpose behind § 10(c)—to have available remedies necessary "as will effectuate" the Act.

The Courts not only may, they must, permit a good deal of flexibility and adaptation in the remedies prescribed. The obligation to respond to contemporary demands for resourceful and imaginative judicial ingenuity, *Bros. Inc. v. W. E. Grace Mfg. Co.*, 5 Cir., 1965, 351 F.2d 208, 209, n.1, *cert. denied*, 1966, 383 U.S. 936, 86 S.Ct. 1065, 15 L.Ed.2d 852, ought not to be left to Judges alone. The responsibility must rest on all adjudicators.¹⁰ Certainly, as this Court recognizes, meeting this obligation involves being hospitable to the distinctions born of differences.¹¹

In light of these general principles, how fares the objections urged by a four time loser to the specific elements of the order? First, and easily dealt with, is the requirement that a notice of the Board's order (see subparagraph (d) and "Notice to employees" note 4 *supra*) be sent to each employee's home.¹² This requirement does not place any real financial strain on Stevens and imposes no serious technical problems. Moreover, it surely aids in dispelling the chilling effect of

Footnotes at end of article.

Stevens' practices by giving the employee an opportunity in the privacy of his home to see that someone stronger than J. P. Stevens & Co. has a voice in protecting those who wish to support the Union. *Stevens I* at 305, *Stevens II* at 906, and *Stevens III and IV* at 1022; *Standard Oil Co. v. NLRB*, 9 Cir., 1968, 399 F.2d 639; *NLRB v. H. W. Elson Bottling Co.*, 6 Cir., 1967, 379 F.2d 223.

The second element of the order requiring the Company to read the notice to the employees (see subparagraph (g) note 4 *supra*) would perhaps present a more difficult question if, as Stevens urges, we have to read *NLRB v. Laney & Duke Storage Warehouse Co., Inc.*, 5 Cir., 1966, 369 F.2d 859 as the law of the Medes and Persians which altered not. But we think Judge Feinberg in *Stevens I*, at 304-5 characterized our action correctly as "albeit without much discussion * * * [and] although it had enforced such a provision in the past. *Jackson Tile Mfg. Co. v. NLRB*, 272 F.2d 181 (5th Cir., 1959)." While on that record, for the needs of that case, we declined to enforce a Board order requiring the employer to read a notice "to each employee, singly or collectively", because it was unnecessarily embarrassing and humiliating to management, *NLRB v. Laney & Duke Storage Co., Inc.*, *supra* at 869, embarrassment takes on a minor value when outweighed by the necessity of effectuating the policies of the National Labor Relations Act. The necessities which become exigencies are as variable as industrial life itself. Thus, in *NLRB v. Texas Electric Cooperative, Inc.*, 5 Cir., 1968, 398 F.2d 722, we enforced a Board order requiring the employer to read the notice because it was shown that a large number of the employees were illiterate. Moreover, in *NLRB v. Bush Hog, Inc.*, 5 Cir., 1968, 405 F.2d 755, against a similar *Laney & Duke* assault, this Court also enforced a Board order requiring the employer to read the notice. There we said:

"Where . . . the Board has found numerous infringements of protected rights and a low literacy level among the company employees, we cannot hold that the Board abused its discretion in the notice reading requirement of the present order." 405 F.2d at 759.

But it misreads the categorical imperative of § 10(c) and the elasticity woven into it by *Gissel*, and others, to think that illiteracy or low intelligence levels are the only justifications for this remedy. After all, the traditional posting of the notice has a therapy beyond mere communication. In a world of widespread publicity, aided by vigilant or militant organizers, it is unlikely that a Board order or the Court enforcement of it would be unknown to the affected workers. A part of the medicine is the traditional acknowledgement that the employer has, but will not again, deny employees' rights. For repeated violations persisted in despite intervening declarations of illegality, the Board is warranted in impliedly concluding that such conduct has created a chill atmosphere of fear and, further, in recognizing that the reading requirement is an effective but moderate way to let in a warming wind of information and, more important, reassurance.¹³ Certainly it is not "a patent attempt to achieve ends other than those which can fairly be said to effectuate the policies of the Act." *Virginia Electric & Power Co. v. NLRB*, 1943, 319 U.S. 533, 540, — S.Ct. —, —, 87 L.Ed. 1568, 1574.

We likewise enforce that part of the Board's order requiring the company to give the Union reasonable¹⁴ access for a year to the company bulletin boards (see subparagraph (e) note 4 *supra*). We do this even though there was no specific showing that the Union was unable to disseminate its lawful propaganda.¹⁵

Here the employees who were active in the Union effort and who distributed Union literature were discriminatorily discharged.

More than that, the Employer's opposition leading to illegal excesses was not localized to the Georgia plants. Employees, too, may get the word. And that word was the story revealed by *Stevens I, II, III and IV*. The warning was there for all to heed. And yet communication of a desire to try—if not to succeed—in organizing for collective action in dealing with this huge and powerful business, is one of the basic aims of the Act. But how to communicate when history proves that identifiable activity imperils the job of the actor? In light of the fear and reluctance on the part of the employees to engage in lawful solicitation that Stevens' conduct must have engendered—a likelihood which §§ 8(a) (1) and (3) show was within congressional contemplation—providing the Union with access to a bulletin board was clearly not a "patent attempt to achieve ends other than those which can be fairly said to effectuate the policies of the Act." *Virginia Electric, supra*. Surely, the Board could conclude that this rather impersonal outlet for Union views was necessary to eliminate the employees' apprehension of incurring the risk of discharge or other retaliation if they engaged in personal solicitation either in or out of the plant.¹⁶ See *NLRB v. H. W. Elson Bottling Co.*, 6 Cir., 1967, 379 F.2d 273.

For like reasons we enforce the portion of the Board's order requiring Stevens to make available to the Union a list of the names and addresses of the plants' employees. (See subparagraph (f) note 4 *supra*.) Stevens argues that the Board's remedy is not appropriate because the "obvious and unabashed objective behind this 'remedy' is to aid the Union in organizing Stevens' employees * * *."

That it may be. But so is a publicized cease and desist order or wild-fire awareness of a reinstatement and backpay order for four employees. See *Stevens II* at 905-06. On the surface, this may appear to be making the lot of the Union easier. But, it is being made easier solely because the employer has made that lot *harder* than the law tolerates.

It bears emphasis that the protected collective activity—and conversely the object of formidable employer opposition—was attempting to organize. A remedy "to effectuate the policies of * * * this [Act]", § 10(c), must dispel, compensate for, or at least neutralize, the frustrating effects of persistent illegal activity. One way, of course, is to assure accurate, effective communication by methods or means which can be demonstrably free from employer retaliation.¹⁷ A list of names and addresses affords two ready ways insulated from discriminatory reprisal—(1) personal visitation and (2) direct mail.

And, while invoked and enforced here to meet the exigencies of unregenerate employer illegality, this remedy gives a certain symmetry in the administration of the Act. Quite apart from, and even in the absence of, employer unfair labor practice opposition, the Board has the power to compel the employer to furnish the names and addresses of employees prior to, and as a part of, a board conducted election. The Board's *Excelsior* rule, earlier upheld by this and the Fourth Circuit¹⁸ was expressly approved in *NLRB v. Wyman-Gordon Co.*, 1969, — U.S. —, 89 S.Ct. —, 22 L. Ed. 2d 709.¹⁹

This nominally puts us in opposition to the Second Circuit's holding in *Stevens II*, at 905, in which that Court relied on *NLRB v. Babcock & Wilcox Co.*, 1956, 351 U.S. 105, 76 S.Ct. 679, 100 L. Ed. 975, which denied non-employees access to the company's property for distribution of Union literature. But not really, for that Court, virtually confessing its own mistake in, having denied a transfer of *Stevens I*, at 306 n. 16, from the Second to the Fourth Circuit where geographically "the action is", would undoubtedly now enforce this provision because, first, the Fourth Circuit has done so in *Stevens III and IV* at 1022-25, and second, *Stevens III, IV and V*

prove that the remedy of *Stevens II* was not stringent enough.²⁰

As the leitmotif in this opus in a major or minor key is the necessity that, within permissible limits, the remedy be tuned to the exigencies of the case, we would emphasize as do all the cases approving adaptability that this opinion does not stand as a precedent for the use of any one or more or all of subparagraphs (d) (e) (f) (g) (see note 4 *supra*) in any particular case. It all depends.

We deny the petition for review and grant the crosspetition to enforce.
Order enforced.

FOOTNOTES

¹For ease of reference we continue the numerical identification employed by the Fourth Circuit in *Stevens III and IV*:

Stevens I: J. P. Stevens & Co. v. NLRB, 2 Cir., 1967, 380 F.2d 292, cert. denied, 389 U.S. 1005, — S.Ct. —, — L.Ed. (2d) —.

Stevens II: Textile Workers Union of America v. NLRB, 2 Cir. 1967, 388 F.2d 896.

Stevens III and IV: J. P. Stevens & Co. v. NLRB, 4 Cir., 1968, 406 F.2d 1017.

The present case, which reviews the Board's June 12, 1968 order, will be referred to as *Stevens V*.

²The violations in this case occurred in Stevens' Dublin, Georgia plants, which are two of approximately 70 plants operated by the company throughout North and South Carolina and Georgia, in which the company is engaged in the manufacture and sale of cloth goods and other products.

³The union involved in this case is the Textile Workers Union of America.

⁴The order provided:

"(d) Inform the employees of their rights under the Act and assure them that Respondent will not engage in the conduct from which it is ordered herein to cease and desist, and that Respondent will comply with the affirmative requirements of this order by mailing a copy of the attached notice marked "Appendix A" to each employee of its Dublin and Nathaniel plants, Dublin, Georgia, and posting copies thereof at the said plants for 60 consecutive days thereafter, in conspicuous places, including all places where notices to employees are customarily posted. Reasonable steps shall be taken by the Respondent to insure that said notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material."

"(e) Upon request of the Union, immediately grant the Union and its representatives reasonable access at the Dublin and Nathaniel plants, for a 1-year period, to its bulletin boards and all places where notices to employees are customarily posted."

"(f) Upon request of the Union, made within 1 year of the issuance date of this Decision, immediately give to the Union a list of the names and addresses of all employees in its Dublin and Nathaniel plants."

"(g) Convene during working time, by departments and by shifts, all its employees in the said plants, and a responsible official of the Respondent, at department supervisor level or above, or a Board agent shall read to department employees the contents of the attached Appendix A."

"(h) Notify the Regional Director for Region 10, in writing, within 10 days from the date of the Order, what steps have been taken to comply herewith."

The notice to be read and mailed to employees reads:

"Notice to all employees pursuant to the recommended order of a trial examiner of the National Labor Relations Board and in order to effectuate the policies of the National Labor Relations Act we hereby notify our employees that:

We will not discharge any employee because of union activities or for antiunion reasons or for filing charges with the Labor Board.

We will not spy on union meetings or on employees attending them or on any union activities.

We will not threaten employees with loss of jobs or the closing or moving of the plant or with any kind of different treatment because they attended union meetings or engaged in union activities or chose a union to represent them.

We will give back to Robert Brown, Rollin Dewitt Loyd, Larry Kelley, and Larry Greenway their jobs and seniority, and we will make up the pay they lost and also pay them 6 percent interest.

The National Labor Relations Act gives all employees these rights:

To organize themselves.
To form, join, or help unions.
To bargain as a group through a representative they choose.
To act together for collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.

To refuse to do any or all of these things we will not interfere with any of these rights including your rights to join or assist Textile Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO, or any other union of your choice.—J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc. (Employer)".

⁵ See [surveillance] NLRB v. Southland Paint Co., 5 Cir., 1968, 394 F.2d 717, 719-20; NLRB v. Bouden Co., 5 Cir., 1968 392 F.2d 412, 414, n.3; NLRB v. Citizens Hotel Co., 5 Cir., 1963, 313 F.2d 708; [interrogation] NLRB v. Camco Inc., 5 Cir., 1965 340 F.2d 803, 807 cert. denied, 382 U.S. 926, 5 S.Ct. —, — L. Ed. 2d —; NLRB v. Griggs Equipment Co., 5 Cir., 1962, 307 F.2d 275, 278; [threats] Textile Workers v. Darlington Mfg. Co., 1965, 380 U.S. 263, 274, n.20, — S.Ct. —, — L.Ed.2d —, —; NLRB v. Neuhoff Bros. Packers, Inc., 5 Cir., 1967, 375 F.2d 372, 374.

⁶ Stevens was charged with discriminatorily discharging six employees. The Trial Examiner found that two of the discharges were for cause. The Board approved this finding and it is not challenged here.

⁷ The portions of the order to which the company vigorously objects were not part of the Trial Examiner's recommended order, but were added by the Board. The Board stated its reasons as follow:

"In its exceptions, the Charging Party requested the Board to grant an order similar to that granted in *J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc.*, 167 NLRB No. 38, with some extension of its scope. Upon review of all the relevant factors herein, including the Respondent's company-wide history of extensive unfair labor practices as reflected by our decisions in *J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc. (I)*, 157 NLRB 869, *J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc. (II)*, 163 NLRB No. 24; *J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc. (III)*, 167 NLRB No. 37, and *J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc. (IV)*, 167 NLRB No. 38, we are persuaded that the conventional remedies would not be adequate to disabuse the employees of the effects of the Respondent's flagrant conduct. . . . Accordingly, we shall conform our order herein to that adopted by the Board in *J. P. Stevens (IV)*. We shall, however, modify the scope of the *J. P. Stevens (IV)* Order, by requiring Respondent herein to mail copies of the notice to employees of the Dublin and Nathaniel plants, to post copies at the Dublin and Nathaniel plants, and to furnish the Union a list of employees at these plants."

The Board, however, refused to accede to the Union's demand that Stevens also be ordered to give to the Union access to the company parking lots to distribute literature and give the Union an opportunity to reply to any anti-union speech made by company personnel.

⁸ "Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection, and shall also

have the right to refrain from any or all of such activities except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment as authorized in section 153(a)(3) of this title." 29 U.S.C.A. § 157.

⁹ There is a substantial danger that the backpay award has degenerated into "a license fee for union busting." Staff of Subcommittee on NLRB, House Committee on Education and Labor, 87th Cong., 1st Sess., Administration of the Labor-Management Relations Act by the NLRB 2 (Comm. Print 1961). See also *Stevens I*, at 303-04.

¹⁰ Resourceful and imaginative NLRB orders are essential. The labor-management relations of industry are varied and complex. Courts of Appeals cannot require the Board to use only round pegs when the holes may be square, triangular, rectangular, or even pentagonal. See Bok, *The Regulation of Campaign Tactics, in Representation Elections under the National Labor Relations Act*, 78 Harv. L. Rev. 38, 124-41 (1964); Note, *The Need for Creative Orders under Section 10(c) of the National Labor Relations Act*, 112 U. Pa. L. Rev. 69, 90-94 (1963); Note, *A Survey of Labor Remedies*, 54 Va. L. Rev. 38, 94-95 (1968).

¹¹ Thus, this Court has held that when an employer has shown a "proclivity" to violate the Act, the Board can frame its order to cease and desist in broad terms—cease and desist from "in any manner" interfering with employee rights—while if no "proclivity" to violate the act is shown, the Board must limit the scope of the order more nearly to the conduct of the particular case. *Southwire Co. v. NLRB*, 5 Cir. 1967, 383 F.2d 235; *NLRB v. Bama Co.*, 6 Cir., 1965, 353 F.2d 230.

¹² Although the Board usually requires only that the notice be posted on the Company bulletin board, the Board has often used alternative means to insure the notice is communicated to the employees. See *NLRB v. Bush Hog, Inc.*, 5 Cir., 1968, 405 F.2d 755, 758 n. 5.

¹³ The Second and Fourth Circuits have approved the requirement that the notice be read to the employees in all the previous *Stevens* cases. *Stevens I*, at 304-05; *Stevens II*, at 904; *Stevens III and IV*, at 1022. See also Judge Wright's dissent in *International Union of Electrical, R & M Workers v. NLRB*, D.C. Cir., 1967, 383 F.2d 230, 234.

¹⁴ There are ample resources to assure that the Union will abide by the Board's limitation to "reasonable access." This limitation should prevent the Union, as Stevens fears, from taking over control of the Company's plant.

¹⁵ The portion of the order giving the Union reasonable access to Company was not enforced by the Second Circuit in *Stevens I*, at 305, but in *Stevens II*, at 905, on a record the Company says was identical with *Stevens I*, that Court enforced the order. Of course, by this time the Board and Court had seen the ineffectiveness of the order in *Stevens I*.

¹⁶ When an employer has engaged in massive unfair practices, there can be a resulting fear of reprisals that must be dispelled before the situation is restored. See Bok, *The Regulation of Campaign Tactics in Representation Election under the National Labor Relations Act*, 78 Harv. L. Rev. 38, 140-41 (1964); Note, *The Need for Creative Orders under Section 10(c) of the National Labor Relations Act*, 112 U. Pa. L. Rev. 69, 90-94 (1963).

¹⁷ The list of employees serves to complement the bulletin board requirement. See subparagraph (e) note 4 *supra*.

¹⁸ *Howell Refining Co. v. NLRB*, 5 Cir., 1968, 400 F.2d 213; *NLRB v. Hanes Hosiery Div.*, 4 Cir., 1967, 384 F.2d 188.

¹⁹ Even after grant of certiorari in *Wyman-Gordon*, we adhered to *Howell*, note 18 *supra*

and granted summary reversal in *Green-dyke Transport, Inc. v. Davis*, 5 Cir., 1969, 406 F.2d 1158, which was one of the early cases in the Fifth Circuit's precalendaring judicial screening procedure. See *Murphy v. Houma Well Service*, 5 Cir., 1969, 409 F.2d 804.

²⁰ As do we, the Fourth Circuit in *Stevens III and IV*, at 1024, found support in the *Excelsior* analogy. See note 18 *supra* and related text.

CATTLEMEN, RANCHERS, AND MEAT PACKERS MAINTAINED LOW PRICES

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest achievements in productive efficiency has been accomplished by the cattlemen, ranchers, and the meat packers. The other day I was discussing inflation with my friend Roscoe Haynie, who has had many years of experience with Wilson Meat Packers. In discussing the housewives interest in food prices, we made some comparisons on meat.

An interesting base period was September 17, 1951, when the Federal Government had OPS price regulations.

Eighteen years have passed since these ceiling prices were established. Most every other segment of our economy, such as automobiles, appliances, homes, real estate, clothing, and plant wages have all had prices go up tremendously.

We realized that the accomplishments of the meat packing industry cannot be maintained indefinitely. But, here is a special salute to America's great ranchers, cattlemen, and meat packers whose efficiency has brought economy and savings to the American housewife.

Below, we have listed the September 17, 1951, ceiling prices compared to present prices taken out of the daily newspaper:

	Sept. 17, 1951, ceilings	Now
Chicago base, wholesale carcass beef:		
Choice beef.....	56.00	45.00
Good beef.....	54.00	43.00
Standard beef.....	49.00	42.50
Utility beef.....	47.00	41.50
Cutter and canner.....	42.50	42.00
Chicago base, beef cuts, wholesale:		
Rounds.....	61.00	57.00
Chucks.....	55.00	41.50
Ribs.....	68.00	60.00
Loins.....	82.50	81.00
Live cattle prices:		
Choice.....	34.20	31.50
Good.....	31.50	29.00
Standard.....	27.30	27.00
Utility.....	21.80	21.00
Cutter and canner.....	19.50	20.00

PFC. DOUGLAS S. WINN

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to advise my colleagues of an honor which has been bestowed on the son of our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. LARRY WINN.

His son, Pfc. Douglas S. Winn, who is stationed with the U.S. Army in Korea, was named "Soldier of the Month" of his battalion.

While I was in Korea last August, I had the pleasure of meeting this fine young man who is a credit to his family and his country.

Private First Class Winn, who has been assigned to the First Battalion, 31st Artillery at Camp Casey in Korea since last April, received the award from his commanding officer along with a 3-day pass.

I know our colleagues will want to join me in extending congratulations to the son of the gentleman from Kansas.

MR. AGNEW WIDENS THE GAP

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, continuing a tradition he established during last year's campaign, Vice President AGNEW has stooped to name-calling of the most base and vile nature in carrying out his apparent responsibilities as the hatchet man of the administration's southern strategy.

By calling supporters of last week's Vietnam moratorium "an effete corps of impudent snobs who characterize themselves as intellectuals," Mr. AGNEW not only impaired the dignity of the high office he holds, but senselessly lowered the level of Vietnam debate and widened the gap between Americans who, as a matter of conscience and conviction, differ on this issue.

It is curious that in adopting so much of the Vietnam policy of its predecessor, the Nixon administration has also adopted its rhetoric. Last year's "Nervous Nellies" are "effete snobs" in 1969. And in the meantime, more Americans die, national priorities are distorted further, and the divisions in our society grow deeper.

With the hope that someone in the administration will take the time and trouble to counsel the Vice President against giving vent to his baser emotions, I present for the RECORD today's New York Times editorial on Mr. AGNEW's remarks:

MR. AGNEW DOES NOT UNDERSTAND

Vice President Agnew demonstrated a truly monumental insensitivity to the most profound concern of millions of Americans—and particularly the nation's youth—when he described last week's Vietnam Moratorium as the creation of "an effete corps of impudent snobs who characterize themselves as intellectuals." He has learned nothing from the remarkable demonstration in which idealistic young men and women from the nation's campuses were joined by Americans of every generation and from all walks of life in an urgent appeal that the United States Government follow a more effective path to peace.

The purpose of the Moratorium was to underscore the need for active pursuit of peace in Vietnam. Far from undermining the President's position of leadership, it presented him with a strengthened mandate to carry out with more vigor and more determination the basic policy he says he is

pursuing. Neither he nor Mr. Agnew gives evidence of understanding what the Moratorium was all about.

Mr. Agnew darkly hinted at some treasonable duplicity because the planners of the Moratorium had failed to renounce support from Hanoi—a support they had never asked.

He sought easy applause from a Republican fund-raising audience in New Orleans by ascribing the success of the Moratorium to "a spirit of national masochism."

In the same speech, he lambasted the nation's youth in sweeping and ignorant generalizations, when it is clear to all perceptive observers that American youth today is far more imbued with idealism, a sense of service and a deep humanitarianism than any generation in recent history, including particularly Mr. Agnew's.

The ominous strains in Mr. Agnew's words are that they equate support of the war with manliness, while describing as effete those who call for a redoubling of the nation's dedication to peace. It is the mark of insecure nations and politicians to mistake unquestioning support of military ventures as the test of patriotism. This is exactly the approach to the American destiny which the most articulate and politically alert sector of the nation's young intellectuals have questioned and rejected. Mr. Agnew's incredible obtuseness can only add to the frustration of millions of Americans—young and old alike—who believe that rational dissent must be given a fair hearing. His insensitivity to this principle of American democracy will give comfort to those who preach the gospel of disruption and violence.

PITTSBURGH WOMAN—BETSY ROSS BROUGHT TO LIFE

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, last spring Sophie Wolanin of Pittsburgh appeared as Betsy Ross at the annual fund-raising event for social welfare projects sponsored by the Association of Pittsburgh Business Women's Clubs.

News of the sophisticated lady reached "the mother country" and the story was carried in the August 1969, Dictionary of International Biography, circulated in 112 countries around the world. I believe it is the first time a Pennsylvanian and a Pittsburgher has been so honored.

During this 50th anniversary of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, this week of October 19 to 25 has been set aside to spotlight woman's role in today's world.

It is certainly fitting that we call attention this week to this organization which has done so much toward seeing that women are an informed and active electorate, and to honor them for their civic and social responsibility.

I would like to pay particular tribute to Miss Sophie Wolanin and to the Business and Professional Women's Club of Pittsburgh for presenting this unique and accurate portrayal of a very important woman in our Nation's history, and I take this occasion to include the article at this point in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

BETSY ROSS BROUGHT TO LIFE

Betsy Ross the famous Philadelphia seamstress and American patriot, was recently brought to life when Sophie Wolanin, a mem-

ber of the Pittsburgh Business and Professional Women's Club, was a model in the "Fashion Trip—America" featured at the annual fund-raising benefit of the Association of Pittsburgh Business Women's Clubs held at the University Club.

The Association, comprising 12 professional and service organizations, represents some 1,100 women. Its purpose is not only active participation in community and public affairs, but benevolent and social welfare projects as well. Much of the Association's effort is channeled towards the social welfare of children—in particular, the handicapped child, and the under-privileged child, who needs extra attention—frequently providing for them in various ways and making financial contributions.

Such benevolence necessitates fund raising and this event usually takes place early in May.

Each of the 12 organizations participating in the historical pageant had one of its members portray some important woman in American history. Miss Wolanin, representing the Business and Professional Women's Club of Pittsburgh, portrayed Betsy Ross, who made the first American flag. More than 325 women attended the benefit.

The beautiful Colonial dress, which Miss Wolanin wore at the pageant was symbolical of the year 1777, when Betsy, then 25, was commissioned by a three-man committee to make the flag. This committee consisted of General George Washington, Robert Morris and George Ross, who was her uncle.

PAINSTAKING RESEARCH

The dress was made by Sophie's sister, Mrs. Stanley J. Brenick of Sharon, Pennsylvania, after careful and painstaking research into the costume history of the period.

Lending a dramatic touch to the Betsy Ross portrayal were Eagle Scout John Flower, Junior, aged 14, and Second Class Scout Jeffrey Craig, 11, both of Troop 228, Bethel, Park, Pennsylvania, who demonstrated the proper way to fold the flag.

The purpose of this demonstration was to pay honour to the flag and to instill patriotism in the citizenry viewing the pageant. The authentic flag used was loaned to Miss Wolanin by the Flag Plaza Foundation through the efforts of Mr. David J. Buerklin, director of relationships, Allegheny Trails Council of the Boy Scouts of America.

Miss Wolanin likewise demonstrated to the audience how to cut a five-pointed star. According to legend Betsy Ross made a suggestion to General Washington that five-pointed stars should be used in the flag when she was commissioned to make it.

As a souvenir of the evening, a colourful commemorative Betsy Ross envelope in which was enclosed a brief history of the first stars and stripes, as well as instructions on making those stars, was given to each woman attending the benefit.

In addition, through the efforts of a fellow co-worker, Mr. Stanley W. Litts, director of sales, Westinghouse Credit Corporation, Miss Wolanin was able to obtain on behalf of the Pittsburgh B.P.W. Club, a small supply of Ross commemorative stamps, which the United States Post Office Department issued in 1952 on the 200th anniversary of Betsy's birth. These 17-year-old stamps, considered as prized collectors items, were purchased by the women in honor of the occasion. This gesture helped increase the net proceeds of the benefit by an unexpected, but welcome, amount.

THE NARRATOR

Narrating the historical portrayal of the Ross story was a fellow B.P.W. member, Miss Grace E. Underwood. According to reports, the entire Betsy Ross Act received the popular acclaim as "best in the show."

Reviewing briefly the early history of the United States, a year after the signing of the Declaration of Independence, on June 14, 1777, the Continental Congress in Philadelphia adopted this resolution:

"That the flag of the United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be 13 stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation."

Since Congress did not specify the arrangement of the 13 stars on the blue background, Betsy had them arranged in a circle, based on the idea that no colony should take precedence.

General Washington described the symbolism of the flag as follows:

"We take the stars from heaven, the red from our mother country, separating it by white stripes, thus showing that we have separated from her, and the white stripes shall go down to posterity representing liberty."

In 1916, President Woodrow Wilson proclaimed June 14 as the anniversary of the creation of the first stars and stripes and as Flag Day, which is annually observed throughout America.

Our flag is a proud symbol of the history of our people and our country. Its 13 stripes for the original 13 colonies and its stars for every state will always serve to remind us of our struggle from a small, young country to the greatest nation on earth.

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the week of October 19 marks the 41st anniversary of the National Business Women's Week, a time specifically devoted to dramatizing the contributions of women to the professional and business world.

The first observance took place in 1928. In the years since then, women have made tremendous advances in our society. From an early effort of business and professional women to achieve acceptance and status based on their ability and accomplishments, NBWW has grown to be a nationwide observance of the contributions of women in every segment of our society.

The objectives of National Business Women's Week are noteworthy: to publicize achievements of business and professional women everywhere, on the local, State, and National levels; and to publicize the objectives and program of the national federation.

The National Federation of Business and Professional Women itself has an impressive membership of more than 180,000 women active in all the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Founded in 1919, its growth is exemplified by its emblem, the Nike—Winged Victory of Samothrace, which symbolizes progress. And the Federation of Business and Professional Women can indeed take pride in the progress it has made toward attaining its objectives, which are fourfold:

First, to elevate the standards for women in business and in the professions;

Second, to promote the interests of business and professional women;

Third, to bring about a spirit of co-

operation among business and professional women of the United States; and

Fourth, to extend opportunities to business and professional women through education for industrial, scientific, and vocational activities.

The membership of this federation represents a force which is being effectively molded for the promotion of excellence in business and government. Its voice is the voice of conscience and concern. A leader since its founding in 1919 in the effort to advance women's rights and upgrade the status of women in this Nation, its members are to be commended, encouraged, and supported in their good efforts.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the action items of this year's legislative platform adopted by the Federation of Business and Professional Women at its national convention last summer. These are proposals that would benefit men as well as women, and deserve our careful consideration. They include:

First, continued support for legislation to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex.

Second, active support for pending legislation providing for a broadened head-of-household benefit under the Internal Revenue Code; increased personal exemptions for dependents under the Internal Revenue Code; and a more equitable distribution of the tax burden.

Third, the proposal and support of legislation providing for uniform laws and regulations for men and women as to working hours, working conditions, rates of pay, equal employment opportunity, including retirement for age; equal treatment for working men and women in the area of survivor and retirement benefits; and increased child care deductions under the Internal Revenue Code.

Fourth, the proposal and support of State legislation to provide for uniform jury service and uniform qualifications in the selection of men and women to serve on grand or petit juries in any court.

Fifth, support of legislation that will bring about more effective crime control and law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, these are legislative matters which have waited long and in vain for congressional attention. For nearly 25 years in both the Senate and the House I have been sponsoring and supporting the equal rights amendment to the Constitution and legislation which would guarantee equal conditions of employment to all American citizens, regardless of age or sex. This session, I have once again introduced such legislation, and once again I hope that it will be passed.

This Nation has only gradually awoken to the energy, creativity, and potential which our womanpower possesses. I think the contributions of women to American life were possibly best summed up by President Kennedy when he said, in 1961, that:

As was foreseen by the early leaders, women have brought into public affairs great sensitivity to human need and opposition to selfish and corrupt purposes. These political contributions and the manifold activities of women in American communities are the outgrowth of a long tradition by pioneering by American women. They stand as an encouraging example to countries in which women are only now achieving equal political and social status.

During this week which is dedicated to publicizing the achievements of business and professional women everywhere, it is with admiration for these able women that I extend my best wishes to them. I congratulate President Harmon and the more than 3,800 local organizations which make up the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs on their progressive and essential work.

A SELECT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESSIONAL MAILING STANDARDS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, to say that the proper use of the franking privilege often raises complex, technical, and difficult questions for Members of Congress is to state the obvious. The franking problem is a continuing one. Every year we are faced with new questions of frankability and past answers do not always fit the new questions that arise. In our fast-paced world there is a constant changing of ideas, events, modes, and methods of communication. The result is often honest confusion for the Member confronted with a totally new franking question.

In the past Members could submit congressional material to the Post Office Department for approval and for rulings on the frankability of the matter. However, last December's decision by the Post Office that it could no longer make such rulings has left a void in this area.

Mr. UDALL of Arizona has proposed a resolution to establish a Select Committee on Congressional Mailing Standards which would fill up this gap. I join with him and with others in supporting this measure as an effective way to meet a continuing and often thorny problem. This proposal would direct the bipartisan select committee "to provide guidance, assistance, advice, and counsel, through advisory opinions or consultations or both, to any Member of the House of Representatives, upon his request in connection with the mailing or contemplated mailing by the Member of franked mail."

Such an advisory body could do much to protect both Members of Congress who had honest doubts on a question of frankability and the public who has the right to make sure that the franking privilege is used in an ethical manner. It would allow any doubts to be resolved in advance and would assure that the franking privilege was not abused.

KOREA TODAY

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, this month's Army Digest carried an interesting and informative article on our military presence in Korea. I include it in the RECORD at this point:

KOREA TODAY: THE VIGIL CONTINUES

Along 17½ miles of tense and troubled frontier, you hear the accents of Iowa farm boys, Georgia mill workers, Harvard Law grads. Some are regulars, long-term professionals; others are performing an obligation of citizenship. All have a hard and endless job—watching the line along the American sector of the Demilitarized Zone, which straddles Korea's 38th Parallel.

An entirely new generation has grown up since a gray Sunday in June 1950 when North Korea dispatched 117,000 tough, Soviet-equipped regulars south to strangle the infant Republic of Korea.

From 16 nations came a swift response. American troops spearheaded an international army, the first of its kind and purpose—the United Nations Command. It met the crisis to force the North Koreans, and the Chinese Communists who intervened to rescue them, to the conference table at Panmunjom—where recriminations still fly like shots.

Today, actual shots still fly as Communists continue to break the unquiet peace.

Soldiers of the United Nations Command are involved almost daily in some Communist-initiated act of violence along the 151-mile DMZ. Their vigilance continues against hostile raiders and infiltrators trying to move south. Throughout Korea, UNC forces react swiftly to eliminate enemy agent teams and infiltrators who strike hard and often at their positions.

In January 1968, a 31-man North Korean commando team crept into Seoul on a deadly mission—to assassinate ROK President Chung Hee Park. Intercepted a short distance from the Presidential Mansion, they were hunted down and killed or captured.

Since 1967, there have been about 1,600 incidents involving Communist violations of the Armistice, some 40 percent of which were small firefights. More than 550 enemy infiltrators and agents have been killed and nearly 50 captured.

As General C. H. Bonesteel III, commanding general, UNC/USFK/Eighth U.S. Army, observed: "With the exception of the conflict in Vietnam, nowhere else in the world today is there so direct and inflammable a confrontation between Free World forces and vicious, strong and aggressive Communists as there is along Korea's DMZ."

Despite Communist orations at the Panmunjom truce table, there is nothing to indicate that the situation has changed appreciably since the signing of the Armistice, July 27, 1953, when General Maxwell D. Taylor, then Eighth Army commanding general, told his troops: "There is no occasion for celebration or bolsterous conduct. We are faced with the same enemy, only a short distance away, and must be ready for any moves he makes."

Some of the United Nations countries who made Korea a proving ground of Free World resistance to Communist aggression have left token forces. The ROKs themselves man most of the 151-mile armed frontier. And the presence of the U.S. 2d and 7th Infantry Divisions, and 314th Air Division tells the Reds: "We're still here—and still ready."

Across the American sector of the line

stretches a security system that includes modern observation devices and a newly completed barrier fence. But the real barrier is in the hearts of the South Koreans, backed by their American and United Nations allies. Behind that protective line, this ruggedly anti-Communist country has achieved political stability and impressive economic progress, making it one of the success stories of the United States assistance program.

STRONG TRADITION

Korea is a proud nation. Its people have kept their national and cultural integrity for thousands of years, despite invasions by the Chinese, Mongols and Japanese.

Korea's location is of strategic importance. Geographically, it occupies a position athwart Communist approaches to the North Pacific. The Korean peninsula lies at the apex of three great power triangles—Russia, Red China and Japan. The capital, Seoul, is less than 500 air miles from Peking, the Chinese Communist capital, and from Harbin and Mukden, China's great industrial centers. It is even closer to Russia's ice-free port of Vladivostok.

Red China and the Soviet Union maintain substantial forces nearby. Just north of the Demilitarized Zone stands the North Korean army, third largest in the Communist world. But the ROKs remain undaunted.

Since the 1953 armistice, the Republic of Korea has built a well-led well-organized and thoroughly capable military force, which numbers among the largest in the non-Communist World. Its force of more than 500,000 is organized into two armies, five corps, 17 divisions. In addition, it has two divisions serving in Vietnam. A newly organized Home Defense militia, composed mainly of ex-servicemen, but including some 15,000 women volunteers, numbers about 1.9 million.

For the past three years, ROK soldiers have served with allied units in Vietnam. Their 48,000-man force there is noted for its toughness in combat and rugged effectiveness in civic action and psychological operations.

PROGRESS

Behind the protective shield of its determined soldiers, Korea has achieved an economic miracle. New roads, highways, factories, the stepped-up tempo of manufacturing and construction mark its long strides toward modern development. Exports, which amounted to only \$32 million in 1960, exceeded \$500 million in 1968. The Gross National Product has been climbing between 8 and 12 percent a year for the past five years.

Not only new industries but cultural and educational institutions as well are springing up all over the republic. Its literacy rate is among the highest in the world.

Korea's growth as a peaceful, prospering nation provides an inspiring example to other developing countries. In less than two decades, it has shown the world how a society can modernize and prosper under free institutions.

To developing nations around the world, Korea's visible progress toward growth and stability presents an attractive alternative to the repressive methods of totalitarian rule.

Amid the heightened tensions brought about by infiltrations and forays from the north, Korea, the Land of the Morning Calm, maintains its vigil—and its serenity. Today, ROK forces make up the bulk of the United Nations Command. Shoulder to shoulder with other members of the United Nations Command, U.S. Forces Korea and the Eighth U.S. Army, they share a common determination to stand their ground on cold and barren ridgelines to show aggressors that freedom is not an empty catchphrase—that it will be defended whenever and as often as necessary. This is Korea today.

WICHITA FALLS PUBLISHER THE FRIEND OF THREE PRESIDENTS

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rhea Howard of Wichita Falls, Tex., was recently singled out by the Dallas Times Herald as a "Friend of Three Presidents." Not only has Mr. Howard been a friend of three Presidents, but he has also been instrumental in the growth and development of his community, his State, and his Nation through his active work in the newspaper business and the Democratic Party.

The Governor of Texas, Gov. Preston Smith, once described Mr. Howard as a man who "had the nerve to walk out front, with his back to the crowd." This rare quality of leadership, Mr. Speaker, has stood for a number of years as an inspiring standard of public service to his fellow Texans. His courage and conviction have championed many causes, and it is with a great deal of pride that I would like to share the accomplishments of this Texan with my colleagues, to whom I commend Rhea Howard as an exemplary statesman:

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Oct. 8, 1969]

HELPS BUILD CITY: WICHITA FALLS PUBLISHER FRIEND OF THREE PRESIDENTS

(By Lois Luecke)

WICHITA FALLS.—A Texas publisher who earned the friendship of three U.S. presidents and whose counsel was sought by the White House says a newspaperman has to be a champion for both the community and the area in which he lives.

"I don't see how any man who runs a newspaper can dig a hole and crawl in, leaving the battleground of civic life. He must be a part of his city. He must take sides in issues. He must help solve the problems," he says.

At 77, Rhea Howard, editor and publisher of the Wichita Falls Times and Record News, a newspaper veteran of 62 years and a long-time Democratic party leader in Texas, daily practices his philosophy of journalism.

"There is no such thing as a city standing still," he will tell you. "Wichita Falls has gone forward and the newspaper has had something to do with it. A man who puts out a newspaper has to keep abreast of the times—maybe ahead of the times—to provide leadership."

Howard followed in his illustrious father's footsteps when he became head of the Times Publishing Co. upon Ed Howard's death in 1948. He was 55 when he took the helm of the newspaper his father founded in 1907. In his 21 years as publisher, associates have seen not only a continuity in the fulfillment of the Times' founding principles but a new era of involvement based on personal commitment and leadership.

He was tapped, and answered the call, for help in nearly every civic endeavor; he threw himself wholeheartedly into his political party's campaigns and has been a delegate to the last five national Democratic conventions.

Howard was one of 22 Texas publishers invited by President John F. Kennedy in October 1961 for a briefing and consultation on national and international affairs—an occasion which Howard deems "the highlight of my newspaper career."

A close friend of former President Lyndon

Johnson from the time Johnson was a freshman Texas congressman, Howard frequently corresponded with the president and talked to him by telephone, or, personally, on his numerous trips to the capital. Recently, Johnson made a special trip to Wichita Falls to have dinner with the Howard family.

Howard worked hard and successfully for the candidacies of both Kennedy and Johnson.

His newspaper was one of the few which supported President Harry Truman in 1948. Associates recall that at the dedication of the Sam Rayburn Library in Bonham, Truman singled out the publisher to shake his hand and comment, "Here's my good friend, Rhea Howard of Wichita Falls."

Howard is a member of the President's Club, a group of professional and business men in the United States. He is committee-man from the 30th Senatorial District of Texas, and a member of the Texas State Democratic Executive Committee.

His involvement in politics—which he says is the "lifeblood of the nation"—reflected an earlier day when his father became one of the "Famous 40" of the Texas Democratic delegation who voted for the hard-fought nomination of Woodrow Wilson in 1912.

But here at home in the Red River Valley, Howard is best known as a protagonist for his city, which was built, some say, on faith, oil, cattle and agriculture—in that order.

He is given much of the credit for the reactivation and growth of Sheppard Air Force Base, the largest technical training center of the Air Force. Military expenditures in the area total some \$200 million annually, bolstering the area's economic stability.

Howard served on any number of committees whose efforts culminated in building a \$57 million network of highways—the Red River Expressway system.

He has consistently reserved Page One newspaper space to promote the city's foundation fund to attract industries, and has served as a director of Industrial Development, Inc.

The same priority newspaper space is given each year to the United Fund. Popular or not, if the Times believes a bond issue for civic improvements should pass, Howard says so, editorially.

A recent front page Times editorial favoring a tax on alcoholic beverages rather than food and drugs was widely published throughout the state and a high government official said the editorial's influence spelled the difference in the new tax bill in the legislature.

His newspaper was one of the first in Texas to inaugurate a farm news department. Howard himself served some 32 years as a member of the irrigation district board.

The Times has sponsored the luncheon for 4-H Club and FFA members at the annual Junior Beef Show held in Wichita Falls since 1931.

The Times for years campaigned to have Midwestern declared a state-supported college—a dream realized in 1961. Howard now is a member of the board of directors of the Midwestern University Foundation.

Following the principle that you don't spend what you haven't got, Howard is proud "that the last brick was laid" on the Times' new \$1 million plant, and employees moved in February 1969, "it was all paid for."

The new plant is a far cry from the original. The Times was started, he recalled, in the late 1890s when his father bought the old Weekly Times, "A shirttail full of type and a George Washington hand press" for \$100. On May 14, 1907, daily publication was inaugurated.

Rhea Howard, then a "skinny newsboy," sold the first bundle. He later wrote news stories, sold ads, set type, melted lead, fed the presses and swept out.

After attending Trinity University, then at Waxahachie, and Eastman School of Busi-

ness in Poughkeepsie, N.Y., Howard returned home to become an officer in the Times Publishing Co.

Howard, like his father, had seen slimmer days. He remembers too well the Depression and the soup lines. A member of the school board, Howard recalls, "We couldn't pay the teachers without discount—only script—and we couldn't feed the children. No one was paying taxes except the utility companies."

It was perhaps this experience that led Howard later to say: "My temperament has always led me to dwell on the virtues of men and institutions rather than upon their limitations; my disposition has always been to build rather than tear down or join the wrecking crew."

It perhaps also was this experience that set afire his community spirit.

Throughout the years, Howard has kept in effect an early-day policy of the Times—no liquor advertisement. The abusive use of alcohol, the Times had concluded, broke up too many families. This policy cost the newspaper some lucrative contracts and at one time the ill will of a company stockholder. "But I think it has paid off," said Howard.

In 1960, the Headliners Club in Texas named him "Publisher of the Year." In May 1966, he was chosen to represent Texas at the Air War College at Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., where leading Americans were briefed by Pentagon officials on the awesome military power of the nation.

A member of The Associated Press, his father was one of the early-day Associated Press members, and the National Press Club in Washington; he also is active in the American Newspaper Publishers Association; the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association, the American Society of Newspaper Editors and the Texas Daily Newspaper Association. He is a member of Sigma Delta Chi, honorary journalism fraternity.

A 32nd Degree Scottish Rite mason, Howard was honored as a life member several years ago upon completion of a 50-year membership.

On July 25, 1967, an appreciative hometown observed "Rhea Howard Day," by official municipal proclamation. At a luncheon celebration, the then Lt. Gov. Preston Smith described Howard as a man who "had the nerve to walk out front, with his back to the crowd," adding, "You simply can't lead a parade from the rear."

Howard and his wife, the former Kathleen Benson of Wichita Falls, will celebrate their 56th wedding anniversary on Oct. 22, 1969. They have one daughter, Mrs. (Anna Katherine) James B. Barnett of Wichita Falls, four grandchildren and two great grandchildren.

THE NATIONAL GENERAL SERVICES PUBLIC ADVISORY COUNCIL

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the newly created National General Services Public Advisory Council has just completed its first series of meetings. I am happy to report that much progress was made in General Services Administrator Kunzig's desire to make his giant agency more responsive to the public.

The council is ably chaired by my friend and fellow Minnesotan, Mr. Robert A. Forsythe, a Minneapolis attorney and former Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He is a partner in the law firm

of Cant, Haverstock, Gray, Plant, and Mooty of Minneapolis.

Mr. Forsythe was chief counsel of the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Small Business from 1953 to 1955, was administrative assistant to the late Senator Edward J. Thye, has served on the President's Commission on Voter Registration and Participation, was a Republican candidate for the U.S. Senate in 1966, and was the State chairman of the Minnesota Republican Party from 1961 to 1965. Incidentally, he is an announced candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives in 1970.

Forsythe has a long career in public service, and I am happy that he agreed to assume the chairmanship of the National General Services Public Advisory Council. His contribution will be great, and he is to be commended for giving of his valuable time, without pay, in the interest of better government.

THE MORATORIUM

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 14, 1969

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said of the moratorium this evening, by supporters and detractors alike, that I shall endeavor to be brief. I believe it is unworthy—and foolhardy—of a democratic society to try to stifle criticism or dissent in the name of patriotism and so I fully support this untrammelled debate in the House. To all I would commend the admonition of Benjamin Franklin to the members of the Convention of 1787, another crucial period of our history, "doubt a little of your own infallibility."

Vietnam is a tortuous and complicated problem to which there are no quick and painless solutions. We may differ as to the wisest method to pursue, but on one point all Americans are united, the attainment of peace is our most immediate and important national goal. The continuing cost of the war in men, money, and national unity makes imperative the liquidation of our commitment in Vietnam with all possible dispatch. The people are anxious that our Government proceed to do so without temporizing, without attempting to buy still more time in reaching the hard decision on withdrawal and setting it in motion in a phased, orderly plan.

Of course, the military and diplomatic affairs of a nation cannot be conducted by a head count or a show of hands, but the understanding and support of the people are essential in a democracy. To those who are fretful about the image presented to other nations by the moratorium, I would say that our concern must not be with what others say or think of us but how we judge ourselves. Too much concentration on the image imperils the substance. In my opinion, the moratorium reflects the strength and vitality of our democratic processes and puts to rout those critics, domestic and foreign, who label us an imperialistic,

warmongering nation. The people have the right, indeed the duty, to express in lawful assembly their deeply felt convictions on the overriding issue of war and peace. As I have stated to the colleges in my area that are observing the moratorium, let the day be marked as a prayerful affirmation of our commitment to securing an end to bloodshed and a reordering of our priorities.

I have been heartened that many of the measures proposed by me to the previous and present administrations to de-escalate the violence and hasten a settlement have been put into effect, but clearly the pace of our extrication must be quickened. I again urge that the President propose a standstill cease-fire without further delay. As I wrote the President some time ago, urging new initiatives for peace, the lives of young men and innocent people cannot be used as pawns in a chess game played at leisurely pace by their elders. A mother of a 24-year-old lieutenant in Vietnam recently wrote me:

Can you in some way urge and keep after President Nixon to cease the war in Vietnam; yes, our 24 year old son is over there and as his mother I am beside myself. But as I said, we don't want riots, burning of draft cards, college unrest. Just some of the ordinary, middle class people that just want this war over with and all our boys home.

Can I or anyone else say with certainty to this anguished mother that her suffering and her son's sacrifice for an indefinite period longer while negotiations drag on interminably in Paris are worth the price?

It is difficult for elders to grant wisdom to the young, with their confidence and righteousness untempered by the vicissitudes of the years, but it may be the better part of wisdom in this agonizing period to heed the voices of the young. After all, they have the greatest stake in the future; they and their children will experience the shape of the world to come. For some 3,500 years man has been at war 9 hours out of every 10. For more than a decade out of the last 3 we ourselves have been engaged in large-scale warfare and for the rest of that period, in the cold war and in evermore costly preparations for war. Let us hope that, out of all these tragedies, culminating in Vietnam, good ultimately will emerge as the generation born in the nuclear age commits itself unequivocally to building a better society at home and an international community living in peace under law.

A BEAUTIFUL MILESTONE: 77TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Mr. and Mrs. George C. Martz, of Mayport, Pa., which is part of the area I represent, celebrated their 77th wedding anniversary on October 5. There is no other way to describe such an event than to say

CXV—1947—Part 23

they have achieved a beautiful milestone in life and perhaps in history.

Believing this anniversary to be unique, I made certain inquiries and found that this is the longest recorded marriage in the State of Pennsylvania. To add to further attainment this year, Mrs. Martz celebrated her 100th birthday on June 5 and Mr. Martz celebrated his 98th on June 25.

Since their marriage, George and Arnie Martz have lived and worked on the same farm in Mayport—a farm purchased by Mr. Martz from his father in 1892. Six of the seven children born to the Martz couple, and their families, still reside close to the family farm.

I know my colleagues join with me in extending hearty congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Martz, and in wishing them many more years of happiness.

CHROME-PLATED RACISM

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the African Affairs Subcommittee, to which I belong, recently held hearings on American policy in Rhodesia, under the guidance of its distinguished chairman, CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., of Michigan. These hearings mark the continuation of the subcommittee's important efforts to examine our country policies in Africa's crucial southern tier.

Rhodesia has become a touchstone of American policy in Africa. Under the rule of a renegade white minority, the Rhodesian Government is looking for signs of encouragement from Washington whether based on arguments of economics or politics. The Nixon administration has yet to give a clear answer to these arguments but the recent decision to return our consul general to Rhodesia is being interpreted as a sign of American acceptance of the Ian Smith regime. Whether that interpretation is correct will not be known until other, more crucial decisions are made in Washington.

One of the most critical of these is the administration's attitude on chromium imports from Rhodesia which are now under categorical sanctions imposed—with American support—by the United Nations Security Council.

Carl T. Rowan discussed the administration's hesitancy on Rhodesia in a recent column which follows. I also include a discussion on the chrome situation of Rhodesia prepared by the American Committee on Africa:

NIXON SILENCE ON RHODESIA COSTLY

(By Carl T. Rowan)

President Nixon went to the United Nations with a forlorn plea to the 126 nations represented there to pressure Hanoi into peaceful settlement of the Vietnam war.

Nixon will get no help, no sympathy, no consolation from most of these 126 nations. The reason is that, in the eyes of much of the world, whatever moral justification we once had in Vietnam is rapidly disappearing.

If the President wonders why, all he need do is look at White House policy—or lack

of policy—where the racist, outlaw regime in Rhodesia is concerned.

There has been a not-so-subtle shift of attitude in the White House from the Johnson administration to the Nixon administration, with the latter showing a lot more sympathy for the tiny white minority that has seized Rhodesia under conditions where, barring ultimate violent overthrow, that minority will forever rule and suppress the black majority.

For two months, the white House has sat on a State Department recommendation that the United States pull its consulate out of Rhodesia, but the White House has declined to do so. Thus, the U.S. consul general, Paul O'Neill, recently returned to Salisbury, an act that the ruling regime called the best possible boost to the morale of the white minority.

A U.S. that pursues this kind of policy cannot possibly have good relations with black Africa. So whatever little help the African countries might give in extricating the U.S. from a greivous dilemma in Asia is not going to be forthcoming.

A country that ignores basic principles of human worth and decency, that overlooks a brazen trampling of the rights of self-determination in Rhodesia, will never be convincing when it says it is in Vietnam only to guarantee to the South Vietnamese the right to decide their own destiny.

White Rhodesians are in the process of approving a new "constitution that will make that land an even more pernicious police state than it has been these last several years.

That constitution will make it impossible for Rhodesia's 4,800,000 Africans ever to wrest power legally from the 228,000 whites.

In theory, Africans might someday achieve "parity"—that is, an equal number of seats in parliament. But there is a neat little stipulation that this can occur only after Africans pay an equal share of income taxes.

The hooker here is that Africans now pay only about one percent of the taxes. One reason is that while the average wage for a European is about \$4,000, it is only \$400 for an African.

Not in a millenium will Africans reach the economic level where they can meet the tax qualification. Nevertheless, the Ian Smith regime has raised other qualifications for voters, an act designed to exclude thousands of blacks from elections.

Finally, the whites have put in another hooker providing that even after "parity," half the black seats in parliament would be named by the chiefs, who are mostly Uncle Tom servants of the whites, and thus under effective control of the minority regime.

Another outrage is the way the Smith regime has divided up the land. It has set aside 45 million acres for 4,800,000 Africans and 45 million acres for 228,000 whites.

The regime is now in the process of chasing Africans out of "islands" within the areas reserved for whites. The courts ruled that the Africans had the right to remain, but parliament got around this simply by passing a new law.

The new constitution extends to the government the right to censor the press and other publications, a right already exercised on radio and TV. Enshrined in the new constitution is the right of "preventive detention," without bail or speedy trial, of anyone arrested on charges of trying to overthrow the white dictatorship.

This is the kind of regime the White House can't make up its mind about—despite the existence of a United Nations resolution calling upon member states to withdraw their consulates.

The rationale coming out of the White House is that there are 1,100 Americans in Rhodesia, about 850 of whom are missionaries, and that we need a consulate to look after their interests.

We didn't even have a consulate in Southern Rhodesia until 1949 and the American

missionaries there prior to that time managed to get along fairly well.

The other argument is that we need eyes and ears in Rhodesia to send back reports on what is going on in the southern end of Africa. We could post observers 10,000 miles away and the odor wafting out of Rhodesia would make it clear what is going on.

Someone in the White House apparently scoffs at the notion that morality—racial, social, or otherwise—ought to be a big ingredient in foreign policy. They assume that you go with power, and obviously the whites in Rhodesia have the power. They say you go with strength, and obviously the economic interests who want U.S. relations with Rhodesia to continue have more strength in Washington than do the weak, divided African countries that look with so much anger and disquiet on what is happening in the southern end of their continent.

But it was precisely this disdain for the moral elements in foreign policy, it was this notion that might ultimately makes right, that got the United States in the Vietnam dilemma that becomes a tighter, stronger web around Nixon every week.

A FACT SHEET ON RHODESIA AND THE CHROME SITUATION PREPARED BY THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON AFRICA

Recent news reports indicate that certain interest groups are seeking a reversal in American policy against racism in southern Africa. They tend to focus on the fact that sanctions against Rhodesians have forced us to buy chrome from Russia at higher prices.

On the basis of material available from the Department of State, the Department of Commerce and the Department of the Interior, let us note several conditions about chrome imports.

"Chrome" (chromite or chromium ore, and ferrochrome) is one of the 12 Rhodesian products covered by the United Nations Security Council's decision of December 16, 1966, to impose selective mandatory economic sanctions against the British colony of Southern Rhodesia. U.S. restrictions on the importation of Rhodesian chromite, promulgated by a Presidential Executive Order on January 5, 1967, are but one important aspect of our compliance with the Security Council's decision. As the world's leading importer of chromite, the U.S. could not violate the sanctions on that material without damaging the Security Council's program. Such actions would be inconsistent with American obligations under the UN charter.

The major world suppliers of metallurgical grade chromite are the Soviet Union, Southern Rhodesia, Turkey, South Africa, the Philippines, Iran and Pakistan. The United States in recent years obtained the bulk of its supplies from Rhodesia, the Soviet Union, Turkey and South Africa. Although Rhodesia traditionally has been a major source of chromite, so has the Soviet Union, because of the high quality of its ore. During the last four years immediately prior to the UN sanctions against Rhodesia, we imported approximately 30% of our chromite from the Soviet Union. Our consumption of this ore is increasing and for the last two years we have been importing somewhat more than 50% from the Soviet Union.

Concerning the relative prices of Soviet and Rhodesian ore, price quotations on chromite vary according to quality. Soviet ore has traditionally brought premium prices because it is superior to ores from other sources. It has an average chromic oxide content of 54-56% and a 4-1 chrome/iron ratio, whereas Rhodesian chromite averages 48-50% chromitoxide and has only a 3-1 chrome iron ratio. Furthermore, current prices for Soviet ore—about \$48 a ton—should not be compared with those prevailing for Rhodesian ore several years ago—about \$31.35 a ton. Prices for both metallurgical chromite and ferrochrome have increased since the UN sanctions were imposed. It is impossible

to measure the impact of sanctions on prices, and it should be noted that there has been an increased world demand for chromite and ferrochrome and a general price rise for many raw materials, especially minerals. This is due to industrial growth in many countries.

There is no evidence to substantiate the allegation that the United States is purchasing Rhodesian chromite from the Soviet Union. Chromite imported from the Soviet Union, Mozambique, or South Africa is analyzed by U.S. customs officials to prevent the importation of Rhodesian chrome into the United States which may have been falsely documented. These tests have not uncovered and disguised Rhodesian chromite.

It is recognized that there would be certain benefits if the 207,000 tons of chromite currently stockpiled in Rhodesia and owned by American companies were licensed for import into the U.S. The companies contend that because this ore has been paid for, no additional benefits would accrue to Rhodesia. However, the granting of an import license for this chromite would be a visible violation of United Nations mandatory resolutions with which the U.S. is in agreement. The political benefits to the Rhodesian authorities of such an open violation of the sanctions program by the United States would be considerable. It would also have drastic repercussions in majority-ruled Africa.

U.S. Government agencies have carefully studied the U.S. chromite supply situation. These studies, which are under continuing review, indicate that while metallurgical chromite supplies to the U.S. are not abundant, there are adequate supplies available to us for several years. It is not possible to predict beyond that point because of many variables, the chief of which is that contracts for the purchase of foreign chrome generally are not made for more than a year in advance.

The criticism is sometimes made that although the United States cooperates with Britain in applying sanctions against Rhodesian products, Britain does not reciprocate by applying sanctions against Cuba and North Viet-Nam. It must be remembered that sanctions against Rhodesia are not unilaterally imposed by Britain, but are the result of actions taken by the Security Council. The trade embargo against Cuba was imposed by the Organization of American States. As a member of that organization, the United States complies with its embargo against all Cuban goods, including those manufactured or reprocessed elsewhere, such as in Britain. The British have an embargo on the export of strategic materials to both North Viet-Nam and Communist China.

Traditionally we have bought considerable quantities of chromite from Turkey and we are buying over half of their current production. If U.S. firms were willing to make long-term purchase contracts with the Turkish producers, it might be possible to obtain more chromite from that country. We understand, however, that at the present time there is insufficient incentive for Turkish producers to risk their limited capital in expanding their mining facilities. Nevertheless, Turkey provides a strategic resource for the future.

Officials of the American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI) published a paper predicting a shortage in U.S. supplies of chromite. Their prediction did not take account of the General Services Administration sales of surplus stocks of chromite (925,000 tons since 1965) and 525,000 tons of additional imports scheduled for delivery in 1969. AISI consumption figures were also understated because they did not reflect the U.S. metallurgical industry's use of South African and chemical grade chromite. Because data on the movements of chromite stocks are not complete, it is difficult to obtain a precise picture of the supply-demand situation at any given time. Nonetheless, when the above

factors are considered, the supply situation is considerably better than would appear from AISI figures.

It is often alleged that rising chrome ore prices plus U.S. adherence to sanctions have rendered the U.S. production of ferrochrome uncompetitive with foreign imports. In fact, American producers of ferrochrome were facing severe problems even before sanctions were imposed on Rhodesia. Before UDI, American ferrochrome producers were lobbying hard for import quotas.

CRAMER SUPPORTS AND SPONSORS LEGISLATION TO FURTHER STRENGTHEN FEDERAL LAWS AGAINST NARCOTIC DRUGS TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFICKING

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation which proposes to increase the penalties for the unlawful transportation of narcotic drugs by imposing a maximum sentence of life imprisonment on the nonaddicted person who transports narcotic drugs across State lines. This legislation further proposes to make it unlawful to solicit the assistance of or to use a person under the age of 18 in the unlawful trafficking of such drugs. The bill would make it a Federal offense, punishable by life imprisonment, for any adult person to solicit the assistance of, or to actually use a juvenile in an unlawful drug transaction.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot enact laws that are too stringent when dealing with the hideously unscrupulous dope peddler. There are not words derogatory enough to adequately picture this subhuman creature who coldly and calculatingly corrupt and exploits his victims, the majority of whom are caught in his life-robbing web of destruction when they are still in their youth. Assistance for the victim who becomes the helpless captive of the narcotics junkie, while humane and necessary, can only go as far as helping that one individual. Of even greater need is a direct offense against the root of the narcotic world—the pusher—for as long as he is permitted to flourish and to continue to peddle his deadly wares among the unwary, and in most instances, the young, drug addiction will remain unchecked.

For this reason, the toughest offense proposed in this legislation is aimed at the nonaddicted junkie—the mercenary leech who preys upon the innocent for his personal monetary gain, willfully corrupting and exploiting the victimized addict. The bill would prescribe a minimum of 10 years—at hard labor—and a maximum of life imprisonment in a Federal penitentiary for the nonaddicted junkie who transports hard narcotic drugs across State lines.

The bill provides that the addicted narcotics transporter be committed to a Federal hospital for therapy and cure. Such commitment would be a mandatory sentence for the addict who is convicted

under this section of the bill. A distinction is made between the two types of pushers, the addicted and the nonaddicted, in an effort to deal most harshly with the professional suppliers who, while not hooked themselves, willfully initiate and perpetuate the addiction of others.

The provision to make it a Federal offense, punishable by life imprisonment, for any adult person to solicit the assistance of, or to actually use a juvenile in an unlawful drug transaction, is most desperately needed to help protect our young people against the venomous attack of the dope peddlers. Our youth of today are being constantly exposed to drugs through channels promoted and controlled by the adult pusher, and the most effective means of removing this threat would be to remove the adult found guilty of using or attempting to use juveniles in his narcotics trade.

There is no way to speculate the exact number of drug addicts, nor is there any way to estimate the number of crimes committed by these people. But we know for certain the rate is extremely high, and it is obvious that our present laws are inadequate in meeting or conquering the problem. Our President has recommended a broad program to effectively deal with the narcotic drugs situation with cooperation between the several levels of community, State, and Federal Governments. It is my hope that the legislation I join in sponsoring today will lend assistance to the enactment of laws to further strengthen our efforts to combat the transportation and trafficking of narcotic drugs, and to protect all our decent citizens against this evil.

MORATORIUM DAY AND A YOUNG AMERICAN

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, people throughout the Nation spent October 15, moratorium day, in many different ways: by writing letters to public officials, by taking part in demonstrations, by making speeches, by taking part in marches, and by participating in many other manifestations of concern over the war in Vietnam. I thought my colleagues in the Congress would be interested in learning how an 11-year-old boy from New Jersey spent that day.

Paul Kiernan, of 62 Spring Street, Harrington Park, N.J., conducted his own private poll on Vietnam. He asked 45 people, six questions, recorded their replies and sent them to me in an effort to keep me informed of my constituents view on this vital subject.

For the benefit and information of my colleagues, I am pleased to include the questions Paul asked, and the replies he received at this point in the RECORD:

OPINION POLL CONDUCTED BY PAUL KIERNAN

1. Do you think Ho Chi Minh's death will have a substantial outcome on the war? 11 people said "yes"; 32 people said "no"; 2 people said not sure."

2. Do you think we should withdraw from Vietnam all at once or on a gradual basis? 33 said "gradual basis"; 7 said "all at once"; 5 said "not sure."

3. Do you think President Nixon is handling the war very well? 25 said "yes"; 15 said "no"; 5 said "not sure."

4. Do you think we should try continuous bombing to bring a speedy end to the war? 18 said "yes"; 25 said "no"; 2 said "not sure."

5. Are you in favor of today's Moratorium? 30 said "yes"; 15 said "no"; 0 said "not sure."

6. Are you in favor of further Moratoriums? 20 said "yes"; 19 said "no"; 6 said "not sure."

OIL IMPORT CONTROLS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared on the subject of oil import controls:

OIL IMPORT CONTROLS: WHO NEEDS THEM?—A FRANK DISCUSSION

(NOTE.—In the past decade, federal government studies made under three Presidential administrations have stated that limiting the import into the U.S. of foreign oil is essential to national security. A recent study by the Interior Department again confirms the national security need for controls. Nevertheless, the mandatory oil import control program, established in 1959, is once again under study . . . and under attack.

(The following interview with George V. Myers, executive vice president, presents our views on oil imports and the control program as applied to the Eastern two-thirds of the United States, which comprises Districts I-IV. Oil import controls for District V—the West Coast, Alaska, and Hawaii—are applied on a somewhat different basis.)

Question. Why is an oil import control program necessary?

Answer. For national security, both economic and military. An assured supply of domestic petroleum energy in times of emergency is essential. This has been proven dramatically by two Middle East conflicts in the last 12 years. The need is fully supported also by federal government studies.

As to the broader economic aspects of national security, oil and natural gas supply 75 per cent of our nation's energy needs. Oil alone provides 44 per cent. Petroleum will be the major energy source for years to come.

There is no ready substitute for petroleum. Synthetic liquid fuels from coal or oil shale do not exist in commercial quantities, and will not for years.

The only way to assure firm supplies of vitally needed oil is to provide adequate incentives to producers to find and develop new U.S. reserves continuously. Import controls help achieve this, by insuring a market for U.S. production at reasonable prices.

Question. What proof is there that a strong domestic producing industry is essential to national security?

Answer. Following the 1967 Arab-Israeli war, oil shipments from parts of the Middle East to certain countries of Western Europe and to the U.S. were suspended. Domestic reserve producing capacity was available due in large part to the import control program. Domestic producers were able to meet resulting needs of the U.S. and much of Western Europe. Without a strong U.S. oil industry, we would have faced much graver problems.

Question. What would happen if import restrictions were removed?

Answer. Imports would grow rapidly in volume, because overseas oil costs at least \$1.25 a barrel less than domestic crude, delivered on the U.S. East Coast. Domestic production therefore would decline, and domestic exploration would eventually cease. It is very doubtful that exploratory programs in remote areas such as the North Slope of Alaska would be undertaken without import controls. An accelerated reduction in the nation's reserves would follow.

Question. How would increasing imports affect domestic natural gas supplies?

Answer. Natural gas associated with oil production accounts for about 25 per cent of the total in this country. Increases in natural gas reserves and natural gas deliverability are not now keeping up with increases in demand. Increasing imports would result in cuts in exploratory efforts and would make this bad situation worse.

Question. Why can't we shut in much of our U.S. production, import cheap foreign oil, and then produce the domestic shut-in production in times of emergency?

Answer. You can't shut off oil production and then suddenly turn it on to meet emergencies. Wells, pumps, treating and measuring facilities, pipelines, and a host of other supporting activities must continue full time to keep oil production going. Shutting in these facilities for any prolonged period would mean permanent loss of many of them. Others would require months of time and very substantial expense to start up after prolonged shutdown. There is also the obvious problem of widespread loss of employment for thousands of highly-skilled personnel in any prolonged shut-down of production, and the nearly impossible task of recalling such men and women if an emergency required it. In short, a dynamic oil industry is essential to national security, and such an industry needs continuing adequate economic incentives.

Question. What general philosophy does Standard favor for allowing foreign oil to come into the United States?

Answer. We should accept limited overseas oil imports because dispersal of petroleum reserves is worldwide, with strategic value for us and friendly nations. However, overseas oil should only supplement, and should not supplant domestic production. Canadian oil offers a high degree of security, and must be given priority.

Question. Import controls have been attacked because the program forces American consumers to pay more for their oil. Can you comment on this?

Answer. The assumed cost savings from heavy foreign imports would be more than offset by the losses. Unrestricted imports would cause a cut of U.S. oil prices, resulting in an estimated overall gross reduction in cost to consumers of about \$3 billion a year. But offsetting this would be a loss of federal, state, and local tax and other revenues from the domestic industry of about \$2.3 billion a year. It is quite probable that this government revenue loss would be made up through substantial increases in federal, state, and local excise taxes on products such as gasoline.

Furthermore, if domestic production were substantially displaced by overseas production, a severe economic setback could be predicted for U.S. oil-producing regions, because U.S. exploration and production activity would ultimately virtually stop. Further, refining and chemical operations would shift out of the U.S., at the insistence of foreign producing nations. Overall the loss of at least 100,000 jobs could be expected. Heavy dependence on foreign oil would eventually lead foreign producing nations to raise their prices, a move our country would be relatively helpless to resist.

Overall, it is quite probable that in the

long run the removal of crude oil import restrictions would result in a net increase in cost of petroleum products to consumers.

There would also be a substantial flow of money out of the U.S. to foreign oil-producing nations, resulting in damage to the U.S. balance of payments.

The most important loss would be national military and economic security. It is impossible to put a price tag on that.

Question. Do you think the present import control program should be changed?

Answer. Yes. The original Presidential proclamation called for a "fair and equitable" distribution of the low-cost imported oil among domestic refiners. However, this requirement has been ignored since the very outset of the program, in several ways.

One is the historical guarantee. It gives unfairly large import quotas to a select few refiners. These special quotas were based on imports by these refiners prior to the establishment of the import control program and presumably were in recognition of early investments in overseas producing properties. It is most doubtful that this special treatment was ever warranted; assuming that it was, the refiners in the historical group have been more than adequately compensated for their early investments by having received special benefits for over ten years. This feature should be abolished.

Question. What other changes do you recommend?

Answer. The sliding-scale formula should be eliminated. This formula is used to divide imported oil, remaining after the historical and other special allocations have been deducted, among refiners. The sliding-scale feature was designed as government aid to small refining companies, but it creates inequities by penalizing refiners as they increase in size. During the current period, in the part of the country east of the Rocky Mountains, the smallest refiners receive foreign crude allocations equal to 19.5 per cent of their refinery throughput while the largest refiners are limited to allocations of less than 4 per cent.

Also, the sliding scale gives unfair competitive advantages not only to small, independent oil refiners, but to refineries owned by the largest chemical companies. If economic aid to "small" refiners is required, it should be accomplished by some means other than the oil import program.

Question. What about special allocations to certain companies to import products from their refineries in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands into the U.S.?

Answer. These are unfair exceptions granted to a few companies. There are four grants of at least 10 years duration that total 80,000 barrels a day. An additional 38,000 barrels a day is provided as a special historical grant that comes in completely free of allocation control. No other refiners receive such special guarantees, and low-cost oil that otherwise would be shared by all is unfairly diverted to these few.

Question. Chemical companies have special privileges, too, don't they?

Answer. Yes. Chemical companies complained that they faced a shortage of low-cost domestic feedstocks for their plants. They claimed this would impair their ability to compete for both foreign and domestic markets, thus reducing their favorable contribution to the nation's balance of trade.

But the facts are that chemical companies already receive the benefit of lower-cost feedstocks, since a portion of their raw materials is made with foreign oil. Further, they already have access to a wide range of domestic feedstocks at prices competitive with, or lower than, foreign raw materials.

Import licenses awarded to chemical companies since 1966 have rarely been used by them to import foreign feedstocks, which

was the avowed purpose of granting them in the first place. Instead, they are traded for domestic raw materials such as refinery and natural gas liquids. The chemical companies realize a substantial and unwarranted monetary gain as a result of their exchanges.

Chemical companies now receive almost 90,000 barrels a day of quota, or more than 11 per cent of their input, compared with an average of about 5 per cent for all refiners under the sliding-scale formula, and only 3.8 per cent for our company. Chemical companies continue to press for a 100 per cent port quota. This would mean that their imports would be 770,000 barrels a day—or about 67 per cent of total controlled imports into the Eastern U.S. This would destroy the program.

Question. The Machiasport, Me., foreign trade zone proposal has received much debate. Could you explain it?

Answer. Foreign trade zones were designed to stimulate foreign trade by setting aside certain U.S. locations where foreign materials could be processed in U.S. plants and the resulting products exported from the U.S. They were not meant to be the means of avoiding oil import control. So long as petroleum products from a foreign trade zone are used in the foreign export market, the trade zone concept is acceptable to Standard Oil. We are only opposed to its misuse.

In the Machiasport scheme, a proposed foreign trade zone refinery would be allowed to ship products into the U.S. customs territory in volumes far in excess of permissible imports for other refiners. Apart from the inequity of special treatment for one refiner, the greatest danger is that this is bringing a proliferation of similar proposals. This scheme typifies the continual pressure of preferred treatment under the import program.

Question. Are there inequities associated with Canadian crude-oil imports?

Answer. Imports of Canadian oil are being managed today in a most irregular manner.

According to the 1967 control arrangement of the Canadian and U.S. governments, only recently made public, refiners in Chicago are not allowed to import any Canadian crude oil this year, even though Chicago and the upper Midwest are ideally located and have demand for Canadian crude oil.

A North American energy policy, for the benefit of both Canada and the U.S., should be developed under such a policy until the time that U.S. demand exceeds domestic producing capacity, allowing for appropriate reserve producing capacity, imports of Canadian and overseas oil should grow at rates equal to U.S. demand growth. After U.S. demand exceeds producing capacity, less the reserve capacity, overseas oil imports should continue to grow at the demand rate. Canadian oil will supply the difference between U.S. demand, and supply to the U.S. from domestic and overseas production.

Question. How should this rising volume of Canadian oil be allocated?

Answer. We believe Canadian oil should be allocated to refiners who wish to process this oil in direct proportion to their refining input.

Question. What solutions does Standard Oil propose, to make the import control program effective and fair?

Answer. The following points should be the criteria of any revised plan:

1. It must enhance national security.
2. It must be equitable for all.
3. It must be simple to administer.

The current over-all volume of controlled imports into the Eastern two-thirds of the U.S. seems about right—namely, 12.2 per cent of domestic production.

Inequities in the present program should be corrected. Allowable imports should be allocated to refiners of crude oil in direct proportion to refinery input. This would

place the benefits of low-cost foreign crude in the hands of those organizations which are the customers and supporters of the domestic producing industry.

Specifically, we urge elimination of the historical allocation, the sliding-scale formula, and special allocations for chemical companies and island refiners. Trade-zone refineries should not be used to circumvent the program.

An equitable program will insure our national security and be fair to all concerned, whether producers, refiners, marketers, or consumers.

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, during this week of October 19 to 25, it gives me great pleasure to salute the achievements of all business and professional women, during this the observance of National Business Women's Week.

This annual observance sponsored by the members of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., affords us opportunity to take special notice of the tremendous advances of American working women over the last 50 years. During these years, the working women of America have made tremendous strides in almost every field of human endeavor, education, science, communications, human relations, and government. In their effort, they have helped by their example to cast aside ancient prejudices while endeavoring to lay a foundation for even greater achievements in the years ahead. The challenges met and the changes made by working women in the past several decades are just a beginning to the advances that must be made. Certainly, the women of America have a unique responsibility to guide our country through these perilous times. We must direct new found horizons and advances to the cause of peace, justice, and equality in our world.

The individual talents of the many women of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs can be used most effectively in their communities to make a better America and a better world. Never before have women been confronted with so great a challenge to which they must respond. Certainly, if we are to fill the needs of a nation dedicated to individual freedom and fulfillment of its people, we must be leaders in our own business and professions as we pursue the causes of peace and justice.

As a Member of Congress, a lawyer, and a member of the Business and Professional Women's Clubs, I have for many years attempted to further the rights of all women. In particular, I have tried to correct some of the inequities now existent in law which discriminate against the working woman and it is my hope that this legislation will obtain necessary support for early passage and a better place in our society for all women.

CAN SST'S COOK THE EARTH?

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Chicago Today recently carried an editorial which deserves the highest consideration and widest dissemination possible.

For many years I have stated that we should not proceed with the development of a supersonic transport system until it could be determined what the effects would be on our citizens and the flora and fauna of the United States. Now the prestigious National Academy of Sciences has estimated that a fleet of 400 SST's flying an average of four flights a day would inundate the stratosphere with 150,000 tons of water vapor daily, which would be trapped and remain for years. Atmospheric scientists say this would wrap the earth in a "semipermanent" cloud cover that would turn it into one big, hot greenhouse.

We will not only have to contend with deafening noise, but also the possibility of being slowly cooked by ultraviolet rays.

At a time when we are stagnating in our own pollution from many sources, it is my hope that this Government will thoroughly investigate the effects of the SST before engaging on a costly program that could produce inestimable damage throughout this country and the world. I strongly commend the Chicago Today editorial to my colleagues:

[From Chicago Today, Oct. 3, 1969]

CAN SST'S COOK THE EARTH?

In addition to its more obvious dangers—such as the capacity to deafen people below—the supersonic jet air liner may work destruction on nature itself. This grim possibility has been raised by scientists who believe the SST's vapor trails could wrap the earth in a "semi-permanent" cloud cover that would turn it into one big, hot greenhouse.

The scientists, working in atmospheric research centers at Albany, N.Y., and Boulder, Colo., say it could happen the same way a car's interior heats up in the sun with the windows rolled up. Ultra-violet rays from the sun penetrate the roof and are absorbed by the seats, which bounce back the heat as infra-red rays which cannot penetrate the roof to get back out. The same goes for a cloud-shrouded earth—ultra-violet rays would be admitted and heat would bounce off earth as infra-red rays that can't get back out.

The National Academy of Sciences has estimated that 400 SST's making an average of 4 flights a day would load up the stratosphere with 150,000 tons of water vapor daily. Once trapped where there are no vertical drafts to move it, the vapor will remain for years, just as the volcanic dust from Krakatoa stayed around and colored sunsets for 25 years.

So it's conceivable that the SST could not only make us deaf but medium rare as well. It's appalling to think about, and we wish the SST planners would begin thinking about it too. But the atmospheric scientists say they haven't even been consulted by engineers working on the SST. They aren't getting any government money for their research, either, altho the SST will be amply funded from that source.

The cloud-cover hypothesis has not been proved, the researchers point out. But Alfred Hulstrunk of the Atmospheric Research center in Albany sums it up: "Technology is just

going ahead, assuming nothing will happen. But we really can't afford a wait-and-see attitude on this kind of a problem."

We certainly can't. This subject should be explored thoroughly before another move is made in the SST development. The public should set up a loud and insistent clamor on the subject, and should do it soon—before the sonic boom drowns out any sound of sanity.

OMAHA COUPLE CELEBRATES 70TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in these days of moratoriums and the like, it is certainly refreshing to read of a couple like Herman and Myrtle Wulff of Omaha.

The Wulffs last week celebrated their 70th wedding anniversary. She is 94 and her husband 95. They have had a wonderful life together.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the following story on this couple which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald:

THEY SAID "I DO" AND THEY HAVE FOR 70 YEARS

(By Elizabeth Flynn)

On Oct. 18, 1899, Herman Wulff and Myrtle Blaco were married in the house in Blair, Neb., where they were to live as newlyweds for two years before moving to Omaha in 1901.

On Friday, a day ahead of their 70th anniversary, Mr. and Mrs. Wulff will be feted at a reception from 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. for family, friends and fellow residents of the Eppley Care Complex, the couple's home since last July.

There'll be a three-tiered cake and coffee and entertainer Jack Evans will be on hand to sing at the party.

Earlier in the week, presents already were arriving, including a package from Mrs. Wulff's circle at Benson Presbyterian Church and two perfect roses from a friend's garden.

Looking almost as fresh and certainly as pretty as the posies was their recipient.

Mrs. Wulff, who'll be 94 in November, was wearing a red wool suit with blush-pink blouse, pearl necklace and earrings—and a bright gleam in her eyes.

She talked with animation of her seven decades of married life.

Mr. Wulff, 95, who is hard of hearing, interjected a comment from time to time prompted by Kenneth Chapman, the couple's son-in-law and devoted admirer.

The late Mrs. Chapman was the Wulffs' daughter, Dorothy.

After her death in 1949, the Wulffs combined households with Mr. Chapman and the little granddaughters and sent them through Benson High School and the University of Omaha.

One is now Mrs. Thomas Morrow of Kalamazoo, Mich. The other is Mrs. Dennis Huffman of Claremont, Calif.

And the Wulffs have five great-grandchildren.

PLOUGHED WITH OXEN

Both Mr. and Mrs. Wulff are natives of Nebraska's Washington County, where Mr. Wulff's parents, German immigrants, homesteaded and ploughed the land with oxen.

Mrs. Wulff's English-born father, Richard Blaco, was a farmer and stock raiser and a member of the first Nebraska Legislature.

Appropriately, the couple met in a grocery

store at Kennard, Neb., where young Herman Wulff was working.

He's been in the grocery business ever since, owning a store for many years at Sixty-first Street and Military Avenue and later working as grocery manager for the Farmers' Union.

When the Wulffs moved to Benson, the village consisted of a post office, a barber shop and a hotel where they lived until they could build their own home—the first of four they eventually owned on Linn Avenue (now Sixtieth Avenue).

"There weren't any electric lights or any telephones," Mrs. Wulff reminisces ruefully.

"In our store, we sold everything from kegs of nails to toothpicks. I kept the books. Mornings, we'd go around to pick up grocery orders; in the afternoons we'd deliver 'em. My, was I glad when we finally got a phone!

"For the farmers, we'd stay open Saturdays till midnight, Sundays we were open till afternoon, when we went to the baseball game."

Both Wulffs are ardent baseball fans. Mr. Wulff never enjoyed dancing; his wife did—and still does.

Mr. Wulff is a Mason and Shriner and belongs to the Scottish Rite and Knights Templar.

Mrs. Wulff proudly wears a 50-year pin from Narcissus Chapter, Order of the Eastern Star.

"YOU JUST DID"

Inevitably, the couple was questioned: "How have you managed to keep your marriage going for 70 years—nearly three-quarters of a century?"

Mrs. Wulff's warm, gentle voice became firm.

"In those days, when you said 'I do,' you just did!"

Mr. Wulff's reply was enigmatic when the question was put to him in a note written by his son-in-law. He read it, leaned back and laughed loudly.

"Seventy years!" he chortled. "That's a long time!"

THE HONORABLE AND RESPECTED JOHN W. McCORMACK, SPEAKER OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would not have the temerity to stand here to defend the honor of our beloved Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, for it unquestionably needs no defending nor can it ever be challenged—even by the artists of insinuation. But I can, indeed must, join with my distinguished colleagues in saluting the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. I can honestly say that I have never met a finer man. Integrity, loyalty, devotion to God, family, and country are words that today fall harshly on ears attuned to a different drum, but they are words expressing the ideals upon which this country was built and upon which it shall continue to prosper. And they are words, too, that describe our Speaker. I feel that the country, the House of Representatives, and the Democratic Party have been singularly blessed to have a leader such as JOHN McCORMACK. He is that rare and oft-sought man—a strong leader with conscience,

a man of power with great compassion. He has been an inspiration to us all and I know that I speak for every Member of the House of Representatives when I say that we have complete and utter confidence and faith in his judgments. The House of Representatives and the Nation are grateful to JOHN McCORMACK, a truly devoted man.

AID-TO-THE-ENEMY DAY

HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am pleased to insert the following editorial which appeared in the New York Daily News of Wednesday, October 15, 1969, in support of President Nixon's efforts to bring the war in Vietnam to an honorable conclusion:

AID-TO-THE-ENEMY DAY

Organizers of the manifold demonstrations set for today against further U.S. participation in the Vietnam war lump them under the title Vietnam Moratorium Day.

We have a better name for it. We call it Aid-to-the-Enemy Day.

Our name for it derives from the fact that the enemy is loudly applauding these demonstrations.

Mrs. Nguyen Thi Binh, head of Red North Vietnam's delegation at the Paris peace talks, says it's all too, too wonderful, and sends her "most friendly salutations" to the demonstrators.

Hanoi Hannah, an English-speaking witch, and we don't mean witch, who broadcasts Red propaganda to U.S. troops in South Vietnam, opines that President Richard M. Nixon "is going to get his first taste of the kind of massive anti-Vietnam war demonstration that drove his predecessor into political oblivion."

We hope the prominent Americans who have expressed sympathy for Moratorium Day are happy about the company they are keeping. Some of these Americans are Mayor Lindsay, Sens. Javits and Goodell, W. Averell Harriman, and more than a few "liberal" columnists and TV-radio commentators.

The treacherous nationwide jamboree got its start in the brain of a Harvard Divinity School dropout.

It has been snapped up, amplified and financed by Kooks, Reds, Dupes and a few idealists, and overpublicized by various news media, so that today may witness a lot of U.S. mob convulsions which will greatly encourage the enemy.

THEY HOPE TO WRECK NIXON

The situation is complicated by the fact that many of President Nixon's political enemies see in the anti-Viet war agitation a hope of ruining him as an effective chief executive now and as a possible candidate for reelection in 1972.

Such opportunists are to be found in both parties.

Up to now, the President has declined to be swayed by this mounting mob hysteria against him and the war. We hope most earnestly that he will stand pat on that, come what may.

If he does not—if this movement succeeds in losing the war for the United States and its South Vietnamese and other allies, the consequences can only be disastrous.

For one, South Vietnam will be overrun by bloodthirsty Communists bent on

slaughtering every South Vietnamese who fought for or sympathized with our side.

For another, world communism will have won a smashing victory over Americanism and liberty.

And this victory will have been achieved by mobs, in a contest against the elected government of the U.S.A.

What should patriotic Americans do today, and in the later antiwar demonstrations plotted by these same helpers of our Red enemies?

The Committee for Responsible Patriotism has one suggestion which we think is excellent; namely, run your car with its lights on today if you have a car, and fly the American flag if you can—to register sympathy for the U.S. war effort and contempt for those who would sabotage it.

MESSAGES TO THE PRESIDENT

Or why not send a postcard to Hon. Richard M. Nixon, the White House, Washington, D.C. 20006, and tell him in your own words that you deplore these efforts to bring defeat on the United States and support his persistent work for an honorable peace?

Or you might just send the President an immortal saying by a great American named Stephen Decatur: "Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong."

We feel sure the President will be glad to hear from you—the more of you the better.

CHICAGO DEMONSTRATION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, approximately 10 days ago, elements of the SDS ran amok in Chicago in a performance that was truly shocking.

A very sound and necessarily spirited commentary on the radical left rampage in Chicago was carried in the Thursday, October 16 Suburban Life of La Grange, Ill., which I insert into the RECORD at this point:

A PIG'S A PIG FOR A' THAT

They came, they saw, they disrupted and they blew the whole bit. Instead of furthering their cause, whatever that is, the Weatherman faction of the Students for a Democratic Society wreaked damages in the thousands and gave more thousands of innocent college students a black image by their rampage in Chicago.

This "intelligentsia" was nothing more than a mob of hoodlums who smashed windows in apartment buildings and stores and damaged hundreds of cars. They came looking for trouble, carrying clubs and chains and wearing helmets. Make no mistake about it; this was planned anarchy.

Yes, they came looking for trouble and were prepared to start trouble. "Let's get the pigs," was the cry. "Let's show this world that it's about to be taken over by us. You people can't do the job. We're your salvation."

Those were the rallying cries, in effect, that the leaders of these punks put forth. They had no intention of peaceful protests against the Vietnam war or whatever else they had in mind, real or imagined.

Is the way to salvation of the world's problems to be found in smashing windows, hurling rocks, wrecking parked cars, taunting policemen, all in the so-called name of freedom and brotherhood? Is love of man tattooed on the end of a club?

And then when they get busted by the police they cry "police brutality." How ridiculous can they be? They come to town prepared to do battle, start the trouble themselves and then bawl like little kids when they're stopped from doing what they shouldn't have been doing in the first place. They claim to be adults, but they're nothing but spoiled children. Their infancy is appalling.

While their childishness somehow can be forgiven the cost of the vandalism cannot. Who gives these wet behind the ears punks the right to roam up and down the streets busting up the works?

If they're going to use the word "pig" they had best look to themselves. If they're so familiar with the species they should recognize it in themselves.

If anything good came out of the SDS rampage it is that decent students throughout the nation will recognize the organization for what it is and will avoid it like a plague.

The Weathermen put forth their bellwether; they are a bunch of clowns.

A MIND-SPINNING TRIP CHANGED OUR DESTINY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we begin to assess the needs in our national space program in the next decade it is well to examine in retrospect contributions of our national space program to date. Perhaps the most outstanding achievement in the last decade in space has been the Apollo 11 lunar landing. A Washington Post staff writer, Thomas O'Toole, in a Sunday, July 27, article, did much to capture the importance of this great first in history. As his words recapture this great moment of the lunar landing, it is important to look to the future and make decisions as to our will and desire not only to be first in space but first in the application of space to our needs here on earth. I commend the reading of this article to my colleagues and the public.

The article follows:

A MIND-SPINNING TRIP CHANGED OUR DESTINY

HOUSTON.—There it lay, barren, beautiful and untouched for more than 4 billion years, while man worked his way out of the caves—all the time looking up at his neighbor 250,000 miles across empty spaces, wondering what it was and dreaming how he might get there to find out.

When the time came for man to fulfill his dream, his own planet was in a turmoil that came close at times to a living nightmare. But the irony was forgotten when the moment came for man to change his destiny, the moment when two men out of all the world's millions descended in a four-legged machine named Eagle to a bleak plain in the moon's Sea of Tranquility.

With the whole world holding its breath, Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldren came down out of the black and airless void, the orange flame of their machine's braking engine bathing the lunar surface in an eerie glow. "Kicking up some dust," said Armstrong. "See some faint shadows . . . Drifting to the right a little . . . Contact light . . . O.K., engine stop."

There was a pause, a brief stoppage of hearts that seemed forever. "We copy you

down, Eagle," said a young North Carolinian named Charlie Duke from Houston's Manned Spacecraft Center.

"Houston, Tranquillity Base here," replied Neil Armstrong at 4:17 p.m. EDT July 20, 1969. "The Eagle has landed."

WHERE WERE YOU?

It immediately reminded people of remarks made in the past when something happened to change our lives: "Well, I made it . . ." "Watson, come here, I want you . . ." "What hath God wrought?"

What had been wrought this time? When men began to ponder it, they found they couldn't. Now that it had happened, it was something that made minds spin. Man on the moon . . . It sounded at once so simple and so absurd that it became a useless exercise to relate the event to anything on earth.

It was a little bit like the day Pearl Harbor was attacked or the day the war ended in Europe or the day darkness came to the Northeastern United States in the middle of rush-hour traffic.

Where were you when the lights went out? Where were you when two men landed on the moon? Almost no answer would ever make sense. "I was brushing my teeth." "Drinking." "Kissing my girl." "Having dinner with friends." "Fighting with my wife."

If the landing put people in shock, what took place almost seven hours later was even more boggling to the mind.

Wearing a cumbersome white pressure suit and a bulky backpack that rose over his shoulders, Neil Armstrong backed out of the Eagle's open hatch and down a 10½-foot ladder. He reached out to pull a lanyard and a television camera came out, aimed squarely at the ladder and at Armstrong coming down.

"Man," said Duke, a quarter of a million miles away. "We're getting a picture on the TV."

Suddenly, there Armstrong was, on television screens the world over, backing down the ladder like some surrealist image to the moon's surface. The first man on the moon was about to take his first steps on the moon and the whole world was watching him do it.

Clear and stark in sharp blacks and whites, the picture of a craggy moon, a landing machine and a man in the foreground was eerie in its beauty, incredible in what it all meant.

"It looks like a Kline painting," said Norman Mailer, who came to Houston to write about what he felt it meant for Life magazine. It *did* look like a painting by the late abstract expressionist Franz Kline, who worked with broad and bold sweeps of black and white, until you suddenly realized that the man in the picture was moving.

Armstrong reached out his left foot. "I'm going to step off the Lem now," he said—and did it.

"That's one small step for man," Armstrong declared. "One giant step for mankind."

A QUICK ADJUSTMENT

Just how big a step only time will tell, but one thing was certain even as Armstrong moved out of range of the television camera, looking like some apocalyptic vision in his white space suit and fishbowl helmet: man had forever changed his destiny. In some small respects, Armstrong's first steps on the moon were like the first steps man took on

his own planet after he'd crawled up out of the sea 2 million years ago.

Just 15 minutes after Armstrong had come down the ladder, Aldrin joined him. Moving rapidly about in the airless, one-sixth gravity, both men quickly adjusted to their surroundings and at times behaved like small boys at a summer picnic.

"Notice how you can pick up the rocks," Armstrong said. "Yeah, they bounce and then . . . Boy, you can really throw things far out here, can't you? And Neil, didn't I say we might see some purple rocks? They're small and sparkly."

Growing more serious, as if they remembered why they were there, Armstrong and Aldrin unveiled the plaque they had carried with them from earth, the plaque that said: "We came in peace for all mankind."

With that, the two men planted an American flag.

While you knew it was happening, you couldn't quite believe it. A woman watching Armstrong's first steps around the landing craft, listening to his first words, said later she had no idea of time or even where she was. "I didn't know whether the children were up," she said, "in bed or racing around in the back yard."

Both men climbed back into their landing craft at about 1 a.m. "Adios amigos," said Aldrin as he climbed the ladder.

History had been made, though not easily.

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE MORATORIUM DAY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 19, 1969, there appeared an editorial in the Dallas Times Herald written by my good friend Felix McKnight which should be read by every Member of this body. It is food for thought and perhaps some people in this country should partake of it:

MEMO TO HANOI: DON'T BE MISLED

(By Felix R. McKnight)

Lest Hanoi get the twisted idea that this entire country took its eye off the ball on Wednesday and danced in the streets, 200 million strong, there should be another message sent its way.

It is the inalienable right, the privilege, of free people to go their unfettered way, to voice opinions on "Moratorium Day"—something not even the McCarthys, the McGoverns, the Kennedys or the Yarboroughs could imagine on the streets of Hanoi.

It is also cricket, in American streets and on campus, to disagree with the president of the United States. No heads are chopped for such license.

But it should be signaled to North Vietnam and its sickening foot draggers in Paris that a few other things also were happening in the United States on Wednesday.

Ninety-nine per cent of the citizenry—which also loathes war but prefers to get out of Vietnam the valid, thoughtful way proposed by the President—very normally went about their daily chores and responsibilities.

Babies were born in ten thousand places—hopefully into a better world.

Ten million students did not drop out of classes and go barefoot and unshaven to "peace meetings" marked with upsidown American flags.

The magical Mets pounced on Baltimore—after 55,000 tyranny-free fans thundered out "The Star Spangled Banner" in their beloved Shea Stadium.

Fifty thousand automobiles—and washing machines, refrigerators, food, medical remedies, clothing—came off assembly lines and started to the people.

People thronged clothing, food and drug stores to buy their necessities—with money they earned in a land with its lowest unemployment level of history.

Men who learned their skills in the open universities of this land transplanted hearts and kidneys.

The sensitive hands of surgeons saved human lives on a thousand operating tables.

Men and women did not glance up from microscopes and lab work as the quest for cures to cancer and other killers went on and on. Not cures for Americans—but for all mankind, including the Viet Cong.

Men and women of government, from village to Washington level, stayed with their jobs to assure equal job opportunities, housing and justice for all citizens.

On corner lots, in city parks and playgrounds, a half-million kids—black and white—played PeeWee football, tackled hard and wound up shaking hands.

In ten thousand places men built airports, hospitals, schools, homes and industries—and stayed on the job.

In cathedral, church and synagogue men and women who seek the true peace gave silent prayer for the safe return of battlefield warriors—and the end of war's evils.

In the Congress men dissented—but all held to the indestructible thread of freedom, of dedication to the purpose of this country. Some drifted into the valleys of partisanship, others to the peaks of statesmanship. But none, Hanoi, would sell out on your terms.

No, Hanoi didn't get confused about the status of the United States of America.

Wednesday wasn't "a day off" in the national life. It might have seemed so to you from reading and hearing the chant of a few self-appointed "saviours" among the New Left politicians and commentators.

A fractional few protested in our streets against a President who worked for peace even as they jeered. No one was shot.

Recall, Hanoi—and the restless sideline coaches of this nation—that on another day, a year ago, an enlightened Communist took his people to the streets in protest. Protest blunted by tanks and guns.

Dubcek of Czechoslovakia today is stripped of his right to do anything. The protest of his people has been muted.

In this free, enlightened land there can be protest. There was on Wednesday.

But it will not derailed the orderly, honorable withdrawal—and eventual peace we all seek.

SENATE—Wednesday, October 22, 1969

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

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

Eternal Father, Lord of men and nations, on this national day of prayer,

teach us how to pray, when to pray, what to pray, and to whom to pray that the life of prayer may be the way of life in this good land. Make us mindful of our godly heritage. Restore in us the faith of our fathers that we may trust not in our own strength but in the wisdom and light which comes from Thee.

O Lord, chasten and correct us where-

in we are wrong. Confirm and strengthen us wherein we are right. Save us from violence and discord, from distrust of one another and from disobedience of divine law. Unite us in heart and mind and action that we may be one people whose might is in the right and whose strength is in Thee.

We pray now for the President and his